In his excellent SURF Lecture for 2006, The Young Foundation Chief Executive and former advisor to Number 10, Geoff Mulgan, spoke about the history of regeneration work and upcoming challenges. In doing so he posed two intriguing time travel questions to his audience.

If you were transported back to 1976 knowing what you know now, what would you press those in power to do to avoid the difficulties we face now?

And secondly, what should those in power now be doing to avoid the biggest challenge you anticipate we will face in 2036?

SURF is very keen to gather responses to Geoff’s challenge from a wide range of key figures across the regeneration fields in Scotland, and we’re particularly keen to get your answers so that we can represent them in the next issue of Scotregen.

We will of course then pass your views on to those who have the responsibility for setting out future policy, so this is a good chance to make sure they get your message. Just send your responses to Geoff’s two questions direct to andymilne@scotregen.co.uk or by post to SURF, Fairfield House, 1 Broomloan Place, Glasgow G51 2JR

A copy of Geoff Mulgan’s SURF 2006 Annual Lecture text is available on the SURF web site at www.scotregen.co.uk

THE POLITICAL DEBATE OF 2007

REGENERATION POLICY MANIFESTOS 2007
Your chance to help the politicians to get it right.

Scotland’s politicians are laying out their stalls for the May 2007 elections. SURF wants to make sure regenerating Scotland’s communities is at the heart of their manifestoes.

• What kind of political leadership is needed?
• What are the priorities?
• What approaches offer the best hope for successful and sustainable regeneration?

SURF is organising an Election Question Time event for SURF members and invited guests to directly inform and question leading representatives of the 6 main political parties.

March 22nd 12noon – 2pm in the Scottish Parliament.

This is a free event for SURF members and invited guests. There will be a high demand for places, so book yours, Email derek@scotregen.co.uk.
A new view from the chair.

SURF’s 2006 ended with the joyous event of our Annual Awards and Ceilidh. It was a celebration of the efforts of everyone involved in community regeneration and identifies some of the best projects in Scotland for the year. It drew together the very wide cross-section of people that SURF rejoices in, including Deputy Communities Minister, Des McNulty and Geoff Ellis of DF Concerts who, among many other successes, organise the annual T in the Park concert. Geoff raised interesting questions about the role of popular culture in regeneration, to community activists from all over Scotland. Geoff’s was not the only cultural contribution. After the applause and presentation photographs were over the floor was cleared for our first ever SURF Ceilidh. It was a great evening, and with support of the Scottish Executive we have been able to produce a booklet describing all the winning, highly commended and short-listed projects from the 2006 awards. We will be working with Communities Scotland’s Scottish Centre for Regeneration and others to help ensure their success can be of benefit to all of us.

As for 2007, if not New Year’s resolutions, we could nevertheless look for some strategic objectives, and taking a cue from our Awards ceremony, an appropriate mantra for coming year might be Holistic, Healthy and Happy.

Holistic is one of those words that rapidly moved from rare technical use to wide abuse, but of course does encapsulate the idea at the heart of regeneration, which, to be successful, needs to tackle all aspects of a community’s life.

One of the critical elements of any holistic approach is that of health provision within an area. But of course, health is not the outcome of solely medical intervention but of the much wider public responsibilities regeneration tackles and thus it becomes also one of the best outcome measurements for a holistic approach to regeneration.

Finally, we should not be ashamed to have as our target the comfort and happiness of people and communities. This is not to endorse the “positive thinking” promoted in different manners by Richard Layard or Noel Edmonds – quite the reverse. The work of SURF members – both professional and community activists – is creative and should bring with it the satisfaction and pleasures that work, which makes a difference, gives to providers and beneficiaries alike.

In answer to those economists who in calling for sacrifices noted that, “matters would come out well in the long run” John Maynard Keynes replied that, “in the long run, we are dead”. So although physical outcomes take time to develop, happiness should be the by-product of the process that comes along with taking control of our environments and lives and thus delivered in the here and now.

Finally, it is good to welcome Brodies, one of Scotland’s leading law practices, as SURF’s eleventh sponsor member. Their additional support, and that of our existing sponsors, provides SURF with core financial and intellectual support to allow SURF to better fulfill its objectives.
Deputy Communities Minister Des McNulty, presented the SURF Best Practice in Regeneration Awards for 2006 at a hugely enjoyable presentation dinner in Glasgow’s Radisson Hotel on December 7th.

Details of all these projects are available in a special SURF awards publication on the SURF web site at www.scotregen.co.uk

SURF is always keen to know more about what its members think of its services and how we can make these more relevant and useful. As an initial exercise, in part of a wider research and marketing effort, we recently undertook a survey of 271 SURF member group contacts. It consisted of a range of questions on SURF’s practices and services.

The results were both encouraging and helpful. For instance, over 50% of the respondents valued SURF mostly for the opportunities it offers for making contacts and accessing information that is useful to their work. Even more pleasing was the fact that over 98% thought that the topics covered in SURF’s events were relevant to the issues their organisation faced. When we asked what other topics members would like to see covered we got a very interesting (and slightly daunting) set of results including:

- More strategic issues which are Scottish issues, not just locally based ones
- Health and Regeneration
- Anti social behaviour in relation to regeneration
- Seminars/discussions on Cultural Planning and the role played by public art in regeneration etc.
- Linkage between urban and rural regeneration
- More examples of activities that have been successful on the ground
- More stress on the physical manifestation of regeneration
- More Community led discussions/presentations with view to sharing info/experiences of communities and helping to develop a bottom up culture into regeneration.
- More on the business side, economic development, physical regeneration led by private sector etc
- Highlight who the policy makers are in regeneration.
- Geographic regeneration versus thematic regeneration
- Employability, overcoming barriers, practice lessons of successful approaches and practical seminars/ workshops rather than talks.
- The development side of regeneration, and how to get the private and public sectors to work together.
- Health and spatial planning
- Links between city-wide and neighbourhood regeneration strategies
- Transport and public health. Local and global impacts of urban policy on physical and social environment
- More coverage of holistic regeneration rather than focusing in on specific projects.
- More on physical regeneration - i.e. land, development, funding and construction issues
- Evaluation of Regeneration projects.
- Local seminars/events tailored to the issues in specific regions/geographical areas.
- Alternative funding sources, Legal structures, Social Auditing

The SURF board will be using the survey results and other consultations to help form our future work. In the meantime you can see a list of all the main planned activities for SURF in 2007 on page 12.

Of course, if you have other ideas on what we should be focusing on we’d be pleased to hear from you. Email andymilne@scotregen.co.uk
The Out of the Blue Drill Hall, Dalmeny Street, Edinburgh, is the venue for the second Cultural Planning Masterclass on Thursday 8th March 2007.

Presented by Fablevision on behalf of the National Cultural Planning Steering Group in partnership with the University of Strathclyde Cultural Planning Pilot the day aims to:

- Introduce the policy context of cultural planning in Scotland, UK, Europe, USA and Australia
- Position cultural planning approaches in context with other approaches to urban and community issues and understand key similarities and differences
- Learn from case study examples of cultural planning approaches in Edinburgh

The day will also offer an opportunity to hear more about the Scottish Executive’s Cultural Pathfinder programme and discuss the connection to The Community Planning process in Scotland.

The day is open to all, but as places are limited, please contact liz@fablevision.org to reserve a space as soon as possible.

Dear Andy

Regeneration of Communities is a term that flows so easily from Officials and Politicians mouths, but what do they mean by it? We are told by them that they wish to see all communities prosper and poverty eradicated; unfortunately they do not seem to be able to put words into action.

I have been involved within my local Community of MidCragie and Linlathen for over 15 years, trying to improve the lives of those who are living there. During that time I have heard the same old story, about what others, for example officers and politicians from the local authority are going to do to our area to make things better.

The problem with this approach is that they do not know how it feels to live in the situation that we live in, they call our area deprived and as such our housing and car insurance goes up in price making it difficult for local people to ensure their properties and belongings.

I believe that there is a way to Regenerate all communities and alleviate poverty but there has to be a change in mind set from both the politicians and the Civil Service and that way is proper, equal partnership working.

Many people will say that we work in partnership now and that is true, but it is an unequal partnership with those at the top holding onto all the powers to change things and using this power to veto ideas brought forward by the community.

As everyone will know Community Regeneration Funding is coming to an end in 2008, we must use this time to change the way Communities and local service provider’s work in partnership. Equal partnership can only work if everyone can sit around the table with mutual trust. Service Providers must stop trying to access community monies to balance their budgets and community activists must get realistic about what they want to see in their community and who pays for it.

A possible solution to this could be through joined up working where all service providers and local people make up an annual action plan for the year ahead with named individuals to lead each task. The issues raised in the action plan can then be funded through match funding for example environmental improvements can be funded through Local Authority Funding and Regeneration monies this would double the amount of monies available for the regeneration of the area.

Match funding of projects would allow larger and more effective investment and improvements within the areas requiring regeneration and only when this can be achieved can we start to make the much needed inroad to the regeneration of our communities.

Partnership working is not about the communities taking power away from local politicians or civil service, it is about everyone working together for the benefit of the entire council area.

Yours
Allan Petrie
Putting the public in planning

Promoting greater public participation in the land use planning system

‘The idea of citizen participation is a little like eating spinach: no one is against it in principle because it is good for you’

(Sheri Arnstein)

The new planning legislation proposes much more involvement from communities in local decisions. Planning Aid for Scotland is dedicated to supporting that process. Here Petra Bieberbach outlines the challenges for putting the public in planning and how Planning Aid can help.

The new Planning etc (Scotland) Bill which received Royal Assent just before Christmas is widely regarded as an ambitious piece of legislation. The most important changes are the emphasis placed on early community involvement and a new hierarchy of dealing with applications. The new system, it is argued, will pave the way for better and earlier involvement of all people in the planning process. This new emphasis will be underpinned by a new Planning Advice Note (PAN) on Community Engagement, which for the first time spells out how Local Planning Authorities and developers should involve communities.

Why participation matters?

There have been opportunities in the past for people to get involved in the planning system. However, very few people knew about these, and even fewer people got actively involved. Apart from a perceived lack of interest, there is also a distinct problem of under representation. It is important that people from all walks of life are involved in shaping their local environment, so that everyone can feel part of a process which will affect their quality of life.

It is a big challenge to engage people that are not normally involved, who feel that they have little to contribute, or that their views are not listened to. To start with, people need to be given information and knowledge that they can trust alongside opportunities for engagement. Usually, methods of engagement tended to be very structured. However, low levels of participation are not going to be overcome by just trying harder. We have to bring the planning system to the people. We also need to look at new methods of engaging with people.

How to ensure more participation?

In every community there are some residents who hold down several key roles in representing community interests, often communities are dominated by small groups of well-connected people. A new culture of participation must reflect a wider range of people and provide for more informal engagement methods.

Proper participation can only take place when people genuinely feel that they have the power to change things. This requires devolving power. We need to stop inventing ever more structures of participation, and invest instead in changing the culture of engaging. For example, Planning Aid for Scotland is trialling a new way of involving people who find the traditional way of responding to structure plans difficult and dull, but who nevertheless have a vision of what they would like their area to look like in 10, 15 or 20 years. By using performance and visual art we reach out to new groups of people who, in the past, were left untouched by traditional methods of engagement.

To get community engagement in the planning system right will require a shift to early participation by a more diverse range of people using a variety of methods and utilising existing places where people already come together. It can only be done by working in partnership with a range of organisations.

The role of Planning Aid for Scotland.

Planning Aid for Scotland is an independent charity which promotes and facilitates greater opportunity for people to learn and participate in the land use planning system. Established in 1993 it is a volunteer-led organisation, with currently over 120 volunteer planners who assist and provide advice to members of the public on all matters relating to the planning system across Scotland.

Our role is to enable people to get involved in the planning system, working in a participatory way, so that they can help themselves to have a say. Our services include:

- helping people and community groups to engage in planning process
- providing a free and independent professional service
- training programmes for people and community groups, so that they can learn about the planning system
- action research to inform our work and generate best practice

The service that we provide is unique, in that the advice given is free, independent and impartial. Our work is aimed primarily at people who are:

- on low incomes
- members of vulnerable social groups
- members of ethnic or minority communities
- young and old people

If you would like to know more about the work we do or how we may help you, please contact the Planning Aid for Scotland office on 0131 220 9730.

Petra Bieberbach
Planning Aid for Scotland
petra@pafs.co.uk
**Voluntary action, valuable changes**

**– recognising the role of individuals in driving regeneration**

Community engagement is not just about attending meetings and responding to consultations. Every day thousands of people volunteer to get directly involved in projects and programmes that benefit their communities and wider regeneration efforts. Here, Eleanor Logan, Chief Executive of the Voluntary Action Fund explains how this activity supports civil society and helps put communities in the driving seat.

The Voluntary Action Fund (VAF) has been funding “voluntary action” for over 25 years, providing essential packages of funding for projects which encourage people to get involved in making their lives or their communities better places to live. In funding these projects over the last quarter of a century we have been able to bear witness to the role of individuals in communities in driving forward regeneration – and regeneration at the heart of where it is needed most.

One of the funding programmes which have made the most impact have been the Unemployed Voluntary Action Fund (UVAF). This was a landmark fund – leading the way for the establishment of the current funding climate, being established before today’s key players such as the Lloyds TSB Foundation and the Big Lottery. UVAF was established in the late 1980’s as a UK Government driven initiative to reduce the numbers of people unemployed through providing quality volunteering opportunities which would provide skills and experience. 25 years on and we are coming to the end of UVAF but are still meeting the same needs. In 2006, volunteers funded by VAF delivered over 4,500 volunteer hours per week, assisting 15,629 people across Scotland. Importantly of the volunteers who left their placements, 34% went on into employment and 19% took up education or training with the remainder leaving due to ill health, family commitments or moving to another placement. Volunteering is still delivering personal change, skill development and increased employability.

At VAF, we target our funding towards projects where volunteers are “hard to reach”. Our new fund, the Volunteering Scotland Grant Scheme, actively defines that 70% of the volunteers involved in projects need to be hard to reach and this ranges from having a mental health problem, to being homeless, to being a carer, to being from an ethnic minority etc.

As well as promoting the inclusion and equality of all in regeneration, driving forward social change and regeneration at the heart of communities is also a key aim for VAF. We let communities define their own solutions.

One example of a recent UVAF project which does just this is Midlothian Advice and Resource Centre (MARC). MARC is a well-established community organisation that tackles poverty and disadvantage in practical ways like information and advice, volunteering opportunities, and low cost household goods. The group was formed in the early eighties as the Dalkeith Unemployed Workers Centre and in 1982 it was one of the first ever groups to receive a UVAF grant, which acted as a springboard for its subsequent development. From 2003-2006 the group received a further grant from UVAF, to establish a volunteer-run furniture store selling donated household goods at low cost to families and individuals in need. MARC now has two shops open, in Mayfield and Bonnyrigg, staffed by over thirty volunteers. They also now has a paid staff team of eight, of whom more than half are previous volunteers and the shops are rapidly becoming self-financing. The input of jobs and trading are an essential part of the regeneration contribution which MARC provides through its shops and work. But its only one part of the picture, the human regeneration is often more important. MARC is a hub for community support, driven by volunteers who often have complex needs.

As Richard Vivian, the Project Coordinator says: “This approach is a win-win for the whole community and it rests on volunteering. Volunteering changes people, and people change communities.”

The funding programmes we run receive the majority of their income from the Scottish Executive, in recognition of the role of the funded projects in driving regeneration. In providing VAF with the resources, the Executive recognises the role we play in supporting projects. Its not just about giving out the money and hoping for the best. VAF provide a unique support package to funded organisations, many of whom have not received a major grant before, and in return have high expectations for a funding relationship based on mutual respect and learning. Importantly, we are also able to evidence where the funds go and what they achieve as well as structure the learning from our programmes.

Recent research we carried out showed that VAF funding (across our programmes) was not only delivering change in communities and importantly in individuals but was also actively delivering a range of Government policies around social inclusion and regeneration, as well as the Volunteering Strategy and the Vision for the Voluntary Sector.

So, volunteering really works. We’ve been evidencing this for 25 years and although we have improved many communities and changed the lives of countless individuals the need is still there for this practical solution to lasting change. The needs of our communities are complex, from young people who are not in education or training through to the isolated elderly. We are not as cohesive as communities in the past, lacking many of the social foundations we used to rely on to stimulate inter generational support.

At VAF we are witness to the power of voluntary action as a means of providing the social glue we all need in our communities. But it doesn’t just happen naturally. Sometimes its just a push in the right direction, a small grant to support the costs of a volunteer training around Child Protection issues. But, if we really want to pull those with the greatest need into the regeneration of our communities, support and funding does need to be in place. VAF provides this support, as do other funders. Often it doesn’t cost much – most of the VAF grants are under £ 30,000 per annum. The solutions often do not involve complex structures or targets. It may not be innovative, but they work.

So, looking forwards to 2007, VAF would wish to see a continued commitment in a new Holyrood administration and beyond to supporting voluntary action across the age ranges and recognising the place and value of individuals in making change happen. Its taking community engagement to the next level at the same time as letting the community be in the driving seat. After all, communities know best what needs to be changed and how this needs to happen.

To find out more about VAF and our plans, please contact Eleanor Logan on 01383 620780 or visit the website at www.voluntaryactionfund.org.uk.
Regeneration and Health - what’s the impact?

Hilary Thomson made a thought provoking presentation at a SURF Open Forum on Health and regeneration in May 2005. In this substantial article she provides some more detail on her continuing examination of the impact of regeneration efforts on health outcomes.


Most urban regeneration programmes have a common aim to tackle urban deprivation and poverty. Tackling deprivation through initiatives to improve material living standards, education and job opportunities should have direct impacts on these key areas. In addition to these direct impacts, investment which aims to alleviate deprivation is often linked to indirect impacts on other outcomes, such as health. The links between regeneration investment and health appear to be obvious and are currently used to justify large-scale investment in national regeneration programmes. 13 14 Indeed, a joint publication from the Department of Health and Neighbourhood Renewal Unit explicitly states that ‘local neighbourhood renewal and other regeneration initiatives are in a particularly good position to address health inequalities because they have responsibility for dealing with the wider determinants that have an impact on peoples’ physical and mental health’. 15

What empirical support is there that urban regeneration does lead to health impacts?

In addition to the embracing of ‘joined-up’ policy illustrated above, there is increasing demand for policies to be grounded in evidence. Evidence of effectiveness or ‘what works’ is required to validate expectations that a certain policy will deliver the hoped-for result. However, previous reviews of research have found very little published research which has investigated the health impacts of regeneration. 13 17 Another possible source of evidence is the national evaluations which accompany regeneration programmes. These evaluations are often produced as government reports but the data contained in them have not previously been reviewed: It is for this reason that we carried out a systematic review of these evaluations.

Our review included all national level evaluation reporting on the impacts of national area based regeneration initiatives in the UK (1980-2004). (Table I) For the purposes of this review we defined impact to be an objective assessment of programme impacts. 20 21 22 48 Stakeholders’ own perceptions of impacts, which were not considered to be an objective assessment of programme impacts. 20 21 22 48

Evaluations identified

From our initial searches we identified around 90 documents reporting evaluation findings from the ABI programmes included in the review. Over half of these evaluations were process evaluations, often reporting the different strategies to deliver or manage regeneration initiatives and were not included in our review of impacts.

Thirty five evaluations were described as evaluations of impact, but 25 of these were not included in the review, see Table II. The main reason for excluding these evaluations was that many relied exclusively on gross outputs to report impacts. For example, reporting amounts of money spent, or miles of new road built by the programme. Without a baseline measure, the reporting of gross outputs alone does not provide an indication of change or impact, and so these evaluations were excluded from the review. In addition, four evaluations did provide any supporting data, 16 17 18 19 and a further four evaluations relied on stakeholders’ own perceptions of impacts, which were not considered to be an objective assessment of programme impacts. 23 21 22 40

| Table I: Area based initiative (ABI) programmes included in this review |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| ABI programme               | Main focus of programme               |
| Urban Programme 1969-1980s  | Grant based programme to deal with areas of special social need through supplementation of existing programmes covering economic, environmental, employment and social projects. |
| Urban Development Corporations (UDC) 1981-1998 | Property and economic regeneration to attract inward investment. |
| New Life for Urban Scotland (New Life) 1988-1998 | Comprehensive multi-agency regeneration programme to improve housing, environment, service provision, training and employment for local people in four areas. 16 |
| Small Urban Renewal Initiatives (SURI) 1990-2003 | Housing led regeneration to widen housing choice, improve quality of housing quality and the local environment, improve economic prospects and lever public and private funding. 16 |
| City Challenge 1992-1998 | Comprehensive multi-agency regeneration to improve quality of life of residents in run-down areas. 16 |
| Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) 1995-2001 | Comprehensive multi-agency regeneration through initiatives on employment, training, economic growth, housing, crime, environment, ethnic minorities and quality of life (incl. health, sport and cultural opportunities). 16 |
| Regeneration Partnerships (aka Social Inclusion Partnerships-SIPs) 1996-1998 | Co-ordinated approach to tackle and prevent social exclusion and demonstrate innovative practices. Main activities focus on education & training, and initiatives to reduce poverty, crime, and promote employment, enterprise, empowerment and health. 16 |
| New Deal for Communities (NDC) 1998-2000 | Neighbourhood based programme delivered through multi-agency partnerships. Aims: to reduce inequalities in crime, worklessness, education, housing and health between the 39 target areas and the rest of England. Key characteristics of this programme are: long-term commitment to deliver real change, communities in partnership with key agencies, community involvement and ownership, joined-up thinking and solutions, and action based on evidence about ‘what works’ and what doesn’t. 16 |

| Table II: Identified impact evaluations and reasons for exclusion from final review |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Evaluations Reporting on ABI achievements n=35 |
| - Relied exclusively on gross outputs n=17 |
| - Relied exclusively on stakeholders’ assessments n=4 |
| - No supporting data presented n=4 |
| Evaluations included in final review n=10 |
| Evaluations excluded from the final review n=35 |
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Impacts reported
A total of 10 evaluations assessing impacts (changes in an outcome measure between two or more time points) were identified and included in the final review.\(^1\)\(^1\)\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)

A summary of the reported impacts on health and key determinants of health is presented below.

Health and mortality impacts
Three evaluations assessed changes in ‘self-reported’ health or mortality (death rates) (Table III).\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)

One evaluation assessed self-reported health but the effects on this measure were mixed.

Although mortality rates fell in both evaluations which measured this outcome, there were no comparisons with national or regional improvements or reductions in mortality rates over the same time period. Therefore it is unclear whether or not these improvements are linked to the regeneration investment or merely reflect the general trend in falling mortality rates in the UK.

Employment & unemployment impacts
Impacts on employment and unemployment were the most common outcome measure included in the evaluations. The measures used included: ‘% of working age in employment’, ‘number of households with at least one person economically active’, ‘% unemployed’, ‘unemployment rate’, ‘% change in number of unemployment claimants’, and ‘% unemployed who have been unemployed for >12 months’. Improvements in employment were reported in 7/9 evaluations which assessed impact on employment measures.\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)

Table III: Summary of health impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health or related outcome (time period of assessment of change) &amp; Programme</th>
<th>Overall improvement</th>
<th>Range of effects in same direction?</th>
<th>Improvement compared to wider trend?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-reported health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB (3 yrs)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mortality rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB (4 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life for Urban Scotland (6 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five of the evaluations which reported an overall improvement also reported the impacts for the separate study areas; in four of these there were improvements reported across all study areas.\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)

Over the period of the evaluations there are likely to have been changes in employment levels regionally and nationally. Eight evaluations compared changes in employment and unemployment rates in the regeneration areas with national or regional trends over the same time period.\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)

In five instances the reported improvement was not over and above the improvement in similar employment measures nationally. (Table IV)\(^1\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)

Education
Five evaluations reported impacts on school achievement within the target areas.\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)

School achievement improved consistently in each regeneration area with very little evidence of negative impacts in some case study areas. In addition, in one evaluation the reported improvements were greater than the improvements in the same measure over the same time period across England (+4.2% v +1.8%). (Table V)\(^2\)\(^3\)

Housing impacts
Although housing improvement was a key feature of five of the ABI programmes included in this review, improvement in housing quality was only assessed in one evaluation.\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^3\)

One other evaluation assessed changes in rent; average social housing rent was reported to have doubled during the investment period (7-8 years). (Table VI)\(^2\)\(^3\)

Table IV: Summary of impacts on employment and unemployment measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme (approx period of evaluation)</th>
<th>Overall improvement</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
<th>Range of effects in same direction</th>
<th>Improvement compared to wider trend?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on employment measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life (10 yr)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB (3 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+4%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURI</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+9%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on unemployment measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB (2 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB (4 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB (3 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate Action (7 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-29.5%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP (4 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP (4 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-32%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life (10 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Programme (10 yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Challenge (2 yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life (10 yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Challenge (2 yrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V: Summary of education impacts (pupils achieving >4 GCSEs grade A-C or 3 standard grades)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme (approx period of evaluation)</th>
<th>Overall improvement</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
<th>Range of effects in same direction</th>
<th>Improvement compared to wider trend?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on employment measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life (6 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Challenge (2 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+4.5%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB (3 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+4.2%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB (5 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+5.8%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRB (3 yrs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* any member of the household with a CSE/GCSE/O-level
Income impacts
Change in the number of households with incomes of less than £100 per week was assessed in two evaluations. In both cases there was an overall improvement in this measure, but in one case the range of effects across the study areas included both negative and positive effects. (Table VII)

Table VI: Summary of housing impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Overall improvement</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
<th>Range of effects in same direction</th>
<th>Improvement compared to wider trend?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UDC (residents from target area now living in improved housing) 13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>+42.5%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate Action (average weekly rent local authority tenants) 27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>+99.3%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VII: Summary of income impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Overall improvement</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
<th>Range of effects in same direction</th>
<th>Improvement compared to wider trend?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRB (3 yrs) 13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Life (6 yrs) 23</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-16.5%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion
What are the impacts of ABI investment?
ABI programmes have often been evaluated but existing evaluations have often focussed on reporting process and implementation issues, with reports of impacts being limited to an audit of what the investment has been spent on. Consequently, very little is known about the actual impacts (change in outcome between two time-points) of ABI programmes on either socio-economic or health outcomes. What data are available suggest that there may be some positive impacts, in particular for employment and education outcomes. However, these improvements may not always be over and above the general trend (national or regional) and adverse impacts remain a real possibility. Education and employment outcomes have been included in most impact evaluations, whereas impacts on housing quality, income and health have rarely been assessed. (Figure I)

Impacts for whom?
In addition to determining if an ABI programme has affected impacts on key socio-economic outcomes, it is also important to know who has or has not benefited from the investment. Only one of the ABI evaluations we identified gathered data which were able to track changes among the same individuals before and after the ABI investment. Without individual-level data questions remain about whether or not ABIs impact on places rather than on target populations.

Improving our knowledge and evidence base
The dearth of knowledge around the impacts of ABI investment, in particular socio-economic impacts, may be alarming for those interested in ‘value for money’ policies. Improved use of rigorous impact evaluation may go some way to address the current shortcomings in knowledge, but it is unrealistic to expect that evaluation, no matter how well-designed or well-resourced, will provide definitive evidence linking impacts to a specific component of an ABI programme. The multi-faceted nature of ABI programmes, the diversity of contexts in which they operate, and the myriad of ‘other’ influences on health and socio-economic outcomes mean that attributing impacts to ABI investment will always be problematic.

Nevertheless, some improvements in future evaluation reporting and methods could help to strengthen knowledge in this field. In particular, comparing changes in routine national or regional data may indicate to what extent reported impacts are additional to what might have happened without the investment; the use of panel surveys (following individuals over time) provide useful data on the impacts on target populations rather than only geographical areas; impact evaluations should be designed to test a clear theory or hypothesis specifying mechanisms for predicted impacts; and finally improved reporting of the evaluation methods used is required to enable readers to interpret the data more accurately.

Conclusion
National ABI investment aims to reduce socio-economic deprivation and may be an important strategy to improve health and reduce health inequalities. However, both the health and socio-economic impacts of these programmes remain unknown owing to the lack of impact evaluations carried out. Improved evaluations designed to assess the health impacts of this significant public investment are required in order that the potential benefits of future investment may be maximised and detrimental effects minimised.

Acknowledgements: This article is based on a research paper published in the Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health. The work was funded by the Chief Scientist Office of the Scottish Executive Health Department and the ESRC Evidence Network. The funding sources had no involvement in the substantive direction of this review.
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develop integrated planning and delivery for health improvement, improving life circumstances and tackling health inequalities.

The aims for this consultancy are to:

• identify any factors and processes that facilitate and hinder planning and delivery for health improvement and improving life circumstances and well-being at the Community Planning Partnership level;

• establish ways to improve the planning and delivery of the health improvement agenda in particular activity aimed at reducing inequalities and improving life circumstances;

• test out and develop mechanisms and tools to support the integration and alignment of health improvement and improving life circumstances work with mainstream services and cross-cutting agendas.

Blake Stevenson Ltd, consultants in social and economic development, have been commissioned to undertake this work in three selected areas: Aberdeenshire, Fife and North Ayrshire. In each area the consultants are working closely with the Community Planning Partnership’s health sub-group to explore ways in which planning and delivery can be developed to ensure that identified outcomes are achieved. The work is taking place in two stages: a diagnostic first stage and a second stage to support identified ways forward. The team has completed stage one in the three areas and a new planning tool, the Integrated Health Improvement Framework, will be tested during the second stage.

One of the key issues identified during the work to date, that relates to Hilary Thomson’s article, is the need for evidence: both the evidence of need so that needs can be assessed and priorities identified in each area and also the evidence of “what works”, particularly in relation to the social determinants of health, so that informed decisions about outcomes and associated activities can be made. As Hilary’s article indicates, there is a dearth of easily accessible evidence of “what works” in relation to the social determinants and impact on health and there is a recognised need for greater attention to this area.

The consultancy has an associated e-bulletin and this can be accessed at: www.healthscotland.gov.uk

Glenys Watt
Director, Blake Stevenson Ltd
0131-335-3700
admin@blakестevenston.co.uk
Urban Regeneration – Partnership Working

The Scottish Executive’s “People and Place – Regeneration Policy Statement” put a lot of emphasis on bringing the private sector into regeneration strategies. As we approach its first anniversary, Denis Garrity of Brodies Solicitors gives his view on how the Public/Private relationship should work.

“The public and private sectors want to work with each other to enable regeneration and rejuvenation of some of our most deprived and deserving communities.”

My own words, and put primarily in the context of property-based regeneration projects, but I have little doubt that this is the truth. They may have their own very different reasons for doing so, but the ambition to be involved and to succeed is mutual.

Is there enough of this partnership-working between public and private sector taking place, and what are the challenges faced?

Urban Regeneration is a phrase that has been given increasing prominence in the last few years, and the Urban Regeneration Company (to the extent that such a thing exists in Scotland) follows closely. There is an interesting parallel between public/private working partnerships and the URCs that are often the intended outcome of the initial working relationship. That is because the public and private sectors will most likely need to work in partnership to create the URC, which is itself likely to be some form of joint venture or partnership entity.

It is also worthwhile trying to identify what “urban regeneration” is for this purpose. The phrase still means different things to different people, and may always do so. It is maybe easier to look at it in the negative, namely that an urban regeneration project, for present purposes, is simply one that is not a stand-alone commercially viable project. In property terms at least, the latter have been carried out for many years in the form of residential, office, industrial, retail and mixed developments, all without an “urban regeneration” badge attached. The challenges there are already being met.

It follows that an urban regeneration project in this context is one which a commercial entity is unlikely to undertake without external leadership, direction, funding or some other catalyst, and this is where the public sector has a role to play.

Each need, desired outcome, and resulting project is likely to be different; and therefore the solution and route to achieving it is also likely to be bespoke. For many, it is this lack of certainty; fear of failure; fear of the unknown, that creates a paralysis.

The phrase still means different things to different people, and may always do so. It is maybe easier to look at it in the negative, namely that an urban regeneration project, for present purposes, is simply one that is not a stand-alone commercially viable project. In property terms at least, the latter have been carried out for many years in the form of residential, office, industrial, retail and mixed developments, all without an “urban regeneration” badge attached. The challenges there are already being met.

It follows that an urban regeneration project in this context is one which a commercial entity is unlikely to undertake without external leadership, direction, funding or some other catalyst, and this is where the public sector has a role to play.

Each need, desired outcome, and resulting project is likely to be different; and therefore the solution and route to achieving it is also likely to be bespoke. For many, it is this lack of certainty; fear of failure; fear of the unknown, that creates a paralysis.

The “style” URC is often seen as the panacea to dealing with all the risks and implementation hurdles involved, and for some it can even be seen as filling in the gaps in setting the true objects and purpose of the project.

The reality of working together is not as simple as a shelf company, but it might not be as difficult as many imagine. No lawyer or accountant will be able to provide a one-size-fits-all corporate structure that encompasses all regeneration aims and objectives, and is a suitable implementation model for each scenario. What professionals are good at however (or should be) is the creative application of know-how, principles and experience to advise on options, identify and analyse the risks involved, and provide suggested solutions. In a nutshell, the art of the possible. It is pleasing to see this happening across Scotland, and there are several large-scale regeneration projects underway already.

I do wonder, however, if more could be achieved if fear of failure and the unknown could be removed. SURF itself has a clear role in the sharing of experience and know-how, as well as ideas and innovation, and every barrier that can be removed can only lead to more successful outcomes.

A corporate structure, or URC, is only one of various options for implementing any project. Alliances, partnerships and other forms of joint venture might be equally suitable or even more appropriate. For some projects, or parts of projects, it might even be beneficial for a local authority or other body to carry it forward by themselves. In true lawyer-speak, it all depends. Thankfully there are a number of tried and tested structures, and most projects fall naturally into one of them with appropriate refinements.

So what’s the key to a successful working partnership between the public and private sectors? The same as any other: leadership, ambition, a strategy, project management, and hard work. Where are these found -- in the public sector or private sector? In truth, they are found in both to varying degrees and in different people. In the context of public sector-derived urban regeneration of the type described, I would suggest that the key challenge is leadership. By the very nature of what is being considered, this leadership must be found in the body challenged with achieving an outcome, or with the ambition to succeed. The rest is like any partnership – you just need to get the right people to the party. Whether they come from the private or public sector is irrelevant.

Denis Garrity - Partner, Brodies LLP

If you have any views or comments in relation to this article or any of the others in this issue of Scotregen we’d love to hear them whether you want them published or not. Just e mail andymilne@scotregen.co.uk
Dr Stirling Howieson of Strathclyde University is interested in numbers. From understanding the 'big bang' to managing your credit card repayments, numbers hold the key to everything. Here, in his regular Scotregen column, he offers some more interesting figures......

The number 3: When investing in energy efficiency measures what number should be used?

In the mid 90's Britain's largest bank was one of the first companies to sign up for the Energy Efficiency Office's "Making a Corporate Commitment" campaign. Although subsequently trumpeting its achievements in a glossy brochure, buried in the text was the admission that only, "projects with a 3 year or less pay-back period would be considered for capital investment".

Their energy bill was less than 1% of their costs. They invested less than 1.25% of this energy bill in energy efficiency measures. No objective performance indicators were published in the report, but the reader was left in no doubt as to their 'green' credentials. If the same criteria were to be adopted in the domestic sector, based on the Family Expenditure Survey from the same era, it would have allowed the average householder to invest 83p per annum; a sum that was some way short of that needed to buy one 12W low energy light bulb! Although we know from Mao that the longest journey must start modestly, is completing the first step really sufficient grounds for glossy brochures and triumphalism?

And why only 3 years?

Banks appear to be willing - some may say are positively insistent - to loan money to anyone for almost anything, over a 10 to 25 year period. So why such pessimism when it comes to their own estate? The Scottish Energy study contained this telling conclusion, "There is a tendency for buildings to be designed to minimise capital costs, with little regard for lifetime running costs". I would submit that when considering something as important as saving the planet the number 3 is inappropriate, unless immediately followed by two 00's.

Dr Stirling Howieson
Strathclyde University
s.howieson@strath.ac.uk

The Numbers Game

"projects with a 3 year or less pay-back period would be considered for capital investment".

Their energy bill was less than 1% of their costs. They invested less than 1.25% of this energy bill in energy efficiency measures. No objective performance indicators were published in the report, but the reader was left in no doubt as to their 'green' credentials. If the same criteria were to be adopted in the domestic sector, based on the Family Expenditure Survey from the same era, it would have allowed the average householder to invest 83p per annum; a sum that was some way short of that needed to buy one 12W low energy light bulb! Although we know from Mao that the longest journey must start modestly, is completing the first step really sufficient grounds for glossy brochures and triumphalism?

And why only 3 years?

Banks appear to be willing - some may say are positively insistent - to loan money to anyone for almost anything, over a 10 to 25 year period. So why such pessimism when it comes to their own estate? The Scottish Energy study contained this telling conclusion, "There is a tendency for buildings to be designed to minimise capital costs, with little regard for lifetime running costs". I would submit that when considering something as important as saving the planet the number 3 is inappropriate, unless immediately followed by two 00's.

Comments/suggestions for further investigation to: s.howieson@strath.ac.uk

SURFstuff

For more information on any of the events listed below you can visit the SURF website at www.scotregen.co.uk or contact Andy Milne on 0141 585 6848 or at andymilne@scotregen.co.uk
The SURF Open Forum and networking programme continues to develop in numbers participating and cross-sector representation. Work goes on to develop Forum outcomes so that they are more useful to, and influential on, policy-makers.

The November 2006 Open Forum on ‘Mixed Communities’ in Glasgow was attended by 50 participants. Three presentations were followed by open plenary discussion. Speakers were Richard Parker of PricewaterhouseCoopers, Alisdair McIntosh, Head of Regeneration Policy at The Scottish Executive, and Professor Ade Kearns of the University of Glasgow’s Department of Urban Studies.

The calibre of speakers, timely topic and open session format produced a lively and inter-active session. Richard Parker’s presentation, drawn from his recent USA study tour, was particularly thought provoking (perhaps even provocative in a constructive way). Issues raised included:

- There’s a good case for going beyond Decent-Homes-type standards to something more transformational. The mixed community approach is part of the continuing process of learning about regeneration and sustainability.
- A need for new models of ownership and delivery (beyond simple block housing stock transfers from local authorities)
- A need to build trust and leadership at local level – some Forum participants were exercised over questions of perceived social engineering implications of the mixed community model

- There is no shortage of private capital; the private sector can secure finance and shoulder commercial risk. The challenge is that the public sector needs to take the lead role of facilitator and enabler. Collaboration among all partners is key.
- Confirmation that the Executive are exploring, with Communities Scotland, a rollout of pilots around the mixed communities theme.

Thanks are also due to The Wise Group, a SURF member organisation, for their provision of additional clerical support at the Forum.

At the time of writing this report, the subsequent Open Forum had just been delivered on the theme of ‘Health and Wellbeing and Regeneration’. This was on the 25th January 2007 in Glasgow. Yet again, it was necessary to close bookings and over 80 participants attended. A more detailed report on this Forum will be available soon. Meantime, it was heartening for SURF to have had such success in attracting a wide-ranging number of participants from the public health and wellbeing sectors. The popularity of this Forum, and the similarly themed one in May 2006, indicates the timeliness and relevance of focusing on the linkages between the regeneration, public health and wellbeing agendas. SURF will end this busy 2006/07 end quarter with the following Open Forums:

22nd February 2007 - The Scottish Regeneration scene one year after People & Place. Edinburgh

29th March 2007 - The first SURF Open Forum in the Highlands & Islands region in Inverness.

The visit to Inverness is an exciting new venture area for SURF and represents SURF’s contribution to the Year of Highland Culture. SURF sponsor member, Highlands & Islands Enterprise, is providing valuable advice and practical assistance on the programme for this event. The overall theme will be the unique Highland region approach and culture around regeneration.

The Open Forum and networking programme is funded by Communities Scotland with the aim of facilitating independent opinion and feedback to policy makers in Scottish regeneration.
Evaluating community regeneration

A new report for Communities Scotland reviews approaches to evaluating community regeneration programmes in Scotland and the UK, in order to identify good practice and lessons and recommendations for future evaluation. It focuses especially on formative and summative evaluations (sometimes called ‘ongoing’ and ‘expost’ evaluations).

The report highlights the need for evaluation arrangements that are usable, relevant, timely, robust, and both formative and summative — informing policy appraisal and choices, identifying and spreading good practice, and allowing local and national stakeholders to identify and support ‘what works’.

Approaches to Evaluation in Community Regeneration - Research from Communities Scotland Report 76, by McQuaid R.W., M. Greig, C. Lindsay, Employment Research Institute, Napier University Published by Communities Scotland, Edinburgh (December 2006).


People and Place ‘Sounding Board’ set up

When the Scottish Executive launched “People and Place - Regeneration Policy Statement at the SURF Annual Conference last March, the minister for Communities referred to setting up a sounding board for the development of an action plan based on the aims in the statement. Here Scottish Executive colleagues outline progress on the sounding board so far.

A new Regeneration Sounding Board met for the first time in December 2006 to share their experience and expertise in regeneration with Communities Ministers. The ‘Sounding Board’ brings together experts from the private, public and community sectors from Scotland and the rest of the UK. The then Communities Minister, Malcolm Chisholm said:

“Our regeneration policy statement, People and Place, set out the Executive’s commitment to raising the pace on regeneration in Scotland. We are following through on this with support for Urban Regeneration Companies and with investment of over £200 million this year to bring new life to Scotland’s most disadvantaged communities.

It is vital that we get the maximum impact from this investment and that we listen to those with knowledge, experience and expertise as we go forward. This group will help deliver exactly that. It has a wealth of invaluable experience and a variety of fresh perspectives. There was ample evidence of this at our first meeting and I am sure the Sounding Board will make a valuable contribution to regenerating Scotland.”

The members of the Sounding Board are:

1. Keith Anderson is the Edinburgh Waterfront Development Partnership Director.
2. Chris Brown is chief executive of Igloo Regeneration
3. Julie Cowans is a freelance writer researcher and advisor on Urban Policy and Sustainable Communities.
4. George Gillespie was the first Scottish community representative to chair a social inclusion partnership
5. Betty Glasgow is a resident of Wester Hailes in Edinburgh and has over 30 years’ involvement in regeneration.
6. Maud Marshall has been chief executive of the Urban Regeneration Company in Bradford since 2003 and was previously director of investment at Communities Scotland.
7. Corrie McChord OBE FRSA has been a Council Leader for 16 years and currently leads the Political Administration of Stirling Council.
8. Ken Ross is chairman of the Sounding Board.
9. Barbara Turnbull of RBS is a career banker with a degree in mathematics from St Andrews University

People and Place, the Executive’s Regeneration Policy Statement, was published in February 2006. It reviewed progress towards economic and social regeneration of deprived communities and set out a wide range of actions to increase the focus and pace of change. The sounding board was proposed as part of this new approach.

‘As a firm believer in community involvement I’m glad to be one of two community representatives on the Executive’s sounding board for their People and Place Action Plan. Hopefully Betty Glasgow and I can help make sure that the plan reflects what’s really needed in disadvantaged communities across Scotland.’

- George Gillespie

Richard Rollison, a policy officer in the Executive’s Regeneration team, will be one of the key speakers at the SURF Open Forum on February 22nd in Edinburgh. This event will revisit progress on People and Place since the earlier Open Forum on the same topic in March 2006. To book your place e mail Derek@scotregen.co.uk

SURF Seminars

SMALL TOWN REGENERATION - NO SMALL MATTER

40% of Scotland’s population live in ‘small towns’. Borders Council, in co operation with CoSLA have produced a report which seeks to:

• Highlight the issues and challenges facing Scotland’s towns
• Clarify responsibilities in the Scottish Executive for small towns
• Make the case to the Scottish Executive for a Small Towns Review
• Bring together good practice case studies on the development and regeneration of small towns

SURF is working with Borders Council and other key players to provide an opportunity to hear

• the main findings of the report from its authors
• reaction and comment from the Scottish Executive and CoSLA
• lessons from approaches in England and Europe.

The SURF Small Towns seminar will take place in CoSLAs conference centre in Edinburgh on Tuesday March 27th.

To find out more and to book your place visit the SURF website at www.scotregen.co.uk or e mail derek@scotregen.co.uk

FOOTBALL AND REGENERATION

SURF, in partnership with Heriot Watt University’s Social Enterprise Institute, is teaming up with some of the top players in regeneration to produce an event that will tackle some fascinating questions:

• What is the role football in place based regeneration and how can it be better defined and supported?
• How can small clubs survive and thrive in a challenging economic climate and what is the role for social enterprise?
• What more could be done to link football with health and inclusion aims?
• How can the love of football be a force for active citizenship and democratic enlightenment?
• What opportunities are there for linking physical, economic and social regeneration through football?

More details to follow, keep your eye on the ball via the SURF website at www.scotregen.co.uk
Communities team, and Sandy Cumming continues to do an excellent job irritation, and to all our readers for any confusion. – Andy Milne, editor

mistakenly referred to John Watt of HIE as the Chief Executive of that organisation. John is of course the Head of HIE’s Strengthening Communities team, and Sandy Cumming continues to do an excellent job as the Chief Executive of HIE. My apologies to John and Sandy for any irritation, and to all our readers for any confusion. – Andy Milne, editor

Some more alert readers may have noticed that in our last edition I mistakenly referred to John Watt of HIE as the Chief Executive of that organisation. John is of course the Head of HIE’s Strengthening Communities team, and Sandy Cumming continues to do an excellent job as the Chief Executive of HIE. My apologies to John and Sandy for any irritation, and to all our readers for any confusion. – Andy Milne, editor

"With the help of SURF, Dundee has been at the centre of policy development and debate on regeneration in Scotland - we have been very pleased with the return on our investment as a sponsor member".

Councillor Jill Shimi, Council Leader and Chair, Dundee Partnership Forum

Join SURF

SURF’s membership is the backbone of its work.

Become a SURF member and get:

• A guaranteed 33% discount on SURF seminars conferences, and study visits.
• Advance notice of all of our events.
• A complimentary invitation to SURFs’ annual lecture and a free copy of the speech.
• Priority access to our programme of Open Forums
• Information on SURFs annual Regeneration Awards for best practice and reduced rates for the Awards presentation dinner.
• Copies of our quarterly Scotregen journal sent directly to you and your key colleagues.
• Access to our members’ library of SURF publications and reports on our Website.
• Get connected to a truly independent and informed network of regeneration organisations and individuals. Your support will help SURF be an effective catalyst for improving all our efforts to create successful and sustainable communities across Scotland.

To find out more and for a form to join SURF visit our web site at www.scotregen.co.uk or contact Andy Milne directly by calling 0141 585 6848 or e mailing him at andymilne@scotregen.co.uk
At the end of the 19th/beginning of the 20th century a new approach to gardening developed that remains to this day, the basis for most gardens and landscapes in the temperate world.

The men and women responsible were rebelling against the authoritarian, rigid designs of the Victorians but their rebellion was social as well as artistic. Ruskin and William Morris, united by a commitment to a creative life for everyone, but with Ruskin looking backwards to a past that could not be returned to and Morris looking forward to a socialist future. Lutyens and Jekyll of course figure in the book, but so do many lesser known, but just as interesting architects, horticulturists and artists. A further contradiction of the movement was that although international, its roots in each country were drawn from indigenous culture and plants and one of the pleasures of this book are lesser known schemes in Europe and North America.

The ideas were developed not in the private estates of the aristocracy or the public parks of the Victorians but in private gardens. The approach of linking house and garden, of creating ‘rooms’ within garden, of encouraging ‘hands on gardening’, by men and women, and using new technologies in printing and publishing to spread knowledge widely, represented a democratic impulse that continues today.

A few more plans would have been welcome but this short, well written book with glorious photographs is highly recommended.

Every Day Spaces by Pauline Gallacher, Thomas Telford Publishing, ISBN 0 7277 3344 3, £25.00

In contrast ‘Every Day Spaces’ deals with the design, development and subsequent life of five public spaces created at the end of the 20th/beginning of the 21st century. Boosted by Glasgow’s description as UK City of Architecture and Design 1999, five neighbourhood public spaces were identified to be procured by local Housing Associations.

The book describes the high hopes and aspirations generated by a study trip to Barcelona and two sustained multi-disciplinary workshops involving community representatives and architects; the frustrating difficulties in securing the funding (originally there were 20 neighbourhood spaces proposed); the difficulties of agreeing on future maintenance responsibilities and their construction, handover and subsequent use. Each project and client are described in detail including the difficulties and problems that most of them encountered.

This is a powerful and important book. Hundreds of millions of pounds of private and public money are spent each year in ‘place making’ from new suburban estates to dense urban developments, from city centres to edge of town business parks. This book is required reading for anybody involved in such work.

Given its focus it understandably does not tackle the current unwritten but dominant rule that all public space is first of all for vehicles and only afterwards for people but both Ken Worple, in his thoughtful introduction, and Gallacher do touch on the other key issues. These include the need for a wide ranging politics of social renewal; just as the Arts and Crafts movement was based on socialists and feminist ideas and was part of the creation of a new society, such a renewal is necessary at the beginning the 21st century if we are to create a public realm where, as its name describes, the public rule.
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