Exploring New Models of Community-based Planning in the Devolved UK

Project Report

Simon Pemberton
Deborah Peel

October 2016

About the Authors

Simon Pemberton, PhD, is Reader in Human Geography at Keele University. Simon worked on several post-doctoral research projects concerned with rural regeneration partnership working and the institutional governance of transport before becoming Head of Regeneration for a local authority in North Wales. After four years in practice, Simon took up the position of Director of the Merseyside Social Inclusion Observatory at the University of Liverpool between 2004 and 2010. Subsequently, Simon held the position of Senior Lecturer in Geography and Planning at the University of Birmingham. In 2013 he was appointed Reader in Human Geography at Keele University. His academic work has a strong policy application and bridges the geography-planning-public policy interface. He has research interests in three main areas: 1) The rescaling of the state and implications for urban and rural regeneration; 2) Superdiversity and urban planning; and 3) Community-based planning.

Email: s.pemberton@keele.ac.uk

Deborah Peel, PhD, is a French graduate, social scientist and independent scholar. Following a period of some ten years working in local government in town planning (1989-1999), Deborah held academic positions at the Universities of Westminster, Dundee, Liverpool, and Ulster. Most recently she held the Chair of Architecture and Planning at the University of Dundee. Since 2016, she is Emeritus Professor at the University of Dundee and holds a Visiting Professorship at Wageningen University. She has researched and published widely, including studies of community development trusts, the reform and modernisation of statutory land use planning, and education and training in the built environment. She is an Executive Board Member of the European Observatory on Local Autonomy.

Email: d.peel@dundee.ac.uk

Acknowledgements

Disclaimer
Links to materials were accurate at 22 October 2016. Where possible we have used open sourced materials.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

This report sets out the findings to a pilot study undertaken between July 2015 and April 2016, and funded by the Planning Exchange Foundation. Our motivation in carrying out this work was to extend, and flesh out, an earlier desk-based study[1] through interviews with people directly involved in implementing community planning in practice.

Our previous work was informed by a comparative literature review which highlighted issues in relation to multi-level governance and the reworking and rescaling of service provision. The reshaping of local – or community-based – governance has led to new types of service and new service providers. As state-market-civil society relations are reconfigured, the so-called 'filling-in' of local governance raises questions for the nature of horizontal, vertical and cross-scalar relations, and joint-working.

Our purpose in undertaking this study was to get a sense of perceptions and experience on the ground of those directly involved in implementing community planning. Set against the evolving legal and policy background to community planning in the devolved UK, this report summarises some of the key findings and themes emerging in contemporary community planning practice with a view to mapping a number of research priorities.

1.2 Structure of the report

This opening section provides the background to the study. We set out the research aim, objectives and methodology. The next section defines the context for understanding community planning, and we draw attention to wider strategies of public sector reform and issues in relation to the terminology of community planning.

The core of the report is organised around our research objectives which are grouped under four headings:

- Section 3: Community planning arrangements in the devolved UK.
- Section 4: Models and practices of joint-working.
- Section 5: Community engagement.
- Section 6: Community planning and land use planning.

In the conclusions, Section 7, we tease out the key points, make some general recommendations, and set out a number of priorities for future research. Section 8 explains what we have done in terms of disseminating the work. Section 9 lists the principal references used.

---

[1] Pemberton, S., Peel, D. and Lloyd, M.G. (2015) The 'filling in' of community-based planning in the devolved UK?. *The Geographical Journal*, 181(1), pp.6-15.

1.3 Background to the study

Efforts to provide appropriate public services that are effective, efficient and equitable is not a new concern.[2] Over time, changing economic contexts and societal trends, such as an ageing population, a concern with inequality and resource constraints, have provided new conditions for re-thinking the type, nature, scale and mode of delivery of public services. Following the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, for example, efforts to promote sustainable development under the Local Agenda 21 initiative were an attempt to join up services at the local level to better address community needs, particularly in areas of deprivation.[3] Notwithstanding the present enthusiasm for community planning, the family of community-based governance initiatives has a long pedigree.

Community planning takes various forms, and models of community planning comprise different dimensions, including focusing on community engagement techniques,[4] ideas relating to supporting community enterprises and bodies, and involvement in service delivery by the third sector, for example.[5] Indeed, it is acknowledged that different interpretations – or social constructions – of community planning can sometimes muddy the waters in terms of different parties' expectations.

Important threads running through community planning debates are issues of control, and the extent to which public services are best managed at centralised or local levels. As services are redesigned, questions are then raised in relation to the remit and responsibilities of service providers; how to resource, manage and integrate services; how to maintain quality standards; and how to manage roles, relationships and expectations across the different interest groups. In this pilot study, we wished to explore current practices of community planning in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland with a view to mapping comparative experience and identifying research priorities.

Lying behind the general notion of 'community planning' is a drive towards the decentralisation of services to enable more responsive local services, support greater influence and control by community and voluntary groups, and offer greater sensitivity to user needs in defined places or localities.[6] In the UK, community planning has thus emerged as a specific type of 'policy partnership vehicle' to address a range of issues. From an organisational perspective, community planning is designed to assist in reducing service duplication, overcome organisational fragmentation, and deliver relatively more integrated – and better – public services. From a community – or civil society perspective – the emphasis has been on securing greater – and earlier – engagement, offering improved and more coherent service responses to complex needs, and, in some cases, decentralising responsibility for service design and delivery.

---

[2] Terry, F. (2004). Public Management – Time for a Re-launch. Available at: http://www.publicnet.co.uk/features/2004/01/30/public-management-%E2%80%93-time-for-a-re-launch/

[3] Lucas, K., Ross, A. and Fuller, S. (2003) *Local Agenda 21, community planning and neighbourhood renewal*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Available at: https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/local-agenda-21-community-planning-and-neighbourhood-renewal

[4] See, for example, Community Places (2013) *Community Planning Toolkit: Community engagement*, Belfast: Community Places. Available at: http://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/sites/default/files/Engagement.pdf

[5] Escobar, O. (2015) *Reimagining Community Planning in Scotland: A Vision from the Third Sector*, Edinburgh: What Works Scotland. Available at: http://www.vascotland.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/WP-Reimagining-Community-Planning-august-2015.pdf

[6] See, for example, the Scottish Government's (2016) consultation draft on community planning guidance. Available at: https://consult.scotland.gov.uk/community-empowerment-unit/community-planning-guidance/user_uploads/00497123.pdf-1

Interestingly, in England for example, specific interest has been paid to the delivery of housing, through a particular model of community planning, that of neighbourhood planning. This focus draws attention to the relationship between the community plan, understood as having a services focus, and local development plans, which have a physical remit, and are concerned with the allocation, use and development of land. How to manage this relationship raises several questions which, we felt, were important to explore, particularly since the introduction of a statutory link between community planning and land use planning in the 2014 legislation for Northern Ireland, for example, and similar debates in Scotland.[7]

Moves to 'empower' communities, as in the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015, have witnessed new statutory rights being developed and strengthened, including, the right to buy. In tandem, new statutory duties have been devised. These duties include mechanisms for requiring statutory public bodies to work together, to work actively to engage local people, and to work to support local communities if they wish to deliver their own services. As such, new relations between different 'partners', and at different scales, are emerging. This inter-sectoral working involves attending to aspects of cross-scalar governance.

The evolution of community planning across the UK has involved new approaches to performance management. A range of measures dedicated to assessing the effectiveness of community planning has developed. Initially driven by a concern with outputs and processes, this monitoring aspect has witnessed a turn to an outcomes-based approach. Here, there is evidence of a turn to concentrate on a well-being focus, a 'policy move' which offers a more holistic way of appreciating service aims.

Finally, since political devolution, efforts to implement service decentralisation have witnessed differences in approach in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, reflecting priorities at the sub-national level. In particular, then, we were interested in examining the reconfiguration of local public service provision in the context of political devolution in the UK.

1.4 Study aim

Given the range of initiatives emerging in the broad field of community-based governance, our aim in carrying out this research has been to critically reflect on the separate developments that have taken place across the devolved UK, and to see what shared learning may be derived from the different approaches to designing and implementing community planning.

The literature highlights a number of themes. Previous studies have, for example, attempted to evaluate the processes and outcomes of different models of community planning; and highlighted issues concerned with: resourcing and support for implementing community planning, the extent of formalisation of governance arrangements, leadership issues, the nature of joint-working, scales of working, the importance of local and national politics and the regulatory environment for community-based planning.[8]

---

[7] For example, one of the questions asked in the 2015/16 "Root and Branch" Review of the Planning System in Scotland specifically asked what the relationship between community planning and land use planning should be, recommending stronger alignment. Available at: http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Built-Environment/planning/Review-of-Planning

[8] Wells, P. and Goudie, R. (2005) *Process Evaluation of Plan Rationalisation: Formative Evaluation of Community Strategies*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. Available at: https://www.shu.ac.uk/research/cresr/sites/shu.ac.uk/files/formative-eval-community-strategies.pdf

The report seeks to take forward work that has focused on how community planning may encompass a spectrum of relational models, involving, for example, collaborative relations as a consequence of cross-boundary working,[9] as well as the relationship between community planning and land use planning.[10] It also explores the extent to which working and service delivery arrangements involve statutory or voluntary-style models of joint-working, and which may involve the development of a memorandum of understanding or 'concordat' approach.[11]

Through examining the policy, legislative and organisational arrangement for community planning, the report additionally considers the ways community planning has been initiated and delivered. Building on our earlier work,[12][13] the study provides the basis for considering policy convergence or divergence and the explicit policy learning evident within and between the devolved administrations.

The purpose of this study was to tease out practitioner experience and critical reflections on such issues in the design and delivery of local public services in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, with a view to better understanding how community planning is operating on the ground. In particular, we were concerned with exploring multi-level governance and joint-working in the prevailing context of public sector reconfiguration and sustained financial cut-backs.

In terms of time-line, the study encompasses the period following political devolution, that is, we are concerned with understanding community planning under the Scottish Parliament and the Welsh and Northern Ireland Assemblies. This time-frame is generally accepted as having witnessed variance in public service design and delivery across the UK.[14] In short, a broader interest in constitutional reform, and political powers being devolved to the nation-regions, may be seen as having stimulated discussions about further devolution, decentralisation or diffusion of powers to local people. Community planning features as an important dimension of this broader agenda and merits attention.

1.5 Study objectives

Informed by these debates, this scoping study was designed around five main objectives:

1. To identify and explain the legislative, policy and organisational arrangements for community-based planning across the devolved UK.
2. To identify models of joint-working under community-based planning.
3. To explore how joint-working relations are designed, organised and managed.

---

[9] Sullivan, H. and Skelcher, C. (2002) *Working Across Boundaries: Collaboration in Public Services,* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

[10] Peel, D. and Lloyd, M.G. (2007) Community planning and land use planning in Scotland: a constructive interface? *Public Policy and Administration*, 22(3), pp.353-66.

[11] Peel, D. and Lloyd, M.G. (2012) The Edinburgh Concordat: Contractual, Collaborative Positive Planning?, *Public Performance & Management Review*, 36(2), pp.275-289.

[12] Pemberton, S. and Lloyd, M.G. (2008) Devolution, community planning and institutional de-congestion? *Local Government Studies*, 34(4), pp.437-451.

[13] Pemberton, S., Lloyd, M.G. and Peel, D. (2014) The filling in of community-based planning in the devolved UK, *The Geographical Journal*, 181 (1), pp.6-15.

[14] See, for example, Deloitte (2014) *The State of the State 2014-15*, London: Deloitte LLP. http://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/uk/Documents/public-sector/deloitt-uk-state-of-the-state-2014.pdf

4. To consider the implications arising in respect of the interests reflected within joint-working arrangements and issues of community engagement.

5. The relationship between community planning and land use planning.

Given the emerging interest in developing a constructive bridge between community planning and statutory land use – or spatial – planning, a final objective was:

6. To identify research priorities for enhancing joint-working in community-based planning and links with land use planning.

1.6 Methodology

In undertaking comparative work, our aim was to develop a structured approach to exploring the nature of community-based planning in England, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales. We reviewed the legislative, policy and organisational arrangements for community planning in each nation, and undertook in-depth semi-structured interviews with key actors involved with community planning in each of the devolved territories between July 2015 and April 2016 (Table 1).

Table 1: Research Participants

	England	Scotland	Wales	Northern Ireland
Central Government	Communities and Local Government (x2)	Scottish Government Public Bodies & Public Service Reform Division	Welsh Government Local Government Division	Government of Northern Ireland Department of the Environment
Local government associations for the four countries of the UK	Local Government Association	Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA)	Welsh Local Government Association	Northern Ireland Local Government Association
Community body (national level)	Locality Planning Advisory Service	PAS (formerly Planning Aid for Scotland)	-	Community Places
Strategic partner	Independent Steering Group member	National Health Service	National Health Service	-
Local authority	Strategic level	Strategic level	Strategic level x 3	Strategic level (x 2)
Local authority	Delivery level (neighbourhood planning)	Community level (regeneration)	Delivery level (sustainability)	Land use planning Education and employment

Table 1 shows that a multi-scalar, multi-sectoral approach informed the selection of participants, with the aim of exploring different agendas at different levels. Interviews were conducted nationally with senior civil servants. Here, the objective was to develop a central government and strategic perspective on community-based planning practices, and to better understand how this policy area had evolved over time. In order to build up a local government perspective, interviews were undertaken with representatives from the local government associations of the four countries of the UK. The four Associations share a common agenda, making the case for subsidiarity beyond Westminster, Holyrood, Cardiff, and Stormont, and strengthening the powers of local government,

increasing fiscal autonomy at the local level and strengthening local democracy.[15] They also reflect sub-national priorities. In order to capture a community perspective, interviews with community bodies with a national focus were undertaken and provided insights into the nature of evolving community roles, engagement dynamics and priorities.

To illustrate practice at the local authority level, four urban-centred mini case studies (one in each territory) were selected to frame interviews with local strategic and operational actors involved in community planning, including local authority officers and other partner organisations. Taken together, the intention was to develop a composite institutional picture of current practice. A copy of the topic guide used to structure the interviews is attached as Appendix One.

We acknowledge that there are certain limitations in generalising from a small-scale, scoping project. First, we inevitably had to be selective in the number of interviews undertaken. We were alert, however, to the fact that certain bodies had an advocacy role or campaigning element as part of their mandate. We understand, too, that government spokespersons, for example, were necessarily constrained by their obligations to reflect ministerial positions, and the timing of the 2016 general elections in the devolved administrations. The perspectives reflected in this study, we suggest, are nevertheless indicative of the (small p) political nature of this topic. Second, we acknowledge that we only carried out four mini case studies. These were urban-based and place-specific, so it is important to consider what rural, or island contexts might mean for community-based planning and governance. Throughout, however, we were able to test and challenge assumptions through researcher triangulation and we suggest that the in-depth nature of the project offers some useful insights into contemporary community planning practice.

1.7 Research ethics

Two remarks are pertinent:

Ethical approval was obtained from the respective institutions in preparing this pilot study, with a view to respecting the opinions of those interviewed. All comments are anonymised and every effort has been taken to ensure that comments are not attributable.

Full use of materials that are open source is made in order to facilitate access to the study findings and wider reference material.

---

[15] See, for example, UK Councils unite in devolution call. Press release. Available at:
http://www.cosla.gov.uk/news/2015/04/uk-council-leaders-unite-devolution-call

2. CONTEXT FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING

2.1 Introduction

By way of contextualisation, it is helpful to locate community planning within wider strategies for public sector reform. Moreover, a historical perspective provides a counterbalance to contemporary efforts to effect change. In this respect, a concern with finding new ways of managing and delivering public services has been informed by alternative theories within the broad field of public administration. Ideas and practices associated with New Public Management, in particular, may be seen as prompting an interest in developing and implementing efficiency gains in traditional public service approaches. This agenda involved moving to the use of different service-providers, for example, including the contracting out of typical state services to different providers.[16] This shift in delivery mode precipitated a turn to local government as the 'enabling authority' rather than sole deliverer. Over time, citizens became consumers of services with a 'right to exit' and service quality was measured in terms of particular contractual relations and initiatives, such as the Citizen's Charter. Such arrangements defined a particular state-citizen set of relations.

Given the changing arrangements, measuring the effectiveness of services became a priority and a range of performance and evaluation tools and techniques followed. In recent times, continuous public spending cuts have accentuated a concern with how to reconfigure the Welfare State. Attempts to transform established expectations of the nature of a Welfare State have stimulated parallel debates around the principles necessary to shape service design and delivery. As services are rationed, attention has deliberately focused on issues of equity and how best to prioritise services. Here, the priority of tackling inequalities, particularly in relation to health and poverty, has taken centre-stage.[17]

Propositions for service design and delivery are shaped by ideological perspectives, and serve to illustrate contested solutions around the appropriate balance of control and responsibility between central and local government.[18] Such debates draw attention to the functional, territorial and scalar dimensions of public sector activity and in what ways public policies and public services are redistributive.[19] A continued – and to a large degree a more urgent – emphasis on modernisation and reform has been driven by the effects of the global recession from 2008 and a particular ideological response driven by a commitment, by certain political leaders, to financial austerity. A concern with developing more efficient services and making best use of resources has witnessed the introduction of shared services, for example.[20] In effect, reduced financial resources have meant that

---

[16] Wilson, J. (2004) New Management of Public Services: The United Kingdom Experience, *Viešoji Politika Ir Administravimas*, 7, pp. 49-59. Available at: https://www.mruni.eu/upload/iblock/86f/6_j.wilson.pdf

[17] See, for example, the signing up to the UN's Sustainable Development Goals by the Scottish Government. Available at: http://news.scotland.gov.uk/News/Leading-the-way-in-tackling-inequality-1b49.aspx

[18] See, for example, Murray, J. (2014) *Policy Paper: The role of local government in a modern state*, London: Centre for Labour and Social Studies.
http://classonline.org.uk/docs/2014_the_role_of_local_government_in_the_modern_state.pdf

[19] Keating, M. (2013) Rescaling Welfare. Presentation to the British Academy/Royal Society of Edinburgh Enlightening the Constitutional debate. Seminar on Welfare and Public Services, 20 November 2013 Glasgow. Available at: https://www.royalsoced.org.uk/cms/files/events/programmes/2012-13/speaker_notes/MichaelKeating.pdf

[20] Peel, D., O'Keeffe, B., Shi, L., Leith, K. and Keaveney, K. (2012) *Shared Services Across Local Government: Sharing International Experiences*, Armagh: International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD). April. Available at: URL: http://i2ud.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Shared-Services_International-Case-Studies.pdf

efforts to secure the on-going sustainability of service provision and delivery at a local level have become a priority. Community planning nests within these debates.

2.2 Local service provision and delivery

What service provision and delivery at a *local* level mean in practice, however, is open to debate. For example, the UK Government signed the Council of Europe's Charter of Local Self-Government in 1997. The Charter was subsequently ratified by the UK in 1998, committing the UK, alongside other ratifying member states, to guaranteeing the political, administrative and financial independence of local authorities. Critically, this Charter provides that the principle of local self-government shall be recognised in domestic legislation and, where practicable, in state constitutions. This confirms the emphasis on the continued central role of local government in service delivery.

In tandem, and reflecting European principles of subsidiarity, increasing attention has been paid to actively seeking to involve communities in the design, delivery, and indeed evaluation, of local services. This approach is referred to as 'co-production'.[21] Whilst there is some evidence of tensions and limitations in respect of how co-production in the context of community planning might best be adopted, it is argued that there is considerable potential to develop models of co-production that can simultaneously promote community well-being; help to secure democratic engagement and participation in decision-making; and achieve efficiencies in service delivery through integrated service provision.[22] Here, it is useful to note that community-centered approaches have evolved over time, being variously associated – and to varying degrees – with thinking around community development, community education, community work and community engagement.

Since the millennium, it has been suggested that there has been a degree of shared learning in the evolution of community planning across the four nations of the UK.[23] Interest in sharing and comparing insights in this way may be critically analysed using a body of related theories concerned with notions of policy transfer, lesson-drawing and policy mobilities, for example.[24] Such thinking draws attention to different styles of policy-making and implementation. It is argued that policy style is context dependent and affected by a combination of differences, such as the type of policy problem faced, the size and relational inter-dependencies of a particular jurisdiction, and associated ideological, cultural and attitudinal responses to policy processes, which are affected by the power and influence of different interest groups.[25] Explanations of why, and how, policy develops in a particular way are thus contested and dynamic over place and time.

Whilst public service reform and modernisation is an international phenomenon, political devolution in the UK offers an interesting arena for comparing context-specific ways for delivering appropriate

---

[21] See, for example, http://www.thinklocalactpersonal.org.uk/_assets/BCC/nef_Co-production_1.pdf

[22] See, for example, Boyle, D. and Harris, M. (2009) *The Challenge of Co-production: How equal partnerships between professionals and the public are crucial to improving public services.* Discussion Paper. London: NESTA. Available at: https://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/the_challenge_of_co-production.pdf

[23] Laffin, M. (2007) Comparative British Central-Local Relations: Regional Centralism, Governance and Intergovernmental Relations, *Public Policy and Administration*, 22/1, 74-91.
Available at: http://ppa.sagepub.com/content/22/1/74.full.pdf

[24] Pemberton, S., Peel, D. and Lloyd, M.G. (2015) The 'filling in' of community-based planning in the devolved UK?. *The Geographical Journal*, 181(1), pp 6-15.

[25] Cairney, P. (2013) 'Majoritarian Versus Consensus Policymaking' or a 'Common European Policy Style'? The Case of the UK and Scotland, Paper presented to the Japanese Political Science Association Annual Conference, Hokkai Gakuen University, Sapporo, September. Available at:
https://paulcairney.files.wordpress.com/2013/08/cairney-jpsa-2013.pdf

local public services. Much of this reform programme was initially driven by a commitment to Best Value, which provides a statutory basis for accountability, use of resources and performance management, together with vision, leadership and partnership working.[26] Within this context, and since 2000 in particular, there has been a raft of legislation and policy guidance, as well as dedicated national commissions, including the 2011 Christie Commission in Scotland and the 2014 Williams Commission on Public Service, Governance and Delivery in Wales, aimed at rethinking the public sector and how best to re-organise services and service delivery in efficient, effective and equitable ways.

In short, public sector reform and modernisation in advanced economies, increasing and more complex service demands, and, more recently, financial pressures on public services, provide the overarching context in which the design of policy, restructuring and rescaling of institutional arrangements, and the nature of joint-working for the planning and delivery of public services takes place. Within this broad rethinking of providing services in a more coordinated way has been the introduction of community planning.

2.3 Defining community planning

At this point, it is worth noting that terminology around community planning is problematic insofar as the term means different things in different contexts. Here, it is helpful to take a step back. It is generally agreed that the concept of community planning in the UK was introduced in a 1995 Labour Party draft policy paper, *Renewing Democracy, Rebuilding Communities*.[27] The proposal was for local councils to produce a document setting out service objectives and priorities, alongside a set of performance targets. From this perspective, community planning is seen as resembling the 'Performance Plan' within the Best Value regime.

A pilot project programme initiated by the Labour Party at the end of 1995 involved 14 English councils and one Scottish council (Clackmannanshire). Reflecting thinking at that time, the pilot project was primarily concerned with developing new approaches to consulting communities about the local authorities' own strategies and service planning and delivery, with less attention given to partnership arrangements.

In tandem with efforts to improve the community focus, as set out in the White Paper, *Modernising Local Government: In Touch with the People*,[28] a particular emphasis was placed on the reform and modernisation of the public sector. These debates set the tone for subsequent statutory and policy developments. The Foreword to the White Paper, for example, reminds us that this agenda was cast in terms of devising public services 'fit for the 21st century'. The aims were expressed in terms of quality and equality:

> *People everywhere deserve and rightly expect a pleasant and safe environment in which they can live and work. We all want good quality public services, with rising standards in our schools and in our*

---

[26] See, for example, Northern Ireland Local Government (Best Value) Bill Explanatory & Financial Memorandum http://archive.niassembly.gov.uk/legislation/primary/2000/niabill19_00-efm.htm and Scottish Government information: http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Government/PublicServiceReform/14838/564

[27] This history, including the pilots, is explained in: Rogers, S., Smith, M., Sullivan, H. and Clarke, M. (1999) Community Planning in Scotland: An Evaluation of the Pathfinder Projects commissioned by COSLA, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive and COSLA. Available at: http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/158150/0042793.pdf

[28] Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) (1998) *Modern local government: in touch with the people,* London: DETR. Available at: http://www.politicsresources.net/docs/DETR1998.pdf

> *health care. We want local communities where everyone can participate in society, and effective care is available to those who need it* (DETR, 1998, p.2)*.*

Moreover, it was clearly stated at that time that the nature of service provision was expected to be different. Whilst acknowledging the central role to be played by local authorities, the intention was based on changing and challenging established practice:

> *To do this, councils need to break free from old-fashioned practices and attitudes. There is a long and proud tradition of councils serving their communities. But the world and how we live today is very different from when our current systems of local government were established. There is no future in the old model of councils trying to plan and run most services. It does not provide the services which people want, and cannot do so in today's world. Equally there is no future for councils which are inward looking and who are more concerned to maintain their structures and protect their vested interests than listening to their local people and leading their communities* (DETR, 1998, p.2).

These political ambitions created a particular environment in which power relations between central and local government, and different scalar, sectoral providers and local communities might variously be reconfigured.

Since then, and set against shifts in political control at central government level, including coalition governments in Scotland, England and Wales, and power-sharing in Northern Ireland, the last two decades have witnessed considerable experimentation in local public services.

Policy experimentation has been shaped by different ideologies, influenced by market-based thinking, and informed – to varying degrees – by the European concept of subsidiarity. Ideas concerned with the appropriate scale of governance, or the fundamental nature of representative or participatory democracy, have also been influenced by changing state-market relations, and particularly, the scope of the state. As Giddens differentiated, somewhat graphically:

> *The neoliberals want to shrink the state; the social democrats, historically, have been keen to expand it.*[29, p.70]

These ideological debates have informed wider discussions about the extent and nature of central control – and particularly the size of the state. It is worth noting, however, that Giddens goes on to argue:

> *The issue isn't more government or less, but recognising that governance must adjust to the new circumstances of the global age; and that authority, including state legitimacy, has to be renewed on an active basis.*[p.72]

It follows that the diversity and reach of those potentially able to be involved in the active design and delivery of public services can – or, indeed, has to – be extended.

The 21st century has seen sub-regional government variously evolve, with greater devolution of powers, including, most recently, a broadening of powers to initiate primary legislation in Wales. Such responses to renewing sub-national governance on an active basis provide part of the context to the introduction of community planning.

Devolution debates at the UK level precipitated discussions not only about decentralising powers to the Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, but to local government and local communities,

---

[29] Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

effectively giving greater power in determining local need and prioritising services.[30] Notably, Miliband made the case for "double devolution":

> *I call it 'double devolution' – not just devolution that takes power from central government and gives it to local government, but power that goes from local government down to local people, providing a critical role for individuals and neighbourhoods, often through the voluntary sector.*[31]

To date, the extent of community control has been somewhat marginalised, although experience of community development trusts, for example, illustrates new forms of localised service support. In Scotland, new legislative measures in the form of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 are being put in place to facilitate asset transfer, for example. In England, a number of new 'community rights' were introduced through the 2011 Localism Act, including a 'right to bid' to manage local community assets.

As such, the potential for 'community planning' lies in offering a number of avenues (or models) for service delivery, in terms of the roles played by individual citizens, and, particularly, in terms of how state-citizen relations are managed. Here, the legitimacy of local government performs an important democratic function.

How core public service provision has evolved in practice has resulted in various design and delivery approaches being put into place, new joint-working relations emerging, and new vocabularies developing. Importantly for this study, ideas and terminology in relation to community-based planning tended to vary across England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, as society grapples with how to conceptualise, articulate and provide core public services in the face of growing inequalities. Public service provision at the local level is being actively socially reconstructed; concepts and definitions matter, particularly if shared learning is to take place meaningfully.

2.4 Summary

By way of summarising the main concepts involved in community planning, since 1999, there has been a turn to localism and neighbourhood planning in England. In Scotland, conversations have progressed from community planning to community empowerment. In Wales, there have been on-going discussions on the modernisation of public services, the absolute centrality of securing resource efficiencies, and a recent emphasis on securing long-term sustainability and community well-being. In Northern Ireland, the restoration of powers to local government, after almost forty years of centralised control, has provoked deep debates about roles, rights and responsibilities, and how best to reconfigure the arrangements and delivery methods of local public services, based on the sharing of activities, resources and visions, and alignment, including with the Republic of Ireland.

Variously, ideas of social, economic and environmental well-being; resilient communities; and sustainable development perform important rhetorical devices in developing local service provision. Reflecting a concern with being 'in touch with the people', there remains an important emphasis on community engagement. Critically, there is a noticeable attempt to ensure that those formally involved with community planning do their utmost to engage with local communities, particularly those who tend to be excluded. Moreover, there is an emphasis on handing power over to local communities to manage services themselves.

---

[30] See, for example, the UK Government's on-line resource in relation to devolution. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/devolution-of-powers-to-scotland-wales-and-northern-ireland
[31] Weaver, M. (2006) 'More power to the people, urges Milliband', *The Guardian* on-line. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/society/2006/feb/21/localgovernment.politics

3. COMMUNITY PLANNING ARRANGEMENTS IN THE DEVOLVED UK

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this section is to outline some of the main features of community planning in terms of its legislative and policy basis across the devolved UK. The institutional arrangements in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland provide the working context for discussions about community planning, including the respective statutory and organisational arrangements; and bottom-up models and practices of joint-working.

The discussion is located within the broader devolved governance context for policy learning and thus it is important to appreciate the comparative context. Specific measures and arrangements are in place to maintain regular interactions and good communication between the UK Government and devolved administrations of the Scottish Government, Welsh Government and Northern Ireland Executive, through, for example, the Memorandum of Understanding and its Supplementary Agreements, but there is also evidence of additional sharing and comparing of community planning experiences[32] and changes in relation to land use planning through initiatives such as the Inter-Parliamentary Research and Information Network.[33] Reflecting ideas of policy transfer,[34] the study findings offer evidence of policies being adapted to fit local circumstances.

3.2 Scalar relations

Across the devolved UK, perceptions of the appropriate level of decentralisation operate at a number of levels, including EU-national, national-regional / sub-regional and national-local. Whilst England is the only country of the UK that does not have its own devolved parliament or assembly, moves to decentralise power by the New Labour Government were important in exploring, and then shaping, the development of regional and sub-regional structures of governance, as well as new community planning responsibilities for local government.

When compared in the round, interviewees in the devolved regions tended to refer to issues of scale, territory and proximity in their elaboration of decentralised and devolved powers. The local government associations of the devolved regions located community planning in a discourse around democratic renewal:

> *"I think a large part of it is down to the fact that you have got a lot of small authorities (in Wales).……. A lot of the Localism Act didn't come into Wales for that very reason, you know. There was this feeling that you already had the Community Strategies and they were supposed to be building up from all the communities beneath them, so why have another layer?"*
>
> Welsh Local Government Association representative.

---

[32] See, for example, Cave, S. (2013) *Community Planning*, Research and Information Service Research Paper NIAR 220-13, Belfast: Northern Ireland Assembly. Available at:
http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/globalassets/documents/raise/publications/2013/environment/11913.pdf

[33] Cave, S., Rehfisch, A., Smith, L. and Winter, G. (2013) Comparison of the planning systems in the four UK countries. SPICe Briefing 13/35. Available at:
http://www.parliament.scot/ResearchBriefingsAndFactsheets/S4/SB_13-35.pdf

[34] Stone, D. (2001) *Learning Lessons, Policy Transfer and the International Diffusion of Policy Ideas*, CSGR Working Paper No. 69/01. Available at: http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/2056/1/WRAP_Stone_wp6901.pdf

"To me, the Scottish debate is quite unique, and I think, just because of the proximity of everybody, it's a much smaller place, so the debate is that much more focused and you're speaking face-to-face to the key players."

Convention of Scottish Local Authorities representative.

Implementation of community planning is of necessity context specific. Notably, the case in Northern Ireland is very different, given the progressive (though interrupted) restoration of powers to local government since the 1998 Belfast / Good Friday Agreement. The radical restructuring of local government, including boundary reorganisation to reduce 26 local authorities to create 11 councils in 2015, gave rise to the potential for experiential learning from the devolved nations, and England. There was also scope to build on local experience from related partnership working activities, such as those in relation to policing and safety.

It is evident that community planning in Northern Ireland continues to be shaped by the power-sharing nature of Central Government and political control over certain service functions. On-going sectarian concerns further accentuate expectations for community planning on the ground, particularly in relation to developing shared services in the form of community planning:

"I think [..the introduction of community planning] was to try to overcome the historical issues that we've had here, in addition to sort of modernising local government in Northern Ireland. We went from a situation where there had been no major local government legislation since 1972 – and that was rectified in 2014. And, in the meantime, obviously, in other areas of the UK and other places, there had been a lot of changes of thinking and a lot of iterations of what councils should do and should be.

And we very much, as a sector with the DOE [Department of the Environment]… we looked at what had been put in place in Scotland and Wales, and being a bit more similar to Northern Ireland than England would be. And we felt that community planning was a good step and the right direction, particularly given the fracturing of public services in Northern Ireland which is much more prevalent than it would be in other areas."

Northern Ireland Local Government Association representative.

It is yet to be ascertained whether the 2016 departmental reconfiguration in Northern Ireland will reduce service fragmentation, or simply introduce another set of relational dynamics. These changes have come about relatively swiftly on top of the new local government boundary and institutional changes which have yet to bed in fully. Nevertheless, the perceptions of the foundational role to be played by community planning in Northern Ireland's public sector reform were encapsulated by the Local Government Association representative as: "*the only show in town.*" This view of the leading role to be played by community planning was echoed by a national community body representative in Northern Ireland who suggested that for the new council level *"community planning is almost the overarching approach to the way they wish to do local government*." Given that Northern Ireland is the most recent adopter of community planning, such recognition of the approach is testimony to community planning's place in the rescaling and revision of the public service landscape.

3.3 Legislative, policy and organisational arrangements

In terms of the legislative basis for community planning, the Local Government Act (2000) was important in both England and Wales in formalising a new community leadership role for local government. This legislation placed a specific emphasis on modernising public services, securing citizen participation and engagement, and integrating service delivery. Consequently, similar local partnership structures were developed in both areas to deliver local community planning – Local Strategic Partnerships in England and Community Strategy Partnerships in Wales. Given that each delivery mechanism was non-statutory (and with only the local authority having a duty to 'consult'

other partners), it is, perhaps, unsurprising that common criticisms emerged around the ability of local government to secure integration of partner activities, and to engage with local groups. Thus, over time, efforts were made to re-shape and strengthen community governance activities.

In England, there was arguably a slightly earlier move than Wales towards the formal monitoring and performance management of community planning arrangements, with the introduction of Sustainable Community Strategies and Local Area Agreements in 2004. In Wales, the Welsh Government's 'Making the Connections' agenda and the 2006 Beecham Review – led to new performance management systems being introduced in Wales, and which became more evident with the re-configuration of Community Strategy Partnerships into Local Service Boards. In addition, this approach has been strengthened more recently in Wales with the introduction of Public Service Boards in 2016. Indeed, the Public Service Boards have a statutory basis to develop Well-Being Plans that directly inform national well-being targets and objectives. For some, then, the use of statutory powers has called into question the extent of subsidiarity being achieved from national government, and at a more local level in respect of engagement with local communities:

> "I think you've seen the Welsh Government, in a lot of cases, trying to exert more control… trying to look at more of this, sort of, one size fits all approach…"
> Welsh Local Government Association representative.

In England, since 2010, there have been a number of interventions by national government that have sought to develop greater freedoms and incentives for local collaboration and to create a lighter touch regulatory environment in respect of performance management. This activity has included the removal of Local Area Agreements. On the other hand, concerns with neighbourhood (land use) planning have also become increasingly predominant to facilitate what has been termed a 'pro-development' localism, focused on increasing and underlining the local benefits of housing and economic development.[35] It has also emphasised devolving power to local communities. This attempt at further service decentralisation can be selective, however, in terms of the groups and interests that may be actively involved:

> "If you speak to some people, they are quite critical of it, because their sort of take on it, it feels like it's, sort of, whipped, it feels like there is a certain direction."
> Local authority strategic officer 1.

> "We work with parish councils because we like them, they've got accountability. They're very often at a neighbourhood level."
> Civil Servant 1, Communities and Local Government.

Community planning in Scotland found its legislative basis in the _Local Government in Scotland Act 2003_ but has subsequently been revised.[36] Initially devised to improve scalar connections between national priorities and those at regional, local and neighbourhood levels, community planning is predicated on joint-working and rationalisation. Important principles underpinning community planning were identified as turning on cross-sectoral partnership working; coordination; and community engagement.

An Initial Review of Community Planning in 2006 by Audit Scotland noted that community planning has the potential to add value to existing joint-working through providing: "_a local strategic_

---

[35] Clark, G. (2011) _Planning for growth._ Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/planning-for-growth--7

[36] Campbell, A. (2015) _Timeline for the Development of Community Planning in Scotland_. July. Available at: http://whatworksscotland.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Development-of-Community-Planning-in-Scotland-Timeline.pdf

framework and building a culture of co-operation and trust".[37] This comment highlights the importance of 'softer' dimensions, such as trust, in working relations – aspects that require nurturing. It was identified, however, that the full potential of joint-working was undermined by a number of administrative aspects, including institutional, organisational, structural and performance management issues. Community engagement and elected member involvement were also identified as relatively weak.

Reflecting the "tight financial context" and a perceived need to improve flexibility and create more freedom, in 2007 the Scottish Government and Convention on Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) signed a Concordat. This voluntary-based agreement allowed for the removal of ring-fencing and the right to retain efficiency savings, and increased local autonomy.[38]

Moreover, since 2007, a majority Scottish National Party administration has promoted an outcomes-based approach to public sector activity, based on the National Performance Framework. For community planning, this initially involved the preparation of Single Outcome Agreements. Subsequently, the 2011 Christie Report shifted the policy emphasis towards *prevention*, *performance*, and *people*, whilst still highlighting the central role of community planning and *partnership working*.[39] This initiative was followed by the 2012 Statement of Ambition, which emphasised the need for partners to assume joint responsibility for the outcomes, indicators and targets set out in the Single Outcome Agreement and agreed with the Scottish Government.[40] This arrangement raised expectations and effectively demanded:

> *"…a more intricate, sophisticated understanding of local circumstances and a more intense response from partners."*
>
> Scottish Government representative.

Importantly, joint-working was encouraged rather than legally required.

The Community Empowerment (Scotland) Bill (2014) sought to improve public services and enhance community voice within the strengthened context of an outcomes-based approach. Integral to the subsequently enacted Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 was the strengthening of the duties on partners to participate in community planning, the extension of the range of public sector bodies subject to community planning duties, the replacement of Single Outcome Agreements with Local Outcomes Improvement Plans, and the introduction of locality plans for those areas where communities experience the poorest outcomes.[41] The clearer legal arrangements for community planning imply that what might have previously been seen as a partnership approach based on invitation and encouragement, cooperation and trust, were not effective. Imposing statutory obligations, however, means there is then an important task to be done in terms of legal compliance. The 2016 consultation exercise on the associated community planning guidance and regulations emphasises that community planning continues to be seen as the central driver for transforming public services at the local level.

---

[37] Audit Scotland (2006) *An Initial Review of Community Planning*, Edinburgh: Available at: http://www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/docs/central/2006/nr_060616_community_planning.pdf (p.6)

[38] Scottish Government and COSLA (2007) Concordat. Available at: http://www.gov.scot/resource/doc/923/0054147.pdf

[39] Christie, C. (2011) *Commission on the Future Delivery of Public Services*, June. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Available at: http://scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/352649/0118638.pdf

[40] Community Planning Review Group (2012*) Community Planning Review - Statement of Ambition*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Available at: http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Government/local-government/CP/soa

[41] Campbell, A., Evans, A., Gilman, L. and Reid, A. (2014) *Community Empowerment (Scotland) Bill*. SPICe Briefing 14/58. Edinburgh: Scottish Parliament. Available at: http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefingsAndFactsheets/S4/SB_14-58_.pdf

The legislative basis for community planning in Northern Ireland is set out in the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014. The Act makes the link between community planning for a district and well-being explicit, with community planning partners being required to identify long-term objectives for improving well-being in social, economic and environmental terms, working towards sustainable development and promoting good relations. In relation to monitoring, the 2014 Act also stipulates that councils must produce a statement every two years setting out progress made, and outcomes achieved, in meeting the community plan objectives for their respective district. Importantly, the Act makes a statutory link between the community plan and the local land use development plan. It is anticipated that in aligning the two plans, not only will duplication in community engagement, for example, be reduced, but there will be better synergies in service outcomes. The situation in Northern Ireland is different from elsewhere in that the reorganisation of local government and rearrangement of powers creates a fresh canvas for service design and delivery. In this context, the land use planning system is specifically oriented towards a 'place shaping' approach which incorporates a spatial analysis and visioning process. An underlying aim is for each council, within the framework of community planning, to shape places for local communities through linkages to other functions, such as regeneration, local economic development and local tourism. Specifically, and noting the reference to business involvement,

> [the local development plan] provides the spatial strategy for the community plan, flowing from the vision for the council area and its communities, and linking public and private sector investment through the land use planning system.[42 para 10.2]

In terms of devising and designing the legislative provisions for community planning, there appears to have been learning from the changes made to earlier models of community planning across the devolved UK:

> "Yes, I really do think, those [new councils] who really grasped it, that is how they're … learning, looking very much at the Scottish practice in terms of where they are now 15 odd years later. And trying to not exactly jump to… straight to there. Because it's the third generation of plans for Scotland. But to learn a lot from what's happened there.
>
> And, certainly, particularly in relation to working with other partners, and Councils here, I guess, we have some, you know, like, PCSPs, so, Policing Community Safety Partnerships. There's already, some of those partners …, you know, those partnerships were already there. And they're building on that. And some of them have, I think, also taken the opportunity to be able to reflect on, maybe, how they would do those differently, as well.
>
> But, yes, I think, particularly with education, health, some of the, those big players that really impact on their citizens in their areas, that, you know, they have to work with those partners to have any influence."
>
> National community body representative – Northern Ireland.

In terms of the learning and transfer of policy initiatives and practice, there is thus some potential to side step some of the interim stages taken. Nevertheless, legislation and policy are then tailor-made, based on deriving lessons from experience in earlier models of executing partnership working.

Statutory guidance in Northern Ireland accompanying the 2014 legislation sets out how the eleven new councils, as lead partners, will '*work with statutory bodies and their communities to develop and*

---

[42] Department of the Environment (2015) *Statutory Guidance for the Operation of Community Planning Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014*, Belfast: DoE. Available at:
http://www.niccy.org/media/1682/community-planning-guidance-oct-2015.pdf

implement a shared vision for promoting the well-being of an area, community cohesion and improving the quality of life of its citizens.'[43]para 3.3 Significantly, community planning is seen as a long-term process. The statutory provisions establish the basis for joint-working across the regional and neighbourhood scales, and proactively encouraging community engagement, ensuring that that engagement spans the preparation and monitoring stages of community plans.

3.4 Summary

Efforts to reorient community planning, understood as integrated service provision, would suggest, on the one hand, a concern with institutional, organisational and administrative aspects, as different actors, including professionals, practitioners and politicians, are encouraged to approach the nature and impact of their service provision in new ways. On the other hand, there is a service-user, or civil society, perspective which emphasises not just the right to be consulted, but the right to be actively engaged in service delivery.

Notions of community engagement in public services are being reconfigured and extended in particular ways. For example, in England, the shift to neighbourhood planning has been predicated around the theme of devolving power and securing community involvement (but in terms of local planning processes), efficiency (in respect of planning processes) and engendering a pro-growth attitude. More broadly, concerns with neighbourhood budgeting have also involved an emphasis on commissioning and service re-design and delivery.

In Scotland, community planning has been modified, in part, in relation to wider issues, such as land reform. In Wales, there are on-going attempts at securing service efficiencies and reinforcing both horizontal and vertical relations, especially with the Welsh Government. In Northern Ireland, community planning has become a mechanism, in part, both for coordinating institutional corporate plans at one scale, and addressing community needs and devising shared visions at the neighbourhood level, at the other. Significantly, in Northern Ireland, community planning is part of the transformation of the public sector - and local government - in particular.

With reference to understanding the statutory bases for community planning in the devolved UK, we would highlight certain themes which have emerged over time. Whilst there are differences in the legal, institutional and cultural arrangements for community planning across England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, and the pace and context for change vary, key points involve:

- a shift from community planning partners being invited or encouraged to participate in community planning to a statutory duty on partners to engage in partnership working;
- joint responsibility on partners, at all scales, to engage in all stages of the community planning process, from preparation to monitoring;
- how to secure full participation, and under conditions of increased demand and reduced public sector resource;
- a turn to an outcomes-based approach, and with an emphasis on service-user benefits and experiences, and reducing inequalities;
- a stronger focus on well-being;
- new performance regimes, and a commitment to continuous improvement as part of a long-term process;

---

[43] Department of the Environment (2015) *Statutory Guidance for the Operation of Community Planning Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014*, Belfast: DoE. Available at:
http://www.niccy.org/media/1682/community-planning-guidance-oct-2015.pdf

- new rights in relation to service provision being extended to civil society and the third sector, including rights to 'build', 'challenge' and 'plan';
- new statutory linkages between land use planning and community planning;
- a stronger emphasis on proactively engaging communities in all aspects of community planning, particularly those individuals and communities experiencing disadvantage;
- greater visibility of community planning in related activities, including scope for new forms of elected member involvement in relevant statutory body activities.

4. MODELS AND PRACTICES IN JOINT-WORKING

4.1 Introduction

In this section we consider the different models that have emerged for community planning in a devolved UK, as well as how joint-working relations for community planning have been designed, organised and managed.

In terms of models of community planning, we have already noted above how the terminology relating to community planning is contested. On the one hand, 'community planning' may be seen as representing an attempt to redesign the services communities need. This view tends to characterise community planning as involving integrated service provision. From this perspective, models of community planning may be viewed from an institutional or organisational viewpoint. Here, a strong argument is made that community planning demands joint-working and strategic alignment of organisational resources, priorities and actions. This means that traditionally separate (so-called silo-oriented) public sector organisations, such as those concerned with housing, education, health, employment and safety, for example, but also social care and social inclusion, need to rethink their service objectives to better meet the needs of individuals, families and communities.[44] The explicit integration of regeneration within the framework of community planning in Northern Ireland is a case in point.

A community planning perspective asserts that services are required to be relatively more user-responsive, reflecting the reality that solutions to individuals' needs are rarely resolved by a single-service approach. This thinking is consistent with the idea that certain problems are 'wicked', that is, complex, difficult to solve, and likely to be intertwined with a range of issues.[45] It follows that a relatively more holistic approach to devising service responses is required.

On the other hand, there is a strong emphasis in community planning on services being citizen-centred, reflecting the inter-related and multi-faceted nature of the lived experience, and the needs of individuals. From this perspective, models of community planning assume a user-centred approach, requiring an understanding of specific users' needs over the life-course, and necessitating user or community input into the type and nature of services provided. Interestingly, such responses are not new. One local authority representative referred to experiences of joined-up working by service providers in the mid-1990s, for example, dealing with the issue of young people and sexual health. They highlighted the need for services that were innovative, multi-faceted and responsive to users and pointed to the bottom-up influence that triggered the intervention:

> "…but the idea came from young people, and it wasn't to focus on teenage pregnancy. It was to look at it holistically. So it was a service that was centrally based with an outreach element – but focussed on everything from information, to one-to-one support, to relationships, and mental well-being, to fun - doing things that were 'just good fun', as well as providing key sexual health services."
> Local government officer – neighbourhood level – Scotland.

---

[44]http://www.sitesplus.co.uk/user_docs/880/File/SWAN%20BDOR%20Outcomes%20Report%20Towards%20a%20Concordat.pdf

[45] Rittel, H.W.J. and Webber, M.M. (1973) Dilemmas in a general theory of planning, *Policy Sciences*, 4, pp.155-169. Available at: http://urbanpolicy.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Rittel+Webber_1973_PolicySciences4-2.pdf

Two decades later, efforts to create models of joint-working are still evolving, but certain core principles remain: community planning is predicated on improving connections between specific policy areas; and must be context- and place-specific and citizen- and community-relevant.

Given the spectrum of models for community planning – from an institutional to a community perspective, as well as the degree to which priorities are driven from 'above' or 'below' – there is a need to consider who is involved in the design, organisation and management of such arrangements. Therefore, the sub-sections below focus on the influences shaping and defining the nature and priorities of community planning, how community planning is organised and delivered on the ground, and the ways in which community planning is managed and evaluated in terms of its effectiveness.

4.2 Models of community planning

The social construction of community planning may be seen as 'caught' – at least in part – between statutory (top-down) interpretations – which define the legal operating remit of state bodies – and popular (bottom-up) understandings – which reflect the particular aspirations of the communities of place, identity and interest, and who are, paradoxically, this policy area's very focal point. Political constructions of community planning are a consequence of prevailing ideologies, and, as the remit and extent of community planning have evolved over time, awareness of, and expectations of, community planning have likewise changed.

In Northern Ireland, in particular, community planning became a central building block in meeting the overarching ambitions of the Review of Public Administration. This broad programme for public sector reform continues to involve fundamental government restructuring with wider development of policy. Crucially, this institutional rescaling has led to substantial decentralisation to local government. With the restoration of an extensive range of powers to eleven new councils, this has dramatically changed the service context for local communities:

> "The big thing here, I guess, was about local government having more power, and what local Councils could do with that, given that they were closer to the ground in terms of how community planning can actually be delivered or structured. But, you know, I do think it was mainly about service planning and how you can do more with probably less resources, and, back then, there were a lot more resources than there are now - so it's an even bigger issue.
>
> But, I think, like many places, it's such a condensed concept. I think community planning is really not the best term actually for it, because communities assume, then, that it's all about communities, and obviously the outcomes are very much, sort of, about communities. But it isn't about communities doing their own plans. And then people think, 'Is it managers planning?' The fact that Councils also have the new power, all of the [land use] planning powers transferred has confused things, too… I think, … the whole delay in that happening didn't help.
>
> National community body representative – Northern Ireland.

Pragmatically, one local government respondent, operating in a strategic capacity in a local authority in Northern Ireland, encapsulated their understanding of community planning thus:

> "So, for me (and maybe that's very simplistic) – but, for me, it's a case of - if you had the proper planning process, and you actually looked at proper outcomes… you know, you decided: 'This is what we want to achieve'; 'These are the interventions that we want'… How are you actually going to change what's happening at the minute, then? That's what community planning is for me."
>
> Local government strategic representative 2 – Northern Ireland.

Examining the links between education and employability, and the need to join up different service providers, offers a practical example of what community planning, understood as integrated service delivery, seeks to do in practice:

"*But I think it's particularly the case in Northern Ireland that we [local government] can't deliver on our own. So for the areas that I'm most interested in, and I think the areas that affect the neighbourhoods dramatically, like employability and skills, for example... I mean, that is the perfect example where …[…]..there are so many, you know, partners that are responsible and people across the city... And actually, if you have an individual, it's their whole pathway. You know, literally from the day there were born until the day they die in terms of employability, education, skills….*

So if [….community planning] really was done properly, then I think that's sort of the perfect example of it. And it's there where the city, if you like, decides or agrees collectively, 'Well, what are the most important things?' And having decided that, how you're actually going to do them."

<div align="right">Local government strategic representative 2 – Northern Ireland.</div>

In Scotland, in contrast, a strategic local government respondent, when asked what the term 'community planning' signified, cautioned:

"*It's a misnomer. We have got local strategic planning, which is co-community planning, which is run by A, and we've got neighbourhood planning, which is called local community planning, which is run by the Communities Team. And the two are both mechanisms for joining-up the available public sector resources so they can, in a period of scarcity, make the best impact on the profile of needs that are perceived by those that are doing the joining-up. So, locally, the agenda roles will be slightly different from the ones which, at a strategic citywide level, are pursued.*

But, in both cases, it's a response to a scarcity of resources. And a desire to, I think, deliver better outcomes - even if you had plenty of resources.

So, at its simplest, it's a bringing-together of those who can look at the bundle of things which were described as needs or wants, and the bundle of responses that agencies can make. And that is the interface of the planning bit - how you do that."

<div align="right">Local government strategic representative - Scotland.</div>

This observation suggests that the ambitions for community planning may potentially obscure issues of strategic- and neighbourhood-level public service planning. Moreover, various reports (e.g. Audit Scotland (2014) found differences in performance across Scotland's community planning partnerships, suggesting that some local models operate more effectively than others. Subsequent legislation and policy is intended to address identified concerns.

In Wales, respondents highlighted some similar observations to both Northern Ireland and Scotland in terms of a focus of community planning around securing integrated service delivery, and achieving 'more with less':

"*It is about a group of people that come together to look at unblocking issues and talking about the really difficult stuff that is happening and which needs a group of people to work at a strategic level. There is a clear remit of breaking down barriers, but also working together.*

<div align="right">Strategic Local Service Board representative – Wales.</div>

There was, however, also a degree of uncertainty evident over the extent to which community planning was about strategic engagement, or whether it was more about local community engagement:

"*I would challenge you to go down, you know, that street and get anybody to say what the hell it is.*"

> "*Do you look over the balcony, or are you in with the people below? You know, are the people below looking up at the balcony? What's the remit?*"
>
> Strategic Local Service Board representative – Wales.

The situation was summarised, in Wales, by the following respondent:

> "*Some have operated strategically picking out some high level issues where they could improve joint-working and sort of trying to marshal all the resources underneath them and all the different partnerships in the area. But some others have focused and tried to engage on quite specific local issues that were causing a problem.*"
>
> Welsh Local Government Association representative.

In England, the present iteration of community-based governance turns heavily on neighbourhood planning, which closely resembles a local land use planning activity in terms of allocating land for housing, and promoting local economic growth. This form of community planning may be directly traced to the community 'rights' option, as formalised in the 2011 Localism Act:

> "*Neighbourhood planning is, in many ways, it's very narrow in its focus and it was designed to be so. It's kind of, not an accident…they're just, kind of, head down in the planning function, and it's different to, you know, in Wales. It's just planning, just about planning here in England...you get an assurance over the deliverability of the housing and the system's rigged so that that conclusion's always positive in terms of development, in the sense of numbers, not in the sense of what it looks like, where it is and so on.*"
>
> Civil Servant 2, Communities and Local Government.

Nevertheless, there was an acknowledgement that neighbourhood planning – by its very nature – could also inform a consideration of broader community planning issues:

> "*Looking back, it's fairly obvious that, you know, if you ask non-planners based in the community to come round and only think about land use policy, I mean, obviously they're not. They're just going to think about where they live and some of that's about land use and some of that's about loads of other random stuff.*"
>
> Civil Servant 2, Communities and Local Government.

Another central government respondent articulated the issues as follows:

> "*There's quite a wide power. There's loads of stuff you can do with it that's not necessarily about housing. And it can lead into other things……other community rights…. There's only so much we can do about employment through a neighbourhood plan. So they've gone on and become involved in other activities, for example, around local service transformation and community assets.*"
>
> Civil Servant 1, Communities and Local Government.

Thus what can be identified is a range of models being promulgated for community planning, but with an organisational perspective frequently to the fore, and especially in Wales. Nevertheless, being citizen-centred and being responsive to local need was also evident in terms of models of community planning. In the devolved nations, there was an emphasis on shaping local service delivery through local input and local intelligence. Overall, the implications are that models of joint-working will continue to evolve as further improvements are sought.

4.3 Designing joint-working arrangements for community planning

With reference to the design of joint-working arrangements for community planning, there is a need to consider the dominant political ideas or discourses. Section Three indicated the extent to which legislation has evolved, and powers relating to community planning have been strengthened. The various time-lines in terms of how community planning has evolved across the devolved UK demonstrate the extent to which the nature of partnership working in the public sector has changed on an incremental basis.

From a top-down perspective, designing and developing 'effective' working relations may extend from promoting organic and voluntary relations, where partnerships or shared services are actively encouraged, to the use of legal arrangements and duties to cooperate, where relations are underpinned by statute. Such issues are explored further below.

4.3.1 Policy incrementalism

Some interviewees were able to position contemporary developments for community planning in relation to a longer historical – and ideologically informed – time-line. For certain individuals, there was a sense in which personal experience of four decades of change in public service provision had revealed prolonged concerns with respect to the appropriate balance between strategic working and local service delivery, the size of local government, and the breaking up of certain democratically accountable, strategic functions, particularly in the light of neoliberal influences stemming from political thinking in the 1980s.

> *"So we've ended up at a governmental level with incredible waste, incredible duplication, incredible slamming-up of services, and then 'community planning' pops up as a mechanism for corrective therapy. We'll bring it all back together again, and we'll join up all those things that we've spent decades taking apart. And it's a 'game'.*
>
> *If you stand back from it, and if you get long enough in the tooth about it, this is a game of change. And change gives the illusion of progress, and people make their career on change. They don't make their career on delivering sustainable, measurable outcome changes. So, you know, … it's reinvention*."
>
> <div align="right">Local authority strategic officer - Scotland.</div>

Taking a post-war model of public service values and service provision as his starting point for explaining his experiences of the changes occurring in the public sector, led one interviewee to comment:

> *"It's a long term dismantling of Beveridge*."
>
> <div align="right">Local authority strategic officer – Scotland.</div>

The ever-changing context, the interviewee commented, was similar to that of the Roman historian, Petronius, reflecting on his experiences of the Roman Army:

> *…we trained hard … but every time we were beginning to form up into teams we would be reorganised. I was to learn later in life that we tend to meet any new situation by reorganising; and a wonderful method it can be for creating the illusion of progress while producing confusion, inefficiency and demoralisation.*[46]

---

[46] Cited by the Convener of Lothian Regional Council, Councillor Eric Milligan in the Foreword to Midwinter, A. (1995) *Local Government in Scotland: Reform of Decline*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

A number of interviewees in both England and Wales also highlighted that the on-going restructuring and rescaling of the public sector had impacted detrimentally on the design of joint-working arrangements for community planning. For example, it was suggested that the rationalisation of Local Service Board arrangements in Wales had taken considerable effort and time to '*bed down*', simply highlighting, perhaps, that change takes time to implement. On the one hand, such observations indicate a concern not only with the transaction costs involved in organisational change but also the potentially adverse effects on morale.

On the other hand, the various iterations suggest a certain pragmatism with respect to how policies bed in, work (or not), and evolve in practice. Working at the neighbourhood level in community planning, one local government officer noted how long improvements can take to happen, and how, in tandem with managing on-going interventions, there is organisational change to contend with:

> *"So where I am now - in terms of community planning, or local community planning and city-wide community planning - is [that it's] part of a decentralisation strategy that the Council has progressed since the late '90s - providing more democratic structures, and opportunities for the local communities…- a reinvention of local community planning structures three times!*
>
> *There used to be Neighbourhood Service teams, which were all professional staff, which evolved into Neighbourhood Partnership Networks, which evolved into the Local Community Planning Partnerships, which is the structure we currently have to implement local community plans, and they've been in place since 2007, 2008."*
>
> Local authority strategic officer - Scotland.

Such stories of on-going responses to restructuring were evident across the case studies and further change was anticipated.

4.3.2 Resourcing

An emphasis on securing efficiency gains and improving the effectiveness of ever-reducing resources was also very evident in the design of such arrangements. Better use of resources was used to justify the design of community planning structures, with a view that community planning offered, not only a way to sustain public services under conditions of increased demand and resource constraint, but to address long-term issues and a changed focus. Data sharing, staff allocation, and sharing equipment may all serve to improve resource efficiency. Against a background of financial cut-backs, human issues, however, appeared to persist:

> *"So even standing still in this climate is pretty good. Welfare reform changes, bedroom tax, universal credit… You know, it's really difficult for people, and there are quite intractable problems, because it's multi-generational. And there's a lot of, you know, beliefs and values and things that people just hold core to them, that are just embedded across, you know, two generations now. And so it's quite difficult to bring about change for people."*
>
> Strategic community planning partner – Scotland.

A pooling of partners' budgets, and a move away from funding individual organisations, were identified as offering opportunities to inform the design of new arrangements, and in the context of placed-based community planning in Wales, for example:

> *"We're very much place-based. It's about the place… We've got some quite committed partners there who want to see things work. At the end of the day they're not fighting over the budget..."*
>
> Strategic Local Service Board representative - Wales.

A key resource highlighted for facilitating joint-working within community planning arrangements was the availability of designated officers within partner organisations with defined responsibilities to undertake specified activities:

> "Unless they've had a clear resource team underneath them to help drive things through, the next time, they talk about the same issues. And, of course, nothing is happening in the meantime. They're all busy people, so they come back and they start coming up with the same old ground again and, you know, people start to think 'this is a waste of time'. In the areas where they've put some resource behind it [the former Local Service Board], and some work has been going on in-between meetings, then it has been better."
>
> Welsh Local Government Association representative.

Dedicated officer support was therefore perceived as being crucial in ensuring that community planning 'added value', and that priorities for action set out by strategic community planning partnerships were taken forward. Nevertheless, considerable variability existed across Wales – and indeed the other devolved territories – in respect of the presence of community planning delivery teams to implement agreed actions.

4.4 Organisation of joint-working relations for community planning

In terms of the organisation of joint-working relations for community planning, there is a need to consider the organisational forms emerging and who is leading and driving such arrangements. In this respect, the discussion focuses on three key themes: i) the importance of cross-scalar working, ii) the nature of centre-local relations; and iii) organisation and delivery in practice. In so doing, this helps to highlight the partners involved in community planning processes and the role that civic leaders may play; and the opportunities for civil engagement that may exist.

4.4.1 Cross-scalar working

A first key point that emerged related to the importance of cross-scalar working for community planning, and the implications for organisational arrangements. For example, the importance of cross-scalar relationships in securing commitment and support to community planning arrangements was identified as a recurring theme in shaping the extent of collaboration between partners.

In Wales, the Inquiry into Local Service Boards highlighted the need for a better buy in from local partners, including those at a strategic level, as well as the engagement of health bodies[47]. Nevertheless, interviewees argued that the introduction of new arrangements for community planning in Wales (in the form of Local Service Boards) had detrimentally impacted on the delivery of local priorities. Indeed, interviewees highlighted how many public sector organisations, such as the police or health, have a regional or sub-regional remit and therefore have had to service a significant number of community planning partnership arrangements. This multiple servicing role has meant

---

[47] National Assembly for Wales (2008) *Inquiry into Local Service Boards. Health, Wellbeing and Local Government Committee* (Cardiff: National Assembly for Wales), p.5.
Available on-line at:
http://www.assembly.wales/en/pages/searchresults.aspx?k=inquiry%20into%20local%20service%20boards&q =inquiry%20into%20local%20service%20boards

that individuals representing such organisations have not only had competing demands on their own time, but also had to manage competing priorities for the resources of their employer:

> *"Scale is a key issue – certain partners have to service multiple Local Service Boards – for example, the Police, Probation Service and Health. There are lots of partners that sit around that have a regional representation, not just X. So even a focus on X is a challenge."*
>
> Local authority strategic officer 2 - Wales.

Hence there are clearly questions about how best to organise roles and responsibilities, both in terms of organisational capacity, and jurisdiction. In some cases, such issues were compounded where the involvement of local elected members in community planning arrangements made it difficult for working beyond individual local authority boundaries. Indeed, in relation to (the now defunct) Community Strategy Partnerships, it has been reported how a significant number of local councillors of local authorities in Wales initially viewed the community planning process as a direct threat to their control of local authority services and funding. This situation had been compounded where changing local political leadership had led to discontinuities in the local authority's approach to community planning.[48]

As a result of changes in local political leadership and local councillor resistance, there has been considerable variation across Wales with respect to the extent to which community planning arrangements have focused strategically to improve joint-working as opposed to focusing on local issues. In certain parts of Wales, some Local Service Boards merged in an attempt to realign their activities with some of their partners and in an attempt to develop a broader cross-scalar and inter-sectoral approach. But even where this took place, interviewees highlighted how separate plans had often still been produced, and which meant that a concern with local issues had tended to predominate.

The uncertainty and upheaval associated with public sector restructuring in Wales also impacted on the ability of certain partners to be consistently represented within community planning arrangements.

> *"The difficulty at that time was the Health Boards were drawing out, you know, into one, instead of the six that existed previously in this area of Wales, and which pulled people back. I can remember probably two years of struggling at a local level, trying to get health board representation. We really did struggle with it."*
>
> Strategic Local Service Board representative - Wales.

Such issues remain pertinent given that the new Public Service Boards in Wales will at least initially be based upon the existing structure of local government. In addition, with the introduction of the 2015 Well-being and Future Generations Act and Public Service Boards in Wales, some interviewees welcomed the fact that such structures will be statutory and offer a longer-term perspective beyond election cycles. However, others seriously questioned the ability of Public Service Boards to do things very differently given a lack of resources and the nature of current funding mechanisms. A different resource allocation model was generally deemed to be essential in creating a step change in partners' ways of working. In this respect – and returning to the idea of pooled budgets – place or area allocations focused on preventative 'up-stream' activities were seen as offering potential to deliver the new Well-being Plans more effectively rather than continuing to fund individual organisations and actions which dealt with problems that had already emerged.

---

[48] Williams, P., Rogers, S., Sullivan, H., Evans, L. and Crow, A. (2006) *People, Plans and Partnerships: A National Evaluation of Community Strategies in Wales,* Cardiff: Welsh Government.
Available at: http://llyw.cymru/statistics-and-research/people-plans-partnerships/?lang=

As such, these points allude to the increasing pressures on the public sector in terms of demand, financial limitations and quality improvements. This has changed the operating and organisational context for community planning. As a consequence, there are attempts not simply to modernise and reform the public sector, but to reinvent public services. Strategic level changes have been driven by efforts to rationalise the public sector and thus served to alter the constituency and inter-relations of the players involved. Moreover, in Scotland, the emphasis on local determination of community planning form and focus has led to a variety of community planning models emerging on the ground. On the one hand, this local differentiation is to be expected, given the very different contexts of the urban, rural, coastal and island communities to be served. On the other, strategic partners operating across different local authority areas will need to be adept in adapting to local forms.

In Scotland, it was also evident that organic attempts at joint-working in some council areas to improve public service provision had been identified by Central Government as a model worth rolling out across Scotland. As ambitions for integrated services provision through partnership working have grown, the legal basis for community planning has been strengthened. This turn to statutory force is, perhaps, counter-intuitive, given the initial bottom-up ambition to improve local services. The Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 places the National Performance Framework on a statutory footing. Strengthening the performance regime around an outcomes focus means that more effort will need to be paid to elaborating and demonstrating achievements in relation to individuals, families and communities on the ground.

In Northern Ireland, the relatively recent introduction (April 2015) of the duty to prepare community plans, in tandem with the creation of the 11 new councils means that it is far too early to assess progress. It is very clear, however, that Northern Ireland engaged in an in-depth examination of models of community planning operating across the devolved UK,[49] whilst also being sensitive to extensive experience in partnership working in the existing councils, such as the Policing and Community Safety Partnerships. This work was accompanied by a wide-ranging set of activities in relation to capacity-building and support for transition committees by the Community Planning Foundation Programme, for example. It is also clear that there will be local differentiation in terms of the precise form each community planning arrangement adopts. The use of workshops and consultation activities with different stakeholders, for example, has explicitly served to shape local solutions.[50] Moreover, national guidance emphasises the importance of cross-scalar working.

4.4.2 The importance of centre-local relations

The nature of central-local relations in Northern Ireland is very different from other parts of the UK, given a history of centralised decision-making, the radical reforms to local government underway, the new local authority boundaries, and changes in job roles and personnel. This particular situation, and the relatively small size of Northern Ireland, creates a particular context for new relational dynamics:

> *"[Community planning is] ... coming from different directions. I think you have had the, kind of: 'Here's the strategy', 'Here's the regulations', coming from the Department [of the Environment] - top down.*

---

[49] See, for example: Blake Stevenson & Strategem (2005) *Case Study Analyses for RPA on Community Planning in Operation within the UK and Ireland*. October. Available at:
http://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/sites/default/files/CommunityPlanningR2.pdf
[50] See, for example, Belfast City Council's 'Belfast Conversation' initiative as part of its efforts to co-create the 'Belfast Agenda'. Available at:
http://www.belfastcity.gov.uk/council/Communityplanning/TheBelfastConversation.aspx

And creativity and innovation coming from the Chief, the newly appointed Chief Executives, who, a lot of them, are really grasping this as an opportunity to put their mark on the Council and how they're doing things. And to re-organise the entire Council - and very much put their stamp on it. And take forward community planning."

<div align="right">Community Body National Level – Northern Ireland.</div>

The climate in which community planning is being put into effect in Northern Ireland may thus be considered as very different from governance contexts elsewhere across the devolved UK. One view suggested that community planning was symptomatic of a new working culture and mind-set, involving central and local government, but also other partners:

"And seeing it [community planning] as just a different way of working. You know, the way we should do things - rather than it being this thing called 'community planning'. It's about working together, aligning services, addressing needs, getting better at comms [communications] for citizens. And really looking at that as a way of working, really, as opposed to just branding it purely as community planning. So it's been quite different, I think.

And the Councils - we were part of a contract for working with the Department [of the Environment] to support the 11 new Councils and developing it - community planning- and the preparing.

And … right across the board - there's so much enthusiasm. And, you know, a number of the Councils are seeing it as an opportunity to do something differently, and to build better working relationships with some of those other partners, and, really, for the Council to have that power - and to really show the, sort of, civic leadership, that, perhaps, we haven't had here from Councils, given the limited powers that they did have previously.

So, I think, it's both. I think we, sort of, got this regulation and strategy coming from the top-down - but not being overly prescriptive either, you know. It was, sort of -here's the broad way to do it, but, you know, you can still decide yourselves. And the local Councils have really gone forward with it, just taken it and are putting their mark on it, and then making it for their local area, too.

So it's not just community planning for the region. It's what's going to be best for our Council area - and really getting that ownership and drive behind it. And, certainly, where that's happened, I think you can see those that are maybe developing faster and have a real grip of community planning."

<div align="right">Community Body National Level – Northern Ireland.</div>

In Northern Ireland, there was also evidence of the new councils cooperating to influence central government. Here, influencing the emerging Programme for Government was identified as important.

There were also aspects of scale in terms of how local and regional priorities might be impacted:

"So, I think, they [local councils] really see the benefit of that, and even, I think each of the 11 Councils, you'll probably see them working together more to influence central government, and having alliances together to try and persuade central government, because there's going to be that angle, as you would expect there to be - to be local priorities and then regional priorities. So I think the new Chief Executives are working very well and very… in a smart way really, in terms of having their own alliances and agencies that they'll be able to pull together to influence central government."

<div align="right">Community Body National Level – Northern Ireland.</div>

To a degree, this situation contrasts with what is happening in England and Wales. In England, it has been noted how previously the links vertically between community planning arrangements – in the form of Local Strategic Partnerships – and other sub-regional, regional and national policy initiatives

and governance arrangements was limited.[51] Beyond 2010, a consideration of strategic relations in respect of neighbourhood planning – as well as broader concerns with service re-design and neighbourhood budgeting – highlighted in particular how central government had made on-going attempts to develop strategic relations directly with local communities rather than local government. Nonetheless, the removal of the requirement for Local Strategic Partnerships has, arguably, undermined attempts to secure integrated approaches to local delivery and how efficiencies in local budgets could be re-allocated through a collaborative discussion with national government:

> *"There's definitely an issue where, you know, local authorities say, well, we can put money in here but the benefits will accrue to the National Health Service (NHS), and also, you know, we put money in here and it saves central government money, and cannot we have some of that? So I think that's an argument we haven't resolved at all……"*
>
> Civil Servant 2, Communities and Local Government.

Moreover, the role of local authorities in supporting neighbourhood planning was argued to be less about whether they felt such activities were a good idea or not and more about checking and monitoring, and undertaking a range of examinations to expedite the process:

> *"I think ministers are in a place where they want to make sure that no local authorities are delaying, or seen to be delaying, and there are examples where it's taken a long time to do certain parts. We pay them money and I think ministers feel that, well, in those situations you should be, you know, marching to the beat, quite a speedy drum. So perhaps we will have a situation where you just automatically proceed to the next stage if it takes too long."*
>
> Civil servant 2, Communities and Local Government.

With reference to Wales, a similar lack of a statutory obligation for non-local authority partners to participate in strategic community planning partnerships (at least until the introduction of Public Service Boards) was cited as a key weakness in terms of securing strong joint-working relations. Equally, continuing attempts at the structural reorganisation of local government in England and Wales have been identified as being potentially unhelpful and disruptive in terms of working relationships both horizontally and vertically, and despite efforts to secure a closer working relationship between the Welsh Government and local community planning partnerships.

4.4.3 Organisation and delivery in practice

New models and iterations of governance for community planning are emerging across the devolved UK. Yet, on-going concerns were raised by interviewees over the ability of structural reorganisation to deliver results in practice. From a Scottish perspective, one interviewee commented:

> *"… I mean some of that stuff Britain does very well, and it does… it does governance very well, actually, you know. We can actually plan very well. Whether our* delivery *matches our planning, I think, has always been the challenge, for me, and often we don't follow through on the plan. We plan, we create a legislative process, we restructure around that plan - as we're doing with health and care now - and we do all of that stuff. The real issue with health and care is there are certain sicknesses in the system. One of them is we don't pay enough tax for the outcomes we expect… So let's reorganise, and see if we can lose some of that political issue in a reorganisation. I reckon in five to ten years' time we'll be having the same debates as have been up to now, and that are being deflected by the integration of health and social care in Scotland.*

---

[51] Darlow, A., Percy-Smith, J. and Wells, P. (2007) Community Strategies: Are they delivering joined up governance? *Local Government Studies* 33(1), pp.117-129.

> *So it's a good thing to do. It will have benefits. It will shake up. It will allow some people to leave on voluntary retirement. It'll bring new blood through into the system. But it won't ultimately achieve the outcomes that are desired of it, because we don't put enough input…"*
>
> Local authority strategic officer - Scotland.

Moreover, the extent to which community planning arrangements could be organised strategically, whilst at the same time being used as a tool to empower local groups, was deemed to be crucial in shaping delivery in practice. This was exemplified in relation to neighbourhood planning in England:

> *"There's also, kind of, conversations going on about the whole localism versus not having, kind of, anything strategic at all……."*
>
> Local Government Association representative 1 - England.

> *"It's really given some communities a seat at the table with local authorities. It's, kind of, made groups grow in confidence and capability. They're getting to grips with really complex technical plans."*
>
> Civil Servant 2, Communities and Local Government.

Notwithstanding such arguments, given the emphasis on housing and local economic growth in neighbourhood planning in England, it remains to be seen whether strategic government ambitions are realised in practice, and how these pan out on an England-wide basis. Sustained community capacity and input may also prove to be an issue in such arrangements, and which may therefore reinforce and privilege the organisational perspective to community planning discussed earlier.

Overall, the section has therefore highlighted how issues have emerged over the extent to which strategic partners have been able to service multiple (local) community planning structures in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. But in the context of neighbourhood planning in England, the exact opposite may be evident. Indeed, an interviewee in England reported that one designated neighbourhood plan area was cutting across five local authority boundaries. Therefore, the neighbourhood plan had to be in general conformity with all five local authorities' local plan, introducing increasing complexity in respect of the organisation of joint-working arrangements. This also called into question the importance of leadership:

> *"The whole process is crying out for a leader……….I would like to say that what is important is the council, and the role of officers as well. I think without that, local authorities can pretty much choose, if they wish, to be lukewarm…."*
>
> Local authority strategic officer – Wales.

More broadly, with reference to centre-local relations, it was identified that there has been considerable variability in respect of the vertical relations that existed between central government and local community planning partnerships. In this respect, the need for joining up nationally, as well as locally, was perceived as being crucial in shaping the effectiveness of organisational arrangements for community planning. However, it was claimed that this had been frequently undermined through an inconsistency of direction from central government in respect of informing community planning structures, and their subsequent effectiveness. This point will now be considered further in the following section.

4.5 Management of joint-working relations for community planning

The management of joint-working relations for community planning may include national inspection, auditing, and performance regimes. These activities variously affect operational dynamics and working relations and have evolved to focus on outputs, processes and, most recently, outcomes.

4.5.1 Outcomes-based working

An important theme to emerge from the study was the increasing attention on outcomes as a way to focus different parties' working ethos around holistic goals. An outcomes-based approach is designed to orient service providers towards putting in place measures to achieve change in individuals', families' and communities' quality of life. The approach shifts attention away from inputs and outputs towards making a difference in people's lives.

Notably, the introduction of the National Performance Framework in Scotland and the 2007 Concordat between the Scottish Government and COSLA were influential in shifting attention towards outcomes, particularly in Scotland, but also elsewhere. Here, the use of logic models, in which stakeholders participate to ensure inputs, actions, outputs and outcomes are evidence-informed, logical and achievable, is an example of reorienting service thinking away from a potentially narrow service-focus on, say, the number of work placements made, to something more holistic.[52] Orienting services around well-being, arguably, creates space for service innovation. The 2015 Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act has not only strengthened the status of the Performance Framework but focused attention on identifying local outcomes that meet national priorities. The remit of the new Act was summarised as follows:

> *"It gives a defined purpose for what community planning should achieve for the first time, which is very much about improving local outcomes and tackling inequality. It places a range of duties on a number of partners - not just the local authority, but also the health board, integrated joint board, etc., - to support community planning. And the involvement of communities is right at the heart of it".*
> Local authority strategic officer - Scotland.

In Wales, there has been the development of a much closer working relationship between local and national government. This closer working became particularly evident with the introduction of Local Service Boards, and, indeed, with ministers signing off the activities of the Local Service Boards, and with Government officials sitting on each Board. But there have also been tensions between national government and local areas on the specificity of national targets set out for the Single Integrated Plans of the Local Service Boards.

> *"The Welsh Government were very specific saying, 'You need to set yourself targets…..You can't just say "improving trend" or "decreasing trend"….we want percentages. And the Local Service Board felt quite strongly that it didn't want to do that."*
> Local authority strategic officer 2 - Wales.

Hence, with the move to statutory Public Service Boards (with responsibility for producing a Well-being Plan), there was the hope amongst those interviewed at a local level that the new national performance management arrangements for community planning – and focused around securing national well-being outcomes - would not be overly prescriptive, as this could detract from what the new Boards could achieve.

> *"I really hope it is not a list of 'you must do this, you must do this'. Because Public Service Boards will lose the opportunity to be the local lead for the area if that is the case and we will be so tied up in equality and assessments and everything else. To just tick the boxes for Welsh Government, it will be a missed opportunity."*
> Local authority strategic officer 3 – Wales.

---

[52] See, for example, Scottish Government (2009) *Towards a Mentally Flourishing Scotland: Policy and Action Plan 2009-2011*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Available at:
http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2009/05/06154655/2

The longer-term approach to monitoring change under new arrangements for community planning developing in Wales was also generally welcomed by local interviewees. Nevertheless, it was reiterated that such an approach to assessing service effectiveness and measuring outcomes on the ground would require a change in approach at a national level in terms of working beyond electoral cycles, a shift in mind-set which may prove difficult to achieve.

> *"X is a working class town – there are lots of health problems as a result and it makes it difficult to achieve outcomes. Long-term behavioural change focused around prevention is required. But short-term outcomes are often required. The scepticism comes from the fact that you operate on a four or five-year political cycle and the politicians will work to that cycle and that's what drives their decision."*
> Welsh Local Government Association representative.

Notwithstanding such pessimism, some moves towards adopting a longer-term approach have already been developed in different parts of the UK. Furthermore, the 2015 Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act is informing the development of a longer-term approach by the Public Service Boards in Wales, and with an acknowledgement that considerable time will be required to secure generational change.

4.6 Summary

A number of key messages emerge overall in terms of the design, organisation and management of joint-working arrangements for community planning. These include:

*   the extent of integration in respect of cross-scalar arrangements;
*   the importance of local politics in terms of the receptiveness of the local authority to community planning and working with other 'extra-local' partners (including central government);
*   the guidance available from national government;
*   the availability of local delivery structures (such as local delivery teams) to implement priorities set out by community planning partnerships;
*   the history of relations between the local authority and local neighbourhoods, and which may vary considerably by local authority area and impinge on local intelligence gathering and the co-production of service design (and delivery);
*   the extent to which the local authority local plan is up-to-date, as this can help to strengthen relations and linkages between community planning and other forms of planning.

5. COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

In the introduction, we positioned the interest in public sector and public service reform and modernisation in light of broader efforts to bring government 'closer to the people'. Since the late 1990s, there have clearly been efforts to advance this agenda and address aspects of democratic renewal. The positioning and engagement of communities in community planning is thus all-important, raising critical questions about the extent to which civil society is placed on a spectrum of being passive or active, and, crucially, the degree to which service providers and partners assume responsibility for involving individuals and communities and delivering services.

Whilst the various statutory provisions in each of the four jurisdictions set out community involvement requirements, how participation is perceived, put into place, and experienced by the various interests differs. Importantly, however, community engagement, in the current iterations of community planning, extends beyond simple requirements to *inform* local people about the existence of a community plan. It has shifted to incorporate active engagement of local individuals and community bodies, potentially in service delivery. As a consequence, there are democratic and technocratic dimensions to be considered. These considerations extend to how community engagement in community planning is meaningfully linked to other statutory consultation requirements, such as those involved in land use planning.

5.1 Democratic dimensions

Positioning community planning with reference to understandings of multi-level and cross-sectoral governance is variable. Significantly, it is generally recognised that the UK remains a highly centralised state in terms of local powers and decision-making.[53] How wider civil society – and individual citizens - engage in issues of service delivery clearly also varies across time, place and scale and the extent to which power is devolved similarly fluctuates. As new models of service delivery emerge – such as those involving community bodies – new issues for multi-level governance come to the fore. Consequently, changing levels of responsibility suggest a new strategic and coordinating role for local government.

In Scotland, for example, community planning, as a local level activity, was couched generally in relation to the European concept of subsidiarity. A COSLA representative, for example, was quite clear in stating that community planning needed to be understood in terms of empowerment:

> *"We've really been hammering that [subsidiarity] because what we kind of get is the view from Government that things can be devolved. But then you're saying, 'We're not asking you to let us do some things that you're prepared to keep control of. We're asking you to… We're asking for subsidiarity. We're asking for you to hand over the power over some things and to trust…[…]… trust local players to really, within some sort of framework, to really be free to say, 'This is what's best for our area.'*
>
> *And, within a framework, there are some things we would invest in - and some things that we wouldn't - because they're not right for the priorities and the needs of this area."*
>
> Convention of Scottish Local Authorities representative.

---

[53] Smith, J. (2013) Local government in England: do we comply with the European Charter of Local Self-Government? Report to the Local Government Association. Available at: http://www.local.gov.uk/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=1f372790-a6b2-4e78-90ad-30cff0016f2a&groupId=10180

Reference was also made, in the Scottish context, to the activities of the 2014 Commission on Strengthening Local Democracy, and, fundamentally, "*what needs changing*" in relation to democratic structures (National community body representative - Scotland).

The extent of the influence of the European Charter of Local Self-Government on local government in Scotland was also introduced by the COSLA representative as inviting a strengthening of local government powers:

> "*…where we had a direct interaction with the EU on the European Charter and subsidiarity and whether it is actually being played out in the UK. In our case, they came to Scotland to say, 'What's your experience of it?' And, I think, we were saying, that our experience of it is there's a lot of rhetoric around devolving things to local government, but probably the reality of that doesn't match up.*
>
> *And, in our view, the European Charter and subsidiarity aren't being acted upon… […] So in the Scotland Bill, and in other places, we've been pressing for - if not the European Charter provisions - something like that. Something that gives local government rights to act.*"
>
> Convention of Scottish Local Authorities representative.

Notably, Article 3 of the Charter states:

> *Local self-government denotes the right and the ability of local authorities, within the limits of the law, to regulate and manage a substantial share of public affairs under their own responsibility and in the interests of the local population.*

As such, the Charter emphasises the role of local authorities in managing the local public sphere. Recognising the local level of authority in relation to multi-level governance, the concept of subsidiarity gives further credence to the importance of proportionality, local competence, autonomy and appropriateness of service planning at the local level. Thus, in relation to the European Union, whilst it is not the case that local government is always the most appropriate body, it is confirmed that:

> *The subsidiarity principle, (European Union (Art.5 (3) TEU)), requires the EU to consider which level of government is appropriate where decisions towards a specific end should be taken and that these should take place at the level closest to the citizens. Often this would mean local government.*[54]

The June 2016 EU Referendum result occurred after the interviews had been undertaken, but the extent to which local autonomy is decentralised to the level of citizens and communities remains open to question:

> "*Well, the challenge is that, if you push power down, you have to give power away. So, if you want to 'empower community', i.e. the Community Empowerment [Scotland] Act - who's giving way to that?*"
>
> National community body representative - Scotland.

Placing community involvement in a European context invites comparative analysis, particularly in relation to the nature of the powers given to, and held by, local communities in all their richness and diversity. In terms of international learning, the context of local community governance, understood

---

[54] Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (2014) *Subsidiarity: Scottish Local Government influencing the European Agenda*. Brussels: COSLA. Available at:
http://www.cosla.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/cosla_subsidiarity_scottish_councils_influencing_eu_agenda-.pdf

as community power, is thus all important, raising new expectations. One perspective was that community control remains relatively weak:

> "… I think what we need in the UK, as a whole, is to look at our government structures, which are actually incredibly outdated, and they don't fit anymore. So, therefore, if you have a European look at subsidiarity - subsidiarity in Norway, Sweden, Germany, France… looks very different to the subsidiarity here because we don't have that kind of level. […] It starts with local government in the UK, or district councils in England. But, you know, at that level, actually, you're still quite remote from the people, you know."
>
> National community body representative - Scotland.

Nevertheless, aspirations on the ground, and how the precise opportunities for involvement are perceived and realised, tend to be very different. The range of players (statutory, business, third sector, community body) expected (and required) to participate in community planning is extensive, raising questions about the place of individual community members. The status of communities in the emerging model of community planning in Northern Ireland, for example, illustrates this point:

> "I mean, you think of the actual duty of community planning now that's bestowed on Councils and the community planning partners - so not just Councils - and … you know, it is - kind of – […] 'community of local governance nearly.' And local authorities, the other public services providers, and, then, sitting alongside that, like, the private sector, and then the community involvement sector - and then citizens, maybe, - even further back."
>
> National community body representative – Northern Ireland.

Issues relating to where and how 'community' fits within community planning arrangements, and the extent to which there are opportunities for involvement in community planning, were also highlighted as important elsewhere. In Wales, it was identified that the non-statutory nature of community planning structures had impacted on the extent of community engagement that had taken place, and on the levels of interest and awareness by the general public as to the remit and role of such structures. Questions were also raised over the extent to which structures for community planning should be focused on empowerment. For example, a number of individuals questioned: 'H*ow far down do you go?*' and that: '*It was not necessarily for the Local Service Board to respond, given its plan is longer-term*' (Local authority strategic representatives 1 and 2).

In England, interviewees highlighted how the extent of maturation of local authorities' work with local communities considerably impacted on the extent to which local communities were involved in the design, development and implementation of neighbourhood planning activity. This is particularly relevant in relation to efforts to secure the wider engagement of individuals beyond the 'usual suspects', and to develop a sustainable long-term approach to community engagement:

> "The fundamental thing is that the Neighbourhood Forum…..if this were to really work…..it needs to be either parished or given some long-termism. You know, not constituted just to produce the neighbourhood plan….. it must be there to deliver, to implement the plan".
>
> Independent Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group representative – England.

Moreover, in relation to widening involvement beyond '*the retired people in the Home Counties*' (Civil Servant 1, Communities and Local Government), it has been widely reported how the focus of neighbourhood planning has extended in many areas to include more deprived localities, the business community, ethnic minorities and transient communities. Nevertheless, transient communities were viewed as particularly difficult to engage, given that they may have less interest in the neighbourhood plan due to their mobility and lack of place attachment.

Emerging thinking and practice in community planning therefore demonstrate that, whilst community involvement is no longer seen as a tokenistic element, or mere add-on, to public service design and delivery, as understood in terms of Arnstein's (1969) hierarchical ladder of degrees of power in participation,[55] there are still aspirations for more power in some quarters.

5.2 Technocratic dimensions

Facilitating community engagement involves putting the necessary structures, processes and techniques into place. Taking the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014 by way of example, the legislation demonstrates the statutory requirement imposed not only on the council, but also the community planning partners, and the need actively to seek participation in determining the service focus and the review of the community plan's effects. Specifically, Part 10, Section 73(1) of the Act states:

> *A council and its community planning partners must seek the participation of and encourage the persons mentioned in subsection (2) to express their views, and take those views into account, in connection with—*
>
> *(a) community planning;*
> *(b) the production of a community plan for the district; and*
> *(c) the review of community plans.*

Such obligations raise fundamental issues about the design of the necessary arrangements for diverse communities of interest, place and identity to be actively (and equally) engaged.

The case of Northern Ireland is particular, given, in part, because of the centralisation and subsequent interrupted transfer of powers to local government. Nevertheless, a history of bottom-up and self-organised self-help led to an extensive set of community-based groups serving local needs. The signing of a Concordat between the Northern Ireland Government and the community and voluntary sector, for example, is indicative of the important role played by civil society in that jurisdiction, the acknowledged value of active citizenship in developing public policy, designing citizen-centred services and ensuring services are appropriate and responsive; and the need for partnership working at national, sub-regional and local levels.[56]

The implications are that effort is required in building new capacity. In Northern Ireland the new context appears to have given councils an important platform for engaging citizens, although experience is differentiated on the ground:

> [*for*] *"…nearly all of the 11 Councils, engagement was high up on their priority of issues that they wanted to tackle. And all of them have done quite extensive engagement, so that they can say, 'Well, we have this sound evidence base on which to identify what our priorities and what our issues are in the area.'*

---

[55] Arnstein, S. (1969) A Ladder of Citizen Participation, *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 35(4) 1969, pp. 216-224. Available at: http://www.lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.html

[56] Department for Social Development (2013) *Concordat between the Voluntary & Community Sector and the Northern Ireland Government*, Belfast: DSD. Available at: http://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/sites/default/files/WorkingTogetherR5.pdf

And so, actually, to date, there's been quite a lot of engagement, and, in some cases, it has been purely information, 'This is the new powers which Councils have' and 'This is what we're going to do', and 'We don't know exactly what we're going to do, yet, but we're going to, kind of, take you along on that journey.'

And then others have left it to, kind of, later where they're able to, to say, 'This is our structure. This is how we're going to do it. And we actually want you to be a part of the design of it.' And there is that very much technical design approach, and no one was excluded.

And there's been something like 150 people at a series of workshops in terms of co-designing the process of developing the community plan. So it's, kind of, strange that engagement has been quite high up there on the agenda. And in terms of ensuring that the citizen is included, I think that is because it's been driven by local Councils."

National community body representative – Northern Ireland.

In Scotland, efforts to promote and facilitate effective community engagement across different spheres, such as health and social care, have been informed by various guidance. The National Standards for Community Engagement, for example, are a set of good practice principles for use by public sector bodies, third sector organisations, community groups, elected members and the private and independent sectors. Originally introduced in 2005, the Standards were revised in 2015-16 in light of the changing policy landscape and emphasis on community empowerment.[57] A range of public sector agencies and individuals have endorsed the seven standards as being appropriate to the new context for supporting shared decision-making, and shared or community-led action, and which result in positive impact.

In Wales, discussions over the structures, processes and techniques for facilitating community engagement were made in the context of broader proposals for reorganising local government in Wales, as well as a turn to 'Place Plans' initially proposed in the development of the Planning (Wales) Act 2015. (We return to this latter aspect in Section 6.)

With regards to proposals for further local government reform in Wales,[58] questions were raised by interviewees in respect of the ability of the new Public Service Boards – which will be based on local authority boundaries – to respond to issues at a local level, especially if there are voluntary mergers and an eventual move to fewer, but larger, authorities. As such, technocratic concerns appear to outweigh issues of democratic accountability.

The relative selectivity of local authority support in both Wales and England was also highlighted as a key issue in terms of community engagement. For example, in relation to neighbourhood planning in England, discussions had arisen over the extent to which support should be targeted towards those most likely to produce a neighbourhood plan:

"I think X for instance is very, very far off. They've been designated. They've been designated for a while, but I think it's just because it's so laborious, the process and how they set themselves up. I'd almost be surprised if they ever get a neighbourhood plan done. That's, kind of, difficult, I think, for us, because if we think there isn't much chance of them getting a neighbourhood plan done, well, should we prioritise other areas?"

---

[57] Scottish Community Development Centre (2016) *National Standards for Community Engagement*. Glasgow: SCDC. Available at: http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Built-Environment/regeneration/engage/standards

[58] Welsh Government (2014) *White Paper – Reforming Local Government*, Cardiff: Welsh Government. Available at: http://www.wlga.gov.uk/non-wlga-publications/welsh-government-l-white-paper-reforming-local-government

Consequently, whilst technocratic concerns are frequently focused around the importance of structures and processes, these are power-laden, and thus the involvement of particular communities and individuals in community planning may be strategically selective, as well as spatially uneven.

5.3 Summary

Community engagement is a prerequisite of community planning. Indeed, some definitions of 'community planning', and in other international contexts, are synonymous with community engagement. Three aspects from our findings merit attention.

First, community engagement has traditionally been framed in terms of involving people in responding to professionally - and politically-led planning processes. Conventionally, this consultation stage occurs once a plan or strategy has been drafted. The new thinking in community planning emphasises not only endeavouring to engage communities in plan design and preparation in shared ways, but also in plan monitoring. Taking communities' views into account and engagement over the longer term is linked with a turn to an outcomes-based approach and greater attention to the impacts felt. Moreover, adopting a community planning approach emphasises developing strategic uses of community engagement in order to reduce community consultation fatigue and develop more holistic solutions.

Second, the requirement actively to engage people – particularly disadvantaged communities – is set out in legislation, and this duty extends to community planning partners.

Third, the notion of community engagement has progressed from a relatively instrumental concern with informing communities about services to community bodies (potentially) running particular services. This has been reflected in terms of the 'community right to challenge' set out under the 2011 Localism Act in England, for example, and which provides the opportunity for local communities to bid to run their own services. The 2015 Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act similarly provides for co-production and emphasises combining the mutual strengths and capacities of community bodies to achieve positive change. From this perspective, and reflecting on the earlier iterations of public service reforms highlighted in Section 2, users have thus moved from being passive to active citizens – potentially from consumer to provider. There are, nonetheless, deep questions around the reach of such community engagement ideals and the extent to which those who experience multiple disadvantage can participate in this new governance arena.

6. COMMUNITY PLANNING AND LAND USE PLANNING

As models of community planning have evolved, questions have been raised about its relationships with other public sector activities, and, rather more fundamentally, other plans. A special issue on community planning and strategies in 2000, for example, flagged a concern that the introduction of community planning in England and Wales might simply produce another plan, leading to the question: *'How many plans does it take to improve health and well-being?'*[59p.8] Rather, it was argued, an over-riding objective of community planning was to change processes and impacts on the ground.

Another commentator, at that time, pointed to the ambitious nature of community planning to be: '*holistic, joined-up, cross-cutting, collaborative, empowering and sustainable*'.[60p.3] This ambitious agenda remains a familiar one. So how does one integrate plans and put strategic planning into practice at the local, neighbourhood level, and in a way that is meaningful to local people? This section considers the particular relationship between community planning and land use planning, given certain similarities in focus. We address the particular features of this link in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. First, however, we set out a way of understanding the linkages.

6.1 Constructing a link between community planning and land use planning

There are important similarities between community planning and land use planning. First, there is a 'planning' function, understood as coordination to shape future action. Second, there is a 'community' focus. Third, there is a statutory duty to produce a plan. At face value, therefore, there is an intrinsic link between these specific activities that seems not to require further thought. In practice, however, the physical and public service link is not always clear. There are then practical aspects to consider in terms of devising shared processes and outcomes.

When statutory community planning was first being introduced in Scotland in the early 2000s, for example, the need to facilitate a 'constructive interface' between this new public activity and the established land use planning system was identified.[61p.3] At that time, questions were raised about the relationship between the various plans, ownership and process, but also the nature of the necessary culture to achieve cooperation across the public sector.

The precise remit of land use planning – as the physical manifestation of a community vision – and its relationship with community planning requires elaboration. In terms of terminology, it appears that 'place' can serve to provide a link between what are intended to be two mutually supportive activities:

> *"Well we use it [spatial planning] because land-use is a little bit one dimensional. So, we like the place agenda - that's why we use spatial planning…. because when you're planning something there's overall change, service delivery - and spatial planning is the town and country planning or land-use planning part but it brings in also the place agenda."*
>
> National community body representative - Scotland

---

[59] Hamer, L. (2000) 'How many plans does it take to improve health and well-being?', *eg magazine*, 6(8), pp.8-10. London: University of Westminster.

[60] Williams, P. (2000) 'Community strategies will fail if they don't 'muddle through'', *eg magazine*, 6(8), pp.3-5. London: University of Westminster.

[61] Peel, D. and Lloyd, M.G. (2007) Community planning and land use planning in Scotland: A constructive interface?, *Public Policy and Administration*, 22(3), pp.353-366.

Similarly, in Northern Ireland, the new guidance for the operationalisation of community planning emphasises 'place-shaping' in relation to land use planning:

> The local development plan system aims to move away from a narrow land use focus towards a 'place shaping' approach which incorporates a spatial analysis and visioning process.[62,para 10.2]

At one level, public services generally have a physical presence: people visit libraries, clinics, and sports centres, for example. Appropriately designed and located buildings, with ease of access, are matters dealt with, at some point, by the land use planning system, in terms of siting, layout, design and hours of use, for example. Planning new settlements, or retrofitting existing neighbourhoods, involves thinking, not only about place and space, however, but people and services. The siting of new housing – or location of waste or energy facilities - are examples of developments that form an integral part of community life and ultimately community well-being. Understanding local people's views and perceptions of their environment – and public services – is thus directly relevant to land use planning.

There is an important distinction, however. Statutory land use planning in the UK is a practice built on case law, where learned judges have interpreted the law and its application. What may seem to be a planning-related matter in practice may not constitute a 'material planning consideration' in law. Integrating community planning and land use planning as a single, strategic planning approach may thus prove to be somewhat challenging in practice.

Drawing on the case study from Wales, for example, there is clearly an awareness of the potential strategic linkage between these two activities, even if joint-working is not happening in practice:

> *"The Local Development Plan should be a mechanism, in my mind, to deliver the aspirations of the Community Strategy. And the idea is to tie the two, and, you know, they were always seen as the top two strategy plans, but it never really happens…. they're trying to second-guess within Planning, well, which land should we develop, which land should we allocate for, you know, what purpose?"*
>
> Local authority strategic officer 2 - Wales.

It follows that there is a logic in finding ways to 'bridge' these two activities so that each process is mutually informed. Pragmatically, and from an organisational perspective, joint-working in relation to consulting communities at the different stages of plan preparation might offer efficiency savings. In terms of the logic, quality and effectiveness of the plan, there are potentially direct synergies to be gained, as inter-related aspects can be identified, discussed and (hopefully) mediated. Priorities can be discussed. Moreover, best practice guidance on community engagement warns that *over* consulting communities can result in consultation fatigue and overload.[63] Reducing the amount of consultation, through shared exercises and use of data might minimise that risk – and offer better results. As the 2015 Northern Ireland guidance highlights:

> Common to both the local development plan and community planning processes is that they aim to provide a long term vision/framework to support the social, economic and environmental needs of the area, require an evidence-based approach to decision-making, and seek the engagement of the community throughout the process.[ibid, para. 10.4]

---

[62] Department of the Environment (2015) *Statutory Guidance for the Operation of Community Planning Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014*, Belfast: DoE. Available at:
http://www.niccy.org/media/1682/community-planning-guidance-oct-2015.pdf
[63] Scottish Executive (2003) *The Local Government in Scotland Act 2003: Community Planning: Statutory Guidance*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive. Available at:
http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2004/04/19168/35272

As the development plan is monitored, an important consideration is then how progress towards the defined indicators contributes to meeting the high-level outcomes set out in the community plan. Similarly, monitoring of the community plan may indicate review of the development plan. The process is intended to be mutually reinforcing:

> Monitoring and review of the local development plan – after adoption, the plan must be monitored annually and reviewed every five years, or sooner if circumstances require it. The indicators by which the local development plan will be monitored should align with the high level vision, outcomes and actions contained in the community plan. Review of the community plan will assist in determining whether the local development plan also needs to be reviewed.[ibid]

6.2 Differentiated experience across the devolved UK

In terms of the type and depth of connection between community planning and land use planning, experiences clearly differ across the devolved UK. There are also various degrees of connectivity – or disconnect between the two activities. We address each country in turn:

6.2.1 England

In England, since the election of the Coalition Government in 2010, neighbourhood planning has been used to help deliver the Government's economic and housing growth objectives.[64] Furthermore, the neighbourhood planning process – has to some degree – been viewed as being heavily regulated and managed by national government, particularly in terms of delivering housing growth. Indeed, the monitoring of the neighbourhood planning process, at a national level, has been under increasing scrutiny according to those interviewed. This oversight function was particularly evident in those areas proposing large-scale housing development, and given the Government's growth agenda.

Moreover, national government is making renewed efforts to expedite neighbourhood planning where possible and has concentrated on ensuring that local authorities are supportive in this process. Indeed, the focus on plan approval following independent examination was also identified by a number of interviewees as having informed the type of national performance management system now in place, although it was acknowledged that there was some flexibility within the system:

> *"It's really difficult because the results of Communities and Local Government are to do with the number of neighbourhood plans that have gone for examination – 'tick'. To us, if groups have actually had a conversation and said, "No, actually we don't need a neighbourhood plan…..what we need is an action plan or a delivery plan on how we're going to bring forward this particular community project"…… and they've gone out and done that, then we're, like, well, brilliant. That's a success. They've achieved what they wanted to achieve, but it's not a 'tick' on delivering. And that's just how governments work, isn't it? But this broader outcome – has become more recognised."*
> Local Government Association representative 2 - England.

In England, the creation of a wider strategic steering group for neighbourhood planning – as was the case in the mini case study area – can act as a 'mini Local Strategic Partnership,' and which can serve to integrate neighbourhood planning with broader concerns around service integration and delivery.

---

[64] See the RTPI's description of neighbourhood planning available at: http://www.rtpi.org.uk/planning-aid/neighbourhood-planning/what-is-neighbourhood-planning/

Nevertheless, opportunities for the engagement of local residents in such arrangements also need to be considered.

Furthermore, it was recognised that land use planning, through the neighbourhood plan, could only do so much and that the neighbourhood plan was:

> '…not going to, sort of, be the answer to everything.'
>
> Independent Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group representative.

It was further suggested that some type of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis could initially be undertaken by local communities. Local communities could then remain flexible as to whether the neighbourhood plan was the most appropriate response, given the results of the SWOT analysis. In turn, this approach could act as a catalyst for communities to engage in broader processes of community planning concerned with community infrastructure, local services and neighbourhood budgets.

One suggestion was that the examination process associated with neighbourhood planning might also currently undermine the adoption of a wider approach, and the development of links between land use planning (through the neighbourhood plan) and broader processes of community planning. As such, our research indicated that independent examinations of neighbourhood plans had led to examiners recommending that a number of broader policy areas be taken out of the neighbourhood plan. Indeed, interviewees noted how examiners had advocated that only the planning policy elements should be included and examined, rather than the non-planning policy elements.

Perhaps, one of the most striking differences in community-based governance in the devolved UK relates to the precise focus of community planning, with England offering a particular emphasis on managing housing need. The practical experience of communities preparing a neighbourhood plan – effectively undertaking a land use planning function - differentiates the English model from the relatively more integrated service delivery emphasis evident in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

6.2.2 Wales

From a contemporary perspective, in Wales it has been reported how "*planning officers rarely get involved in community planning.*" [65.] This limited involvement was despite the production of the Wales Spatial Plan in 2004 (update 2008), which attempted to set the context for local and community planning, and which split Wales into six spatial plan areas.

The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 identifies the need to link with both the Environment (Wales) Act 2016 and Planning (Wales) Act 2015 at a national level. Questions remain, however, over the level of integration being achieved. For example, there was evidence that, as of yet, those involved with the Local Development Plan had not been heavily involved with broader structures of community planning – such as the (earlier) Local Service Board - and *vice versa*. Indeed, beyond informal invitations for planning officers to attend meetings of the Local Service Board, it was considered that there has been a general lack of formal involvement of planning officers in the work of such Boards.

---

[65] See Williams, P., Rogers, S., Sullivan, H., Evans, L., Crow, A. (2006) *People, Plans and Partnerships: A National Evaluation of Community Strategies in Wales*, Cardiff: Welsh Government, p.87. Available at: http://llyw.cymru/statistics-and-research/people-plans-partnerships/?lang=

This situation may now be changing, in part given the restrictions on public sector expenditure and the implications arising from the approval by planning officers of major infrastructure developments on the costs of wider service delivery. At the very least, there appears to be a general awareness that connections can be made:

> *"I think some of the public sector partners are now starting to become more aware of major planning decisions because of austerity. Before they would just ride with it, but now they're saying, 'Actually, this is going to put huge pressure on our services.'...So people are, in some cases, a bit smarter in relation to assessing impact on their services of planning decisions. Because they just can't afford to absorb it anymore."*
>
> Welsh Government representative.

In respect of Place Plans, work had started in certain parts of Wales on producing these as a new form of Supplementary Planning Guidance, and which can provide the opportunity for local engagement and involvement in shaping local planning decisions, and feed upwards into more strategic plans, including the Well-being Plans of the Public Service Boards. Nevertheless, the final Planning (Wales) Act 2015 removed proposals for statutory 'Place Plans' at a local level, and which may have strengthened the links between physical land use planning and community planning. Consequently, a potential opportunity for more closely integrating land use planning with structures of community planning in Wales has arguably been lost.

6.2.3 Scotland

In Scotland, a 2015 study examining the scope for developing stronger connections between community planning and spatial planning identified a number of potential barriers to such a move, including: understanding the two activities; timescales; and statutory processes; reduction in resources; institutional barriers; commitment to implementation; and culture. There were, however, common objectives in the two processes, including: delivering outcomes and the sharing of similar processes, resources and knowledge. Given the, prevailing conditions of financial and resource constraint, and, in many respects, shared focus, it was recommended that stronger joint-working could bring mutual community and organisational benefits, and meet Government objectives of furthering service integration and building services around communities.[66]

The relationship between land use planning and community planning has also been explicitly raised as part of the 2016 Independent Review Panel on Planning in Scotland. One respondent, the Scottish Urban Regeneration Forum (SURF), for example, noted:

> *Scotland's statutory Community Planning framework provides a nationwide basis for cross-sector service prioritisation and coordination. It is the kind of high-level, strategic collaboration that a thoughtful taxpayer would expect to happen anyway.*
>
> *As a practical concept, it stands in positive contrast to the lack of a similar cooperative leadership model in England and elsewhere. It does not, however, have any meaningful connection to the spatial planning system.*

---

[66] Hayes, S. and Miller, N. (2015) *Linking People and Places: Spatial and Community Planning,* Edinburgh: RTPI Scotland. Available at: http://www.rtpi.org.uk/media/1301398/linking_people_and_places_final_-_web_version_march15.docx

Alignment would provide both processes with additional value around community engagement, strategic collaboration and pro-active planning. In the context of public spending reductions, capitalising on this value becomes all the more desirable.[67]

Due to the regeneration focus of SURF's work, this may be considered an important view, since, as an activity, regeneration has long since sought to provide integrated and holistic solutions to long-term problems.

The Independent Review Panel's 2016 report highlights that land use planning tends not to be represented in community planning partnerships, but, importantly, there is scope to:

create efficiencies, for example by allowing for joined up community engagement on a place based agenda. It will also be important to create synergies between development plans and emerging locality plans.[68]

Importantly, the Panel's first recommendation for creating strong and flexible development plans stated:

Aligning with community planning, development plans should be recognised as a central and powerful driver of the place agenda. To achieve this there is a need to focus on outcomes, rather than policy and procedure.[ibid, p.10]

The indications are that the imminent white paper in relation to the statutory planning system in Scotland may well involve a different focus for land use or spatial planning, but certainly see a more formal assertion of the necessary linkages between 'physical' and community planning:

Planning needs to move away from micro-management of the built environment, avoid focusing on processes which add little value, and to focus instead on delivering great places now, and for future generations. Whilst this has been an aspiration for some time, the current context of public sector finance, low market confidence, complex interagency relationships, land reform and community empowerment all demand that there is a renewed and collective drive towards achieving this goal [ibid, para.1.6]

6.2.4 Northern Ireland

Given the particular political context in Northern Ireland, and the centralised land use planning system that prevailed largely until April 2016, community involvement in spatial planning had, prior to the restoration of powers to local government, been somewhat limited:

"*I think, in the early days, certainly, the only impact the community ever had, would have been through the forward-planning work of the local development plans that were produced for Northern Ireland over the years between '74, and well, I suppose, just recently… And, I think, over that period, the knowledge of local communities to have an impact on those plans has become greater. So that, in the early days,… Area Planning produced it, and, I think, they rarely got objections to it.*"

Strategic / Local Government Planner – Northern Ireland.

---

[67] SURF (2016) Response to the Independent Review of Planning. Available at:
https://ideas.scotland.gov.uk/independent-review-of-planning/align-spatial-planning-with-community-planning
[68] Beveridge, C., Biberbach, P. and Hamilton, J. (2016) *Empowering planning to deliver great places*. An independent review of the Scottish planning system. Edinburgh: Scottish Government, May. Available at:
http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0050/00500946.pdf

The restoration of land use planning powers to local government, and the new powers around community planning and well-being, changes the context quite dramatically.

Significantly, the statutory link between community planning and land use planning in the 2015 legislation in Northern Ireland suggests that Northern Ireland has the most explicit links between community planning and land use planning. Moreover, as discussed in the preceding sections, the legislation provides the scope for active community engagement.[69] The publication of departmental guidance has also provided for a strong argument for the strategic alignment of the two processes.[70] Time will tell whether the perennial concerns around capacity, confidence and willingness to engage, for example, and the need to resource appropriate tools and techniques, can be addressed.

6.3 Summary

As community planning has matured, the alignment of the land use planning dimension has attracted further attention. In part, this connection may be explained by a strengthening in the emphasis on 'place'. Both community planning and land use planning have progressively moved towards the concept of place since, in part, this term is held to be more meaningful for local communities. There has also been a concern with improving the impact of the activities.

Given restrictions on public sector budgets, efforts to secure efficiency savings through the strategic alignment of community planning and land use planning activities have come to the fore, and with potentially a bigger role for local communities in shaping the outcomes of both processes. Attention to the different stages of each planning activity, including the visioning, consulting, monitoring and reviewing stages, is in evidence, with a clear indication that the plans, processes and intended outcomes involved are mutually informing and reinforcing. As such, there is scope, through proactive joint-working, for collaborative gain.[71]

Based on the evidence gathered, there would appear to be a number of technocratic and democratic implications and related issues concerning how governance and performance management systems of relevance to each planning process are configured. Linking back to Section 3, practical issues would also appear to turn on the extent to which the bridging between community planning and land use planning requires some type of formal legitimacy, that is, whether there is a requirement for a statutory link between community planning and land use planning to be made, or whether those involved in both sets of activities cooperate in more informal ways. Given that community planning is predicated on joint-working across the full spectrum of service providers, it is reasonable to ask why land use planning requires specific attention.

---

[69] Department of the Environment (2014) *Information Leaflet 16: Pre-Application Community Consultation Guidance*, Belfast: DoE. Available at: http://www.planningni.gov.uk/index/advice/advice_leaflets/pre-application_community_consultation_guidance_-_june_2014.pdf

[70] Department of the Environment (2015) *Statutory Guidance for the Operation of Community Planning Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014*, Belfast: DoE. Available at: http://www.niccy.org/media/1682/community-planning-guidance-oct-2015.pdf

[71] See, for example, Amey (2008) *Collaborative Gain Research Study*. Report for the Improvement Service. Broxburn. Available at: http://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/sites/default/files/AlignmentR13.pdf

7. CONCLUSIONS AND RESEARCH AGENDAS

An important aim of this study was to explore contemporary thinking about community planning in the devolved UK with experienced practitioners and policy-makers. The intention was, literally, to flesh out a desk-based study that had identified a number of theoretical issues in community-based governance. Our starting point was that the post-devolution context, and a sustained 'hollowing out' of the state, had led to a 'filling in' of new structures and policy approaches; community planning was one such initiative that sought to 'join-up' services – or work across boundaries. How was it working in practice?

Through speaking with a range of actors at national, sub-national, strategic and neighbourhood scales, we offer the following observations. In particular, we critically reflect on the findings and tease out some research priorities. These are broadly based around the key research objectives for the study.

7.1 Conceptual / terminological issues in community planning

The nomenclature of community planning infers that communities lie at the heart of this field of policy and that it involves a forward-looking – or vision-oriented - activity. For some of those interviewed, the view was that communities had quite limited powers, and the term 'community planning' was ambiguous – if not misleading. Certainly, in research terms, the nuances in the terminology – and quite explicit differences between England and the devolved nations in terms of the focus on neighbourhood planning – made drawing precise comparative insights difficult. We have been at pains to point out that context matters, and there was a clear sense in which place mattered both within and between the four nations examined. Terminology and practice are clearly evolving. Arguably, as the statutory bases for partner and community participation are strengthened, there is a need for clarity since terminological difficulties may be an obstacle to action:

Research Priority 1
Develop a conceptual map of the evolving terminology with a view to better understanding the relationships between 'statutory' and 'popular' definitions of community planning and what this means for delivery of efficient, effective and equitable services.

7.2 Community planning as evolving policy

It is clear that England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland are at different stages in their community planning journey. The processes of devolution and decentralisation are on-going; power is being re-negotiated. The respective community planning experiences must be seen against the broader context of changing institutional structures and fundamental reorganisation. Put simply, in England, the Local Government Act 2000 gave rise to one model of community planning. This model was supplanted from 2010 onwards through the development of a different approach by the coalition government, and confirmed through the 2011 Localism Act. In Northern Ireland communities have had to wait until 2015 for the initiating legislation for community planning to be put in place. Again, in comparative research terms, it is important to appreciate these different time-lines and contextual realities, but also to be alert to the legal nuances in terms of duties and rights, for example. In Wales, the emphasis on well-being and future generations and the new planning legislation similarly change the operating context, whilst in Scotland land reform and community

empowerment have altered the public sector- community landscape. A planning white paper is also anticipated which may reconfigure the relationship between land use and community planning.

In practice, some concerns were raised in relation to the iterative, organisational restructuring and inevitable transaction costs involved in devising new structures and processes. There is scope to examine community planning in relation to Lindblom's (1959) theory of 'muddling through'.[72] A different view expressed was that developments in community planning effectively represented a certain fine-tuning, or pragmatism in relation to what was – or was not working. Reflecting Rittel and Webber's (1973) attempts to develop a general theory of planning, *community* planning exhibits many of the same dilemmas.[73] As partnership working is framed in terms of statutory duties, it is important to understand what this context will mean for joint-working of a more informal and cooperative nature.

Research Priority 2
Investigate the evolving legal and jurisdictional arrangements for community planning, and the implications for the formalisation of community planning structures, the respective involvement of local, regional and national partners, and the extent and effectiveness of cross-sectoral and cross-scalar approaches to community engagement.

7.3 The governance of community planning

The new forms of joint-working relations that have emerged for community planning can be explained in terms of the 'hollowing out' of the state and the 'filling in' of layers of governmental relations as part of a multi-level governance.[74] A number of commentators have argued that devolution in the UK has led to increasing convergence in the nature of governance and policy structures.[75] In contrast, in terms of community planning, it has been illustrated that context (place) matters, and with variation existing both within and between each of the devolved nations.

An important focus in respect of governance structures for community planning relates to integration. This may be complex and contested, as well as layered.[76] Nevertheless, it should seek to enable both horizontal and vertical relations at different scales of working, from the national and regional levels to the local (e.g. neighbourhood or locality) level.[77] A focus on integration also highlights how this may be shaped by central government. Indeed, what can be discerned across all four nation states are examples of 'meta-governance' – the influence of national government on local attempts to develop joint-working and associated issues of to whom the state gives powers, on

---

[72] Lindblom, C. (1959) The Science of "Muddling Through", *Public Administration Review*, 19(2), pp.79-88 Available at: http://urban.hunter.cuny.edu/~schram/lindblom1959.pdf

[73] Rittel, H.W.J. and Webber, M.M. (1973) Dilemmas in a general theory of planning, *Policy Sciences*, 4, pp.155-169. Available at: http://urbanpolicy.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Rittel+Webber_1973_PolicySciences4-2.pdf

[74] Goodwin, M., Jones, M. and Jones, R. (2012) *Re-scaling the state: Devolution and the geographies of economic governance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

[75] Shaw, J., MacKinnon, D. and Docherty, I. (2009) Divergence or convergence? Devolution and transport policy in the United Kingdom, *Environment and Planning C,* 27, pp.546–67.

[76] Morgan, K. (2002) The new regeneration narrative – local development in the multi-level polity, *Local Economy*, 17(3), pp.191–199.

[77] Allmendinger, P. (2003) Re-scaling, integration and competition: future challenges for development planning, *International Planning Studies,* 8, pp.323–328.

what terms, and how the state chooses to redraw and redefine its distribution of powers over time.[78]

Key findings that emerged from the study pointed towards the importance of a duty on partners to participate in all aspects of the community planning process, the potential of pooling budgets to secure integration of activities, the potential impact of further local government reorganisation on the development and continuity of joint-working relations, and the need for (land use) planning officers and those involved with the community plan to be linked from the outset. In addition, pertinent questions arose over the extent to which those most transient or seldom heard should, or could, be involved in community planning structures, and the impact of previous working experiences on governance relations. All of these points therefore require further investigation and elaboration – and particularly in other contexts – for example, rural areas.

Research Priority 3
Explore the governance structures and relations of relevance to joint-working in community planning – for example, between central and local government, and in both urban and rural contexts.

7.4 The scaling and re-scaling of community planning activity

The re-scaling of the state is an on-going process and which can impinge on the ability of local, regional and national actors to service community planning arrangements. Evidence from each of the nation states suggests that there has been a 'structural' filling in of the state, and which has involved the emergence of new forms of governance for community planning. Nevertheless, in relation to cross-scalar working, there is also evidence of 'relational' filling, involving new or reconfigured arrangements between local community planning partnerships and other institutions and organisations.[79] In this respect, the previous restructuring and re-scaling of the state can shape the extent to which current actors are able to engage with the new territorial scales of intervention for community planning – as such they may associate with new structures and scales for community planning to different degrees.

There may also be difficulties in securing horizontal and vertical integration in governance for community planning where there is little evidence of any previous intervention. Indeed, if reference is made to the emergence of new neighbourhood planning arrangements in England, those areas engaging later in the process have – in some instances – experienced difficulties where their proposed territorial scales of working cut across, or challenge, the rationality of existing boundary designations.

A number of responses to securing cross-scalar working emerged from the research - for example, the use of master-planning in setting out a framework for securing integrated working. Strong leadership was also noted as helping to facilitate joint-working relations with other partners beyond the local area in order to deliver the priorities in the local community plan. Nevertheless, the actual ways in which this can be achieved requires further exploration. For example, what type of structures might be required? Who should be involved? Could pooled budgets facilitate cross-scalar working? What role should national governments play in this process? How do the evolving

---

[78] Jessop, B. (2000) 'Governance failure'. In: G. Stoker (Ed.) *The new politics of British local governance*. Basingstoke: MacMillan, pp.11–32.
[79] Shaw, J. and MacKinnon, D. (2011) Moving on with 'filling in'? Some thoughts on state restructuring after devolution, *Area*, 43(1), pp.23–30.

arrangements for community planning impact on cross-scalar relations? How might (local) politics, place and identity impact on the extent of integration within cross-scalar approaches?

7.5 Politics, power and community planning

The changing structures and scales of state activity can both influence – and also be influenced by – the nature of local politics and local political strategies.[80] In turn, the outcome of this relationship can shape processes and structures of community planning. As the structures for governing community planning evolve, so too will the dominant forces, and the strategies that are pursued.[81] Hence 'objects of governance' for community planning may be differentiated and focused towards some interests and collaborations over others, some spatial scales of intervention over others, and some time horizons over others.[82]

If Northern Ireland is taken as an example, it has been reported how, historically, planning has been centralised.[83] However, the introduction of community planning has led to an increase in the importance of social and political forces at the local level. A wider set of partners (for example, planners, community organisations and other local actors) are now involved in community planning processes. But the objects of governance for community planning are contested – whilst there is a focus around securing social well-being and economic development, long-standing political and religious tensions are also shaping community planning activities.

In England, it has been highlighted how the move away from earlier community planning approaches to a focus on neighbourhood planning has led to new concerns with securing economic and housing growth, and underpinned by new national political strategies and state projects focused around re-stimulating the private sector and community-self-help. But the emphasis within neighbourhood plans of allocating more – not less – land for housing development could be viewed as involving the privileging of private sector interests over others.

Thus further research is required to explore the importance of national and local politics – and inter-relations therein – on the nature and focus of community planning activities in England, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales. In what ways might the new relations between the UK and the European Union following the June 2016 EU Referendum result impact subsidiarity and local democracy debates across the UK and in cross-border areas on the island of Ireland? How important is the regional / strategic dimension for community planning? What impact will future local and national elections have on community planning? Which activities may be prioritised as a result? Which actors involved in community planning arrangements may secure more power? Will national

---

[80] Pemberton, S. and Goodwin, M. (2010) State power, local government reorganisation and accumulation and hegemony in the countryside, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26(3), pp.272-283.

[81] Brenner, N. (2004) *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[82] Jessop, B. (1997) 'A neo-Gramscian approach to the regulation of urban regimes'. In M. Lauria (Ed.) *Reconstructing Urban Regime Theory: Regulating Urban Politics in a Global Economy*, London: Sage, pp.51–73.

[83] McNeill, L., Rafferty, G. and Sterrett, K. (2006) *Community Planning in Belfast*. Belfast: Queens University, Belfast.

governments use national targets to reduce local discretion? What implications may arise for the engagement of local communities? To what extent may local elected members associate or disassociate with community planning arrangements?

Research Priority 5
Explore the ways in which national and local politics shape the evolution of community planning arrangements, the actors and scales that are privileged (over others) and the implications for democratic and / or technocratic approaches to community planning.

8. STUDY DISSEMINATION

Conference presentations made:

Peel, D. '*The Power of Community Planning*', Presentation made to the Annual RTPI Young Planners Conference 2016, 'Planning for change: Shaping our future', Europa Hotel, Belfast. October 14.

Peel, D. and Pemberton, S. '*Well-being and Strategic Alignment: Insights from Community Planning in the Devolved UK*', Presentation made to the UK-Ireland Planning Research Conference 2016, Cardiff University, September 6-7.

Peel, D. '*Community Planning in Scotland: Towards constrained autonomy?*' Presentation made as part of the Community Planning Track at the UK Ireland Planning Research Conference 2015, London South Bank University, September 11.

Pemberton, S. and Peel, D. '*Urban governance and new models of community-based planning in a devolved UK'*, Presentation made as part of the Planning in the Wake of Austerity Urbanism track at the Royal Geographical Society / Institute of British Geographers Annual International Conference 2015, Exeter University, September 3.

Forthcoming Article:

Peel, D. 'Rethinking Shared Services: Towards Shared Outcomes?' *Borderlands, the Journal of Spatial Planning in Ireland*.

9. REFERENCES

Allmendinger, P. (2003) Re-scaling, integration and competition: future challenges for development planning, *International Planning Studies*, 8,pp.323–328.

Arnstein, S. (1969) A Ladder of Citizen Participation, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35(4) 1969, pp.216-224. Available at: http://www.lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.html

Audit Scotland (2006) *An Initial Review of Community Planning*, Edinburgh. Available at: http://www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/docs/central/2006/nr_060616_community_planning.pdf

Beveridge, C., Biberbach, P. and Hamilton, J. (2016) *Empowering planning to deliver great places*. An independent review of the Scottish planning system. Edinburgh: Scottish Government, May. Available at: http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0050/00500946.pdf

Blake Stevenson & Strategem (2005) *Case Study Analyses for RPA on Community Planning in Operation within the UK and Ireland*. October. Available at: http://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/sites/default/files/CommunityPlanningR2.pdf

Brenner, N. (2004) *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brookfield, K. (2013) *(Ad)Ventures in Neighbourhood Planning Local Implementation of a New Planning Regime*. London: Planning Exchange Foundation. Available at: http://planningexchangefoundation.org.uk/reports/Neighbourhood%20Planning%20Final%20Report%202.pdf

Cairney, P. (2013) 'Majoritarian Versus Consensus Policymaking' or a 'Common European Policy Style'? The Case of the UK and Scotland, Paper presented to the Japanese Political Science Association Annual Conference, Hokkai Gakuen University, Sapporo, September. Available at: https://paulcairney.files.wordpress.com/2013/08/cairney-jpsa-2013.pdf

Campbell, A., Evans, A., Gilman, L. and Reid, A. (2014) *Community Empowerment (Scotland) Bill*. SPICe Briefing 14/58. Edinburgh: Scottish Parliament. Available at: http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefingsAndFactsheets/S4/SB_14-58_.pdf

Cave, S. (2013) *Community Planning*, Research and Information Service Research Paper NIAR 220-13, Belfast: Northern Ireland Assembly. Available at: http://www.niassembly.gov.uk/globalassets/documents/raise/publications/2013/environment/11913.pdf

Christie, C. (2011) *Commission on the Future Delivery of Public Services*, June. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Available at: http://scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/352649/0118638.pdf

Clark, G. (2011) *Pro-localism and pro-development: A speech to the Adam Smith Institute*, 2 February. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/planning-for-growth--7

Community Places (2013) *Community Planning Toolkit: Community engagement*, Belfast: Community Places. Available at: http://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/sites/default/files/Engagement.pdf

Community Planning Review Group (2012) *Community Planning Review - Statement of Ambition*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Available at: http://www.gov.scot/Topics/Government/local-government/CP/soa

Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (2014) *Subsidiarity: Scottish Local Government influencing the European Agenda*. Brussels: COSLA. Available at: http://www.cosla.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/cosla_subsidiarity_scottish_councils_influencing_eu_agenda-.pdf

Darlow, A., Percy-Smith, J. and Wells, P. (2007) Community Strategies: Are they delivering joined up governance? *Local Government Studies*, 33(1), pp.117-129.

Deloitte (2014) *The State of the State 2014-15*, London: Deloitte LLP.

http://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/uk/Documents/public-sector/deloitt-uk-state-of-the-state-2014.pdf

Department of the Environment (2014) *Information Leaflet 16: Pre-Application Community Consultation Guidance*, Belfast: DoE. Available at: http://www.planningni.gov.uk/index/advice/advice_leaflets/pre-application_community_consultation_guidance_-_june_2014.pdf

Department of the Environment (2015) *Statutory Guidance for the Operation of Community Planning Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014*, Belfast: DoE. Available at: http://www.niccy.org/media/1682/community-planning-guidance-oct-2015.pdf

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) (1998) *Modern local government: in touch with the people,* London: DETR. Available at: http://www.politicsresources.net/docs/DETR1998.pdf

Department for Social Development (2013) *Concordat between the Voluntary & Community Sector and the Northern Ireland Government*, Belfast: DSD. Available at: http://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/sites/default/files/WorkingTogetherR5.pdf

Escobar, O. (2015) *Reimagining Community Planning in Scotland: A Vision from the Third Sector*, Edinburgh: What Works Scotland. Available at: http://www.vascotland.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/WP-Reimagining-Community-Planning-august-2015.pdf

Gallent, N. (2013) Re-connecting 'people and planning': parish plans and the English localism agenda*, Town Planning Review,* 84(3), pp.371-396.

Goodwin, M., Jones, M. and Jones, R. (2012) *Rescaling the state: Devolution and the geographies of economic governance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hamer, L. (2000) 'How many plans does it take to improve health and well-being?', *eg magazine*, 6(8), pp. 8-10. London: University of Westminster.

Jessop, B. (1997) A neo-Gramscian approach to the regulation of urban regimes. In: M. Lauria (Ed.) *Reconstructing Urban Regime Theory: Regulating Urban Politics in a Global Economy*, London: Sage, pp.51–73.

Jessop, B. (2000) Governance failure. In: G. Stoker (Ed). *The new politics of British local governance*. Basingstoke: MacMillan, pp.11–32.

Keating, M. (2013) Rescaling Welfare. Presentation to British Academy/Royal Society of Edinburgh Enlightening the Constitutional debate. Seminar on Welfare and Public Services, 20 November 2013 Glasgow.

Available at: https://www.royalsoced.org.uk/cms/files/events/programmes/2012-13/speaker_notes/MichaelKeating.pdf

Laffin, M. (2007) Comparative British Central-Local Relations: Regional Centralism, Governance and Intergovernmental Relations, *Public Policy and Administration*, 22(1), pp.74-91.

Lindblom, C. (1959) The Science of "Muddling Through", *Public Administration Review*, 19(2), pp.79-88. Available at: http://urban.hunter.cuny.edu/~schram/lindblom1959.pdf

Lucas, K., Ross, A. and Fuller, S. (2003) *Local Agenda 21, community planning and neighbourhood renewal*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Available at: https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/local-agenda-21-community-planning-and-neighbourhood-renewal

McNeill, L., Rafferty, G. and Sterrett, K. (2006) *Community Planning in Belfast*. Belfast: Queens University, Belfast.

Midwinter, A. (1995) *Local Government in Scotland: Reform of Decline*. London: Palgrave.

Morgan, K. (2002) The new regeneration narrative – local development in the multi-level polity*, Local Economy*, 17(3), pp.191–199.

Murray, J. (2014) *Policy Paper: The role of local government in a modern state*, London: Centre for Labour and Social Studies. Available at: http://classonline.org.uk/docs/2014_the_role_of_local_government_in_the_modern_state.pdf

National Assembly for Wales (2008) *Inquiry into Local Service Boards. Health, Wellbeing and Local Government Committee* (Cardiff: National Assembly for Wales).

Available on-line at:

http://www.assembly.wales/en/pages/searchresults.aspx?k=inquiry%20into%20local%20service%20boards&q=inquiry%20into%20local%20service%20boards

Peel, D., O'Keeffe, B., Shi, L., Leith, K. and Keaveney, K. (2012) *Shared Services Across Local Government: Sharing International Experiences*, Armagh: International Centre for Local and Regional Development (ICLRD). April. Available at: URL: http://i2ud.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Shared-Services_International-Case-Studies.pdf

Peel, D. and Lloyd, M.G. (2007) Community planning and land use planning in Scotland: a constructive interface? *Public Policy and Administration,* 22(3), pp.353–66.

Peel, D. and Lloyd, M.G. (2012) The Edinburgh Concordat: Contractual, Collaborative Positive Planning?, *Public Performance & Management Review*, 36(2), pp.275-289.

Pemberton, S., Peel, D. and Lloyd, M.G. (2015) The 'filling in' of community-based planning in the devolved UK? *The Geographical Journal*, 181(1), pp.6-15.

Pemberton, S. and Goodwin, M. (2010) Rethinking the changing structures of rural local government – State power, rural politics and local political strategies? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 26(3), pp.272-283.

Pemberton, S. and Lloyd, M.G. (2008) Devolution, community planning and institutional de-congestion? *Local Government Studies*, 34 (4), pp.437-451.

Rittel, H.W.J. and Webber, M.M. (1973) Dilemmas in a general theory of planning, *Policy Sciences*, 4, pp.155-169. Available at: http://urbanpolicy.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Rittel+Webber_1973_PolicySciences4-2.pdf

Scottish Executive (2003) *The Local Government in Scotland Act 2003: Community Planning: Statutory Guidance*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive. Available at: http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2004/04/19168/35271

Scottish Government and COSLA (2007) *Concordat*. Available at: http://www.gov.scot/resource/doc/923/0054147.pdf

Scottish Government (2009) *Towards a Mentally Flourishing Scotland: Policy and Action Plan 2009-2011*, Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Available at: http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2009/05/06154655/2

Scottish Government (2016) *Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015. Part 2 Community Planning*. Consultation on draft guidance and regulation. March. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Available at: https://consult.scotland.gov.uk/community-empowerment-unit/community-planning-guidance/user_uploads/00497123.pdf-1

Shaw, J. and MacKinnon, D. (2011) Moving on with 'filling in'? Some thoughts on state restructuring after devolution, *Area*, 43(1), pp.23–30.

Shaw J, MacKinnon D and Docherty I. (2009) Divergence or convergence? Devolution and transport policy in the United Kingdom, *Environment and Planning C,* 27, pp.546–67.

Smith, J. (2013) Local government in England: do we comply with the European Charter of Local Self-Government? Report to the Local Government Association. Available at: http://www.local.gov.uk/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=1f372790-a6b2-4e78-90ad-30cff0016f2a&groupId=10180

Stone, D. (2001) *Learning Lessons, Policy Transfer and the International Diffusion of Policy Ideas*, CSGR Working Paper No. 69/01. Available at: http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/2056/1/WRAP_Stone_wp6901.pdf

Sullivan, H. and Skelcher, C. (2002) *Working Across Boundaries: Collaboration in Public Services,* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Terry, F. (2004). Public Management – Time for a Re-launch. Available at: http://www.publicnet.co.uk/features/2004/01/30/public-management-%E2%80%93-time-for-a-re-launch/

SURF (Scottish Urban Regeneration Forum) (2016) Response to the Independent Review of Planning. Available at: https://ideas.scotland.gov.uk/independent-review-of-planning/align-spatial-planning-with-community-planning

Weaver, M. (2006) 'More power to the people, urges Milliband', *The Guardian* on-line: http://www.theguardian.com/society/2006/feb/21/localgovernment.politics

Wells, P. and Goudie, R. (2005) *Process Evaluation of Plan Rationalisation: Formative Evaluation of Community Strategies*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. Available at: https://www.shu.ac.uk/research/cresr/sites/shu.ac.uk/files/formative-eval-community-strategies.pdf

Welsh Government (2014) *White Paper – Reforming Local Government*, Cardiff: Welsh Government. Available at: http://www.wlga.gov.uk/non-wlga-publications/welsh-government-l-white-paper-reforming-local-government

Williams, P., Rogers, S., Sullivan, H., Evans, L., Crow, A. (2006) *People, Plans and Partnerships: A National Evaluation of Community Strategies in Wales*, Cardiff: Welsh Government. Available at: http://llyw.cymru/statistics-and-research/people-plans-partnerships/?lang=

Williams, P. (2000) 'Community strategies will fail if they don't 'muddle through'', *eg magazine*, 6(8), pp.3-5. London: University of Westminster.

Wilson, J. (2004) New Management of Public Services: The United Kingdom Experience, *Viešoji Politika Ir Administravimas*, 7, pp. 49-59. Available at: https://www.mruni.eu/upload/iblock/86f/6_j.wilson.pdf

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Topic Guide: Exploring New Models of Community-based Planning in the Devolved UK

Overall aim: To examine community-based planning approaches in the devolved UK and the implications for securing good practice.

Section A: General information

1. How long have you worked in your current organisation?
2. How long have you been in your current position?
3. What does your role entail on a day-to-day basis?
4. Has this changed over time? If so, why and in what ways?

Section B: Research themes, objectives and questions

Theme	Research objectives	Indicative questions
Rationale and focus	1. To explain the organisational arrangements for community-based planning across the devolved UK with reference to multi-scale governance, leadership, resourcing, and community engagement.	1. What was community-based planning set up to achieve? 2. Has there been an emphasis on strategy and / or process development? 3. Has this changed over time or not? Why? Why not? 4. What are the benefits / problems associated with the approach(es)?
Governance and policy	1. To explain the organisational arrangements for community-based planning across the devolved UK with reference to multi-scale governance, leadership, resourcing, and community engagement.	1. What are the legislative and policy arrangements for the delivery of community-based planning? 2. In what ways, and to what extent, is community-based planning resourced, monitored / audited by central government? 3. What are the implications that arise for centre-local

		government relations, cross-scalar governance and community-based planning at the local level?
Working arrangements – structural and relational	2. To identify models of joint-working under community-based planning with a view to ascertaining patterns of divergence/convergence and scope for sharing practice.	1. How have joint-working relations been designed, organised and managed?

2. Who are the parties/partners involved?

3. What role do local civic leaders play?

4. What opportunities for civil engagement exist?

5. Which interests are reflected within the development of joint-working arrangements? How? Why? With what results?

6. To what extent have arrangements been influenced from within / beyond the area? By whom? Where? Why? With what results? |
| **Examples of good practice** | 2. To identify models of joint-working under community-based planning with a view to ascertaining patterns of divergence/convergence and scope for sharing practice. | 1. What is seen as working well/less well? Why?

2. How could joint-working in community-based planning and links with land use planning be enhanced?

3. What needs to change in respect of funding / policy / governance / working arrangements? |
| **Future / further research priorities** | 3. To prioritise a research agenda on joint-working in community-based planning informed by identification of the principal concerns of practitioners and policy-makers, and in particular considering the relationship of community-based planning with land use planning.

4. To use the study findings to prioritise a major research application (eg to the ESRC). | 1. What else might need to be investigated to understand processes and patterns of divergence / convergence?

2. Which aspects of community-based planning and land use planning need to be further explored?

3. What other barriers and / or opportunities to joint-working need unpacking? |