ANNEXE A: INITIAL CALL FOR WRITTEN EVIDENCE

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND REGENERATION COMMITTEE

Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland inquiry – Call for Written Evidence

The Committee is currently seeking evidence from interested parties on the Scottish Government’s Regeneration Strategy.

Regeneration

The Scottish Government’s regeneration strategy ‘Achieving a Sustainable Future” was published on 12 December 2011. The Local Government and Regeneration Committee, following its consideration of regeneration aspects of the Scottish Government Draft Budget 2013-14, have agreed to build on this scrutiny and undertake a detailed inquiry on the area of regeneration policy, with a focus upon community empowerment. The remit for the inquiry is:

‘To identify and examine best practice and limitations in relation to the delivery of regeneration in Scotland’.

Themes of interest

Set out below are themes on which the Committee is seeking your views. This is intended to be an open information gathering exercise. The questions set out below are intended to be a guide only. Please feel free to give us your views on any of these themes.

Strategy and Policy Issues

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

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.

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?

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?

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
6. How can it be ensured that regeneration projects are sustainable in the long term?

Practical Issues

7. What actions could the Scottish Governments forthcoming community capacity building programme include to best support communities to „do regeneration“ themselves?

8. What role should CPPs play in supporting the community in regenerating their communities?

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.

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?

How to submit written evidence

You may wish to respond to some or all of the specific questions set out above. Alternatively, you may wish to highlight issues that you consider to be of concern in relation to local Government and Regeneration. Evidence should be reasonably brief and typewritten (normally no more than six to eight sides of A4 in total).

The deadline for receipt of written submissions is 6pm on Friday 15 March 2013.

The Committee prefers to receive written submissions electronically. These should be sent to lgr.committee@scottish.parliament.uk

You may also make hard copy written submissions to:

Clerk to the Local Government and Regeneration Committee
Room T3.60
Scottish Parliament
EH99 1SP
Policy on treatment of written evidence by subject and mandatory committees

This information lets you know how committees of the Scottish Parliament will deal with any information sent in response to calls for evidence and any subsequent correspondence.

Most people who submit evidence want it to be put in the public domain. In addition, the committees of the Scottish Parliament are committed to being open in their dealings in accordance with the Scottish Parliament’s founding principles.

Our normal practice is to publish relevant evidence that is sent to us on our website and we may also include it in the hard copy of any committee report. **Therefore, if you wish your evidence to be treated as confidential, or for your evidence to be published anonymously, please contact the Clerk to the Committee before you submit your evidence.**

You should be aware that it is for the relevant Committee to decide whether the evidence can be accepted on the basis that it will be seen in full by the Committee but will not be published, or will be published in edited form or anonymously. See section on “Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002” below.

There are a few situations where we do not publish all the evidence sent to us. This may be for practical reasons or for legal reasons. Examples of practical reasons are where the number of submissions we received does not make this possible or where we receive a large number of submissions in very similar terms. In that case, we would normally publish only a list of the names of people who have submitted evidence.

In addition, there may be a few situations where may not choose to publish your evidence or have to edit it before publication for legal reasons.

**Data Protection Act 1998**
The Parliament must comply with the Data Protection Act 1998. This affects what information about living people we can make public.

When we publish your evidence, we will not publish your signature or your personal contact information (like your home telephone number or your home address).

We may also have to edit information which can identify another living person who has not specifically given their consent to have their information about them made public.

In these situations, committee members will have access to the full text of your evidence, even though it has not been published in full.

**If you consider that evidence that you plan to submit may raise issues concerning the Data Protection Act, please contact the Clerk to the Committee before you submit your evidence.**
**Potentially defamatory material**

Typically, the Parliament will not publish defamatory statements or material. If we think your submission contains potentially defamatory material, typically we will return it to you with an invitation to substantiate the comments or remove them. In these circumstances, if the evidence is returned to us and it still contains material which we consider may be defamatory, it may not be considered by the Committee and it may have to be destroyed.

**Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002**

The Parliament is covered by the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002. This also affects the way that we deal with your evidence.

As stated above, if you wish your evidence to be treated as confidential, or for your evidence to be published anonymously, please contact the Clerk to the Committee, before you submit your evidence.

In particular, you should be aware that if we receive a request for information under the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002, we may be legally required to release the information to the person who has made the request – even where the Committee has agreed to treat all or part of the information in confidence.

So, in the circumstances outlined above, while we can assure you that your document/name will not be circulated to the general public in the context of the Committee’s current work, we are unable to give you a guarantee that the document will never be released.
ANNEXE B: EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND REGENERATION COMMITTEE

1st Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 16 January 2013

Delivery of regeneration in Scotland (in private): The Committee agreed to consider a draft remit and person-specification for the post of adviser in connection with its forthcoming inquiry on the delivery of regeneration in Scotland, in private session, at its next meeting.

2nd Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 23 January 2013

Delivery of regeneration in Scotland (in private): The Committee considered and agreed a draft remit and person-specification for the post of adviser in connection with its forthcoming inquiry on the delivery of regeneration in Scotland.

3rd Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 30 January 2013

Delivery of regeneration in Scotland (in private): The Committee agreed to consider a list of candidates for the post of adviser in connection with its forthcoming inquiry on the delivery of regeneration in Scotland, in private session, at its next meeting.

4th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 6 February 2013

Delivery of regeneration in Scotland (in private): The Committee considered a list of candidates and agreed its ranking of preferred candidates for appointment to the post of adviser in connection with its forthcoming inquiry on the delivery of regeneration in Scotland.

The Committee also agreed its approach to proposed fact-finding visits as part of the inquiry.

12th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 24 April 2013

Delivery of regeneration in Scotland (in private): The Committee considered its approach to the inquiry, and agreed the supplementary briefing material required in order to support the inquiry. The Committee also agreed to undertake an introductory briefing session with its Adviser and SPICe officials, in private, in advance of oral evidence taking on the inquiry. As part of that briefing session, the Committee agreed to determine a detailed approach to oral evidence taking for the inquiry. Furthermore, the Committee agreed a revised timetable for the inquiry (subject to any further necessary change, dependent upon its agreed approach to oral evidence taking). As a result of the revised inquiry timetable, the Committee also agreed consequence changes to the timetable for its 2013 work programme. Finally, the Committee agreed to undertake any further consideration of its approach to the inquiry, in private, at future meetings.
14th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 8 May 2013

Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland (in private): The Committee received a briefing from—

Ian Wall, Committee Adviser, Scottish Parliament.

Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland (in private): The Committee considered and agreed its approach to oral evidence taking for the inquiry.

19th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 12 June 2013

Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland: The Committee took evidence from—

David Fletcher, Assistant Director of Regeneration, Glasgow Housing Association;

Dr Colleen Rowan, Membership and Policy Officer, Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations;

Craig Sanderson, Chief Executive, Link Group Ltd;

Pauline Barbour, Policy Consultant, Scottish Federation of Housing Associations;

Gavin Corbett, Policy Adviser, Shelter Scotland;

Professor Carol Tannahill, Director, Glasgow Centre for Population Health, GoWell;

Dr Peter Matthews, Lecturer in School of the Built Environment, Heriot Watt University;

Annette Hastings, Senior Lecturer in Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.

Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland (in private): The Committee considered the evidence received.

20th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 19 June 2013

Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland: The Committee took evidence from—

Von Jackson, Secretary, Coalfield Community Federation and Member of New Cumnock Liaison Group;

Karen McGregor, Member, Kirkcaldy East Regeneration Forum;

Margaret Logan, Member, Gallatown East Tenants and Residents Association;

Isabel Dunsmuir, Community Development Co-ordinator, DRC Generations;
Bronagh Gallagher, Network Development Officer, West and Central Scotland Voluntary Sector Network;

George Roberts, Chair, Whitfield Development Group;

Brendan Rooney, Executive Director, Healthy ‘n’ Happy Community Development Trust;

Robert Young, ICT Support Officer, Community Links South Lanarkshire;

Jackie Brock, Chief Executive, Children in Scotland;

Judith Robertson, Head of Oxfam Scotland, Oxfam Scotland.

**Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland (in private):** The Committee considered the evidence received.

21st Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 26 June 2013

**Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland:** The Committee took evidence from—

Eric Samuel, Senior Policy and Learning Manager, BIG Lottery Fund;

Colin McLean, Head of the Heritage Lottery Fund, Scotland, Heritage Lottery Fund;

David Souter, Team Leader, European Structural Funds Programme Delivery, Scottish Government;

Rory Dutton, Development Officer (North), Development Trusts Association Scotland;

Angus Hardie, Chief Executive, Scottish Community Alliance;

Stuart Hashagen, Senior Community Development Advisor, Scottish Community Development Centre and Community Health Exchange;

Andy Milne, Chief Executive, Scotland's Urban Regeneration Forum (SURF).

**Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland (in private):** The Committee considered the evidence received.

22nd Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 4 September 2013

**Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland (in private):** The Committee considered and agreed its approach to oral evidence taking on the inquiry. In accordance with Standing Order Rule 12.4.1 (power to call for witnesses and documents), the Committee agreed to request that Inverclyde Council, and Scottish Enterprise, provide to the Committee, a copy of the independent review on the performance of Riverside Inverclyde and the delivery of regeneration services within Inverclyde, recently commissioned by them.
23rd Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 11 September 2013

Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland: The Committee took evidence from—

Councillor Mairi Evans, Convener of the Infrastructure Committee, and Alan McKeown, Strategic Director for Communities, Angus Council;

Councillor Chris Thomson, Chair of the Enterprise Services Committee, and Jim McCaffer, Head of Regeneration Services, South Lanarkshire Council;

Councillor Lawrence O’Neil, Vice Convenor of the Housing, Environment & Economic Development Committee, and Jim McAloon, Head of Regeneration and Economic Development, West Dunbartonshire Council;

Rachael McCormack, Director of Strengthening Communities, Highlands and Islands Enterprise;

Councillor Thomas Prag, Chair of the Planning, Environment and Development Committee, and Andy McCann, Economy & Regeneration Manager, Highland Council;

Aubrey Fawcett, Corporate Director Environment, Regeneration and Resources, and Stuart Jamieson, Head of Regeneration and Planning, Inverclyde Council;

Allan McQuade, Business Infrastructure Director, Scottish Enterprise.

Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland (in private): The Committee considered the evidence received.

Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland (in private): The Committee agreed to revisit and report separately on the planning aspect of regeneration at a later date.

24th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 25 September 2013

Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland: The Committee took evidence from—

Ian Manson, Chief Executive, Clyde Gateway;

Alan Robertson, Projects Director, Clydebank Rebuilt;

Patrick Wiggins, Chief Executive, Irvine Bay Regeneration Company;

Eric Adair, Director, PARC Craigmillar;

Allan McQuade, Business Infrastructure Director, Scottish Enterprise;

Douglas Duff, Member of Scottish Local Authorities Economic Development Group and Head of Economic Development and Environmental Services, Falkirk Council, Scottish Local Authority Economic Development Group (SLAED);
Margaret Burgess, Minister for Housing and Welfare, and David Cowan, Head of Regeneration Unit, Scottish Government.

**Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland (in private):** The Committee agreed to defer this item to its next meeting.

25th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 2 October 2013

**Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland (in private):** The Committee considered the evidence received at its meeting on 25 September 2013, as well as its approach to the evidence gathered by the inquiry to date. The Committee agreed that it now had sufficient evidence relating to regeneration from a community perspective and wished to consider the strategic approach taken by local authorities, and other bodies involved in regeneration. The Committee also agreed to consider an approach to this work, in private, at a future meeting. It was agreed to write to Scottish Enterprise seeking information on governance arrangements around their role in regeneration. The Committee also agreed to write to the Minister for Local Government and Planning in relation to various matters pertaining to regeneration.

27th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 30 October 2013

**Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland (in private):** The Committee agreed the terms of a letter to the Minister for Local Government and Planning, on issues concerning planning and regeneration, in order to support the Committee's scrutiny of the National Planning Framework (NPF3) and the Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) in early 2014. The Committee also agreed its approach, structure and the witnesses required for their final evidence session on strategy, governance and leadership in relation to the delivery of regeneration in Scotland.

30th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 27 November 2013

**Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland:** The Committee took evidence on the Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland from—

George Black, Chief Executive, Glasgow City Council;

John Mundell, Chief Executive, Inverclyde Council;

Lindsay Freeland, Chief Executive, South Lanarkshire Council;

Adrian Gillespie, Managing Director, Scottish Enterprise.

**Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland (in private):** The Committee considered the evidence received.
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19th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 12 June 2013

ORAL EVIDENCE

David Fletcher, Assistant Director of Regeneration, Glasgow Housing Association;
Dr Colleen Rowan, Membership and Policy Officer, Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Associations;
Craig Sanderson, Chief Executive, Link Group Ltd;
Pauline Barbour, Policy Consultant, Scottish Federation of Housing Associations;
Gavin Corbett, Policy Adviser, Shelter Scotland;
Professor Carol Tannahill, Director, Glasgow Centre for Population Health, GoWell;
Dr Peter Matthews, Lecturer in School of the Built Environment, Heriot Watt University;
Annette Hastings, Senior Lecturer in Urban Studies, University of Glasgow.

Written Evidence

Glasgow Housing Association (178KB pdf)
Glasgow Housing Association (2885KB pdf)
Glasgow and West of Scotland Forum of Housing Association (277KB pdf)
Link Group Ltd (263KB pdf)
Scottish Federation of Housing Associations (226KB pdf)
Shelter Scotland (28KB pdf)
GoWell (7549KB pdf)
Dr Peter Matthews (1900KB pdf)
Annette Hastings (314KB pdf)

Supplementary Written Evidence

Scottish Federation of Housing Associations (10KB pdf)

20th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 19 June 2013

ORAL EVIDENCE

Von Jackson, Secretary, Coalfield Community Federation and Member of New Cumnock Liaison Group;
Karen McGregor, Member, Kirkcaldy East Regeneration Forum;
Margaret Logan, Member, Gallatown East Tenants and Residents Association;
Isabel Dunsmuir, Community Development Co-ordinator, DRC Generations;
Bronagh Gallagher, Network Development Officer, West and Central Scotland Voluntary Sector Network;
George Roberts, Chair, Whitfield Development Group;
Brendan Rooney, Executive Director, Healthy ‘n’ Happy Community Development Trust;
Robert Young, ICT Support Officer, Community Links South Lanarkshire;
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Jackie Brock, Chief Executive, Children in Scotland;
Judith Robertson, Head of Oxfam Scotland, Oxfam Scotland

Written Evidence

Children in Scotland (238KB pdf)
Oxfam Scotland (655KB pdf)

21st Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 26 June 2013

ORAL EVIDENCE

Eric Samuel, Senior Policy and Learning Manager, BIG Lottery Fund;
Colin McLean, Head of the Heritage Lottery Fund, Scotland, Heritage Lottery Fund;
David Souter, Team Leader, European Structural Funds Programme Delivery, Scottish Government;
Rory Dutton, Development Officer (North), Development Trusts Association Scotland;
Angus Hardie, Chief Executive, Scottish Community Alliance;
Stuart Hashagen, Senior Community Development Advisor, Scottish Community Development Centre and Community Health Exchange;
Andy Milne, Chief Executive, Scotland's Urban Regeneration Forum (SURF).

Written Evidence

Big Lottery (244KB pdf)
Heritage Lottery (321KB pdf)
Development Trusts Association Scotland (190KB pdf)
Scottish Community Alliance (205KB pdf)
Scottish Community Development Centre (285KB pdf)
SURF (3242KB pdf)

23rd Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 11 September 2013

ORAL EVIDENCE

Councillor Mairi Evans, Convener of the Infrastructure Committee;
Alan McKeown, Strategic Director for Communities, Angus Council;
Councillor Chris Thomson, Chair of the Enterprise Services Committee;
Jim McCaffer, Head of Regeneration Services, South Lanarkshire Council;
Councillor Lawrence O'Neil, Vice Convenor of the Housing, Environment & Economic Development Committee;
Jim McAloon, Head of Regeneration and Economic Development, West Dunbartonshire Council;
Rachael McCormack, Director of Strengthening Communities, Highlands and Islands Enterprise;
Councillor Thomas Prag, Chair of the Planning, Environment and Development Committee;
Andy McCann, Economy & Regeneration Manager, Highland Council;
Aubrey Fawcett, Corporate Director Environment, Regeneration and Resources; Stuart Jamieson, Head of Regeneration and Planning, Inverclyde Council; Allan McQuade, Business Infrastructure Director, Scottish Enterprise.

Written Evidence

Angus Council (146KB pdf)
South Lanarkshire Council (150KB pdf)
West Dunbartonshire Council (226KB pdf)
Highlands and Islands Enterprise (150KB pdf)
Highland Council (129KB pdf)
Inverclyde Council (158KB pdf)
Scottish Enterprise (79KB pdf)

24th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 25 September 2013

ORAL EVIDENCE

Ian Manson, Chief Executive, Clyde Gateway; Alan Robertson, Projects Director, Clydebank Rebuilt; Patrick Wiggins, Chief Executive, Irvine Bay Regeneration Company; Eric Adair, Director, PARC Craigmillar; Allan McQuade, Business Infrastructure Director, Scottish Enterprise; Douglas Duff, Member of Scottish Local Authorities Economic Development Group and Head of Economic Development and Environmental Services, Falkirk Council, Scottish Local Authority Economic Development Group (SLAED); Margaret Burgess, Minister for Housing and Welfare; David Cowan, Head of Regeneration Unit, Scottish Government.

Written Evidence

West of Scotland Urban Regeneration Companies (68KB)
Clyde Gateway (14KB pdf)
Clyde Gateway Additional Submission (135KB pdf)
Clydebank Rebuilt (2178KB pdf)
Irvine Bay Regeneration Company (125KB pdf)
PARC Craigmillar (1672KB pdf)
Scottish Enterprise (79KB pdf)
Scottish Enterprise (539KB pdf)
Raploch Urban Regeneration Company (31KB pdf)
Blue Sea Consulting (59KB pdf)
Scottish Allotments and Garden Society (29KB pdf)
Orkney Islands Council (22KB pdf)

Supplementary Evidence

Clyde Gateway (165KB pdf)
Clydebank Rebuilt (65KB pdf)
SLAED (88KB pdf)
Scottish Enterprise (141KB pdf)
30th Meeting, 2013 (Session 4), Wednesday 27 November 2013

**ORAL EVIDENCE**

George Black, Chief Executive, Glasgow City Council;
John Mundell, Chief Executive, Inverclyde Council;
Lindsay Freeland, Chief Executive, South Lanarkshire Council;
Adrian Gillespie, Managing Director, Scottish Enterprise.

**Written Evidence**

- [Glasgow City Council (869KB pdf)](Glasgow_City_Council.pdf)
- [South Lanarkshire Council (182KB pdf)](South_Lanarkshire_Council.pdf)
- [Scottish Enterprise (637KB pdf)](Scottish_Enterprise.pdf)
- [Inverclyde Council (4366KB pdf)](Inverclyde_Council.pdf)

**Supplementary Written Evidence**

- [Glasgow City Council (158KB pdf)](Glasgow_City_Council_supplement.pdf)
- [South Lanarkshire Council (173KB pdf)](South_Lanarkshire_Council_supplement.pdf)
- [South Lanarkshire Council – Evaluation of Intensive Intervention Schemes in Scotland (1361KB pdf)](South_Lanarkshire_Council_Evaluation.pdf)
- [South Lanarkshire Council – NEST Evaluation Report (229KB pdf)](South_Lanarkshire_Council_NEST.pdf)
- [Scottish Enterprise (112KB pdf)](Scottish_Enterprise_supplement.pdf)
- [Inverclyde Council (3936KB pdf)](Inverclyde_Council_supplement.pdf)
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- Carnegie UK Trust (250KB pdf)
- Chartered Institute of Housing in Scotland Survey Report February 2013 (139KB pdf)
- Community Land Scotland - Regeneration in Scotland inquiry (79KB pdf)
- Conrad Aldridge (144KB pdf)
- COSLA (137KB pdf)
- Dundee City Council (160KB pdf)
- EKOS Consultants (79KB pdf)
- Fountainbridge Canalside Initiative (351KB pdf)
- Linwood - Whose Regeneration (7408KB pdf)
- Scottish Allotments and Garden Society Regeneration (397KB pdf)
- Scottish Land and Estates (106KB pdf)
- SCVO (125KB pdf)
- Unicorn Property Group (133KB pdf)
- West Lothian Council (162KB pdf)
- BEFS - Built Environment Forum Scotland (413KB pdf)
- Boots (326KB pdf)
- Creative Scotland (415KB pdf)
- North Lanarkshire Council (121KB pdf)
- Planning Aid for Scotland (159KB pdf)
- Transition University of St Andrews (146KB pdf)
- Work Place Chaplaincy Scotland (127KB pdf)
- James Henderson (200KB pdf)
- Aberdeenshire Council (124KB pdf)
- City Design Section of GCC Development and Regeneration Services Department (144KB pdf)
- Glasgow City Council (278KB pdf)
- North Ayrshire Council (236KB pdf)
- RICS Scotland (114KB pdf)
- RTPI Scotland (165KB pdf)
- Scottish Building Federation (201KB pdf)
- Scottish Property Federation (83KB pdf)
- SPT (266KB pdf)
- Strathleven Regeneration CIC (223KB pdf)
- ASDA Stores Ltd (105KB pdf)
ANNEXE E: FACT FINDING VISITS

Introduction

During the course of the Delivery of Regeneration in Scotland Inquiry the Local Government and Regeneration Committee conducted several fact finding visits which included open discussions with local community representatives, visits to community led projects, and presentations on local authority regeneration initiatives. Over the course of eight months the Committee paid a visit to Cumbernauld, Glasgow, Aberdeen, Dundee and Paisley.

Aim

The aim of this annex is to collate the thoughts and impressions gathered at round table discussions with community organisations and individuals during these visits. The following issues were noted by the committee; this is not intended to be a verbatim transcript, or minute of the discussions, but rather a note to capture the main points raised by those who attended the meetings.

Cumbernauld – 14 January 2013

Introduction

The Local Government and Regeneration Committee members paid a fact finding visit to Cumbernauld on 14 January 2013. The visit comprised three key elements; a series of presentations (on the regeneration work being conducted in North Lanarkshire, a history of Scottish Wildlife Trust’s involvement in Cumbernauld, and the Cumbernauld living landscapes project); a site visit to the Cumbernauld Glen regeneration site; and community workshop seminars.

Community Visit

The Cumbernauld Glen regeneration site visit provided the opportunity for Committee members to meet with Scottish Water and visit a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) and discuss asset transfer and community empowerment. In addition the members met with woodland management with regards to tree and boundary issues as well as teachers and pupils from Abronhill High School with regards to the benefits of a mountain bike trail.

Remit

The round table discussions focussed on factors included within the remit of the Committee’s regeneration inquiry, and aimed at supporting the Committee’s forthcoming scrutiny of the forthcoming consultation and draft Community Empowerment (Scotland) Bill.
Attendees
The following individuals and organisations attended—

- Irene Watters (Cumbernauld & Kilsyth Nursery & Out of School Care LTD);
- Esther Bradley (Cumbernauld & Kilsyth Nursery & Out of School Care LTD);
- Keith Johnston (Westerwood Community Council);
- Linda McConaghe (Central Scotland Forest Trust);
- Stewart McCrae (Cumbernauld YMCA / YWCA);
- Francis Fallan MBE (Voluntary Action North Lanarkshire (VANL));
- Gerry Burke (ENABLE Scotland);
- Carol Stark (ENABLE Scotland);
- Lesley Arkison (Get Hooked on Fishing);
- Gillian Green (Student studying for degree in community development)
- Gillian Yardley (Pather Action Group);
- Morag Thomson (Voluntary Action North Lanarkshire (VANL));
- Judith Bremner (Voluntary Action North Lanarkshire (VANL));
- Michelle Thomson (Voluntary Action North Lanarkshire (VANL));
- Jan Wilson (Upperton Residents Committee);
- Jenny Burgon (Abronhill Housing Association);
- Margaret Devlin (Abronhill Regeneration Forum);
- Lisa Smith (JHP Training);
- Paul Holmes (Kilsyth Community Market Garden & Kelvin Valley Honey);
- Rose Cadden (Westfield Community Council);
- Susan Flannigan (Central Coatbridge Community Council);
- William McLachlan (Kilsyth & District Elderly Explorers);
- Liz McCutcheon (Business Gateway Lanarkshire);
- Tom Porter;
- Audrey Cuthbertson (Motherwell & Wishaw CAB);
- Adam Smith (Cumbernauld House Trust);
- Tom Reilly (Seafar and Ravenswood Community Council);
- Chris Lebessis (Lanarkshire Enterprise Services Ltd.);
- Billy Lees (Cumbernauld Forum);
- John King (Condorrat Community Council);
- Zoë Clelland (Inner Forth Landscape Initiative);
- Kate Studd (Inner Forth Landscape Initiative);
- Marcelle Pearson (Voluntary Action North Lanarkshire/Scottish Children’s Panel);
- Alastair Moodie (Auchinloch Community Council);
- Jacqueline Ferguson (Resident - Craigmarloch in Cumbernauld);
- Jim Waddell (Gartcosh Community Council);
- Bryan Johnston (Gartcosh Community Council);
- Roberta McLaughlin (St Andrews High Church Guild);
- Sheila Robertson (St Andrews High Church Guild);
- Craig Sanderson (Link Housing Association);
- Leah Webb (Link Housing Association);
- Jack Banks (Cumbernauld Gardening Club);
- Lindsey Wright (Cumbernauld YMCA/YWCA );
Key Issues
The key issues brought up at the group discussions were as follows—

Communication:

- Links between the Government’s Strategy, the North Lanarkshire Council’s various strategies and community groups on the ground are unclear, and there is a real disconnect between high level strategy and the situation “on the ground”. Many community groups are unsure where they sit within the structure and where they can/should input.

- As such none of the groups present had fed their thoughts into the last iteration of the Single Outcome Agreement.

- It was recognised that there are potential structures in place to allow communities to engage, but that communication from the top down could definitely be improved.

- Some groups were concerned that there was no community representation on the Local Area Teams (LATs), although they recognised that there was representation on the Local Area Partnerships, as they identified the LATs as where decisions were really being made.

- North Lanarkshire Council’s (NLC) approach to public consultation was criticised; there was a general feeling that decisions were made prior to any public consultation, with the consultation being a tick-box exercise. However, the group praised NLC’s work in assisting community groups to access funding – and that NLC’s funding officers were approachable and helpful.

- The creation of a ‘community hub’ where local groups could get advice on issues to do with the practicalities of taking forward a regeneration project would be a positive step. This would also help different communities groups to get together and discuss what is happening and what is being planned.

- Communication was a key issue for all groups. There seemed to be very little communication from local authorities, nor from CPPs. There was no opportunity for the ‘bottom’ (ie those in a community) to influence the ‘top’ (ie those sitting on CPPs).

- It was felt that much of the consultation which took place was just a ‘box ticking’ exercise. There did not seem to be any evidence that community members were listened to. There was no follow up. Indeed there was experience within the group of responding to a local authority consultation and receiving no response.
Funding:

- The majority of participants stressed the need for sustainability in funding, while recognising the current, constrained, spending environment.

- Lack of communication extended into funding issues. When funding was available, this is tended to be compartmentalised into areas like set-up and planning. The effect of this meant that you had to apply several times for funding and there did not seem to be any recognition from one area that you had already done the work.

- On the wider issue of access to funding, all of the groups felt that this was complex and extremely daunting. As, in the main, volunteers, the process was felt to be difficult. There could also be confusion about which funding stream should be accessed. There was experience amongst the group of taking forward a funding application only to be told very late on in the process that the funding wasn’t applicable to their particular project.

- There was agreement that local authorities had this knowledge and that they should be doing more to share this. The ‘community hub’ would provide a vehicle for this knowledge to be shared.
CPP Engagement:

- It was highlighted that the CPP offered minimal support to community organisations to help them to engage, and also that the system should be geared towards making projects happen.

- NLC’s “The Way Ahead” consultation sets out options for dealing with the Council’s reduced budget. It was generally felt that it was good that the Council was consulting, but were concerned as to what would happen with the data produced by those submitting comments, which they thought would be useful for community planning.

- The multitude of community groups in Cumbernauld was discussed, and it was stressed that a better working relationship and communication was required. Some had come up against problems of certain groups not sharing their work or influence with others. One interpretation of why there are so many “vociferous” community groups in Cumbernauld was that there is a perception in the town that Motherwell benefits disproportionately from NLC funding, and that community groups in Cumbernauld are offered little support from NLC.

- In talking about interaction with the CPP, it was clear that most of the groups represented had no dealings with the CPP itself, although some had fed into the Local Area Partnerships. There was also a lot of confusion about the different levels of the CPP, and who was responsible for what within the structure. Again the group felt that this could be a communication issue for NLC.

- CPPs don’t seem to have a big impact on most of the work members of the group undertook. There was a general lack of understanding of their work and role and, in some cases, a complete lack of knowledge about their existence. But it was felt that rather than be on the side of the community, CPPs added another layer to the bureaucracy which already exists and were a management tool.

- The experience of CPPs in general was very poor. There seemed to be very little community involved and it could be difficult to find out who was responsible for them and how to interact with them.

Regeneration:

- In looking at physical, social and economic regeneration, it was noted that there was a large amount of derelict land in the area, and that the proposed Community Empowerment Bill could assist in transferring assets, community right to buy etc.

- There was discussion about what regeneration meant and the group was clear that it can mean different things to different people. It clearly covers derelict builds and the physical environment – all of those round the table had experience of how this could impact on a community. However, it was
felt that equally important was the impact on communities and the change which regeneration can bring in improving lives of people living in these communities. People have to be at the heart of every regeneration project.

Community Empowerment:

- The unanimous response was that getting young people into work would make the biggest difference. The group stressed the work already ongoing, and noted that there was a lot of funding available for businesses to take on young people (community jobs fund, modern apprenticeships etc) but that businesses (especially small businesses) were unaware of the funding and/or how to access it.

- In terms of involvement in community groups, many in the group were keen that younger people (and more of a cross-section of society) become involved, and they talked about the possible barriers to this. It was suggested that groups approach their work on more of a single issue basis as this could encourage younger people to be involved, who were possibly daunted by the time commitment.

Glasgow – 18 February 2013

Introduction
Four members of the Local Government and Regeneration Committee paid a fact finding visit to Glasgow on 18 January 2013. The visit opened with an overview of regeneration and community empowerment in the area. This was presented by Glasgow City Council officials, and representatives from the Glasgow housing Association and the Glasgow Regeneration Agency. The Committee members conducted a site visit before conducting round table engagement seminars with community representatives.

Community Visit
The site visit was co-ordinated by Oxfam Scotland and provided the Committee with an opportunity to look specifically at the gender impact of regeneration funding/policies on women, especially those in vulnerable/ethnic groups and communities. The site visit encompassed the ‘Tea in the Pot’, a drop-in and support service for women in Glasgow, ‘Amina’, a Muslim Women's Resource Centre and meeting with representatives from Sunny Govan radio.

Remit
The workshop seminars were conducted with community representatives and focused on practical experiences of regeneration policy and how best to empower communities.

Attendees
The following individuals and organisations attended—

- Ann Armstrong (Love Milton);
- Karen Coyle (Love Milton);
Key Issues
The main points from the group’s discussion were as follows—

CPPs:

- The need for genuine consultation, particularly in CPP’s: There was a palpable sense of frustration on behalf of participants when it came to engaging with large partners. Consultations were seen as top down approaches where decisions had been pre made and then "rubber stamped" by the community who lacked appropriate power to refuse proposals or change them.

- Both in general consultations with communities for local regeneration or in partnerships (CPP’s, HCP’s etc.) it was felt that clarification was needed on what the authorities “part of the bargain” was, both in setting up funding streams and making them accessible, as well as the need to clarify to what extent the partnership was really “equal”.

- A story was raised about the area of Milton in Glasgow and the consultation process that took place there to regenerate land that had previously been housing stock. It was decided, having consulted with a small section of the
community that overlooked the area (rather than the area in full) that trees would be planted. But upon deeper consideration by a local social enterprise, it was found that many people were unaware of the consultation, and that the overwhelming wishes of a large majority were to have a local community centre erected instead.

- Participants felt that “community” concerns were in fact a “side-line” issue in comparison to an apparent pursuit of largely economic goals and indicators that could be quantified tangibly and that this represented a lack of trust on the part of large public or private stakeholders in projects. Overall, they thought that there had to be a culture shift towards trusting communities and adjusting values from economic indicators to social ones. “Community is the future. Yet community has been seen as a barrier to progress”.

- CPPs do not engage with communities. This can lead to major delays in the delivery of services and facilities. One speaker cited the example for it taking six years to get a community centre through the financing, planning and building phases to getting it open;

- There is no real fact-to-face relationship between the voluntary sector and many local authorities/CPPs. One speaker highlighted the fact that while voluntary sector organisations in Central Scotland were consulted on where council spending cuts might be directed to as to cause the least impact to the 3rd sector, so such consultation took place in Glasgow;

- There is a lack of respect and trust by those in local authorities/CPPs for the role of the voluntary sector, what it can deliver; and what it can “bring to the table” in terms of resources, expertise and ability. The general feeling is that the relationship under the CPP structure has deteriorated from that under the old social inclusion partnerships (SIPs). Representatives from a disability group expressed a view that CPP in Glasgow is hostile to the 3rd sector and that community engagement has fallen away from that under the old SIP system.

- There is also a lack of appreciation that community groups delivers frontline service, mopping up a lot of the ‘overspill’ caused by resource deficits/bad policy decisions as they are the ones who respond to community-based needs.

- There is a democratic deficit under the CPP system. Under SIPs the majority of decisions on funding/projects was taken in Council Committee, via elected members. Today most CPP decisions are based on council officer recommendation only. In Glasgow the CPP is unaccountable, however the reorganisation of the representative system into three areas across the city, and the amalgamation of local community planning boards and area committees presents an opportunity. But, the Glasgow Council neglected to ensure the voluntary sector were included in the initial restructuring plan.
There is no general appreciation of the level of return on investment which the voluntary sector can deliver. CPPs don’t undertake needs assessments or impact assessments. Most voluntary groups can tell you exactly what rate of return they can expect on finances spent by them (MSPs quoted the example from Galgale that for every £1 they spend the generate £14 in return for the community).

The landscape of engagement with local authorities/CPPs/ALEOs is complex, with both a silo structure, and a silo mentality prevailing. Funding is consumed by each tier of bureaucracy so that less is actually available by frontline services. Much community finding which used to come directly to community groups is now channelled via CPPs and ALEOs and this has resulted in a major loss of actual funding to community groups. An example of this is what has happened to the Fairer Scotland Fund when it became amalgamated with the integrated grant funds, thereby being lost for the most part to community groups.

Local authority structures and administration often gives rise to interdepartmental conflict and empire building by senior/middle management. This, in turn, frustrates 3rd sector participation in decision-making. While many councils followed a trend in recent to amalgamate departments and offices so as to deliver on economies of scale (reducing staffing numbers), and so achieve savings. But, the outcome has been that decision-making has been pushed to the upper tiers of council administration, more remote from the facts on the ground and the needs of communities, where spending decisions are subject to greater pressures to conform to wider policy targets, or objectives, or to be funnelled into favoured projects/areas.

Feeling that CPPs are “terrified of equalities” and it does not feature as an outcome for CPPs, probably because it wasn’t a named outcome under the old SIPs system. The Local Government (Scotland) Act 2003 names equalities as an objective for community planning, and Single Outcome Agreements (SOAs) need to be strengthened to deliver on equalities.

Needs to be a change in mind-set and culture in terms of 3rd involvement at executive team and board level of CPPs and decision making skills. Some representatives also raised a major gender factor in terms of 3rd sector engagement in Glasgow in that ‘officialdom’ in the city tends to be very patriarchal, macho, intimidating, adversarial - even hostile to women, who constitute the bulk of 3rd sector members. One female representative at the table, who has a disability stated that of all the barriers she has to overcome when dealing with Council/CPP/ALEO management in Glasgow - even at the most senior level – the greatest barrier was by far and away her gender, much more so than her disability.

Need to be able to show the level of additional funding, top-up funding and funding-in-kind the 3rd sector brings to the table, as local authorities and CPPs don’t often appreciate how much the 3rd sector can contribute
financially. Across an area like Glasgow this can amount to hundreds of millions of pounds per annum.

- **CPPs are very poor as assisting community engagement to understand and engage properly with the decision-making process**, because there is never a serious examination of process to see how the executive board of the CPP is structured.

- **The power relationship can be influenced by participatory budgeting and how the democratic system operates this.** There is a real need to hear directly from front-line groups, rather than having to conform to the hierarchical structures local government designs for engagement.

- **It was pointed out that this issue of who is ‘statutorily required’ to deliver services is often a stumbling block to mind-set change to the Council/CPP delivery of services with the 3rd sector.** Many councils view is that as it is directly elected, therefore, it must be directly responsible for delivery of services. However the NHS is not directly elected and delivers more public funded services that any other sector of society. There was a feeling that the cloak of statutory duties is used as an impediment to looking are changing mind sets.

- **A possible solution would be to giver 3rd sector organisations ‘sing-off’ rights on local plans and community plans with CPPs, in much the same way as has happened in the redesign of care services.** This would level the playing field and force councils/CPPs to come to negotiate and an agreement with the 3rd sector on dedicated funding for delivery of service models etc. as 3rd sector would be in a properly empowered relationship with CPP partners, as opposed to a good will hope based on engagement etc.

**Community Empowerment:**

- **Major concern that the proposed Community Empowerment and Renewal Bill has too much stress on community assets and the transfer of community assets.** This assumes a level of community empowerment which is far above where many communities are when the 3rd sector begins to engage with them. While communities can achieve the level of empowerment/expertise to successfully take control of community assets, it must be done properly.

- **Another concern about the Bill is in relation to the suggestions that Community Councils being the default position/structure for community engagement.** In Glasgow there is a real concern that elected councillors would champion such a proposal as a means of re-establishing a “power base” through control of area committees, whose influence in community engagement which were seen to be watered-down by the SIPs and CPP system. While some community councils may be empowered enough to undertake genuine community engagement, the feeling was that most are nowhere near that level.
To empower 3rd sector we need to develop genuine participatory budgeting and giving communities ownership of their own budgets. Currently very little willingness to move toward this in the case of Glasgow. In order to strengthen accountability some representatives recommended that

Any community empowerment strategy has to be supported with a dedicated funding package to underpin the genuine empowerment of communities. Community empowerment has a function in itself; it is not just about engagement, or engagement plus capacity building, or engaging with communities to gauge their views on delivery of services. It must be about empowering communities to take on their own issues and respond to their own needs. This will be hugely to the delivery of a successful development of the preventative spending/policy agenda.

Communication:

Continuing divisions between public officials and third sector practitioners: Participants felt that there were considerable differences in working practice between public officials and third/voluntary/community practitioners. It was thought that whilst there were many understanding and impassioned public officials who had genuinely high hopes for helping communities, they were constrained by a “system” that had them spend their days repeatedly doing “tick boxing” exercises that were essential for allowing projects or funding to continue; but which was felt were sometimes divorced from the real needs of the community at hand. This meant that public bodies were sometimes unable to respond quickly to changing needs and priorities.

In addition, these concerns led to a general feeling that public officials sometimes were unable to recognise the backlog of experience and deep knowledge that community representatives had about their local area, and the skills they had to help implement new programmes. It was also mentioned that third sector officials had a lot of trust on behalf of local communities and this was especially beneficial for their credibility as opposed to public sector officials, who some felt intimidated them. A few participants also expressed an interest in regeneration officers spending time working in their communities in order to see the problems that were currently being faced and a need to cut down on bureaucracy by letting groups establish themselves without outside help if it is not invited i.e. one group asked for outside help and were told they needed to establish a constitution which was not what they felt was their main goal at the time.

Funding:

Funding problems: Funding problems were discussed briefly in the context of a continuation of problems faced when interacting with the public or private sector. Participants felt processes for funding were over bureaucratised, box ticking took precedence and there was an overzealous “grant culture” and lack of understanding of the problems faced when filling out funding applications that were particularly long, in depth and which had very strict conditions. Above all, funding applications needed to be made
accessible to laypersons in this area. Particular problems also arose with the integrated grants fund, where it was felt decisions were pre made and there was absolutely no room for movement.

- Questions were also raised about partners involvement over long periods of time – i.e. who keeps up with the continuing regeneration process? And this concerned participants when thinking of long term planning in their area.

Community Ownership:

- **Community ownership & Assets**: There was discussion surrounding the prospect of communities increasingly taking over small properties or pieces of land for communal use and social purposes in their areas and it was overwhelmingly felt that this was a very positive step. One story was put forward of a project based in Govan that took over a plot of land and began to hold arts activities, grow healthy food, as well as providing a play room for children. The project costs for this scheme came in at £1000 annually and it was noted that with the right people and assistance, small schemes were remarkably resourceful.

- It was however remarked that there was a great need for help regarding leases, and potential “gifts” of land for community use, as not everyone was familiar with the process of community ownership. Participants felt that these assets were sometimes hampered by lengthy acquisition procedures. With the right help, there was a sense amongst participants that more communities could create welcoming “hubs” of activity, perhaps even social enterprises where regeneration projects could really flourish and increase cohesiveness throughout the overall regeneration process.

- **Communities facing new problems**: A good stock of housing that encourages all types of families and individuals to stay and contribute to an area was acknowledged to be very important by participants.

- There was particular discussion, at the suggestion Stuart MacMillan, surrounding recent national debates on “the bedroom tax” and Housing benefit changes currently being put into place. There was concern from all participants about the importance of locally available housing stock across all local authorities and a desire to see more one bedroom properties being built in order to deal with the problems arising from people having to downsize or pay “tax” where other properties were no longer available to them.

- There was a general dismay surrounding the apparent loss of good work on the part of Scottish local authorities where medium to large houses have featured in future local planning initiatives, which may now no longer fit with the new lexicon of rules for housing smaller families. Concern was also voiced for those who were carers of small children who did not stay in properties full time who would now have to pay the tax. There was similar concern that, particularly in Glasgow, councils were worried about rent arrears in this context for those already on a low income.
• These issues contributed to a more general worry that the fabric of communities would be further eroded by people being moved out of areas that have long been their homes in order to fulfil particular quotas and avoid the bedroom tax, which would remove them from care and social networks.

Regeneration:

• Stigma surrounding “regeneration communities”: Participants noted that there was a general sense of perceived stigmatisation of their communities and the individuals comprising them. There was reference to the term “three generations unemployed” and it was felt that there was an on-going demonization of those on out of work benefits, leading to mistrust and hopelessness. As an antidote to these considerations, representatives actually felt that good regeneration projects considerably helped this sense of hopelessness by providing good projects that increased access to local jobs and activities and that these life affirming ethos’ and activities filtered out to social networks locally, ultimately bringing the community closer together.

• Community engagement with the regeneration process in Glasgow - evidence was mixed as to the level and usefulness of engagement. Some good examples were given of community-based housing associations (CBHAs), which appeared to be a genuine partnership between people and communities and the local authority. CBHAs could provide a focal point for the community, as they had premises which could bring people together. Similar to this, the potential positive role of community anchor organisations, and the benefits of “transformational funding” (funding to help local people run projects) was also highlighted.

• On the SG’s regeneration strategy, there was some positive comment on the general thrust of the strategy, but groups were less clear how it tied together and related to various other pieces of work. Concerns were also raised about a perceived lack of resources to support the strategy.

• On access to regeneration funding, the group’s general view was that well-resourced organisations could access funding, but that people/smaller community groups found it very challenging, especially in terms of the amount and complexity of paperwork involved and the fact that personnel in relevant bodies often changed regularly, meaning useful contacts were lost. In a similar vein, some general comments were made on Glasgow City Council – it was so large that it was called a “monster” – and that there was little evidence of joined-up working, even within the Council.

• The group was very critical of national funding for regeneration, particularly the People and Communities Fund. This, according to the group, was not new money, but simply a renaming of funding that had been around for a decade. However, there was now less money and it was focussed on employability. While recognising the importance of employability, the group questioned why regeneration funding should be used for this, when so
much other funding was already focussed on it – eg the Jobcentre, Glasgow Regeneration Agency etc. The group also questioned whether this employability funding was all “joined-up”, and whether the current focus on youth unemployment etc was to the detriment of older people.

- **Lack of awareness surrounding the Scottish Government’s regeneration strategy:** Initially, the group were presented with an outline of the Government’s Regeneration strategy published in December of 2011 and participants were asked to indicate whether they were aware of the overall strategy and the Government’s future plans for this policy area. Participants however indicated they lacked a fuller awareness of overarching policy goals for the future and indicated that this information had not “filtered down” to a community level for localities to engage with in a meaningful way.

**Local Networks:**

- Local Networks were mentioned as a good way of bringing a range of organisations together, which could then represent the wider community interest effectively. While CPPs had initially engaged well with local networks, apparently in the last 3-4 years the CPP had become much more part of the local authority, and links had become less effective.

- The group also mentioned Social Inclusion Partnerships (SIPs), which, although they had problems, were better than CPPs in some respects as they involved much more face to face interaction.

**Thoughts on Changes to Current System:**

- More money to build capacity, especially in disadvantaged communities;
- Access to funding to enable bottom-up, rather than top-down regeneration and more use/recognition of the role of community anchor organisations;
- More long term funding;
- Better use of resources, especially in communities with long term issues;
- A culture change is needed to allow different ways of empowering communities;
- Resources to allow people to support organisations with funding applications;
- Make the Regeneration Agency and CPP accountable to communities;
- More creative thinking at public bodies, councils and the parliament, and for those bodies to be brave enough to be open in their decision making.
- A need for genuine engagement, not tokenism.

**Aberdeen – 18 February 2013**

*Introduction*

Three members of the Local Government and Regeneration Committee paid a fact finding visit to Aberdeen on 18 February 2013. The visit comprised three key
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elements; a presentation of the regeneration work being conducted by Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Councils, a site visit to a community group project (Seaton Backies), and community workshop seminars.

Community Visits
The Seaton Backies site visit demonstrated to the Committee Members a representation of the work being conducted by Community Groups in the area. In this instance the project aimed to revamp the ‘Backies’ area of Seaton in Aberdeen, and to encourage the community to spend more time outdoors safely.

Remit
The remit of the community workshop seminar was ‘to identify and examine best practice and limitations in relation to the delivery of regeneration in Scotland’. Two broad themes encompassed the focus of the meetings; regeneration and community empowerment. Specific themes within this included, for regeneration, strategy and policy issues, partnership working, and practical issues. Specific themes for community empowerment included strengthening participation, unlocking enterprising community development, and renewing our communities.

Attendees
The Committee used Parliamentary contacts with the third sector interface in Aberdeen to identify local community representatives to attend the community workshops. The following attended—

- Patsy Telford (Turning Point Scotland - Rosie’s Social Enterprise);
- Zara Strange (CAB Aberdeen);
- Nick Pilbeam (Westhill Men’s Shed);
- Alister Clunas (Aberdeen Greenspace);
- Cherie Morgan (Aberdeen Play Forum);
- Alexander Mess (local resident);
- Murdoch Macleod (Regeneration Matters);
- Alexander Grant (Disabled Veterans (NE Scotland));
- David Fryer (Torry Community Council);
- David Fyffe (Corsindale and Fetternear Farms);
- Alastair Minto (Inspire);
- Teresa Lamb (WEA);
- Emma Cameron (local resident);
- Jennie Biggs (Friends of Inch);
- Brian Allan (local resident);
- David Hekelar (local resident);
- David Henderson (local resident);
- Aileen Davidson (Civic Scotland - M26 Group), and
- Phil Mills-Bishop (Community Councillor).
Key Issues
The key issues brought up at the group discussions were as follows—

Volunteering:

- Increased expectations of added responsibilities resulting in less inclination to do voluntary work;
- All levels of government need to provide the resources, training, support and capacity for volunteering to work effectively;
- Greater recognition that volunteering makes big savings for local authorities.
- What stops volunteers running a Community Centre – red tape and bureaucracy. There needs to be a simpler solution for small communities. If they have a vision and a long-term plan they must also have ownership of a budget.

Community:

- Difficulty in getting marginalised people involved in the community;
- Concern over the impact of welfare reforms on third sector bodies;
- To empower people. Barriers to achieving that empowerment must be removed;
- Engagement should leave the community more capable by giving them a helping hand and leading towards local ownership. The community needs a common purpose, a focus, something tangible people can achieve. Successful regeneration will come initially on a small-scale and on a time scale allowing people to see a return on their input. Also need regular “wins” alongside a longer term vision.

Strategies:

- Lack of coordination of funding streams;
- Lack of awareness of local and national regeneration strategies;
- Concern over timing of tendering in relation to biding for funding;
- Rather than seeking a co-ordinated master plan for regeneration, organisations should aim to do something successful (eg Seaton Backies) and then try to apply it elsewhere;
- It was noted that it is hard to measure social regeneration as it is more intangible, although it is just as valuable as physical regeneration;
Something akin to self-directed support is wanted. Small improvement grants to community councils to spend locally have been discontinued. Better if local representatives have the ideas and make it happen, chasing departments and accounting for money adds no value, whereas support and enabling is required. Simple direction and instructions are required to assist. Local offices or officers to assist with suggestions, facilitation leaving the community to make decisions (and get on with it).

When there are short-term funding streams, tightly focussed things get created to meet the funding stream not necessarily the needs. Yet small organisations are often excluded because of the time required to apply.

**Public v Private Sector:**

- Public Sector and large organisations are poor at doing things locally. They don’t like letting go and tend to micro-manage. They are poor at talking across departments and engaging with local communities in a suitable timescale and language. Third sector organisations are over-regulated, subject to too much bureaucracy;

- By contrast private sector will leave you to get on with it albeit subject to reporting requirements.

**Participant Sound bites:**

- Who owns a project in the community, it’s a community project.
- Our challenge is to get people involved, is there a community (out there)?
- Nothing has been done except housing, too much regeneration focusses on housing.
- Commuting does not work for a community
- Time banks have enabled people to contribute to a community
- Our job is to come up with the ideas
- Can have strong voices which dominate and ignore the rest of the community
- Are we being ambitious enough?
- Learning to fail at a local level, take time to get it right but give it a go and avoid being too risk averse.
- About letting it go to get it done locally
- If no money and no focus, what is the point, folk don’t want to participate it it won’t make a difference.
- Extremists create change.

**Dundee – 16 September 2013**

**Introduction**

Four members of the Local Government and Regeneration Committee paid a fact finding visit to Dundee on 16 September 2013. The visit included a scene setting
presentation by local authority officials, followed by a visit to sites under development by Whitfield Development Framework (housing and social centres).

Community Visits
The Whitfield Development Framework visit demonstrated the thought process and planning behind current projects under construction, with the focus on housing and social centres as well as council and NHS centres.

Community Workshop Remit
The remit of the community workshop seminar was ‘to identify and examine best practice and limitations in relation to the delivery of regeneration in Scotland’. It was specifically targeted at those with an interest in community participation and delivery of regeneration activity in their area. The round table discussions focussed on factors included within the remit of the regeneration inquiry, and aimed at supporting the Committee’s pre-legislative scrutiny of the forthcoming Community Empowerment and Renewal Bill.

Attendees
The following persons and organisations attended—

- Caroline Bairner (Dundee City Council Learning);
- Around Project;
- Christine Dallas (Dundee Healthy Living Initiative);
- Yvonne Tosh (Douglas Community Centre);
- Garvie Jamieson (Douglas Community Centre);
- Kim Wilder (Link-Up, Whitfield);
- Scott Ferguson (Timetree Timebank);
- Mary Millar (WDG);
- Mary Adamson (C.A.N (Celebrate Age Network) and O.P.E.N (Older People Engaging Needs));
- Alice Bovill (Strathmartin Regeneration Forum);
- Agnes Campbell (Whitfield Community Panel);
- John Gilruth (North East Forum/Fintry Community Council);
- Tracie MacMillan (Manager of the Finmill Community Centre);
- Jess Morrison (Mill O’ Mains Tenants and Residents Association);
- Barbara Mycoff (North West Regeneration Forum);
- Ron Neave (North East Forum/Fintry Community Council (Finmill Centre));
- Patricia Phinn (Lochee Regeneration Forum);
- Ryann Smart (Finmill Community Centre);
- Larry Todd (Whitfield Community Centre Management Group);
- Bob Wallace (Whitfield Development Group);
- Mike Welsh (Dundee City Council staff officer).

Key Issues
The key issues brought up at the group discussions were as follows—

How to get involved:
• Communication is poor, with individuals having to actively seek out information.

• Both Timeshare and Link-up try to get beyond the ‘usual suspects’, but the same people appear to be on all the committees. Many think “I am not needed others will do it”.

• Meetings are not the best way. More creative solutions are required such as children’s clubs, cooking forums etc. Better on a casual basis to engage people and get input/contributions.

• Lots of people now think it is easy to access Regeneration money (locally). Information is accessible in a short, easy to read, booklet.

• Will it make any difference anyway – we are used to being let down in the past.

• There is a need to get others involved in volunteer work as it tends to be the same people. New volunteers are put off by an apparent lack of structure in the system.

• Encouraging participation by local people was another issue which was discussed. Obstacles such as public apathy; motivated self-interest and disappointment and scepticism generated from past commitments which have failed to be delivered on, makes engaging local people a particular challenge. Representatives from North East Dundee pointed to the success of local Gala Days as a means of engaging with the local community.

• Communities in North East Dundee have had success in using gala days to engage with up to 1000 people from the local community. This has involved the use of stalls set up by various local community groups or CPP agencies to reach out and engage with local people. Also the use of questionnaires, handed out to the public with the use of a prize/raffle for filling in and returning it at the Gala, as proved a very effective of getting feedback from local people on issues of importance to them.

• Gala days are also a means of generating much needed income for community groups, as well as a way of fostering community spirit in an area. Also the informality of the engagement process with local people in an event like a gala day can often make for a better.

• Another major barrier in fostering community engagement is the lack of crèche/childcare facilities which would allow people to attend community meeting and take part in community activities.

• Transport is another impediment to community engagement. Post war communities whose development and structure was often based on the use of car travel means it can be very difficult for people to be able to access facilities or be able to attend local meetings etc.
• Other issues such as fear in having to navigate poorly lit urban areas, or areas with high levels of antisocial behaviour, and the lack of funding to provide facilities like community minibus services also make trying to reach out to people in communities challenging.

The Effectiveness of Scottish Government Policies:

• There is a lot of money being put into physical initiatives, but social infrastructure gets less attention; both is needed.

• You can see physical regeneration but it does not address the underlying issues.

• The Crescent facility will lead to a loss of meeting space. The school will only be available out of hours (issues include safety, darkness and late hours) as well as time. This centralisation may reduce accessibility.

• The Community would not be interested in running the centre if they had to meet all costs.

• Need for more open spaces, grass for people to play on. The Douglas area envy Whitfield for this reason.

Funding:

• It takes time to build capacity in the community. Short term funding for initiatives are a problem as organisations come and go as funding is changed; they just get set up and then disappear as the funding dries up.

• Community sector jobs are predominantly temporary. The impact of this is that when staff move on new working relationships need to be established, and there is no continuity of effort.

• Repeat funding would assist if the period was known and there was an opportunity to re-apply. Mention was made of the old urban aid funding which lasted 4 years with a 3 year renewal possible.

• Cost of child care prevents younger people getting involved. A crèche would be useful and beneficial and it could also encourage people to try tasks which could lead to employment.

• It was noted that schools run reasonably priced breakfast clubs, although there is pressure on spaces in some areas. These clubs enable parents to better access learning portals and return to work.

• Insurance costs are an issue (and prohibitive) and the question was raised whether the council could provide it under their central policy rather than requiring all local projects to provide their own?
• Maintenance costs were raised as an issue, with questions raised as to who would be responsible for a community asset and whether there should be a single person who retains responsibility in each locality and is accountable and accessible, even if such a (council) post is part funded?

• For the unemployed and deprived communities funding is critical, paying anything extra (from benefits) is difficult and invariably breaches poverty levels.

• Ability to seek and access sources of funding was also discussed. Representatives from Whitfield pointed out that the community has recently received a £250,000 grant from the Big Lottery for the redevelopment of Whitfield Green, a local park, to provide a multi-purpose green space for the community.

• Dundee City Council and NHS Tayside are currently developing the Crescent Centre in Whitfield. This will be a co-located, community facility providing both Council and NHS services (such as a library, pharmacy, GP practice), along with private commercial space (retail outlets etc.). This building is also being examined for the provision of a community-based cinema.

• Changes to funding streams for regeneration have resulted in a lot of small community projects in the Whitfield area coming to an end. This reflected a wider discussion on the problems of both short term funding and of the restrictions of ring-fenced funding. The representative from St Martin’s Regeneration Forum pointed out that they (along with other regeneration forums in Dundee) receive £125,000 per annum from Dundee City Council. Along with other funding sources, this provides them with the flexibility to address their own priorities, as opposed to delivering on the priorities set out to by various funding agencies. St Martin’s Regeneration Forum has used its own funding to develop and run their own community centre for their area.

• Despite this, criticisms were expressed in the way this £125,000 was delivered. Currently, £50,000 is earmarked by the Council for the delivery of environmental projects by regeneration forums; £50,000 for set aside for youth diversionary schemes, and the remaining £25,000 is provided as a discretionary small grants fund. The view was expressed by the regeneration forum representative that this entire sum should be provided in a lump sum payment to regeneration forums, and the forums should have discretion as to how the entire fund is spent.

• In relation to general day-to-day spending by the Council on mainstream budgets (e.g. street cleaning, education provision etc.), there was general agreement that communities in receipt of regeneration funding do not get their fair share of spending on such services in comparison to other parts of the City. The perception that more affluent communities get a disproportionally larger share of both the Council’s resources and attention
was expressed in an anecdotal example by one of the community representatives.

What would be a measure of success in 5 years?

- A happier, connected, thriving and more equal community run by local people with doors open to all ages.

CPPs and LCPPs:

- Participation in the CPP system allowed community representatives to have access to someone “who can make a decision” about various issues. This was very helpful.

- There was a view, however, that the quarterly meeting patterns on LCPPs was a hindrance to finding speedy resolutions to local issues which may occur at short notice, or shortly after a LCPP meeting has taken place, and this leads to a lack of responsiveness to issues.

- A major restriction to community groups who wanted to purchase land, or other major community assets, was the need for legal support from solicitors. This was also true for issues around leasing facilities/assets from public ownership.

- If community groups had access to dedicated free legal aid support, as part of a community empowerment structure, this would provide great assistance as well as reduce some of the financial costs involved in taking over assets.

- As example of where a statutory community right to buy facilities was given when the representative from Lochee pointed out that there is currently a vacant school building in their community which could be used as a much-needed community centre for the people of Lochee. The community should have a right to take over these premises.

- Some representatives stressed the difficulty community groups who acquire assets, such as buildings and land, could face in trying to fund their upkeep/operation in the long term. Concern was expressed as to the capacity of community groups to manage such burdens over the long term, especially if the public sector across Scotland (such as local authorities) were finding this issue a challenge.

- Sustainability of assets and resources is a major concern for local community groups. In terms of the day-to-day running of community facilities, such as community halls, centres etc. particular emphasis was made in terms of the cost of water bills as being a major cost sustainability issue. Reference was made to the fact that community-owned assets which were built/acquired before 1997 were exempted from water rates. This is a significant advantage to certain facilities which have been in operation since before 1997, whereas community assets/facilities in the last 15 years have
to carry the full burden of water rates. Any statutory structure and/or support package which is put in place to underpin community empowerment, ownership of assets and land purchase should look to exempt such assets from water bills, and this would be a major financial benefit to the sustainability of such assets in community ownership.

Training issues:

- Representatives from North East Dundee stated that they didn’t get enough opportunities to undertake training to support their community role, however they did have access to facilities. They commented that training such as how the Scottish planning system operated, would be of benefit to them.

- Another representative made the point that working as a community volunteer necessitates engaging with a lot of official acronyms and jargon, in areas like planning, legal issues etc. Training to assist people in “deciphering and decoding’ these would be very useful and help to demystify a lot of the issues local people have to engage with through regeneration and other community work.

- The Chair of the St Martin’s Regeneration Forum made reference to the fact that they have adopted a practice of attaching a glossary of official terms/jargon to the published minutes of Forum meetings, so local people can make more sense of issues under discussion and learn about official terms.

- Another participant made reference to the fact that some training in understanding the legal system would also be of great benefit in supporting the work of local people in community engagement.

Are community groups being listened to?

- Some attendees expressed the view that they do not feel they are getting their fair share of access/allocation of regeneration funding in comparison to other communities in Dundee. The representative from the Lochee Regeneration Forum highlighted what she saw as the disparity between the levels of regeneration funding provided to communities such as Whitfield as opposed to those provided to Lochee.

- Members of the groups felt that the public and residents in their communities were not really consulted on the development of their local regeneration plans.

- Comment was made in relation to communities, such as Fintry, that were planned and developed in such a way as that they didn’t have the needs of people at the centre of their design.

- A point was made that community facilities, such as the Finmill Centre, helps to communicate to the local community what is going on around them.
• Some local community groups have had good levels of contact and communications with agencies such as the Police, SEPA, universities etc.

• Frustration was expressed that local businesses do not engage with, or get involved in, Local Community Planning Partnerships (‘LCPPs’).

• Frustration was also expressed at the way LCPPs operate. Quarterly meetings of LCCPs are often too infrequent to allow them to react quickly to short-term issues which develop in the community which local residents may need to have addressed quickly. The agenda for LCPP meetings are often overcrowded with items of business, leaving very little time for any real quality discussed on important issues, such as levels of drug taking in the community etc.

• It was also commented that LCPP meetings often consist of representatives from ‘official’ agencies (such as the local authority, NHS, police) who present to community members on the progress of various initiatives.

• St Martin’s Regeneration Forum, pointed out that local regeneration forums are far more effective at targeting money where it is really needed in the Community as opposed to LCPPs, local authorities, or national government or its agencies. One participant stated that the biggest problem with LCPPs is that they are “official loaded”.

• Frustration was expressed with difficulties in engaging with official agencies in terms of the needs of local communities. Representatives from Mill O’ Mains highlighted particular issues with Homes Scotland, and their lack of responsiveness to local needs.

• There is a demoralising community effect in delays to delivering basic community facilities. For example, the people of Lochee have been campaigning for over 20 years for the provision of a community centre in their area.

Drug Strategies:

• One representative stated that the issue of drug abuse was the single biggest challenge facing her local community and that there was “a tremendous level of apathy in working class area” as a result. Another point to come from this discussion was the ever-changing nature of drugs strategies by local and national government and agencies. This, it was felt, greatly undermines local efforts to address the situation on the ground as there is no certainty of approach and so no meaningful progress is ever made.

• Concern was also expressed to the practice of some pharmacists in Dundee of dispensing methadone to patients in plain sight of other customers, especially in the presence young children. Also a practice of giving priority to serving methadone users in a pharmacy so as to avoid problems which might arise if methadone patients are required to wait while
other patients are served before them. This leads to a situation locally where other customers often witness the process of dispensing methadone to patients.

Social Deprivation:

- Social issues in older more established communities may be as serious and entrenched as in the ‘newer’ communities, however there was a feeling from some people that their concerns did not receive the same level of focus or attention from policy makers and agencies because they didn’t live in developments dating from the 60s onwards.

- This view was summed up in a housing development, known as Skarne housing units. These housing units were built on a large scale across Dundee from the 60s. They often consisted of three to four storey concrete pre-fabricated housing developments (flats), arranged in a hexagonal configuration around a green space or common area. Owing to sub-standard construction and design, by the 80s and early 90s it was recognised that much of this housing stock has developed numerous problems (poor insulation, ventilation, heating etc.) which made them unsuitable for occupation. As a result of the work carried out in newer green-field developed communities, such as Whitfield, under programmes such as the New Life for Urban Scotland initiative in the 80s and 90s, these Skarne units were deemed unfit for human habitation. Most have now been replaced with new higher quality housing units. However, in older more established communities in Dundee where Skarne units were also developed, they have been retained to the present day.

- This led to a very palpable sense of anger and confusion in the discussion group as to why people living in one community were classed as needing newer housing because such units were considered unfit, while in other communities just two or three miles away, these very same units were still classed as fit for habitation.

- Irrespective of the actual conditions such units may be in any given community, comment was made on the negative message this policy communicated to people across different communities, about where they ranked in the order of importance for officialdom. The result is a very real sense of confusion, anger, grievance and disillusionment by those communities who feel they are losing out in comparison to their neighbours. This, in turn, fosters greater distrust in the commitments made by government and various agencies to deliver on regeneration in those longer established communities.

---

Paisley – 16 September 2013

Introduction
Three members of the Local Government and Regeneration Committee paid a fact finding visit to Paisley on 16 September 2013. The visit comprised three key
elements; a presentation of the regeneration work being conducted by Renfrewshire Council, a site visit tour (including Ferguslie Pre-5 Nursery, Recovery Across Mental Health, Active Communities and St Mirren FC), and community workshop seminars.

Community Visit
The Committee members paid a visit to the award winning environmental project, Ferguslie Park Pre-5 Nursery as well as Recovery Across Mental Health, Active Communities and St Mirren FC and meet those involved in the projects to see first-hand the positive impact community action has made.

Remit
The workshop seminars were conducted with community representatives and focused on practical experiences of regeneration policy and how best to empower communities.

Attendees
The following individuals and organisations attended—

- Stephen Cruickshank (Renfrewshire Access Panel);
- Iain Cunningham (Engage Renfrewshire);
- Ian Findlay (Renfrewshire Witch hunt 1697);
- Iain Reynolds (Johnstone Community Sports Complex);
- Ian Williams (Environment Training Team);
- David Woodrow (Chair of the Bishopton Community Council);
- Kay Taylor;
- Gavin Kenny;
- Stuart Miller;
- C Graham;
- B Crawford;
- Mark Waters;
- Ali Whitty.

Key Issues
The main points from the group’s discussion were as follows—

Local Area Committees:

- Local area committees (LACs) in Renfrewshire are “a waste of time”. The idea that they would bring democracy closer to people at the local level is viewed as “not working”.

- LACs look like a propaganda exercise. They should be more community based.

- Party politics should have nothing to do with local government. Communities should be represented by people who live in them. There is too much scoring of party-political points and backbiting in local government.
- The basic idea behind LACs (to get decision makers around the table) is sound, but only councillors are allowed to vote. This is wrong. If the purpose of LACs was to give the community easier access to the democratic process, then this is not happening. There should be more monitoring of LACs. It was claimed that all funding decisions in LACs are pre-arranged.

- The importance of LACs prioritising and being more focused and responsive was discussed. Often it is a matter of who shouts loudest. LACs need to publicise funding more.

- People do not know how community planning partnerships work. They do not know enough about them.

Regeneration:

- Nothing seems to happen about west end regeneration in Paisley.

- Regeneration is “all talk, smoke and mirrors”. It is important to do things with communities.

- There is a proposal to change a pedestrian area in Paisley, which has been pedestrian for 16 years. People do not seem to be heard in that process.

- No thought is given to sustainability in some regeneration projects. McMaster Sports Centre in Johnstone was closed and is now “an absolute mess”. In another park there is no security. Sustainability of projects should be considered at the outset.

- Access to information about regeneration is important, but the council website, as a prime site for this, is “challenging”.

- A Paisley bus route for 40 years was suddenly changed without any warning, with consequences for the area it covered.

- Blind and visually impaired people have difficulty getting information from the council in audio form. The importance of information formats was discussed.

- There was also a lengthy discussion on the lack of provision of local bus transport, and that the “dial a bus” service was not delivering the level of desired service. The group noted that various organisations had minibuses which were not in use for most of the time, as public assets these could be turned into income generating tools. Also on buses, the group later talked about general provision in the area and the detrimental impact on the community of, generally, there being no public transport after 6pm.
CPPs:

- CPPs have been in existence for 10 years, but there is a lack of knowledge and understanding of them.

Funding:

- Funding should be looked at in the round. For example, the council gave £5,000 for Erskine music festival, but £2,000 had to go back to it for hiring facilities.
- Too much work goes into applying for funding.
- The difficulties of obtaining funding was discussed, especially for more than one year. It was said that funders do not want to fund the same event year on year, but that if enough changes could be made to projects and programmes then funding could possibly be obtained for multiple years, but rarely more than three.
- The Johnstone Community Sports Centre then spoke about its funding issues, particularly with BIG lottery, who “changed the goalposts” significantly recently in requiring groups to own, not lease, assets. This means that, in practice, groups must have funding available for demolition if the project does not work out. The group felt that this and other asset transfer issues were something that could be addressed in the Community Empowerment Bill.
- This led on to a discussion on community trusts, looking at the example of Bishopton, which was in the process of developing its trust. It was felt that the community trust model could serve as a useful “buffer” and take on risks/liabilities which individual community organisations would find too great.

Community Networking:

- The group began by discussing the work of the Environment Training Team, whose work in cleaning up and working on the local area had both environmental and employability benefits – as well as improving the local environment, the group had supported 14 people into work.
- The group then talked about the work of Engage Renfrewshire, stressed the importance of the networks that it can bring together, and the opportunities for networking and making connections that it provides. This helps groups support each other, often from different areas who might not have thought about working together before. Groups can also discuss things that work, and things that don’t, helping each other avoid pitfalls that they have experienced.
- While Engage has limited capacity and resources to assist community groups, it tries to ensure that its support is focussed and targeted where it is
needed most. Another main area of its work is to help community groups build in an enterprise element to their work so that they do not have to continue to bid for funding.

- As a cultural group, the Renfrewshire Witch Hunt 1697 had a different, but comparable, set of experiences to the other groups represented. The group discussed the benefits to the wider community that cultural events can bring (especially in terms of footfall in the town) but also particular challenges faced by cultural groups. Licensing applications were an issue, and the council's licensing department could do more to help.

Communication
- The group then moved on to discuss the perceived lack of help and assistance that community groups (especially those involved in contributing to health and wellbeing outcomes) receive from the local health board, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde. However, this was in contrast to the Community Health Partnership, who engaged much more positively.

- Linked to this, the group discussed communications with the council in general, and found that certain departments were very difficult to contact/hold meaningful meetings with. This could be very frustrating, especially when no feedback was given/emails were never answered, although some departments were improving.

- Finally, there was a discussion about how neighbourhoods that were not necessarily in areas of deprivation still faced similar problems of a lack of facilities/transport etc and that they should not be forgotten.

Single Outcome Agreements:

- The group moved on to discuss how the Single Outcome Agreement affected their groups and how their groups contributed to the outcomes for Renfrewshire. Often groups did not know or thought that they weren’t relevant. But, in reality much of the work of community groups contributed directly to the achievement of SOA outcomes. It was felt that “plain English” versions of SOAs would be very useful in getting this message across.
ANNEXE F: MAP OF REGENERATION FUNDING IN SCOTLAND

The following is our attempt to map all of the various sources of funding which support regeneration policy in Scotland:

HLF – Heritage Lottery Fund
PCF – People and Communities Fund
RCGF - Regeneration Capital Grant Fund

SPRUCE - Scottish Partnership for Regeneration in Urban Centres
URCs – Urban Regeneration Companies
VDLF – Vacant and Derelict Land Fund
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Scottish Government

Local Authority Areas

5

13
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