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Abstract In Scotland, the past 25 years has been a period of remarkable political and economic change. The 1992 closure of the Ravenscraig steelworks complex marked the end of a seminal industrial era. The 1999 opening of the Scottish Parliament was followed by the 2008 economic crash and the 2014 referendum on Scottish independence. Under various Conservative, Labour, Liberal Democrat and Scottish National Party government administrations in Westminster and Holyrood, the period has also featured a considerable diversity of approaches aimed at supporting the regeneration of disadvantaged places. This year, to celebrate its 25th anniversary, SURF organised a series of special events to explore and debate the perceived impacts and value-for-money of the main regeneration policy mechanisms that have been applied during its lifetime. This paper features an overview of the context and purpose of selected mechanisms, and highlights the feedback provided by SURF network practitioners, policy-makers and academics through the anniversary programme discussions.

Keywords: Scotland, regeneration policy, historical context

INTRODUCTION

SURF is a registered charity with more than 250 cross-sector member organisations that share a common interest in alleviating poverty and improving opportunities in Scotland’s poorest communities. Formed in 1992, SURF operates an annual activities programme that features seminars, conferences, study visits, lectures, research initiatives, policy influencing and the SURF Awards for Best Practice in Community Regeneration. It currently employs a small team of six staff, and is directed by a Board of 17 Trustees.

In marking its 25th anniversary this year, SURF organised a series of national debate and conference events in Glasgow and Edinburgh to bring its network together and reflect on the various regeneration policies that have been implemented during the past 25 years. The period has been a notably turbulent one, full of social and economic change as symbolised by key events such as the 1992 closure of the Ravenscraig steelworks, the 1999 opening of the Scottish Parliament, the 2008 economic crash, and the 2014 referendum on Scottish independence. There have
been historically significant changes in government at Westminster and Holyrood, and regeneration policies have evolved rapidly across the various electoral cycles.

Prior to the event series, SURF worked with leading practitioners and academics to draw up a shortlist of the 12 key regeneration-focused strategies and policies in Scotland from the past 25 years. This shortlist was then presented to the SURF network in a series of gatherings to promote discussion and debate.

For SURF, the goal was to use the cross-sector knowledge and experience in the SURF network to compare the perceived impacts and value-for-money of these policies. What learning outcomes are offered by the recent past? Is there scope to enhance the contemporary portfolio of policy mechanisms by exploring relative successes and failures? Do any defunct strategies and vehicles stand out as being particularly high-impact and cost-effective?

Our process was, of course, an unscientific one, subject to a range of valid criticism. All policies are applied within a particular window in time under exposure to unique contextual factors; so, an approach that worked well in the late 1990s might be completely unsuited to the post-2008 economic and social context. There have been formal, in-depth evaluations of some key Scottish regeneration policies, but not others. This presents an additional problem for retrospective comparison.

Furthermore, it is notoriously difficult to measure the impact of any regeneration initiative or strategy amid the ‘noise’ of other policies and general economic fluctuations. Comparisons are further challenged by the reality that the purposes of regeneration policy vary widely — one, for example, may aim to increase economic growth, another to enhance the built environment or alleviate a specific social problem.

Nevertheless, there was a great deal of interest in, and useful outcomes from, the event series. A change of venue was required for a debate on the fundamental question of ‘Does Regeneration Work?’ in Glasgow Women’s Library, following excess demand. This, together with other events, featured hundreds of contributions from public, private, academic, third sector and community group stakeholders from across the country.

SURF shared participants’ enthusiasm for shining a spotlight into the regeneration policies of the recent past and exchanging perceptions on what worked, and what didn’t. In chronological order, the following sections focus on selected policy mechanisms and summarise event participants’ views and perspectives on their respective impacts and value.

**NEW LIFE FOR URBAN SCOTLAND (1988–99)**

In selecting a range of policies and processes that are most clearly targeted at the regeneration of deprived places, SURF excluded more general population-wide policies in fields such as health, education, employability, economic development and planning. The first major policy model that met our criteria for inclusion was New Life for Urban Scotland (NLUS).

Initiated in 1988, the programme was four years old by the time SURF was formed via a gathering of cross-sector regeneration experts in mid-1992. NLUS was a £485m investment in the regeneration of four peripheral housing estates in Scotland’s largest urban centres — Dundee, Edinburgh, Glasgow and Paisley — and administered by local partnerships led by the UK government’s Scottish office. The programme is a strong example of the wider shift in area-based regeneration policy in the UK in the 1980s, in which comprehensive, integrated multi-agency partnership frameworks
that emphasised employability, education and enterprise support began to replace projects that focused more narrowly on land development and the securing of private sector investment in flagship projects.¹

As Prof. Douglas Robertson, University of Stirling, stated in one of SURF’s debates, NLUS represented a novel approach in the Scottish context:

‘We then get partnership areas where we tie the two together — New Life for Urban Scotland was the start of that. And we see the physical and the social getting tied together’.²

In addition to its notability for simultaneously delivering physical and social forms of urban regeneration in a specific geography, NLUS effectively bypassed existing local authority structures, and it was a relatively long-term initiative in operation for just over a decade. This contrasted, as Robertson noted in the debate, with the shorter term, local authority supported projects delivered using Urban Aid finance at the time.³

An interim independent evaluation of the programme, commissioned by the Scottish Executive within a few months of the opening of the Scottish Parliament in 1999, was broadly favourable. It reported that the programme was a pioneering approach that provided value for money, supported significant increases in local employment levels, and improved resident satisfaction rates. It also stated that:

‘The 10-year initiative has made some significant inroads but problems of disadvantage on the estates still remain to be addressed’.⁴

NLUS area Ferguslie Park in Paisley is still identified as the single most deprived small area in Scotland out of more than 6,000 ranked in the 2016 edition of the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation.⁵ There was a perception that the NLUS programme should have left a stronger long-term legacy, in Ferguslie Park and elsewhere, and that the model simply did not deliver on local economic development aspirations.

One participant said the initiative’s value lay in promoting holistic, multi-disciplinary approaches in regeneration more generally, rather than in successfully addressing deep-rooted social and economic challenges in the limited field of the four estates. In SURF’s survey exercise, it was ranked second lowest on impact and third last on value for money out of 12 policy models.

SOCIAL INCLUSION PARTNERSHIPS (1999–2005)

Introduced in 1999, Social Inclusion Partnerships (SIPs) were based on the NLUS model, and directly funded by the new Scottish Executive. As cross-sector, multi-agency bodies, SIPs focused on reducing and preventing social exclusion, delivering projects in education, employability, health, crime prevention and other areas. Around £370m was expended in 48 SIPs, most of which worked in geographic boundaries, while some had a thematic focus.⁶⁷

By way of example, Drumchapel, a multiply-deprived area in west Glasgow, was designated a geographic SIP in April 1999. The SIP Board arranged a major baseline study and established several implementation groups to respond to priority physical, social and economic challenges. More than 100 individuals were directly involved in the partnership structure. Its key projects included a training and employment strategy for people with substance abuse...
issues and a housing initiative providing accommodation for young people threatened by homelessness. Efforts were made to promote consistent monitoring and evaluation frameworks across the SIP programme, although these were not entirely effective due to inconsistent working arrangements for gathering and reporting data. Individual evaluations of SIP tended, however, to be positive. For instance, an independent assessment of East Ayrshire Coalfields Area SIP found that it 'worked effectively and with efficiency' with actions 'entirely consistent with the pursuit of a highly aspirational and ambitious [vision]' A SIP for the Merkinch area of Inverness was reported to have delivered on a number of achievements, including improved access to health services and increased learning opportunities for young people.

In discussing the SIP experience, SURF Annual Conference participants reported that the model was generally successful for promoting a holistic, cross-agency basis for responding to local regeneration problems. While it was noted that the experience usefully informed several later regeneration policy models, it was felt that something valuable was lost when the model was discontinued in 2005 and its key elements were applied across large local authority regions under Community Planning structures.

SURF network comments on specific SIPs paid tribute to the knowledge, experience, hard work and dedication involved in local SIP Boards and working groups. The SIP model was not, however, without criticism. In SURF’s debate event, Gehan MacLeod, founder and manager of the Galgael social regeneration project in Glasgow, was one of several stakeholders who expressed the view that local communities were not included adequately by SIP processes, despite rhetoric to the contrary.

Others noted the lack of success in reaching the private sector, and that SIP designations did not cover enough of the country’s most deprived areas. Further concerns were raised about consistency, with some participants reporting that while many SIP partnership structures worked well, others had ineffective local influence.

Overall, the SURF network generally felt that the SIP model was effective and that it produced a positive legacy in making partnership working and community engagement a standard in subsequent community regeneration activity. SURF Annual Conference participants placed it fifth out of 12 in both impact and financial value.

WIDER ROLE FUND (2000–2012)
Wider Role encouraged registered social landlords in Scotland to undertake regeneration initiatives outside their core service provision by submitting applications to an open grants programme. For most of its lifespan, the fund was delivered via Communities Scotland, the Scottish government’s former agency for housing and regeneration. Introduced in 2000, the programme was in operation for 12 years, distributing £12m per annum in the three years to 2011, and £6m in its final year to March 2012.

Projects proposed for Wider Role funding were required to be consistent with local regeneration plans and also to respond to annual priorities set by Communities Scotland, such as tackling poverty or improving quality of place. SURF Annual Conference participants believed, pound for pound, the Wider Role Fund was perhaps the most influential and undervalued regeneration programme of the past 25 years. Of the 12 policies, they were asked to assess in a special breakout group exercise, they
ranked it top in terms of impact and second in value for money.

Many participants expressed the view that the fund had a transformative and catalytic impact in encouraging housing associations of all sizes to become more outward-looking and develop a stronger collaborative mindset. Others felt that the Scottish community housing movement had always had a ‘wider role’ attitude, but that the Wider Role programme nevertheless helped build capacity and confidence within the sector to improve partnership working and manage innovative regeneration projects.

Several participants provided examples of successful projects that were initially proposed via unsuccessful applications to the Wider Role Fund and ended up becoming financed by other grant programmes or even the housing associations’ and partners’ own budgets, indicating the programme’s value beyond the grant awards. The Wider Role programme was perceived as encouraging imaginative thinking and the development of new connections concerning the relationship between housing provision and a place’s social and economic challenges and opportunities.

There was a strong consensus among SURF Annual Conference participants that the Wider Role Fund should not have been wound up in 2012. Although the People and Communities Fund was viewed as a valuable successor model driven by similar values, some argued that it put housing associations in competition with other players in community led regeneration, including development trusts and trading social enterprises, which was causing some unhelpful resentment on both sides.

**LAND REFORM (2003–PRESENT)**

The regeneration of economically fragile communities was a key motivating factor behind The Land Reform (Scotland) Acts of 2003 and 2016, and key aspects of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act of 2015. These legislative measures, supported by related resources, have granted and supported a series of new rights for community groups to purchase and manage land and buildings. There is more than 0.5m hectares of Scottish land in community ownership, and the Scottish government aspires for this to increase to 1m acres by 2020.¹⁵,¹⁶

A notable example of land reform supporting community regeneration outcomes is the Macrannnahish airbase in Argyll, a former Ministry of Defence facility that was sold to a local community group for a nominal fee in 2012. The extensive site, which has 200 properties and Scotland’s longest runway, now supports a range of local economic functions, hosting 40 businesses and generating annual profits that are reinvested in community projects.¹⁷

The SURF Awards for Best Practice in Community Regeneration, an annual process delivered by SURF in partnership with the Scottish government, has recognised the achievements of several successful community land initiatives. Among many others, these include the enhancement of community-run Ullapool Harbour (winner, Large Scale Infrastructure category, 2014) and construction of new family homes in the remote Highland village of Helmsdale managed by the local development trust (winner, Community Led Regeneration category, 2014).¹⁸

As the above examples indicate, the success of the policy is most evident in rural Scotland, especially the Highlands and Islands. In recent years, an independent Land Reform Review Group has advised Scottish policy-makers to do more to encourage new community land ownership projects in the towns and cities of central Scotland.¹⁹
With roll-out of relevant policy measures on the back of the 2015 Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act and 2016 Land Reform (Scotland) Act ongoing, SURF anniversary contributors agreed that it is too early to judge the extent to which the enhanced application of land reform legislation to urban areas have been successful. They did, however, share a strong enthusiasm towards the added value that local enthusiasm, knowledge and ownership can bring to any land or building regeneration initiative in a struggling Scottish community.

On a more cautionary note, there was agreement that community land ownership is not always appropriate or viable, and that it should not be automatically considered preferable over other forms of response, such as local authority led initiatives. The SURF anniversary events also featured discussion on the difficulty of supporting community ownership projects in high density urban neighbourhoods compared to rural villages. In addition to land and buildings being much more expensive in urban areas, those settings are more likely to involve more complex local dynamics and community relationships.

In being asked to consider land reform measures against 11 other major Scottish regeneration policy initiatives of the past 25 years, SURF event participants placed it fourth in both value and impact.

COMMUNITY PLANNING PARTNERSHIPS (2003–PRESENT)

Each of Scotland’s 32 councils has legislative responsibility for convening and leading a regeneration focused Community Planning Partnership (CPP). In addition to the council itself, and its service departments, these multi-agency local partnerships typically include representatives from NHS health boards, police and fire services and enterprise agencies.

Since 2007, the 32 CPPs have been obliged to agree locally designed Single Outcome Agreements (SOAs) with the Scottish government. SOAs set out plans to improve public services and respond to local social and economic challenges. In 2015, CPPs gained expanded powers through the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act. These powers include the delivery of Locality Plans, which aim to engage community participation as a basis for focused action on problems in disadvantaged places.20,21,22

Community Planning in Scotland has a long and contested history. Consultation outcomes towards the development of SURF’s 2016 Manifesto for Community Regeneration indicated that the framework is generally successful in promoting high level public service prioritisation and coordination. Some commented, however, that this is the kind of strategic public collaboration taxpayers might reasonably expect to happen even if Community Planning didn’t exist as a branded concept. As a practical model, it also stands in positive contrast to the lack of a similar cooperative local leadership format in many other European countries.

Many in the SURF network expressed concerns that the name ‘Community Planning Partnerships’ causes confusion around their relationship to neighbourhood level activity, the empowerment of community groups, and the spatial planning system. In its 2016 Manifesto, SURF argued:

‘Rebranding them as “Service Delivery Partnerships” would more accurately reflect their valuable purpose in seeking to improve the efficiency and outcomes of public service delivery through enhanced intelligence and cooperation’.23

SURF’s 2017 anniversary event participants welcomed the ongoing
changes to Community Planning, which includes the development of Locality Plans, and a Scottish government commitment for its forthcoming Planning (Scotland) Bill to align Community Planning with the spatial planning system. There were various favourable comments about the high status of CPPs and their ability to bring senior local decision-makers together, although there were perceptions of inconsistency, with some being strongly council-controlled and managed, and others operating more collaboratively across multiple agencies in a quasi-independent format.

Among more pointed criticisms was the reality that Community Planning processes takes up a lot of public sector staff time, but without any dedicated budget to spend on the needs identified. Others felt that unlike the SIP model predecessor, CPPs are fundamentally dealing with too large a geography to operate effectively; the average CPP population size is 170,000, while the aforementioned Drumchapel SIP served a local population of 13,500.24,25 In its overall assessment, SURF event participants ranked it ninth place in both impact and value for money out of 12 regeneration policy models from the past 25 years.

URBAN REGENERATION COMPANIES (2004–PRESENT)

Urban Regeneration Companies (URCs) are public/private partnership bodies tasked with managing a strategic, long-term place-based regeneration programme. Originally developed in England and Wales, the Scottish Executive established six URCs in Scotland between 2004 and 2007. URC budgets, structures and approaches varied widely, but all were tasked with engaging the public and private sectors and local community organisations.

By way of example, Raploch URC in Stirling prioritised new housing and infrastructure, complemented by employability and enterprise support functions. In 2010/11 the Scottish government invested £37m in URCs. From 2011 onwards the URCs have been wound up or greatly reduced in scale, except for Clyde Gateway, which operates in east Glasgow and part of South Lanarkshire.26

There was a broad recognition in SURF anniversary event discussions that the 2008 economic crash greatly damaged key URC project master plans, and that national and local political and economic support for the model weakened substantially only a few years into its operation. As they were originally intended to run for up to 15 years, there was a strong perception of lost opportunity. Some event participants noted that Clyde Gateway, which benefited from a leading legacy role in the 2014 Commonwealth Games in Glasgow, appeared to be performing strongly, which indicated the potential in the original long-term support aspirations for Scottish URCs.

It was, however, noted that the URC model was dependent on the housing market for its long-term success, with rising land values and sales of new housing earmarked for later stage regeneration programme activity. While the sharp economic downturn was widely unpredicted, the delivery of wider plans via a single sector was seen as a flimsy, high-risk approach. There were also questions raised about whether new URC vehicles were needed in the first place, given that housing development expertise was already present in local housing associations, who could have served as effective delivery bodies, saving the time and costs of creating new ones.

Some SURF Annual Conference participants also felt that Scottish URC partnerships had tended not to come together effectively, and that some of them
should have delivered stronger outcomes regardless of the economic crash given the level of public investments. There were also negative comments about URCs’ strong focus on community benefit clauses, with some SURF members opining that the provision of work and training placements for young people as part of construction contracts tended to have trivial influence on sustainable local employment levels.

Clyde Gateway, whose experienced Chief Executive, Ian Manson, contributed as keynote speaker to two of the SURF anniversary events, was singled out for praise around its role in reversing population decline in east Glasgow and attracting inward investment and employment. Despite this conspicuous success, participants rated the overall URC programme last place in both impact and value for money among the 12 policy models they considered.

SOCIAL ENTERPRISE SUPPORT (2006–PRESENT)

The Scottish government provides several dedicated support budgets and programmes to encourage the growth of social enterprises, many of which work towards local regeneration objectives. Its current 2017–20 Social Enterprise Action Plan prioritises the stimulation of new social enterprises and the growth of established ones.

The first national audit of social enterprises in Scotland, undertaken in 2015, indicated that the country has more than 5,000 active social enterprises, employing 112,000 staff evenly split between full- and part-time positions, and generating £1.15bn in trading income. The audit, based on a national survey by Social Value Lab, also indicates the significant regeneration activity Scottish social enterprises are engaging in. It found that just over half have improving wellbeing and helping people to actively participate in their local community as specific objectives, while 45 per cent aspire to create employment opportunities and 33 per cent to tackle poverty.

The SURF Awards regularly features social enterprises among winning and shortlisted entries. The Town Centre Regeneration category of the 2014 process, for example, highlighted the work of Firstport in providing a support package for young social entrepreneurs. The ‘Beyond the Finish Line’ initiative provided several months of free workspace in Glasgow’s Merchant City, a grant of £2,000 and one-to-one mentoring. It led to the creation of 12 new social enterprises including new food production, furniture upcycling and construction waste recycling businesses, revitalising previously empty high street units and creating sustainable employment.

Without any observable exception, SURF anniversary participants strongly commended the social enterprise model and the role of the Scottish government and other agencies in supporting its development. Social enterprise support was ranked third place in both impact and financial value among the 12 regeneration policy models considered by the SURF network.

Participants reported from experience that start-up finance was relatively straightforward to access and that the quality of support and advice available to social enterprises around legal, financial and growth matters is particularly high in quality. In addition to delivering or otherwise supporting local community regeneration in many of Scotland’s most challenged communities, SURF event participants felt that the social enterprise sector has motivated private businesses to think more about their social purpose. Similarly, housing associations and other established regeneration actors have progressed employability aims by developing a social enterprise arm.
Participants were enthusiastic about the social enterprise sector’s continued growth and its outward-looking, partner-seeking ethos, which positively contrasts with the silo mentality that can hinder regeneration activity in other sectors. There was, however, a debate about the sustainability of Scottish social enterprises on trading income alone, with some participants sharing their understanding that even some of Scotland’s biggest and most successful social enterprises regularly apply for public and third sector grants.

COMMUNITY LED REGENERATION: THE PEOPLE AND COMMUNITIES FUND (2012–PRESENT)

The Scottish government’s 2011 Regeneration Strategy placed a strong emphasis on supporting regeneration initiatives that are developed and managed by community organisations. The strategy contrasted with the previous 2006 ‘People and Place’ regeneration policy statement, which promoted business growth, employability and skills training, and the boosting of commercial and residential property markets as key policy objectives.  

Beyond citing the work of a single grassroots project in Glasgow, ‘People and Place’ featured no references to community groups, community assets and community led regeneration. Five years later, however, community led regeneration became a central Scottish government policy plank. As stated in the 2011 strategy:

‘The Scottish government is clear that the involvement of local people in public sector led activity is not community led regeneration. Community led regeneration is about local people identifying for themselves the issues and opportunities in their areas, deciding what to do about them, and being responsible for delivering the economic, social and environmental action that will make a difference …’. This Regeneration Strategy places support for community led regeneration at the heart of its approach.  

As a significant departure from the previous property-led regeneration model, the new focus on community led regeneration was broadly welcomed by regeneration stakeholders in Scotland. There were, however, serious concerns raised by SURF and others about the mismatch between the strength of the new policy rhetoric around community led regeneration and the modesty of resources directed towards achieving meaningful change in community development and empowerment.  

The People and Communities Fund was announced in the same strategy as one of its key community led regeneration programmes. It provided £41m of grant awards in 2012–16 via an open competitive application process, and a further £10.75m is allocated for 2016/17. An independent evaluation of the programme, published in August 2017, recommended that the fund should continue.  

SURF anniversary event participants echoed that recommendation, with the main criticism expressed being that it was not bigger in size. Participants would have liked to have seen it support projects in a greater number of places, and over longer timescales. More generally, participants felt that the time-limited nature of current regeneration funding processes is not conducive to long-term change and effective community development, which typically requires 10–20 years of development activity instead of the one to three years of funding that feature in contemporary grant programmes. As previously mentioned, it was also seen as less than ideal that People and Communities in effect replaced Wider Role as the go-to fund for regeneration projects developed by housing associations.
The People and Communities Fund was, however, widely praised by the SURF network, who ranked it top on value for money and second for impact on the 12 regeneration policies from SURF’s lifetime they assessed. It was seen as delivering on the 2011 strategy’s aspiration to support more regeneration activity that is genuinely community led, even if the grant award decisions are decided by the Scottish government. The programme was also seen as being effectively promoted, enjoying a high profile that might be lost if the programme was to be rebranded under a future relaunch, as was indicated at SURF’s 2017 Annual Conference.

CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

SURF event participants agreed that some of the regeneration policy mechanisms applied during SURF’s lifetime have worked well in delivering meaningful, practical outcomes for some of Scotland’s most deprived communities, while others lacked impact and provided generally poor value for public money. Figure 1 shows the spread of the 12 policy mechanisms agreed by more than 100 cross-sector participants in SURF’s 2017 Annual Conference, including some not mentioned above, such as the Regeneration Capital Grant Fund (sixth place) and the Town Centre Regeneration Fund & Action Plan (seventh place in impact, eighth in value).

Annual Conference cross-sector groups agreed, however, that three broad criticisms could be reasonably applied to all 12 of the models they considered. These are:

- **The models are not sufficiently people-focused.** One of SURF’s founding principles is that, “The people who are the intended beneficiaries of any regeneration effort must be meaningfully involved in the process.

![Figure 1: SURF view — 25 years of regeneration models](image-url)
if it is to be successful in planning, implementation and maintenance.¹⁵
SURF 25th anniversary event contributors felt that not enough of the policy processes discussed were consistent with this position. There was, however, some enthusiasm towards the 2015 Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act, 2016 Land Reform (Scotland) Act, and forthcoming Planning (Scotland) Bill, all of which are designed to enhance the role and responsibilities of community groups in regeneration-related areas. The 2016 Fairer Scotland Action Plan, which introduces new anti-poverty measures including the establishment of a Socio-Economic Duty on public bodies, set to be introduced by the end of 2017, and a national Poverty and Inequality Commission, which met for the first time in September 2017, also represented opportunities for further change.

- **Not enough money is invested in regeneration programmes.** Participants were aware that many of the funding programmes in SURF’s shortlist are heavily over-subscribed, and reported that proposals for even modestly funded, short-term regeneration interventions — whether capital or revenue — often require a great deal of time and energy, including formal partnership agreements, to complete. This reality can discourage all players, from local authorities to community groups, from progressing with their regeneration aspirations. It was noted that it is challenging for the Scottish government and local authorities to invest more in regeneration programmes in the context of shrinking budgets and public demands to protect the more politically popular areas of health and education.

- **The models are not adequately sustained.** When pilot and wind-down stages are considered, most of the 12 models considered were in full operation for no more than five years. This was seen as particularly disappointing in the case of URCs, which were intended to operate for decades; SIPs, which built impressive levels of agency-community trust; and the People and Communities Fund, as even if the fund is set to continue in a new guise, any rebrand was seen as unhelpful as the Scottish government and other stakeholders had gone to some length to build awareness and understanding of its profile and objectives. In general, there is also not enough evaluation activity in Scottish regeneration, and that which does exist is often commissioned after programmes have concluded, and are not used to inform ongoing development.

On the positive side, Annual Conference participants also wished to express support for a range of policies not on SURF’s shortlist, including, but not limited to, conservation and heritage programmes, spatial planning reforms and national frameworks, the impacts of lottery programme funding, the 2010 Equality Act, and employability and enterprise support programmes.

There was also a general agreement that community regeneration enjoys a strong standing in Scotland’s political agenda, with the past 25 years having demonstrated a serious and partially successful attempt to derive shared regeneration outcomes from all relevant public policy areas. There has also been extensive support for dedicated regeneration programmes demonstrated across all the major political parties.

SURF will be sharing the outcomes of this exercise formally with our Scottish government partners as part of our founding remit to enhance policy and
practice in community regeneration in Scotland, a role we hope to continue for another 25 years.
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