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1. How can the linkage between the various strategies and policies related to regeneration be improved?

There was a general consensus in response to this question that the wide range of policy documents and strategies that are linked to regeneration could be joined-up more effectively.

COSLA suggested that: “Adopting a holistic approach to regeneration provides the best opportunity to link regeneration to other strategies and policies and the holistic nature of regeneration is also emphasised within the Regeneration Strategy itself. There are a variety of other strategies and policies which have linkages to regeneration. For instance the Agenda for Cities, NPF3, Infrastructure Investment Plan, Enterprise Areas, Community Planning, and the Community Empowerment and Renewal Bill among others have links to regeneration.”

Angus Council proposed aligning “regeneration activities strategically with partnership efforts at the local level through the development and delivery of the Community Plan and Single Outcome Agreement.” They went on to comment that “the approach to mainstreaming regeneration activities with the demise of a dedicated resource, latterly Fairer Scotland funding, has worked in some areas but not in others. Additionally, we know that a number of strategies and policies contribute towards regeneration activities, but this is not necessarily attributable to a focus only on regeneration eg the development of affordable housing or through the provision of new schools.”

Inverclyde Council focused on outcomes, stating that: “A key element of any proposal in developing a strategic Framework is the intention to strengthen the commitment to an outcomes-focused approach to the operational activity. The focus of this approach will be on improving the quality, quantity and sustainability of outcomes achieved by placing results ahead of process; drawing on a sound empirical base; responding to the evidenced priority needs of the community; and improving the co-ordination and integration of public services in order to achieve shared outcomes.”

South Lanarkshire Council highlighted the new EU Structural funds programme for 2014-2020, which “will allow the Scottish Government to define priorities and areas of need. If programmes such as these are developed increasingly looking at areas of opportunity then there is the potential for regeneration projects and jobs to move to relatively wealthy and successful areas. It is fundamental that links are made to need on economic, health and employment grounds and that the opportunities and funding for growth be connected to these areas.”

Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE) noted “strong, clear linkages” between the Government Economic Strategy and the Regeneration Strategy. But it stated that the Regeneration Strategy “has less of a profile and as such perhaps has less of an impact on influencing policy development that might
otherwise be the case.” To improve this, HIE suggests that creation of “a schematic which identifies and shows the relationships between the various regeneration strategies and policies could be developed. Presentation in this form would illuminate, in a way that could be easily shared, any overlaps and inter-relationships, together with how those are linked back to the direction given by the Government Economic Strategy (GES). It could also be beneficial to enable enhanced networking and multi agency objective setting, decreasing duplication and increasing effectiveness.”

Strathclyde Partnership for Transport (SPT) explained its own partnering arrangements: “SPT works closely with its twelve west of Scotland partner Councils across a number of fronts. We agree a prioritised three-year capital and revenue programme but with a ten-year horizon based on the approved Regional Transport Strategy for the west of Scotland. In addition, SPT works in partnership with each of its partner Councils in the development and implementation of their respective Local Development Plans and with the Glasgow & Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan Team in rolling out its plan.”

The Carnegie UK Trust highlighted the Government’s outcomes-based approach and warned of the danger of focusing on regeneration in isolation: “We would suggest that regeneration strategies are more explicitly linked to improving the wellbeing of citizens in Scotland, and are clearly linked to the National Performance Framework. … We see this as part of a wider movement towards understanding, measuring and improving the wellbeing of individuals and communities. Taking a system-wide approach to the overall impact of government activity can encourage joined up working and help services consider their unintended impacts, as well as those that they proactively seek, including regeneration.”

Development Trusts Association Scotland (DTAS) also commented on past regeneration activity: “there was much wrong with previous regeneration programmes. … As an approach it was pre-disposed to destruction, with a focus on ‘clearing the decks’, both physically and socially. It was characterised by silos – divisions of theme, ownership and tenure, and by the chasm between physical and social professionals. Regeneration programmes systematically failed to understand or value ‘the genius of place’ or the holistic nature of people’s real lives. Instead people were caricatured as blocks of statistical need, requiring dilution or displacement. The human timeframes of right now and generational lifespans were ignored, in favour of electoral and profit-making timescales which mitigated against longevity and sustainability.”

Community Land Scotland highlighted the role of both the public and private sectors in regeneration, although it acknowledged that “regeneration strategy has its most important place where the private markets have or are failing to deliver.” In terms of links between the strategies, they stated that: “It would seem clear that, looking forward, all will continue to have important parts to play, but the underpinning strategies and policy context requires to be joined up. This points to the continuing need for the Scottish Government to draw together the key interest in a strategic forum to seek to align policy
approaches and the identification of areas where policy needs to develop. At the more local level Community Planning, with all its imperfections, none-the-less must be central to more localised and joined-up delivery into the future.”

Scottish Community Development Centre (SCDC) stated that: “One of the main issues with Scottish Government strategies related to regeneration is that any current intervention is usually attached to a specific policy area. A variety of divisions or departments within Scottish Government fund initiatives which, although not termed as regeneration projects or programmes, share similar ambitions and are designed to achieve related outcomes. Regeneration deals with a range of interweaving and complex factors directly related to local demographics, history and unique characteristics. This would suggest that one outcome cannot easily be addressed in isolation of another. Moreover, issues of safety, health, unemployment and poor physical infrastructure are particularly pressing in our most disadvantaged neighbourhoods, where such issues tend to compound each other. For regeneration in Scotland to be successful, any combined intervention needs to be planned, coherent and targeted. Most critically, those initiatives need to place the community at their core.”

Finally, Oxfam Scotland suggested “the creation of a Poverty Commissioner and new socio-economic duties aimed at reducing poverty and inequality. A Poverty Commissioner, working across Government strategies, would ensure a relentless focus on reducing poverty. A socio-economic duty, replicating the Highlands and Island Enterprise brief to pursue social development, and applying to both the public and private sector, would ensure all new development and policy was undertaken with long term thinking in mind – benefiting society as a whole and ensuring we do not undermine labour conditions, family relationships or community assets.”
2. Can physical, social and economic regeneration really be separate entities? The Committee would find it useful to hear about projects distinctly focussed on one or more aspects, and the direct and indirect outcomes of such activity.

Linked to one of the main themes to come out of responses to question 1, organisations again stressed the “holistic” nature of regeneration in response to this question.

DTAS stated that: “this holistic approach should be applied equally to government, local authorities and other public sector agencies, many of whom continue to work in silos. It is essential that shifting the focus to community-led regeneration should not be seen as an opportunity to absolve any of these agencies from their responsibility to address problems of a structural nature and invest in, and generally contribute to, community-led regeneration efforts.”

Similarly, Oxfam’s answer was: “Yes. The Scottish Government’s regeneration strategy defines regeneration as “the holistic process of reversing the economic, physical and social decline of places where market forces alone won’t suffice”. Using this definition Oxfam’s partner groups could all be said to ‘do regeneration’. Tea in the Pot running a women’s drop-in centre in Govan; GalGael offering a sense of purpose and community to those experiencing worklessness, depression or addiction; or the Clydebank Independent Resource Centre providing advice and support to help individuals take up their benefit entitlements and deal with unmanageable debt: none of these projects involve physical regeneration, yet the benefits in terms of social and economic regeneration are undeniable.”

SURF though noted that: “It is conceivable that, in relatively rare instances, a community will only require one particular dimension of regenerative support. In the great majority of disadvantaged communities in Scotland – normally those in the 15% most deprived Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation datazones – physical, social and economic problems are usually evident. In many cases all three broad sets of issues stem from the same underlying structural cause, such as the decline of a seminal local industry, or physical dislocation as a result of other developments. The consequential impacts tend to overlap and inter-link so closely that it is inefficient and ineffective to attempt to tackle one in isolation from the others.”

SCDC made similar points that “physical, social and economic regeneration are interlinked”, and also closely linked regeneration activity into specific areas of the Government’s National Performance Framework.

Carnegie highlighted that: “the Trust has found that previous reviews of Scotland’s towns and cities and their policy recommendations have often been dislocated from the wishes of young consumers and their appetite for experimenting with enterprise in their local area. We believe that regeneration relies on engaging with local problem solving, and that local opportunities for experimentation with entrepreneurship should be incorporated into enterprise education in Scotland. … However, where citizens are supported and
empowered to address these local environmental problems then this can also bring about improvements in community cohesion and focus – with citizens inspired to undertake further action to help achieve a range of other economic, social and environmental improvements."

Strathleven Regeneration CIC explained how its Lomondgate project fulfilled multiple aspects of regeneration, which "We have measured outcomes predominantly in terms of economic impacts – in particular, jobs and GVA – and a key milestone has recently been reached with there being more jobs at Lomondgate than existed in the J&B bottling plant prior to its closure. The project was guided by the local community’s call for new jobs and a more diversified economy and was planned holistically as a mixed development in which the component parts (roadside services, business space and housing) are mutually complementary and additional to Dumbarton. Our belief is that, while the project’s manifestation is as large scale property development, it is every bit as much part of community regeneration as smaller scale, community-based projects. Although social regeneration was not an overt objective, Lomondgate has significant social regeneration impacts. “

Community Land Scotland stressed the impact of “community owners”: “While it would no doubt be possible to pursue physical, social and economic regeneration as separate entities, this would be to deny the very close, indeed, the intertwining, nature of these matters. Where community owners excel is by linking all three and using activity in one dimension to support and deliver outcomes in another. These strands of regeneration ought to be seen as indivisible.“

Highland Council stated that: “For regeneration to be complete and successful, action is needed and outcomes achieved across the range of physical, social and economic dimensions of a community. Whether it is necessary or possible to achieve all in a co-ordinated or integrated manner is more difficult to determine, and often particular action can be initiated by events, needs or opportunities arising.”

The Scottish Communities Alliance highlighted the evidence from the Highlands and Islands: “HIE have built into their modus operandi an implicit understanding that it is not possible to address any one of the three ‘legs’ of sustainable regeneration without given due consideration to the other two. One of the principle reasons for the many failed regeneration attempts in the past (chiefly across the central belt) has been the belief that top-down investment in physical regeneration is, of itself, enough to stimulate regeneration. It’s not and the rest of Scotland should learn from the Strengthening Communities approach which has been integral to HIE’s work for many years.”

The Unicorn Property Group made the point that: “Regeneration is not by any means solely the physical improvement and upgrading of a neglected urban realm. Placemaking through coherent civic planning and co-ordinated civil society, hand in hand with an informed and resourced community utilising their own natural assets to create healthier, safer and happier communities is
what regeneration is. Wealth creation, new employment, stake building are all keys to regenerating communities and localities that are low in self confidence and low in attainment. But, the task of actually renovating the wider physical environment is often broadly the role of the private investor, seeking to create value from a low base. The role of government, local and national, is to create in turn a positive atmosphere from the perspectives of physical infrastructure, investment and fiscal policy so that private enterprise can flourish in our local communities."

Creative Scotland raised an issue not covered by any other submission, focusing on the potential impact of culture on regeneration, and vice versa: “Although many projects will have a primary aim which is physical, economic or social successful regeneration is framed with reference to all of these impacts. The three aims are inextricably interlinked – a landmark building which does not engage successfully with its local community has not met its full potential; projects which aim to tackle the social issues such as confidence and skills building would expect to have an impact on access to labour markets.”
3. Are we achieving the best value from investment in this area? If not, how could funding achieve the maximum impact? Could the funding available be used in different ways to support regeneration?

Many responses found this question difficult to answer, as the scale of investment across Scotland is not clear. For instance, Angus Council stated that: “This is a particularly interesting question and is particularly difficult to answer because we actually don’t really know what investment we are making currently on regeneration in the round in order to see the bigger picture and make shifts towards more preventative activities.”

In a similar vein, COSLA’s indicated that work was ongoing to try and map available funding: “Another important dimension is understanding the resources available for regeneration activities. COSLA is currently in on-going dialogue with Scottish Government in relation to various streams of funding referred to in the Scottish Government’s Regeneration Strategy, in order that regeneration funding has the biggest impact possible on local areas and local communities. COSLA have also previously requested that Scottish Government undertake a mapping exercise of regeneration funding streams in order that all those involved are clear on the funds available, who can access them, and the opportunities for match funding. Such an exercise would highlight possible alternative means of funding if an initial bid is unsuccessful. COSLA would reiterate the need for a mapping of the entire regeneration funding landscape to be undertaken at this time, not just solely in terms of funding for the community sector.”

North Ayrshire Council included a detailed analysis of the funding models, and how they impacted on their area, summarised here: “The Regeneration Strategy contains only a limited expression of the funds available and how they will be targeted, focusing more on community empowerment, etc. Certain funding mechanisms are either not available to North Ayrshire (tax incremental finance; vacant and derelict land fund) or are difficult to access or make work (SPRUCE; National Housing Trust). Some models tend to be tested and aimed at more central areas and with a stronger market, examples being the NHT and work by the Scottish Government on development delivery.”

Glasgow City Council focussed on “best value”: The Council has made significant progress in securing best value from its investment in regeneration projects over the last decade. Central to this success, is the Council’s practice to continuously evaluate its performance in order to identify areas for further improvement. To achieve best value, the Council takes an integrated and broad approach to regeneration by ensuring it implements a range of complementary interventions that target the key pillars of people, place and business.”

Liz Davidson provided a specific example from her experience working in Glasgow: “Glasgow recently had a partnership scheme with a local bpt where a compulsorily purchased local landmark in a regeneration area was the subject of a comprehensive restoration and capacity building programme of
activities over 18 months. This was effectively halted by the relative inflexibility of the Big Lottery Fund who could not directly work co-operatively with anyone except the local community, despite the social objectives, partnerships and experience of the organisations involved. This ignored the alignment of other funders, HLF, Historic Scotland, ERDF, GCC already at the table towards the "greater good". Big were only interested in an application written and delivered by the local community itself, believing that their existing involvement in partnership with a not for profit charity meant that they were being sidelined - as opposed to "capacity built" as the Council would in fact have described.

West Dunbartonshire Council also focussed its response on “best value”: “It is West Dunbartonshire’s view that best value is not being achieved at the moment. At this time, the funds related to the Regeneration Strategy don’t provide appropriate support for West Dunbartonshire’s needs and it is considered that there needs to be more flexibility with Scottish Government funding. Considerable investment is necessary to make places more attractive, competitive, sustainable and well-connected in order to stimulate business start-up and growth and associated job creation benefits and to improve the area’s social fabric. Often it is not possible to achieve regeneration in a single 10 year economic cycle and this needs to be considered in the process of developing significant projects and in the allocation of funding.”

Children in Scotland suggested a new idea of using schools as community hubs: “Our proposal is that expanded childcare and out of school play and learning and provision would provide a valuable and effective framework and focus for regeneration and community engagement, underpinned by the national strategies outlined above. Strong communities are built around “social hubs” bringing a range of people and support services together often around recreational as well more formal services. They play a crucial role in promoting social cohesion, breaking the cycle of deprivation and preventing poverty.

Community schools which allow for integrated provision of school and education, family support, health services and promotion by using the existing school estate as wider community assets are an excellent way of putting this principle into practice and have received historic support from Scottish Ministers. Even where this level of integration does not (yet) exist, out of school hour extra-curricular provision such as breakfast, after-school and holiday clubs can greatly improve employability of parents who otherwise find the cost of childcare prohibitive as well as being of considerable merit in terms of children’s attainment and development in themselves.”

Others commented on the current system for allocating and managing funds. Oxfam stated that: “Over the years Oxfam’s partners have witnessed the announcement, implementation and demise of many initiatives that claim to deliver regeneration and community engagement. Often these are imposed

1 http://www.infed.org/schooling/s-newcs.htm
and do not reflect the priorities of local communities. Despite decades of talk about community engagement and participation, the experience of our partners has been that it has been “far too difficult – and generally not possible – for communities to exercise meaningful power in deciding how initiatives have been framed and progressed”.

Instead it seems to Oxfam’s partners that decisions are taken behind closed doors, between officials and economic actors (under the guise of ‘commercial, in confidence’). Despite a great deal of rhetoric and official policies heralding the importance of community engagement, it seems political and economic interests are put ahead of the interests of communities. The experience of our partners is that power is skewed towards money and wealth, rather than community need.”

James Henderson made similar points: “There are likely no ‘magic bullets’ and no ‘quick fixes’ through regeneration to tackling such socio-economic disadvantage, and the role of community anchors will therefore be over the longer-term to support a developing ‘community-control’ (community-led) through work within a community on practical projects – whether physical, social or economic – whilst also continuing to recognise the scale of the problems faced and the investment needed to make change, and to continue to make this ‘visible’ and ‘heard’.”

Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) Scotland stated that: “Investment in the past was on the basis of grant funding. This approach is now largely been abandoned due to budget cut backs as a result of the economic crisis. Grant funding set up a culture of establishing annularity of budgets expenditure without any proper long term investment strategy and good practice asset management. It was a short term approach. Therefore, a change of culture is required as long term investment through loans and equity inputs replace grants. This change requires the acquisition of new skills in investment and asset management. It requires an understanding of how markets work and how they can be shaped and influenced.”

Finally SCVO focussed on the People and Communities Fund, which it stated: “should provide the funds for community organisations to take forward community-led regeneration. However, the view of many in the third sector is that the fund is not providing the flexibility required for community-led regeneration.

As can be seen by the first round of approved funding², the majority of awards have been made to housing associations doing employability work. This is valuable and important work but not the breadth of activity required for diverse communities.

In having only two priorities (employability and preventative action) it is missing the fundamental principle of community-led regeneration which allows communities to set their priorities and outcomes. To be effective the fund

² http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Built-Environment/regeneration/community/pcf/awards
should have an entirely open remit which allows communities to dictate what the priorities are in their area and what methods they employ to meet those priorities.”
PARTNERSHIP WORKING

4. What delivery mechanisms, co-ordination of, and information on the funding that supports regeneration are required, to facilitate access by all sections of the community?

DTAS responded to this question in detail, raising a number of points: “A policy shift towards community-led regeneration requires a corresponding shift in thinking around partnerships. Communities need to be supported to develop and strengthen community anchor organisations, who by running services and owning assets are much more likely to be ‘players’ within regeneration processes, and, therefore, much more likely to be able to engage on more equal terms with other agencies. While partnerships will clearly remain crucial to successful regeneration efforts, we need to rethink what we mean by partnership working within a community-led regeneration context and shift the emphasis to partnerships which are initiated by the community, with specific partners (public, private and third sector), and for specific purposes.

The cumulative total of the available range of funding streams, resources and programmes for community and charitable activity, enterprise, and regeneration is fairly extensive. It is however provided by a wide range of Scottish Government departments, public agencies, consortia and independent funders, making it difficult and time consuming to access for community organisations. This is challenging enough when a community organisation delivers a single service but when one takes into account that community anchors are multi activity organizations, often involved in delivering a number of services, it can place a major strain on organisations and become a major barrier to development.

This situation could be addressed in a number of practical ways. Firstly, all current streams of Scottish Government (and other public sector) grant funding should be ‘regeneration proofed’ – with the objectives and criteria reviewed within the context of community-led regeneration. Secondly, information on all funding with the potential to support community-led regeneration needs to be pulled together in a single information bank with one point of enquiry for community organisations. The Scottish Government currently invests millions of pounds in third sector infrastructure and it should be relatively easy to re-prioritise a small proportion of that spend to deliver this resource.”

SCA broadly agreed: “Taken together there are significant amounts of financial support available for regeneration activity. The challenge for communities is that most of this funding is held and dispensed through unconnected government silos and independent funders which requires the community body leading local regeneration to make multiple and similar applications to many different funders. From the perspective of community led regeneration, the funding system would have to be considered no longer fit for purpose. Previously it served a model of top down regeneration and was relatively efficient (in terms of getting money spent) but ultimately ineffective.”
If community led regeneration is to be a success, the funding system needs to change to reflect the specific requirements of the new approach.”

SURF made similar points: “In recent years, many SURF members have indicated a desire for more accessible information on the funding available to support regeneration activities. A large number of public agencies and third sector bodies are engaged in the funding of regeneration initiatives, some with frequently changing aims and criteria. Given this and the frequent emergence of new community based groups, it is not surprising that some lack awareness of what is potentially available to them. The availability of time and bureaucratic capacity to complete what are often complex application processes is a common problem. They are often just too busy trying to cope with sharply increasing local needs.”

In terms of local authority submissions, West Lothian Council stated that: “Current arrangements are, or appear to be, complex and many voluntary and community based organisations find information and funding difficult to obtain. Recent regeneration funding streams such as the People and Communities Fund appeared to favour larger organisations with significant staffing and financial resources rather than community based organisations working at grass roots level, and greater resources to “pump prime” and subsequently develop local organisations such as community development trusts would be welcomed.

The funding landscape could be clarified by greater co-operation and links between funders, for example a standard basic application form could be developed for submission to a central point where it could be forwarded to funds and funders likely to be interested in the project. Given that larger projects often require a combination of funding from a range of funders, the central funding information service could support small, medium and large organisations.”

Highland Council made the point that: “A challenge often presented is that community led regeneration naturally becomes focused on or is driven by a particular need/opportunity. Other equally important needs may not be recognised by the community. Typically the solution proposed is a community wide survey and needs analysis followed by a local development plan. This can usefully widen thinking and approach but at the same time, can adversely dilute the original purpose and desire locally for involvement. As is further developed in response to Question 8 below, this calls for a partnership between the public sector and the community and a recognition and acknowledgement that each has a particular role to play and any local community development plans prepared, or approach adopted, is one that is shared between the community and the public sector.”

Inverclyde Council highlighted the role of CPPs: “The CPPs are an effective delivery mechanism for co-ordinating the funding that supports regeneration and they support a multi-disciplinary approach. We are well placed to coordinate economic development and regeneration activity. We are also the lead statutory partners in community planning, the key process through which
positive local outcomes for communities are planned and delivered through
the Single Outcome Agreement.”

However, North Ayrshire Council stated that “the rhetoric in the Scottish
Government Regeneration Strategy for more ‘community led’ regeneration is
in conflict with the lower resources available from the People and
Communities Fund when compared to those previously available from the
Fairer Scotland Fund. Within NAC responsibility for developing these groups
is primarily within the remit of Community Planning in association with
Education & Skills and Housing Associations. The shift towards market-
based delivery mechanisms such as Tax Incremental Finance, National
Housing Trust, Business Improvement Districts and SPRUCE, part of
Scotland’s Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas
(JESSICA) raises concerns that these loan based or speculative business
models may not be viable for development projects within marginal areas
where market failure is most evident, or for local organisations in
disadvantaged communities. As an example, the SPRUCE fund will have a
minimum £1m loan threshold, which is unlikely to be suitable for most small to
medium community enterprises. Government funding should be flexible to
reflect the differing market circumstances throughout Scotland.”

Oxfam highlighted its own research, which “has found that local residents are
under-represented on bodies that make decisions about regeneration, and
that local decision-making structures are insufficiently open to substantial
community involvement and shared agenda-setting. More than half the people
living in Scotland’s most deprived 20% of areas report difficulties in improving
local circumstances, compared to less than one-third of people in the least
deprived areas.

Women are often absent from economic decision-making at all levels. Oxfam
has found that even when women attend regeneration meetings, the manner
in which meetings are run can discourage them from participating. Exclusion
has serious repercussions: disempowerment and lack of control contribute to
ill-health and cause adverse health behaviours.”

The Scottish Property Foundation listed a number of challenges, including:
“Access to information, skills and lack of experience… This is partly caused
by the lack of empowerment to officers that are charged to facilitate
regeneration, which makes it difficult to consistently bring the pressure to the
various departments (e.g. Transport, Economic development, Education,
Leisure and Planning Departments). Some of our members have suggested
that this could be addressed by the Government requesting all Local
Authorities to appoint a senior regeneration champion that answers only to the
Chief Executive of the Local Authority. These individuals would then be able
to influence policy and budgets at the most senior level and become a ‘Client’
to the Local Authority departments. Therefore, they would be well placed to
direct each department to resource and deliver in a coordinated and
meaningful way. Each department would then need to prioritise the
regeneration initiatives rather than participate.”
5. Should funding be focussed on start up or running costs? What is the correct balance between revenue and capital funding? Please indicate reasons for your views

This question received few substantive responses. However, Dundee City Council stated that: “There needs to be greater flexibility between capital and revenue funding streams. Many projects will involve capital spend on buildings or equipment with appropriate revenue spend for staffing and running costs. Each project should have a business plan properly assessed, against which the progress can be monitored. Clearly the capital costs will generally be incurred first. Revenue support should ideally reduce as the project gathers momentum and achieves sustainability in accordance with the business plan.”

North Lanarkshire Council also commented that: “What is important is that there is robust monitoring and evaluation (including pre-programme appraisal based on evidence) processes in place to ensure that revenue projects will achieve outcomes and that capital projects are both viable and sustainable.

The correct balance between capital and revenue has to be project specific. Revenue should be related to the essential running costs with a clear business plan of how projects will generate future funding and income generation as appropriate. Otherwise, there will always remain a grant dependency. There will be cases that will not be able to generate income and there needs to be a strong justification for ongoing public/grant support where this is the case with regular sustainability reviews built in to justify ongoing support requirements.”

DTAS also responded, highlighting that: “it needs to be stressed that the single most important element, and the major funding absence currently, is the provision of core funding which enables developing community anchor organisations to build on the voluntary effort invested, and do the detailed work which will implement community plans and deliver new services and regeneration activity. The success of the community-led housing association movement was founded in no small measure on the availability of a staffing resource in the early stages of individual housing association development.

The availability of core funding for community anchor organisations, and the ability to employ a staffing resource, is the single most important requirement and is particularly important for the more disadvantaged, low capacity communities which need to benefit most from community-led regeneration.”

SPT stated that: “Capital Funding is generally easier to quantify and the revenue costs of projects are often underestimated or worse overlooked. Effective business case development and project appraisal should help to achieve predictability in assessing running costs. It is crucial to demonstrate public transparency when setting out the wider costs of projects and communicating the message that, whilst investment in infrastructure is welcome and necessary there are significant ongoing costs to be taken into account and planned for.”
HIE also highlighted capital investment as being: “essential to improve the physical fabric of our communities, but should only be progressed if there is a viable plan in place to maintain and enhance it in the longer term. Targeting resources at project that will generate revenue, stimulate new economic activity and improve the attractiveness of place is essential. In some places that will best be achieved by transferring ownership of assets to communities themselves, but in other places it may be that local authorities or other public bodies are capable and willing to deliver the desired outcomes themselves.

HIE suspects that the bulk of regeneration funding is currently invested in capital works that improve environments, deliver services, create employment, and enhance infrastructure. All valuable outcomes, however, HIE believes that such a model doesn't necessarily optimise regeneration outcomes, as it fails to shift ownership for regeneration progressively away from the state and public agencies towards empowered communities, perpetuating the lead role of the public sector in regeneration.

Shifting a modest proportion of the overall available funding to revenue which supports the development of capacity and structures at community level, in turn supports credible empowered community led contributions into Community Planning Partnerships, and to the identification, planning and delivery of community led development projects. This approach is more likely to deliver a broad basket of strategic outcomes including importantly, enhanced community resilience.”
6. How can it be ensured that regeneration projects are sustainable in the long term?

This question also received a low level of response. Scottish Enterprise highlighted the importance of both public and private sector investment: “Across different components of regeneration, the public sector is only ever in a position to pump-prime change. It requires engagement with the private sector, to stimulate market demand, for this change to be sustained. Provision of business infrastructure is only sustainable if businesses are willing to occupy it, town centre enhancement will only bring regeneration if businesses locate there, and increasing the capacity of individuals will only improve their prosperity if they can secure a job as a result.

In short, regeneration will only have a long-term sustained impact where it succeeds in adjusting the market. Insufficient attention has, at times, been given to this requirement when prioritising resources and designing approaches to regeneration. In determining strategic priorities, we need to develop understanding of where there is a realistic prospect of changing the investment patterns of the private sector. This is not to say we “write-off” places, but that we need to better understand the lessons from successful regeneration, the triggers that have been most important in securing turnaround.”

But, HIE questioned the premise in the question: “Sustainability of regeneration projects in the longer term can not realistically be 'ensured', due to the range of internal and external variables that exist. However, it is realistic to seek to maximise the ‘resilience’ of regeneration projects, including the robustness of the governance of supporting organisations and the confidence and resilience of communities involved in delivering and enjoying the benefits of those projects. Resilience can be realised through appropriate capacity building, high levels of community ownership and empowerment, robust project planning and thorough due diligence by funders. Maintenance of resilience requires a long term acknowledgement by all partners that that very resilience is the long term goal. That is underpinned by early collective recognition of the real whole life costs associated with communities and their infrastructure.”

Dundee City Council noted the issue of market failure: “It must be accepted that certain projects may never achieve sustainability. Many of the issues regeneration must address arise as the result of market failure or long-term underfunding of infrastructure. Funding support is, on occasion, required to fill that gap, therefore sustainability will be more difficult to achieve. Sustainability is more likely to be achieved through rigid scrutiny of projects based on sound business plans set against the agreed regeneration strategies. Those submitting projects are more likely to submit sound schemes if they have had either training or appropriate professional support. It must also be understood that successful regeneration cannot be achieved overnight, nor in the one or two year programmes often favoured by government. Success may take five or more years and governments at both
local and national level must accept that many of these cures may need longer than the life of a government to succeed.”

Carnegie again made the point that regeneration must be “part of a process, rather than a one off top-down intervention,” and that “One way in which this can be achieved is through community management and ownership of assets. Over the past 100 years the Carnegie UK Trust has been actively involved in community assets, originally through grants for public libraries, playing fields and village halls, and more recently through support to the community land trust movement in Scotland and across the UK as a whole.”

West Dunbartonshire Council stated that: “The greatest opportunities are in the physical regeneration of buildings, incorporating energy efficiency measures and renewable technology. Also, the regeneration of open spaces, pathways, improved lighting, signage etc should encourage more sustainable travel choices (ie. walking and cycling) as an alternative to car travel. Taking the projected future climate (milder wetter winters, warmer summers) into account, there is an opportunity for regeneration to contribute to ‘preparedness’. For example, by way of flood prevention initiatives or enhanced greenspace in town centres (provides shade/cools temp in summer, natural drainage). It would be useful if there was enhanced direction from the Scottish Government on the role of regeneration in meeting climate change targets – particularly given the Scottish targets are so challenging.”

BIG Lottery also talked about sustainability, in the context of state aid regulations: “In order to achieve sustainability, many of the community-owned assets we support through GCA require to generate income, sometimes by establishing themselves as social enterprises and carrying out very low key, small scale, limited and localised ‘trading’ in goods and services. In assessing such applications, BIG has to carefully check that any public funding we supply through our grants will not contravene European Union competition law (or State Aid). … BIG does not believe that the State Aid regulations were put in place to stifle the small scale community ‘enterprises’ that many community asset ownership projects so badly need to help them be sustainable.”

Finally, Transition University of St Andrews made the point that: We believe that all community initiatives should begin with a long-term sustainability vision; one that sees the concept of ‘sustainability’ as a goal comprising environmental integrity interconnected with social justice, rather than a term misemployed in meaning ‘long term financial feasibility’. Economic enterprise will of course be one route to achieve this but should not be the end goal. A shift in Government rhetoric and action away from community regeneration to thinking about community resilience would recognise that empowered communities can continue to adapt to change over time.”
7. What actions could the Scottish Government’s forthcoming community capacity building programme include to best support communities to “do regeneration” themselves?

Carnegie has done a lot of work in this area, and in its submission set out some of the key lessons from its research:

- “Change is difficult to initiate, a ‘spark’ or tipping point is therefore required. This can come from within the community – or it can be stimulated from the outside by a public agency or the voluntary sector. Examples of how this might be done include: asking the community what action they would like to be taken; or organising a competition to give local people the opportunity to come up with ideas about how the area could be improved.

- Successful community-led initiatives tend to have a broad spectrum of support from across the local community – this can lead to greater impact and make the achievements of the project more sustainable in the longer-term. Public bodies have an important partnership role to play in helping to stimulate interest and engagement from a large number of community members, for example by securing publicity for activities via websites, newsletters and the local media.

- Inspirational community leaders play a critical role in the success of regeneration-focused projects which are delivered by or in partnership with the local community. Policymakers must ensure that these leaders are given the encouragement and support that they need to be able to carry out this role.

- Projects should not be pushed to achieve too much too soon, but should be encouraged to be flexible, creative and aware of opportunities that emerge. Small, one-off projects can lead to wider benefits than the limited activities that they carry out – for example by developing new connections in a community which may lead to more significant activities being undertaken in the future.

- Developing a community project to support regeneration often requires a wide range of different skills – including; financial skills; project planning; leadership; and community engagement. In some cases local community members will already possess many of these skills – but in others, public agencies have a significant partnership role to play in building capacity amongst local groups.”

DTAS commented that: “Consistent with the philosophy of previous regeneration initiatives, community capacity building has, by and large been done to communities, by local authorities and other external agencies. It is therefore unsurprising that a change in direction of regeneration strategy requires a corresponding change of direction in how capacity is built within
communities. DTAS believes that any available funding should be invested directly within relevant community organisations, enabling them to employ staff, who immediately expand organisational capacity. In turn this enables them to benefit from the programmes and other external support which can then be accessed. If there is one point which the development trust movement would want the Local Government and Regeneration Committee to take on board, then this is it.”

The Heritage Lottery Fund stated that from their perspective: “In the last year we have introduced a range of new measures to help the heritage sector in these challenging times. Start-up grants will be available to support changes in stewardship of heritage - helping communities take on the management of heritage assets and undertake initial options appraisals. Transition funding will help those previously supported by HLF to develop their business plans. A Catalyst capacity building grants programme will help organisations acquire the skills they need to fund raise and attract private investment and donations. A further round of HLF’s Skills for the Future programme will build on the success of our first scheme, offering work-based training opportunities across the sector.”

Oxfam commented directly on the Government’s programme, in that: “We are not entirely clear what the Scottish Government’s forthcoming community capacity building programme is; although we look forward to seeing the detail. We presume there will be substantial crossover with the forthcoming Community Empowerment Bill.”

SURF were clear that the Government needed to do more in this area: “A substantial section of the SURF membership frequently comment on the all too obvious mismatch between the Scottish Government’s rhetoric on this aspiration, and the level of investment that it is presently committing to community empowerment enhancing processes. We hope that the eventual enactment of the proposed Community Empowerment and Renewal Bill will begin to address this reality gap. As we noted in our response to the Bill’s consultation paper in September 2012:

“In order to achieve equality of impact and participation, the [Community Empowerment & Renewal] Bill must address directly the importance of building the capacity of community organisations where required, and developing the capacity of communities to become organised... we have found wide agreement that community capacity building will be integral to the effective delivery of the Bill’s key components.”

South Lanarkshire Council stated that: “Additional resources are required to enable proportionate, responsive and ongoing community capacity building support to be provided. The Scottish Government should work closely with Community Planning Partnerships to identify appropriate community anchor organisations that are often in the best position to engage communities, CPPS can work with them to build their capacity and ensure the appropriate partners are linked in as and when required with the support and expertise
they can bring. There should not be an expectation that short term funding solutions will be sufficient as is sometimes the case.”

RICS Scotland’s cited a possible “lack of skills”, and that “Government needs to ensure that investment comes with good leadership and competent people who have the requisite experience to manage projects. Leaders will orchestrate a team of expert players. They will support and manage a community capacity programme and give confidence to the project. Experts will attract investment from others as risks can be better managed from expert judgement. Experts will attract funding as lenders are reticent to provide funds to those who cannot demonstrate appropriate experience.”

HIE made similar points, stating that: “The provision of specialist advice, guidance and capacity building support is a critical factor to unlock the latent talent, skills, aspiration and commitment within communities. In our experience, community organisations really benefit from access to an adviser knowledgeable in community development (organisational governance, community consultation and engagement, business planning, etc), particularly in the early start-up days. Once organisations become established and more mature, and are well into the ‘delivery phase’ their development needs become more specific.”
8. What role should CPPs play in supporting the community in regenerating their communities?

A wide range of submissions commented in detail on the role of CPPs.

COSLA stated that: “It is important that CPPs are empowered to focus on these activities, including a statutory requirement being placed across all relevant agencies, and not simply local government. CPPs also need to be able to rely on effective relationships and participation across a range of local partners. Although there is some excellent work going on, this is not always clearly linked to overall community planning priorities, and there is a need to ensure that all partners understand their role and remits in relation to regeneration.

The CPP approach seeks to empower community planning partnerships to focus on the issues that matter most to communities. However, transfer of power should not necessarily stop with the organisations that make up those partnerships. It is widely accepted in local government that ‘doing’ services ‘to’ people is ineffective, costly, and jeopardises the trust of communities. That is why community engagement and empowerment is at the heart of the community planning process, including a major role for communities in setting and developing the priorities in SOAs. Over time that also means a dialogue about responsibilities and building capacity within communities to take ownership of outcomes. Councils and their partners are constantly exploring how to evolve that process, including creating community capacity and encouraging communities to take responsibility and control of assets.”

Individual councils also commented. Highland Council were clear that the community should not only be a stakeholder in regeneration but that it “has the potential to be part of or indeed at times, lead the solution. This should be embedded in thinking and reflected in the approach adopted across regeneration activity.” Angus Council explained that the definition of “community” can be important: “There is a need to understand the makeup of community planning partnerships and the role they play in tackling economic, social and physical regeneration already, alongside the need to harness a cohesive approach to working with communities. When we talk about communities it is essential that they focus not only on geographic communities, but also the business community and the communities of interest which focus on individuals.”

North Lanarkshire Council made the point that: “One of the main barriers to community involvement in regeneration is a lack of knowledge of how to get involved. It is therefore important that community groups have effective contact with public sector partners, which can broaden their knowledge of regeneration priorities and issues. Providing community groups with examples of best practice in community-led regeneration, showing how other groups have been able to take forward local based regeneration projects by themselves is an important way of improving knowledge and skills.”
Glasgow made the point that the “Community Planning Partnership is on the cusp of strengthening the role and increasing the responsibilities for community residents on Community Planning structures; ‘Area’ and ‘Sector’ Partnerships are to provide operational and strategic platforms on which all group members will have an equity of role and function; and community councils will be a primary source by which 4 – 6 community residents will populate local Area Partnerships in the first instance.

This logic is sound because the general purpose of a community council is to ascertain, co-ordinate and express the wider views of the entire community within its agreed boundaries. Therefore, Community Planning Partnerships can conclude that community residents on local Area Partnerships can complement the role of the local authority and other community planning partners.”

DTAS questioned the terminology around community planning: “The purpose of Community Planning needs to be clarified and the loose thinking around Community Planning addressed - particularly in light of the Christie Commission. A good starting point would be removing the word “community” from the title of the activity. While there is clearly a need for local authorities and other public sector agencies to continue to meet together to strategically plan future public service delivery, it is questionable whether Community Planning Partnerships, as currently constructed, will generate the kind of imaginative and creative thinking required to deliver Christie, never mind have the ability to genuinely empower communities. To deliver community-led regeneration and to explore and organise the re-provisioning of future public service delivery we need to create a new kind of interface which is fit for the undoubted challenges ahead.”

And, Oxfam stated that community engagement needs to be “pro-poor”, ad that: “As with all channels of participation and engagement, there needs to be recognition of the socio-economic barriers to participation. The challenges of living in poverty, of struggling to make ends meet, provide for one’s family on a limited income, often working several jobs and having little time for oneself means that unless there are mechanisms to support people’s involvement, they will, understandably, feel that the process is not genuinely for them. Ensuring a gender balance in engagement requires recognising that women and men experience and respond to engagement mechanisms differently and that forums which are ostensibly open to all may actually represent rather intimidating spaces for women, especially women from some minority ethnic backgrounds. Therefore a range of outreach processes need to be constructed to reach the poorest communities. They also need to be delivered by culturally and gender sensitive practitioners.”

St Andrews Transition University, as a community group, stated that it did “not perceive any influence of the CPP or have any engagement with it. White has been involved in the development of the local CPP, which has community resilience as a named goal, but has not fully identified strategies to achieve this. A greater cultural change is required in the nature of Local Authorities as enablers of community resilience, as noted above.”
SCA stated that while “CPPs have delivered much better strategic integration of large scale public services”, they have “failed to successfully engage with communities in any way that would encourage community led regeneration. Where CPPs have developed local structures to engage with communities they invariably encroach on the ‘space’ where locally led regeneration might flourish. Whether there could be a role for the new Third Sector Interfaces to protect this space and literally be the interface with CPPs remains to be tested.”
9. How can CPPs best empower local communities to deliver regeneration? Please provide any examples of best practice or limitations experienced that you think the Committee would find useful in its scrutiny.

Conrad Aldridge stated that: “I don’t think that CPP’s or Local Councils want to empower local communities. They see the community’s empowerment as a threat to their own power base. Ref P17 para 80 of the Audit Scotland review of CPP’s. But Localism will only ever have real value when the local community is given the resources (the direct project funding from Central Government and knowledge from experts maybe from the CPP’s and certainly from the Private Sector) to implement its own ideas. The revenue generated by the asset protected community owned schemes can then be directed over many years towards local needs. The funds or net cash flow from the community’s own development projects can easily be directed to addressing the local needs by having a proper monitoring process overseen by qualified and accountable people – possibly aided by the CPP or a Charity, expert at making sure that earmarked money is spent properly.”

In terms of local authority responses, West Lothian Council were clear that: “Improving links between community planning and local teams who deliver services by working with communities is key to enabling successful regeneration. Community Planning must impact at a local level as well as strategic level, and it is this which gives local communities the capacity and opportunities to be involved in decision and the development of services. Community Planning Partnerships must support local structures, and ensure that local regeneration work is valued and encouraged. A commitment to community engagement at a strategic level is also important.”

North Lanarkshire Council highlighted participatory budgeting, “which is very effective as an engagement tool and directly involves local people in making decisions on the spending and priorities for a defined public budget in their area. This also promotes wellbeing, empowerment and a sense of ownership.”

South Lanarkshire Council outlined the possible impact of EU funding, which “provides opportunities for Community Led Local Action Plans which provide opportunities in Urban areas similar to existing LEADER funding in rural areas. As a council we have extensive experience of LEADER funding and the partnerships required to deliver efficient community led local economic development. The funding has allowed the capacity of the rural area to grow with the scale and complexity of projects now increasing. Larger training employment and social enterprises are now developing as are town centre projects. However this has taken several years of support and partnership work.”

Glasgow City Council explained that in its view, “Empowerment should be built on a shared understanding, mutual trust and respect between public bodies and communities. It must be recognised that to achieve genuine empowerment will take a long term commitment from all sides and requires...
embedded core values in how the public sector goes about its business and how communities and their representatives organise to ensure that they are genuine advocates for all those they represent.”

Oxfam made a series of detailed points, in line with their comments highlighted elsewhere: “Community Planning processes draw on institutional structures and representative democracy. Yet in Oxfam’s experience representative democracy is not working for Scotland’s most deprived communities – as evident in their ongoing plight. Supposed intermediary organisations and institutions that are at the forefront of official community planning processes are rather remote from communities and so do not adequately reflect the views and needs of communities.

Real community engagement is about putting disadvantaged communities at the heart of policies and programmes. They need to set the agenda, rather than simply offer their input to the detail on the margins of an imposed agenda. State revenue and civil service targets should be directed to areas and projects that people themselves determine.

One way to do this could be to top-slice some of the funding CPPs and other public bodies are responsible for and re-direct this to community groups through participatory budgeting. Thus far used only on a small scale, Participatory Budgeting can help ensure that public expenditure serves community need and reflects community priorities. Evidence from a successful pilot in Govanhill in Glasgow suggests participatory budgeting has had very positive results (see box below). We believe participatory budgeting should be deployed more widely, following the principle of subsidiarity that locates decision-making as locally as possible….Our disappointment is that, despite such official guidance existing for some time, it is not translating to action at community level. It is not surprising that communities are experiencing consultation fatigue, and becoming tired and disenchanted with government. There is a gulf between rhetoric and reality and, when challenged, government is defensive. Our partners have told us that when they highlight and utilise existing official guidance, officials change the criteria and dismiss the community as against regeneration.”

SCA talked about the importance of culture change: “As an example of how difficult it will be to effect the culture change at all levels in order to encourage community led regeneration to occur, the Scottish Govt’s Peoples and Community Fund is a case in point. This is a fund that was promoted as supporting community led regeneration. However, the first thing the Scottish Government did in the process of setting up systems to distribute the funds was to prescribe what activities it would support – employability and preventative action. This was precisely the approach that used to characterise the previous top down approaches to regeneration and reflected the reality that while the language of regeneration has been updated, the required changes to practice continue to lag some way behind.”
RICS Scotland cited procurement as a major barrier, and that “Best practice of empowerment can be found in continental Europe where the municipality fully collaborates with community organisations. The operational structures provide a balance of community and municipal input which is geared to achieving the right outcomes. Unfortunately governance and regulations are not balanced with achieving good creative conditions for innovative action. Procurement regulations stifle energy and vitality in smaller organisations whether they are from community or private interests.”

Finally, BIG Lottery stated that “One way that CPPs might be able to best empower local communities to deliver regeneration - and especially physical regeneration - is, if appropriate, by disposing of public sector assets to these communities at as low a purchase price as possible. This would then allow funders like us to provide more financial support to help communities develop these assets once acquired. However, it is important that communities are supported to be able to assess the viability and sustainability of potential assets to ensure they are not really liabilities.”
10. How can the outcomes of regeneration truly be captured and measured? What are the barriers to capturing outcomes and how should the success of regeneration investment be determined?

SURF responded in detail to this question, stating that it: identifies the improved wellbeing of local residents as the most important outcome of community regeneration processes. We feel that this central element often lacks prominence, or is overlooked altogether, in the monitoring and evaluation of regeneration projects large and small. One effective tool for tracking changes in a local population’s health and wellbeing prior to and following a regeneration process is the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS). This internationally respected tool is based on a simple 14-question survey that asks interviewees to agree or disagree on a sliding scale with statements about their wellbeing in the last two weeks. A typical statement is, “I’ve been feeling optimistic about the future.”

WEMWBS is used by the GoWell project, an ambitious research initiative that tracks the longterm health and wellbeing impacts of regeneration investments in Glasgow. Interim GoWell findings indicate that improvements in such areas as social housing, the provision of green spaces and the quality of the public realm lead to significant advances in the health and wellbeing of residents of the city’s disadvantaged communities.”

Boots provided some specific examples of how outcomes could be measured: “With regard to the specific outcomes we would refer the committee to the work done by the Welsh Government in developing its ‘Vibrant and Viable Places’ regeneration strategy. It concludes that following indicators should be used to determine how healthy and prosperous local communities are:

- % of workless households (gap between deprived areas and other areas)
- Employment rate (gap between deprived areas and other areas)
- % of people who think their neighbourhood has improved in last 3 years
- % adults reporting fair or poor health (gap between deprived and other areas)
- % obtaining the key stage indicators at age 16 (gap between deprived and other areas)
- % of people with post school qualifications (gap between deprived and other areas).”

Oxfam provided information on its humankind index: “Oxfam’s Humankind Index for Scotland aims to find out what really matters to people, particularly the most disadvantaged. The Index is an attempt to move away from an economy and society based on inequalities of wealth and pursuit of relative status, and towards an economy and society which promotes health (mental and physical) and equality, and reduces poverty, inequalities and over-consumption. It is intended to help policy-makers and communities focus on what is required for a sustainable and socially-just Scotland – one in which resources are built together and their benefits better shared.”
Developed through widespread public consultation, including focus groups, community workshops, street stalls and an online survey, the Oxfam Humankind Index enables Scotland to measure itself by those aspects of life that make a real difference to people, particularly the most disadvantaged.”

West Lothian Council highlighted that: “There are clear challenges around measuring outcomes and the impact of investing in enhancing community capacity and social capital. However, there have been significant inroads into demonstrating the value of regeneration activity through logic modelling, the increasing understanding of the longer term benefits of preventive action and earlier interventions and improved focus at national level on the value of partnership working and co-production to deliver positive change.

By developing a flexible and agile regeneration strategy, we are able to respond to the changing environment, economy and our own diverse communities and needs. The measure of success must be about the improvement in the lives of individuals, families and communities in the regeneration area rather than any physical changes. The measures have to be around quality of life and community resilience, and these are both longer term and harder to reach. For this reason the development of social capital should be a key outcome for the regeneration process, as this is key to the longer-term success of any regeneration initiative.”

In SPT’s view, “Ultimately success can only truly be measured over a period of decades. Where things go wrong it is hugely expensive to affect meaningful change. This is wasteful and damaging to communities bringing with it not only huge physical upheaval but enormous emotional turmoil for the people living in these communities. This is why development aimed at short term economic benefit must be resisted or future generations will pay the cost of economic, environmental, health and social damage.”

Aberdeenshire Council explained that “This is an area we are currently examining. We have previously used Social Accounting to capture the non-financial value being created and we are also trying to capture some of the performance indicators established by the Audit Commission in 2005 for Economic Regeneration. Positive attitudes and strong cohesion are difficult to measure but are key indicators of successful regeneration but there is inevitably a delay between an intervention and a measurable improvement.”

Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations stated that: “Too often in the past, a ‘short-termist’ perspective have been utilised in attempting to measure regeneration initiatives. This has led to a ‘box-ticking’ approach which has not allowed scope for long-term outcomes to emerge and where less tangible, but very significant impacts of regeneration like reduced stigma, increased social capital, and better health and well-being outcomes have not been captured. We would suggest a move towards a more holistic approach.

As we have indicated throughout we believe that communities should be involved in the planning and delivery of local regeneration strategies.
Similarly, communities should also be involved in defining the outcomes of regeneration and in the evaluation of these. Regeneration can only be described as ‘community led’ if this is the case.”