SHELTER
NEW SOUTH WALES

**Regeneration partnerships
and communities**

Shelter Brief 27

February 2006

Regeneration partnerships and communities

By Craig Johnston

First published February 2006.
This copy printed 2 November 2020.

Contents

Tables

Introduction

This paper is a response to the popularity of the concept of 'partnerships' in discussion around virtually any government program in social and economic policy in New South Wales (and similar jurisdictions).

The paper focuses on the implications of application of the concept for nongovernment organizations (NGOs) and citizens/residents, and for advocates of participatory approaches to democracy and public policy. It looks at where NGOs and social-capital based associations (like resident action groups and tenant associations) fit in.

It focuses, secondly, on regeneration of stressed urban areas[1], specifically neighbourhoods or estates characterized by high concentrations of social housing and by features defined as *social exclusion*.[2] Specifically, how might partnerships work so that the most disadvantaged and the least articulate, and social justice advocates, can influence regeneration processes and outcomes?

The paper takes the form of a scan of partnership models for urban and estate regeneration in a few *other* countries, based on an Internet-derived literature review. It is not comprehensive, and the examples and models reported on suggest possibilities not prescriptions. These might be useful for NSW community activists when considering whether to participate in partnerships around regeneration of neighborhoods (e.g. public housing estates) here.

Background

The late 1990s–early 2000s emphasis on partnerships in doing the business of government draws on a tradition of partnerships in business, where individuals join together to maximize their commercial advantage by leveraging resources, i.e. by getting more from the resources each individual can bring to a business venture by not only adding those to another individual's resources but using the pool better.

Indeed, partnerships are a recognized form of organizing businesses and are the dominant institutional form in some industries, such as legal services. It is not different in essence from the idea of a cooperative, traditionally used in some primary industries. It is also not foreign to the practice of government – the concept of federalism is inspired by a similar motive.

In the last 10 years or so there has been a greater focus on partnerships in doing government business for 2 reasons.

One is the greater complexity and reach of government control. Many private firms have begun to eschew top-down ways of organizing in favor of smaller flexible units that interact with each other and with customers in diverse ways – 'horizontally', as well as 'vertically'. Stewart Clegg and Cynthia Hardy argued that:[3]

> On the outside, the boundaries that formerly circumscribed the organization are breaking down as individual entities merge and blur in 'chains', 'clusters', 'networks' and 'strategic alliances', questioning the relevance of an 'organizational' focus.

This way of organizing is sometimes called 'postmodern'. It has extended into government. There was a change in the organizational structure and design of government between 'the new public administration' of the 1960s and 1970s and the 'reinventing government movement' of the 1980s and 1990s.[4] The 'new public administration' was more institutional, more inclined to service provision, and more managerial. It had a greater concern for hierarchy and management. In contrast, the 'reinventing government movement' was more inclined to de-institutionalization and brokering competition between service providers. Rather than focusing on hierarchy, it had a greater concern for structuring incentives, conducting contract oversight and practicing managerial innovation. The 'reinventing government movement' of the early 1990s had a greater awareness of the role and potential of nongovernment (private-for-profit and nonprofit) businesses in delivering government services. Its proponents sought to distinguish a traditional narrow role for government from a broader process in which the agencies of government were at the center of a web that included other agents.

Political scientists have called the phenomenon '*governance*', to distinguish it from 19th century concepts of 'representative and responsible government'. Karen Hult and Charles Walcott refer to governance structures as the patterned ways in which people in organizations discover and articulate goals, select among means, cope with uncertainty and controversy generated both within and outside the organization, and foster legitimacy and commitment inside and outside the organization.[5] (Governance has come to have a different meaning in business management discourse, in both private-for-profit and nonprofit businesses, where it refers to the strategic role of governing bodies in contrast to the management role of senior operatives. That use in business, however, has some affinities with the wider usage of the term in that there is the notion that governing is devolved to different agents away from the formal, top-level, board.)

The concept of '*governmentality*' takes the idea a bit further: it emphasizes the active involvement of people outside government in the workings of the state and hegemony whereby people (as individuals and groups) produce and reproduce their own status of being governed and regulated. This phenomenon is a structural problem for 'community sector' organizations that are dependent on government grants and service contracts. Some housing researchers have argued that nongovernment social housing providers are part of a *shadow state*, because they are so integrally tied to the state through enabling, regulating and subsidization.[6] Others have suggested that this conception of a shadow state role credits nongovernment organizations with too much independence from the state, and that a nonprofit housing association sector that relies on government contracts is part of a new *quasi-public sector*, rather than an independent, community sector or a shadow state.[7]

The idea of partnership extends the ideas of consultation and participation that have been pushed by republicans and social and consumer advocates following civil unrest in the developed countries in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Social critics articulated the notion of *participatory democracy* (or direct democracy) to contrast with the *representative democracy* inherited from the western European and American republicans of the early modern period. The idea involved devolution of decisionmaking down to lower levels (the 'grass roots'), and direct – rather than mediated – decisionmaking forums (e.g. open meetings rather than elected

committees). A legacy of this period was an incorporation and institutionalization of the concept in government programs and operational guidelines. On a 'participation continuum', there is a range of participation opportunities: from receiving information about a matter that has to be decided at one end, through to actual decisionmaking about the matter at the other end. (See Table 1.) Governments operating within the parameters of representative and responsible government have focused in consultation about delivery or product realization. The consultee is consumer. Now (but still within the parameters of representative and responsible government), there is more focus on actual participation in delivery of programs or product realization. The consultee is producer. This is the form of participation that 'partnerships' promise.

Table 1: Public participation spectrum

Increasing level of public impact →				
INFORM	**CONSULT**	**INVOLVE**	**COLLABORATE**	**EMPOWER**
Objective	**Objective**	**Objective**	**Objective**	**Objective**
To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, and/or solutions	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, and/or decisions	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public and private concerns are consistently understood and considered	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution	To place final decisionmaking in the hands of the public
Promise to the public	**Promise to the public**	**Promise to the public**	**Promise to the public**	**Promise to the public**
We will keep you informed	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge your concerns, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and issues are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision	We will look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible	We will implement what you decide
Example techniques to consider	**Example techniques to consider**	**Example techniques to consider**	**Example techniques to consider**	**Example techniques to consider**
Fact sheets Websites Open houses	Public comment Focus groups Surveys Public meetings	Workshops Deliberate polling	Citizen advisory committees Consensus-building Participatory decisionmaking	Citizen juries Ballots Delegated decisions

Source: International Association for Public Participation, 'IAP2 resources', online at <www.iap2.org.au/usefulresources.htm>, viewed 15 December 2005.

The 2nd reason is the need for government to attract upfront sources of revenue for public purposes from outside the traditional sources (taxation). This approach sees public–private partnerships (PPP) as a model for producing better value for money than direct grant-funded projects.[8] It is not a means of expanding the overall level of resources available to spend on government-funded social infrastructure. NSW Treasury has said: 'Even though social infrastructure may be financed by the private sector, the government, through payments made through the contract's life will ultimately fund it.'[9] PPPs present a particular challenge for government because it has to assess the value for money of entering a PPP arrangement in a context where there is likely to be a *principal–agent problem*, specifically, the private sector partner will have better knowledge of the financing of the project than the government and might want to have its government partner share more than an equal portion of the commercial risks.

So, we can see 2 dynamics working with the idea of partnerships proposed by or coming from the state. They can be seen as mechanisms for leveraging *legitimacy*, and they can be seen as mechanisms for leveraging *resources*.

The term 'partnership' is usually used to refer to a relationship established for joint action. Flo Frank and Anne Smith describe it as 'a relationship where two or more parties, having compatible goals, form an agreement to do something together. Partnerships are about people working together in a mutually beneficial relationship, oftentimes doing things together that might not be able to be achieved alone.'[10] The keywords here are agreement, compatible goals, joint action, mutually beneficial, and achieving something not able to be achieved alone (the 'collaborative advantage'[11]). A key trouble with the term is that it is being used for any cooperative or consultative action. Some writers suggest a partnership is more than joint action: Kerry Brown suggests it involves a degree of collaboration that tends toward *interdependency*.[12] What is not included in the standard definitions is any recognition of (pre-partnership entry) power imbalance and information asymmetry that affect the nature of partnership agreements and processes.

Box 1: Disadvantages in pursuing a partnership approach to service delivery

- increased administrative costs which would not be incurred if only one agency was involved
- difficulties in securing agreement to joint action which lead to delays in the delivery of projects and programs
- difficulties in achieving integrated action with consequent reduction in outputs

Source: Cambridge Economic Associates, *National evaluation of the former regeneration programmes,* Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, Edinburgh, 2001, p.28.

Partnerships offered (or imposed) by the state present a challenge for social movements and NGO service providers who want to maintain independence from the state and the market economy: how do you respond to a deep engagement, rather than a shallow engagement, with the state? What are the compromises, the risks, to consider, as well as the promises, the potentials?[13] (See Table 2.) Taylor presents the choice as on the one hand, one between avoiding risk of incorporation by resistance (to government-led social inclusion and partnership programs), and on the other hand, exploiting fault lines and making alliances.[14]

Table 2: Networked arrangements

INTEGRATION RELATIONSHIP	DURATION	GOALS/ PERSPECTIVE	STRUCTURAL LINKAGES	FORMALITY	RISKS/ REWARDS
Cooperation	Short-term	Independent outcomes; participating organizations remain autonomous	Movement in and out by new members; loose, flexible links	Informal	Low risk/ modest reward
Coordination	Medium-term; depends on previous working relations	Joint planning and programming, but members remain autonomous	Some stability of members; medium links; and often a central hub	Informal/ formal	Increase in risks and benefits up to a point
Collaboration	Longer term	New systems and operations; highly interdependent, with sharing of power	Members move outside traditional functional areas; tight links	Formal	High risk/ high reward

Source: B W Head, 'Community engagement: explanations, limits and impacts', paper presented to the International Conference on Engaging Communities, Brisbane, 14-17 August 2005, online at <www.engagingcommunities2005.org>, viewed 24 December 2005, p.10.[15]

Social inclusion

Partnerships are the vogue for delivering welfare services whether in a place-based or non-place based programs. The notion links in with the notion of *social exclusion*, which English social theorists borrowed from mainland western Europe in the 1990s.[16] Social exclusion refers to an accumulation and combination of several types of deprivation that go beyond poverty: it includes lack of education, deteriorating health conditions, homelessness, lack of family support, lack of job opportunities, and non-participation in the regular life of society.[17] The concept also relates to groups of people – ethnic minorities, women, older people, and people with disabilities (and sexual minorities) – who might not be considered to be outside the mainstream of society simply on an income definition of poverty.

According to Michael Geddes[18], the concept of social exclusion has shifted perspective
  ➢ from an exclusive focus on income poverty to a wider view of multidimensional disadvantage;
  ➢ from a static picture of states of deprivation to a more dynamic analysis of processes; and

> from a focus on the individual to a recognition that disadvantage is also experienced within communities.

Box 2: Rationales for using partnership in urban regeneration

- The problems in stressed neighborhoods are complex and involve the whole community. Consequently, no one agency will have the answer.
- Partnerships bring a wide range of experience and perspectives to the problem, again helping to 'add value' to the exercise through a more rounded approach to solutions.
- Partnership arrangements are often the best way to tap into diverse sources of funding, resources and expertise that otherwise would not be available to one agency.
- Partnership arrangements, when they work, help to develop the 'glue' that binds disadvantaged neighborhoods more fully into the mainstream through *a shared understanding of the problems* and *a shared vision of how these can be addressed*. All sides to the partnership can *share responsibility for the outcomes* and, assuming it's successful, *share a pride in the results*.

Source: Bill Randolph, 'Beyond place management: why partnership matters', paper to the National Housing Conference, Homebush Bay, Sydney, 29-30 November 1999, p.3.

The local

A focus on social exclusion lends itself to a focus on 'local partnerships'. A local partnership approach appears to reflect policy recognition of the many actors involved and implicated in the success or failure of attempts to combat unemployment and achieve greater social inclusion.[19]

Michael Geddes did a review of local partnership structures in Europe that sought to combine the resources of a number of actors – governments, businesses[20], NGO service agencies, and local citizens – to work on social exclusion in specific neighborhoods and regions and to develop and implement local regeneration strategies.[21] He identified 4 key features of local partnerships:[22]
> a formal organizational structure for policy-making and implementation;
> the mobilization of a coalition of interests and the commitment of a range of different partners;
> a common agenda and multi-dimensional action program; and
> an aim to combat unemployment, poverty and social exclusion and promote social cohesion and inclusion.

Studies of neighborhood-based mechanisms in Europe suggest that they have a strong local character: 'their specific politico-institutional forms have been conditioned above all by place- and scale-specific political-economic circumstances, coalitions, and struggles rather than by top-down policy directives'.[23] The dynamic in New South Wales is different: the extensive use by the state government of urban development agencies in Sydney has been a device to override local concerns.[24]

The chimera of community

The concept of community has been a contested one in social science for many decades.[25] Despite many theoretical and empirical studies, it remains a dog's breakfast when used in public policy programs. Tim Reddel and Geoff Woolcock note:[26]

> The badge of 'community' is a limited descriptor for the range of organisational forms and perspectives evident in the Queensland initiatives including local networks of service providers, loose alliances of resident action groups, community agencies, peak bodies, regional networks of local government representatives, business leaders and community members.

The concept, 'the community sector', is used differently in the European policy literature to how it is used in Australia. There, the 'community sector' refers to local (and, implicitly, small-scale) self-help or mutual organizations such as sports clubs, resident action groups, etc., and to individual 'community activists'. In Australia, that term has been appropriated by nonprofit nongovernment agencies providing services mainly to disadvantaged clients. English analysts use term, 'the voluntary and not-for-profit sector' or 'voluntary sector', to refer to those agencies (who are a 'sector' in that they are a subset of the health and social/community services industry). I am not aware of a commonly-used term in Australia for the more-or-less informal citizen action that is independent of the NGO services sector, business, and the state, that is, for the community sector as it is understood in the European literature[27], nor of any way that such organizations and individuals might be considered a 'sector' (and a sector of what?). To avoid confusion this paper does not use 'community sector' at all: it uses NGO services sector (cf. English voluntary sector) and grassroots community groups (cf. English community sector). Whatever you call them, the distinction is useful because it alerts us to:

> ➤ the different institutional realities in relation to the state, especially with grant funding or service contracts (on which the nonprofit nongovernment services sector is virtually totally dependent and on which grassroots citizen action groups are virtually totally independent);
> ➤ the risk of *substitutionism* by the NGO services sector, i.e. the risk that welfare agencies will presume to speak on behalf of disadvantaged people and crowd out those people's own voices and action in the process – this might arise from the structural position of NGO services agencies as intermediaries, rather than any necessary mal intent; and
> ➤ the different roles that each plays in empowerment and self-management exercises, and in local partnerships for social inclusion.

Community-based partnerships are partnerships that take place in a community, have community members involved, have a direct impact on a community, and are formed for a community cause.[28] They include government-business partnerships that take place in and impact on a community.

Social partnerships are voluntary, mutually beneficial, innovative relationships to address common societal aims engaged in by individuals and organizations from government, business and civil constituencies through combining their resources and competencies.[29]

Some overseas examples

This section summarizes examples of partnerships involving 'communities' (whether individual citizens and grassroots organizations directly, or NGO services agencies) where the aim has been to promote social inclusion in stressed neighborhoods.

England

The English government agency English Partnerships is a prime example of where the process is more important than content. From its name, the agency could be operating in any field of public policy: in fact, it is the statutory authority (qango) responsible for promoting urban growth and regeneration through land and property development for new towns and suburbs, especially on brownfield sites.[30] Most of the regeneration projects under its brief do not have a social inclusion agenda: projects that do are more likely to be linked to social exclusion or neighbourhood renewal units (variously named over the course of the Labor government's period of office) in the prime minister's or deputy prime minister's portfolios.

However, as a land and property developer it has some particular roles in the English housing market. For example, it has a joint unit, called the Housing Partnership, with the Housing Corporation (the government's regulatory and funding body for affordable housing) and brings forward sites for housing development, particular 'affordable' and 'key worker' housing; and it is developing a number of housing estates.[31]

An emphasis on partnerships predates the Labor government, however; they can be traced back to the government's Urban Program of 1978. In its last years in office, in the early 1990s, the Conservative government introduced two programs that emphasized partnerships. The City Challenge program ran from 1992 to 1994. It allocated £37.5 million to 31 local partnerships in disadvantaged areas.

The Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) program began in 1994, replacing the City Challenge program.[32] It was a grant program for local partnership-based agencies. Agencies getting grants were expected to involve a diverse range of organizations (including local businesses, the NGO services sector, and 'the local community') in the management of the scheme. An example of an agency funded under this program was the St Hilda's Partnership, a company limited by guarantee, in Middlesbrough. The board of director comprises local residents (majority), and representatives from local businesses, housing associations, the local council, etc. This scheme continues to exist but it has been regionalized: it is managed by regional development agencies.

Regional development agencies (RDAs) are parapublic agencies set up by the national government, with a brief to promote economic development of various regions within England.[33] They have partnership-based boards, i.e. boards with sectoral interests represented, especially business interests. These RDAs have sponsored sub-regional partnership committees for particular parts of their region. These structures also have cross-sectoral representation[34], are usually dominated by the local government council, and are usually serviced by a local government staffer. These bodies have not put the same emphasis on communicating with or involving the NGO services sector and grass roots community organizations as the initiatives specifically branded as 'regeneration'.

The Housing Action Trusts (HAT) were statutory authorities (qangos) set up in the late 1980s and early 1990s to regenerate some of the most stressed public housing estates (ownership if which had been transferred from the local council), on a time-limited basis.[35] The HATs focused on the physical state of the estates (both the housing stock and the amenity of the neighborhood, including establishment of traditional street patterns), and also on social and economic issues. They also sought to involve residents in the regeneration process.

There were 6 of them. Their boards were appointed by the deputy prime minister. Those boards included residents of the estates.

The 1st HAT, in North Hull, wound up in 1999, and another wound up in 2002, with the other 4 closing in 2004 and 2005. English Partnerships is the residuary body in terms of proprietary rights, liabilities, and any outstanding work.

The HAT in Castle Vale, on the outskirts of Birmingham, is often cited as a best practice model for a regeneration agency.[36] Management of the estate was transferred from the city council to the HAT in 1993 after a ballot of tenants. The regeneration involved demolition of 32 of 34 residential tower blocks. With the winding up of the HAT, the management of the estate's housing is now undertaken by a community housing association. There is a neighborhood management board (established in 2002), which acts as a clearinghouse for service providers; its membership comprises government agencies, the local council, NGO services agencies, and representatives of residents.

Urban regeneration companies (URC) are nonprofit companies set up to lead regeneration in particular towns.[37] They are set up by the local government and the regional development agency. Local governments play a key role on their boards, which include other 'local partners' including people from business, the NGO services sector, and the 'community'. The core agencies in the partnerships are government sector. English Partnerships provides a funding and other resourcing role, partners redevelopment projects, and sits on some of their boards. They were originally piloted in Liverpool, East Manchester, and Sheffield, in 1999, and covered 16 areas in 2004.

Local Strategic Partnerships (LSP) began to be set up in 2001 and 2002, as part of implementation of the *New commitment to neighbourhood renewal: national strategy action plan*.[38] The partnerships are about coordinated service planning. The agencies that are members of an LSP take many of the major decisions about priorities and government funding for their local area, the boundaries of which correlate with the relevant local government area. The partnerships in the 88 most stressed local government areas are eligible for grant funding from a Neighborhood Renewal Fund; the funding is to improve mainstream public sector services in those areas, and is managed by the local council.[39] One of their roles is to rationalize the number of local partnerships in the local government area.

The LSPs are informal bodies, whose aim is bring together a range of agencies – from the government, private business, religious organizations, NGO services, and community organization sectors – at a local government area level.[40] They are not set up by an act of parliament (i.e. they are non-statutory bodies), though the LSPs that

operate in the 88 most stressed local government areas are accredited by the national government and funding is subject to strict guidelines. Local councils play the lead role in nearly all of them. The LSP parties have tended to have an elite' character, albeit one that is more inclusive than (and undermining of) representative-democratic government embodied by local councils.[41]

Michael Geddes's assessment of LSPs is that: 'Most LSPs are strong on paper strategies and visions but – although it is early days as yet – have yet to demonstrate concrete achievements of any magnitude …'[42]

The New Deal for Communities (NDC) program – also a part of the implementation of the *New commitment to neighborhood renewal: national strategy action plan* – is a grant funding program established in 1998. It funds local projects in the 39 most stressed neighborhoods. The key differences between this program and earlier grant programs like the SRB is that NDC grants are meant to influence and lever mainstream funding and services, and it puts a stronger emphasis on community leadership and involvement.

The NDC projects are managed by sectoral-based partnership committees, as with the LSP committees. However, whereas LSPs are at risk of being dominated by the local council or a cabal of government sector agencies, the NDC project committees have a stronger 'community' representation, with residents forming a plurality or majority of members. [43] In some cases, the resident representatives are elected directly by a ballot of residents in the project area or indirectly by a local residents' association.

Geddes's assessment of NDC partnerships is that '… many NDCs are lagging behind spend and delivery targets and, crucially, having limited impact on mainstream service providers.[44]

Grant monies from the Neighborhood Renewal Fund were also available in those 88 areas for Community Participation Programs (CPPs), whose aim was to:[45]
  ➢ provide funding to stimulate and support community activity so that more people become involved in regeneration;
  ➢ help residents gain the skills and knowledge they need to play a more active role; and
  ➢ support NGO service agencies and grassroots community organizations to be involved in LSPs as equal partners.

The funding stream was for Community Chest grants available for community organizations to run their own projects; Community Learning Chest grants for development of skills, knowledge and community learning; and a Community Empowerment Fund (CEF) to subsidize Community Empowerment Networks (CENs).[46]

The three CPPs ran from 2001 to 2004 and were integrated into one Single Community Program, which will run until March 2006; the program will then be combined with other Neighborhood Renewal programs into a Stronger and Safer Communities Fund to be administered by local councils.

Community participation in regeneration activities and in the LSPs in particular, was seen as a means of affecting and effecting regeneration outcomes. See Box 3.

The Community Empowerment Networks were a type of mini-peak for the not government and not private business organizations involved in the LSP. The CENs varied in format, from those with a membership restricted to a small number of agencies, to those with open membership for individuals as well as groups. The role of these Networks was to be a link between the NGO services sector and grassroots community groups on the one hand, and the LSPs (of which those sectors were members) on the other. A specific role was to choose the representatives of the NGO services sector and grassroots community groups to be on the LSP body. (And, we might speculate, help the ordinary citizen activist to sort out the spaghetti soup that England's various regeneration programs have become![47]) The proportion of CEN representatives on LSP boards ranged from 13% to 42% (evaluation done in 2003-04).[48]

Box 3: Goals for community participation

Social capital – Increase the confidence and capacity of individuals and small groups to get involved in activities and build mutually-supportive networks that hold communities together.
Social inclusion and cohesion – Develop empowered communities capable of building a common vision, a sense of belonging, and a positive identity where diversity is valued.
Service delivery – Ensure that local communities are in a position to influence service delivery and, where appropriate, participate in service delivery.
Governance – Develop a community voice that enables communities to participate in decisionmaking and increase the accountability if service providers.

Source: Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, cited in Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, *Making connections: an evaluation of the Community Participation Programmes*, Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, Research Report 15, March 2005, p.9.

Scotland

The first urban regeneration initiative involving partnerships was in Glasgow in the late 1970s. The central government's New Life for Urban Scotland initiative of 1988 incorporated local partnerships, a difference from previous urban regeneration initiatives.[49] The initiative was deployed in 4 cities, in peripheral suburban areas dominated by public housing estates.[50] The partnership structures included representatives of the government, local governments, statutory authorities, the private sector, and community organizations. The partnerships themselves had no legal status: they were informal bodies chaired initially by the government central agency. Community engagement built on existing community groups. An evaluation found that this approach 'did not go far enough in recognising the inequalities in resources, capacity to deliver activities and ability to make strategic decisions'.[51]

The New Life initiative was evaluated positively in 1989-99.[52] The initiative was followed by the Priority Partnership Areas (PPA) initiative in 1996, which applied to

cities/areas not just to 4 peripheral suburbs. This initiative encouraged citywide urban regeneration strategies and specific proposals to address social exclusion in stressed neighborhoods led by citywide partnerships.

A policy change in 1998 saw the establishment of a new local partnership–based regeneration program called Social Inclusion Partnerships (SIP), which was similar to the New Deal for Communities program in England.[53] These superseded/absorbed the 12 existing Priority Partnership Area partnership bodies and 9 other urban regeneration bodies, and new SIPs were also set up. Of the 48 SIPs, 34 were locality-based, and 14 were 'theme'-based (e.g. health of young adults).

The SIPs had a greater focus on preventative projects for socially-excluded young people than the PPAs, but like them, drew on a 'bottom-up' approach in urban programs with a tradition of government grant funding for services and projects managed by NGO service agencies and community groups.[54] They also had a specific element of community capacity-building.

The SIPs were directly funded by the government, and the government agencies belonging to a SIP were also expected to contribute resources to its work from their mainstream budgets.

The SIPs were umbrella bodies comprised of representatives of the local council, government agencies, the NGO services sector, and grassroots community groups.

A review of community participation in the Partnerships found that such participation promoted comprehensiveness, holistic and comprehensive approaches to regeneration and social inclusion.[55] Yet, the formal evaluation of the Partnerships found involvement of community activists in them had been suboptimal: the evaluation simply noted on this matter that: 'Some areas are moving forward faster than others.'[56] A study of the SIP in Glasgow's Greater Pollack area concluded: '… the process of community consultation and participation during the early stages of the GP SIP was woefully inadequate. At best it was tokenistic, and at worst, local people were being 'exploited' to legitimise the policy process.'[57]

Robina Goodlad commented that the type of participation expected of grassroots community activists at the level of boards, etc., '… places a heavy burden on community representatives, who are rarely supported by the same level of office and information resources that public servants take for granted.'[58]

In 2003, there was another shift in program direction, with promotion of local community planning partnerships (CPPs).[59] These new bodies have a primary focus on 'joining up' government services' planning and delivery in a local government area. Unlike the Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) in England, the Scottish CCPs are not agencies for national government regeneration funding. They are convened by the local government and they bring together the key government agencies as well as representatives from the private sector, the NGO services sector, and grassroots community groups. The new CPPs incorporate the SIPs.

In Edinburgh, there were plans to establish local community planning partnerships in each neighborhood in the city: those bodies are seen as 'new forums where people can

discuss local priorities for services and participate in decisions affecting their community'.[60] The model involves 3 or 4 'community representatives' of accredited community organizations and some representatives from the NGO services sector sitting on each committee. This is aimed to 'ensure that communities have a direct role in decision making'.

The government has also established 3 'pathfinder' urban regeneration companies (similar to those in England – see page 9).[61]

Ireland

The Irish government began establishing area-based agencies to tackle social exclusion using a partnership approach in 1991.[62] Their primary focus has been on unemployment and economic development. Their budgets come from the government and (half) from the European Union (economic development subsidies). By the mid 2000s, there were 38 of them.[63] They were set up as independent corporations under company law, and are therefore not responsible to elected officials like local councillors and MPs. Typically they have boards of 18 persons drawn in equal proportions from government statutory agencies (social welfare, training, or economic development government agencies), the 'social partners' (labor, and farmers and other business), and the NGO services and community organizations sectors.[64] The model allows for:
  ➢ a wider participation in the processes of change, especially at the local level;
  ➢ the agency's economic development policies to draw on local experience; and
  ➢ state agencies to adapt their policies and resource allocations to better meet local needs.

The agencies operate in designated disadvantaged areas, most of which are urban and 2/3rds of the urban localities are in Dublin with high concentrations of public housing. The agencies undertake special projects, and at least one has its own social economy business.[65]

Not all of these agencies have good relations with local communities. Ballymun Regeneration, an urban development company owned by Dublin council, had poor relations with community organizations, and the regeneration process involved some open conflict between stakeholders.[66]

The dynamics of urban regeneration in northern Ireland have been slightly different because of the military situation and religious conflicts.[67] Urban regeneration partnerships emerged from 'peace and reconciliation' partnerships in the mid 1990s. Public policies have been influenced by those of the European Union and Britain and England. They do not show the same degree of integration into economic policy as there is in the Republic of Ireland.

An urban regeneration company, Ilex Urban Regeneration Company, was established in Derry in northern Ireland in 2003. Like its equivalent bodies in England, it has a strong focus on attracting private investment into physical infrastructure and integrating the city better into the global economy.

USA

A key partnership-model regeneration body in the USA is that of the community development corporations (CDCs).[68] These are nonprofit entities established to regenerate a targeted low- or moderate-income neighborhood, with the assistance of federal government and philanthropic/charitable subsidies. They emerged in the 1960s in Afro-American neighborhoods and there are now more than 3,500 of them.[69]

Their focus is on whole-of-community development, with a strong focus on economic development and employment programs, and/or development and provision of affordable housing. In many cities CDCs are the most productive developers of affordable housing for low-income residents, outstripping private developers and public housing agencies. They have also been active developers of commercial, office, and industrial space in neighborhoods that have seen job losses to suburban areas and developing countries. They might also provide – or work with others to provide – welfare services like childcare, youth counselling, and cultural arts projects. They vary in their involvement and effectiveness in community-building.

They have 'community-based' management committees. The sector has some 'chronic weaknesses' – a lack of ongoing operating funding, staff expertise, and poor management systems. The National Community Development Initiative (NCDI) was launched in 1991 to address these issues and improve outcomes in 23 large cities: a key feature of this was the development of local partnerships between government agencies, private firms and philanthropic bodies to channel money to and provide capacity-building training for the sector.[70]

These NCDI initiatives are similar to local partnerships, known as community development partnerships (CDPs), which began in the mid 1980s.[71] CDPs are themselves nonprofit associations of local funders. Their purpose is to act as intermediaries between funders and investers on the one hand and CDCs on the other: they coordinate financial assistance to the CDCs for capacity-building, especially in housing development.

The boards of the CDPs are drawn from the main funders of the CDCs – businesses and philanthropic foundations. In some cases, CDP boards include residents of the neighborhoods where the CDC is operating.

While the CDC concept developed out of grassroots community organizing by nongovernment organizations, the model has been borrowed by government: the Harlem CDC, for example, is a government agency established by the New York state government as an urban regeneration entity promoting economic development.[72]

Comprehensive community initiatives (CCIs) developed in the late 1980s and early 1990s. They differed from earlier urban revitalization efforts by their holistic approach to neighborhood change and a commitment to building 'intangibles' such as community and social capital.[73] In addition, authority and responsibility for the Initiative rest with the stakeholders in the neighborhood or community rather than a government agency. The Initiatives are coalitions of stakeholders, including CDCs, other NGOs, government agencies, private philanthropic bodies and private firms. Most of them were set up and are largely financed by private philanthropic bodies.

Evaluating partnerships with 'communities'

Where there is a range of interests mobilized, we might distinguish them by how inclusive or exclusive they are in terms of involvement or engagement of different interests ('horizontally') and in terms of degree of participation within the coalition ('vertically').

In some of the European partnerships around social inclusion reviewed by Michael Geddes, the partnerships were corporatist-type collaboration between capital, labor, and the state, rather than coalitions between local actors and interests.[74] Most of the partnerships he studied had limited involvement by marginalized communities. In Ireland, which had developed an extensive network of about 280 local partnerships as promoters of social inclusion from the mid 1980s, the nonprofit nongovernment services sector was represented in over half of the 86 partnerships he studied and local community organizations and interests were represented in about half of the 86 partnerships studied.[75]

In terms of influence, etc., within the partnerships, there was a risk of *partnership from above*. Geddes's research identified a 'ladder' of involvement, with the government sector being most strongly and frequently involved, and with less universal involvement of the 'social partners', the NGO services sector, and grassroots community organizations.[76] He concluded that some of the partnership studied were partnerships 'on behalf of' rather than *with* the excluded groups.[77]

Flo Frank and Anne Smith go so far as to define such relationships as not being partnerships at all.[78] They say a 'true' partnership does not exist where:
  ➢ There is simply a gathering of people who want to do things.
  ➢ There is an appearance of common ground but actually many agendas exist.
  ➢ There is tokenism, or the partnership was established just for appearances.
  ➢ One person has all the power and/or drives the process.
  ➢ There is no sharing of risk, responsibility, accountability, and benefits.

Louise Kjaer said as much: a partnership between government, business and nongovernment organizations can only be 'truly successful' once all parties are equally positioned to play an active part in the partnership.[79] In a study of 6 social partnerships in Europe, Kjaer found that the NGOs and informal networks were the weakest link.[80]

In Australia, the Commonwealth governments 'community–business partnership' scheme (promoting partnerships between businesses and NGOs) identifies some basic elements that are common to all 'good' partnerships:[81]
  ➢ Both partners should make roughly equal contributions, and receive equal benefits.
  ➢ Both partners should have some shared values and objectives and have a shared respect for one another.
  ➢ Both partners should take the opportunity of learning from each other and of benefiting from the sharing of ability, expertise, time and resources.

Not surprisingly, some analysts question whether it is possible for a public-private partnership between a community group based on network principles on the one hand, and a bureaucratic organization on the other, to successfully move to a power-sharing and empowerment approach.[82]

The barriers to effective participation of people from stressed communities in partnerships with government and business include:[83]
- ➢ relative lack of capacity and resources
- ➢ low levels of interest and risk of activist burn-out
- ➢ worries about community 'representativeness'
- ➢ need for long-term commitment
- ➢ differences in organizational cultures (different modes of working and behavioural expectations)

Michael Geddes identified 3 conditions for local partnerships around social inclusion to be able to engage with people experiencing social exclusion. Those were:[84]
- ▪ There needs to be an active network of NGO services agencies and grassroots community groups.
- ▪ There need to be resources available for capacity-building for grassroots community groups.
- ▪ NGO services agencies and grassroots community groups need to:
  - o be more open about their own conduct and implement democratic procedures for their conduct, and
  - o enhance their representative base,

  if they are to sustain their claims to speak and act on behalf of their members or constituencies in partnership contexts.

A study of 27 regeneration partnerships in England, Scotland and Wales reached a similar conclusion on capacity-building for 'communities'.[85] It recommended that regeneration programs should:
- o budget for community capacity-building from the start;
- o ensure that project partners understand the need for community development; and
- o measure success in terms of community confidence and skills and residents' views of what has been achieved.

It commented that: 'The best approaches integrate short-term participation exercises with improvements in local democracy, such as the advent of area forums in a number of local authorities.'

A review of the Scottish Social Inclusion Partnerships identified the following lessons for effective participation in partnership structures:[86]
- ➢ Partnerships should be clear on what constitutes the local community and should seek to be as inclusive as possible.
- ➢ Partnerships should map out and build on existing community activity.
- ➢ Partnerships should clearly articulate the role expected of the community at the outset.
- ➢ Structures should remain transparent and open to increasing participation over the lifetime of the partnership.
- ➢ Partnerships should consult a wide spectrum of views, including excluded groups, and pursue participation at different levels simultaneously.

- ➢ Community participation requires supporting infrastructure and resources.
- ➢ Measures of success should be built into monitoring and evaluation frameworks relating to community capacity-building, confidence building, skills development and training.

In short, partnerships with people from stressed neighborhoods need to have transparent and accountable processes, and to also include specific elements that build on the community's own assets and enhance that capacity.

<div style="border:1px solid black; background-color:#ffff99; padding:10px;">

VicHealth has developed a 'partnership analysis tool' that makes the purpose, nature and evaluation of a partnership transparent.[87] (See page 19.) The tool has 3 components:
• a joint/collective assessment of the purpose of the partnership, at the beginning of a partnership-based project;
• a joint/collective mapping of the nature of the partnership: this includes mapping proposed networking, coordinating, cooperating, and collaborating (not all of these features would be relevant to all cases); and
• feedback on the current status of the partnership and suggestions for areas that need further work.

</div>

Estate regeneration

If partnerships are coalitions of equals, and of the willing not the coerced, what are some of the specific issues affecting the capacity of public housing tenants to participate in estate regeneration as partners, not as consumers (or victims)?[88]

Residents' relation to estate regeneration might already be problematic because of the nature, content and process of the regeneration activity. A *regeneration* or *renewal* (the terms seem to be interchangeable) scheme on a stressed estate, which involves social programs, physical works like housing reconfiguration/refurbishment, and environmental improvements, is of a different order than a *redevelopment*, i.e. an intervention that involves demolitions and new construction, accompanied by partial or total, or temporary or permanent, dislocation and/or relocation of residents.[89] For example, the redevelopment of the Kensington estate in Melbourne will see a reduction of public housing residents on the estate from 1,800 to 800[90], and the proposed redevelopment at Bonnyrigg in southwestern Sydney might see a reduction in number of social housing dwellings on the estate from 828 to 600 over a 10-year redevelopment period.[91]

Shelter NSW has suggested that the form and extent of community engagement should vary according to the nature of the regeneration activity.[92] It is clear from the regeneration partnerships literature that the nature of the regeneration activity presents different challenges for community-based partnerships for estate regeneration. As Bill Randolph has diplomatically noted, dispersing a community at the same time as trying to strengthen it *in place* through measures to build social inclusion and cohesion are potentially contradictory.[93]

PPP-based redevelopment projects have been pioneered in Adelaide and in Kensington in Melbourne. These redevelopments have seen a deconcentration of public housing (which might be a worthwhile objective where a high concentration of public housing is associated with chronic social disfunction, but the interest of this paper is the implications in terms of loss of residents who might be stakeholders of a local partnership). What are the power imbalances in a local partnership where one of the results of the partnership venture is a removal of some people from the partnership site? Is the existing community of residents – warts and all – able to make an 'equal' contribution? An obvious difference between residents and other regeneration partners, like government and private developers, is that residents do not bring money or physical assets to the partnership. PPP-based regeneration projects are commercial ventures to which the residents are not a direct party. Kathy Arthurson comments:

> … attempts by housing authorities to involve residents in regeneration are made more difficult in the newly emerging public and private sector partnership approaches to regeneration, as exemplified by The Parks. Commercial in confidence and other clauses necessitated by private sector partnerships increase the complexity of meeting the commitment for facilitating resident involvement.[94]

Marilyn Taylor, commenting on the contribution of residents to regeneration projects in England, noted that the equity that residents bring in has a negative value: '… they are the "problem" that needs to be solved, the deficit that needs to be reversed'.[95] But there is more involved in regenerating a stressed neighborhood than pouring in finance capital. Residents have two assets they can bring to the regeneration partnerships:[96]

- knowledge capital; and
- social capital.

Residents have the local knowledge of what will work and what will not. It is not necessarily they who have a skills deficit, but rather, the government and business promoters of regeneration, in this regard.

Residents already have networked informal relations and survival strategies, of one-to-one aid, etc., that can provide a basis for collective action and problem-solving (though residents might not participate in formal community groups).[97]

These 2 asset sets cannot be dollar-valued, but they are critical contributions to achieving regeneration outcomes.

Attachment

Checklist for partnership in health promotion

This checklist is a tool for members of a project partnership to assess the state of the partnership. Members rate their level of agreement with each of the statements on a scale of 0 to 5.

	Rating				
	0 Strongly disagree	1 Disagree	2 Not sure	3 Agree	4 Strongly agree
1. Determining the need for the partnership					
There is a perceived need for the partnership in terms of areas of common interest and complementary capacity.					
There is a clear goal for the partnership.					
There is a shared understanding of, and commitment to, this goal among all potential partners.					
The partners are willing to share some of their ideas, resources, influence and power to fulfil the goal.					
The perceived benefits of the partnership outweigh the perceived costs.					TOTAL
TOTAL					

2. Choosing partners					
The partners share common ideologies, interests and approaches.					
The partners see their core business as partially interdependent.					
There is a history of good relations between the partners.					
The coalition brings added prestige to the partners individually as well as collectively.					
There is enough variety among members to have a comprehensive understanding of the issues being addressed.					TOTAL
TOTAL					

3. Making sure partnerships work					
The managers in each organisation support the partnership.					
Partners have the necessary skills for collaborative action.					
There are strategies to enhance the skills of the partnership through increasing the membership or workforce development.					
The roles, responsibilities and expectations of partners are clearly defined and understood by all other partners.					
The administrative, communication and decision-making structure of the partnership is as simple as possible.					TOTAL
TOTAL					

4. Planning collaborative action					
All partners are involved in planning and setting priorities for collaborative action.					
Partners have the task of communicating and promoting the coalition in their own organisations.					
Some staff have roles that cross the traditional boundaries that exist between agencies in the partnership.					
The lines of communication, roles and expectations of partners are clear.					
There is a participatory decision-making system that is accountable, responsive and inclusive.					TOTAL
TOTAL					

	0 Strongly disagree	1 Disagree	2 Not sure	3 Agree	4 Strongly agree	
5. Implementing collaborative action						
Processes that are common across agencies such as referral protocols, service standards, data collection and reporting mechanisms have been standardised.						
There is an investment in the partnership of time, personnel, materials or facilities.						
Collaborative action by staff and reciprocity between agencies is rewarded by management.						
The action is adding value (rather than duplicating services) for the community, clients or the agencies involved in the partnership.						
There are regular opportunities for informal and voluntary contact between staff from the different agencies and other members of the partnership.						TOTAL
TOTAL						

	0	1	2	3	4	
6. Minimising the barriers to partnerships						
Differences in organisational priorities, goals and tasks have been addressed.						
There is a core group of skilled and committed (in terms of the partnership) staff that has continued over the life of the partnership.						
There are formal structures for sharing information and resolving demarcation disputes.						
There are informal ways of achieving this.						
There are strategies to ensure alternative views are expressed within the partnership.						TOTAL
TOTAL						

	0	1	2	3	4	
7. Reflecting on and continuing the partnership						
There are processes for recognising and celebrating collective achievements and/or individual contributions.						
The partnership can demonstrate or document the outcomes of its collective work.						
There is a clear need and commitment to continuing the collaboration in the medium term.						
There are resources available from either internal or external sources to continue the partnership.						
There is a way of reviewing the range of partners and bringing in new members or removing some.						TOTAL
TOTAL						

Aggregate Score

						TOTAL
Determining the need for a partnership						
Choosing partners						
Making sure partnerships work						
Planning collaborative action						
Implementing collaborative action						
Minimising the barriers to partnerships						
Reflecting on and continuing the partnership						
TOTAL						

Checklist Score

0–49	The whole idea of a partnership should be rigorously questioned.
50–91	The partnership is moving in the right direction but it will need more attention if it is going to be really successful.
92–140	A partnership based on genuine collaboration has been established. The challenge is to maintain its impetus and build on the current success.

Source: John McLeod, *The partnerships analysis tool for partners in health promotion*, Victorian Health Promotion Foundation, Carlton South, n.d. (c.2005).

Glossary

additionality – the extent to which an output is generated on a larger scale, or earlier, or to a higher quality, or within a geographical area of policy concern, or takes place at all, as a result of a partnership

arms-length management organization (ALMO) – a body set up by a government to deliver some of the government's services, having a relative autonomy from the central decision-making body of government in its operational and often strategic management matters

brownfield – a development site in an established urban area

chimera – a fabrication of the mind; an imaginary monster made up of incongruous parts

civil society – those practices, discourses and institutions in a society that are not part of the state (legislature/parliament, executive/government sector, judiciary) where individuals do things as private persons alone or with others (e.g. sporting clubs); the term is often taken to refer only to the non-economic activities of individuals and groups (and so excludes businesses, business/employer associations, and trade unions) and in this sense it has been appropriated by nongovernment nonprofit lobby and welfare organizations especially in the overseas aid/development field: the term 'civil society organization' used in the overseas aid/development industry and certain international institutions is similar to the terms 'community sector' and 'third sector' used in Australia. However, some organizations such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development regard business and trade union organizations as 'civil society organizations'. The concept does not have a direct connection with the concept of 'civility' understood as polite behavior.

community-based partnerships – partnerships that take place in a community, have community members involved, have a direct impact on a community, and are formed for a community cause; they include government-business partnerships (in which community organizations are not a direct member) that take place in and impact on a community.

community engagement – a 3-path process of giving information to people directly affected by a proponent's action or project; consulting those people about the merit, feasibility or impacts of a project; and seeking participation by those people in the decision of whether to take the action and/or in the implementation of the decision; also called citizen engagement where the focus is on individuals, rather than on groups of individuals with some identifiable bond

community capacity-building – activities that strengthen the ability of people in communities to develop their own skills, networks, and organizations so that they are more able to engage in consultation and community planning; manage projects, services and social enterprises; and engage in partnerships

corporatism – a mode of behavior by the state that enmeshes business organizations, trade unions, and other sectoral bodies into its workings through consultative and regulatory mechanisms, thus coopting their leaderships and inhibiting their ability to resist state power

governance – a mode of government of a society or organization that acknowledges multiple sites of decisionmaking

governmentality – a mode of power where people outside formal government produce and reproduce their own status of being governed and regulated

hegemony – predominant influence of one individual or agency over another, affected by cultural relations as much as by physical force (or the threat or risk of physical force)

information asymmetry – that situation where different people in a bargaining situation (whether a meeting or in a shop) have different amounts and degrees of information about

the choices (whether a policy decision or the value-for-money of a refrigerator); in general, suppliers/providers have more and better information about a product than a consumer

joined-up – jointly-managed and integrated (services)

jurisdiction – the territory over which (usually, governmental) authority is exercised

legitimacy – a situation where something is acknowledged as genuine, based on law or tradition

NDPB – non-departmental public body; statutory authorities; see *qango*

NGO – nongovernment organization, understood as a nonprofit organization even if the nonprofit organization is run as a business

NPO – nonprofit organization, a nongovernment organization that does not distribute any profits/surplus from its activities to its individual shareholders or members; it includes *social enterprises*

parapublic agency – an arms-length agency established by government for a particular public purpose, which is not a general government agency and can be established as a statutory authority or incorporated as a company; see *qango*

partnership – a relationship where two or more parties form an agreement to do something together for their mutual benefit, especially if the benefit is something they would not get if acting alone

principal–agent problem – the situation where the interests of an agent (e.g. a contractor, an employee) might vary from those of the principal (e.g. contracting body, employer) and the principal has difficulties in aligning the interests because of imperfect information

public–private partnership – a project in which there is joint and interdependent government sector and private sector participation

qango – quasi-autonomous national government organization; an English term for an arms-length management body established by government for a particular function; similar to a 'statutory commission' in Australia; see *parapublic agency*

redevelopment – programs to improve the physical conditions of and the quality of life of residents in stressed neighborhoods through improvements in the housing stock and the amenity of the area, typically involving demolition of inappropriate dwelling stock and /or construction of new stock; redevelopment can include the welfare, economic and community-building programs associated with renewal/regeneration, and for this reason some writers use the term in a way not substantially different from regeneration or renewal

regeneration – programs to improve the physical conditions of and the quality of life of residents in stressed neighborhoods through improvements in the housing stock, the amenity of the area, and access to and the delivery of services, usually combined with community engagement and community-building activities; it might or might not involve redevelopment; see *renewal*

renewal – programs to improve the physical conditions of and the quality of life of residents in stressed neighborhoods through improvements in the housing stock, the amenity of the area, and access to and the delivery of services, usually combined with community engagement and community-building activities; it might or might not involve redevelopment; see *regeneration*

representative government – a government that can claim to represent the citizens by reference usually to a process for choosing (and unchoosing) the major decisionmakers; not to be confused with democracy: while democratic government is representative government, all representative government is not democratic (e.g. women, non-propertied adult males, slaves, prisoners, and minors might not be allowed to vote and otherwise participate in decisionmaking forums)

responsible government – a government that is accountable to the citizens

social capital – the resources available to an individual or group that follow from relationships based on mutual acquaintance and trust with other people

social enterprise – a nongovernment business that does not distribute profits/surplus from its trading activities to its shareholders or members and that reinvests any surpluses back into the business, a nonprofit organization which owns the business, or other social causes; see *NPO*

social exclusion – the situation where people do not have access to the goods and services enjoyed by the majority or the norm in a society, e.g. in employment, education, nutrition and health indicators, environmental amenity

social inclusion – the situation where people who otherwise might not have access to the goods and services enjoyed by the majority or the norm in a society are enabled to have that access e.g. to employment, education, good health, environmental quality

social partners – the term used in European Union discourse for the movements and institutions of organized capital and labour, i.e. business/industry organizations and trade unions; not to be confused with *social partnership*

social partnership – a partnership between state, business, and nongovernment organizations for a social purpose/outcome; a cause-based partnership; not to be confused with *social partners*; see also *community-based partnership*

stressed urban areas – areas in cities and towns characterized by poor-quality physical conditions (both neighborhood amenity and building conditions) and poor quality socioeconomic circumstances (multiple indicators of social exclusion); sometimes called distressed urban areas, or deprived urban areas

subsidiarity – the principle that a lower or local authority has a degree of independence from a higher or central authority, based on the sharing of powers between several levels of authority

urban regeneration company – a government agency setup as a nonprofit company (to avoid normal bureaucratic constraints of government sector agencies and to allow for private sector representation/expertise on its managing board) with a brief to undertake urban regeneration activities

wicked problem – a social or economic problem that is endemic and has multiple causes

Endnotes

[1] Much of the policy discussion on regeneration, social inclusion, community engagement, and community-based partnerships also applies to human settlements in rural areas.

[2] Kathy Arthurson and Keith Jacobs, *Housing and social exclusion*, final report, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne, 2003.

[3] Stewart R Clegg and Cynthia Hardy, 'Organizations, organization and organizing', in Stewart R Clegg, Cynthia Hardy and Walton R Nord, eds, *Handbook of organization studies*, Sage Publications, London, 1996, pp.1-28.

[4] George H Frederickson, 'Comparing the reinventing government movement with the new public administration', *Public Administration Review*, vol.56, no.3, May/June, 1996, pp.263-269. Frederickson's comments are based on observations of changes in the USA, but they are also pertinent for Australia (allowing for catch-up).

[5] Karen M Hult and Charles Walcott, *Governing public organizations: politics, structures, and institutional design,* Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, Pacific Grove CA, 1990, p.36.

[6] R K Geiger and J R Wolch 1986, 'A shadow state? Voluntarism in metropolitan Los Angeles', *Environment and Planning D*, vol.4, no.3, 1986, pp.351-366; M J Warrington, 'Welfare pluralism or shadow state? The provision of social housing in the 1990s', *Environment and Planning A*, vol.27, no.9, 1995, pp.1341–1360.

[7] Peter Malpass and David Mullins, 'Re-conceptualising voluntary housing: the implications of local housing authority stock transfer', paper for the HAS Conference, University of Cardiff, 4-5 September, 2001; Peter Malpass, 'The restructuring of social rented housing in Britain: demunicipalization and the rise of "registered social landlords"', *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 2001, vol.1, no.1, pp.1-16.

[8] NSW Government, *Working with government: guidelines for privately financed projects*, Sydney, November 2001, p.55.

[9] John Pierce and Ian Little, *Private provision of public infrastructure and services*, Office of Financial Management Research and Information Paper TRP02-3, NSW Treasury, April 2003, p.4.

[10] Flo Frank and Anne Smith, *The partnership handbook*, Human Resources Development Canada, Hull QC, 2000, online at <www.hrsdc.gc.ca/en/epb/sid/cia/partnership/handbook.shtml>, viewed 13 January 2006. Whether a partnership project produces more than the outputs and impacts of uncoordinated or noncollaborative actions of relevant actors is a test of its value. A report from a European conference on local partnerships commented: 'There is considerable difficulty in disentangling what the partnership produces, as opposed to what some of the programs and projects of agencies participating in the partnership produce.' (Maureen Conway, *Partnerships, participation, investment, innovation: meeting the challenge of distressed urban areas – Dublin, 17-19 June 1998 conference report*, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Dublin, 1999, p.13; republished as Maureen Conway and Josef Konvitz, 'Meeting the challenge of distressed urban areas', *Urban Studies*, vol.37, no.4, 2000).

[11] This term is used in Mark Considine, 'Partnerships and collaborative advantage: some reflections on new forms of network governance', Centre for Public Policy, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, December 2005, online at <www.public-policy.unimelb.edu.au/conference06/Considine_Background_Paper.pdf>, viewed 24 December 2005.

[12] Kerry Brown, Sharon Gyde, Adele Renwick and Karyn Walsh, 'Government-community partnerships: rhetoric or reality?', *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, vol.9, no.2, 2003, p.54.

[13] Respondents in a small Queensland survey of stakeholders in provision of affordable housing reported that the main barrier to entering a partnership was an expectation of a *worse* outcome than acting *independently* (C Susilawati, L Armitage and M Skitmore, 'Barriers to expanding partnerships for affordable rental housing investment', paper to Pacific Rim Real Estate Society conference, 2005, p.8).

[14] Marilyn Taylor, 'Communities in the lead: power, organisational capacity and social capital', *Urban Studies*, vol.37, no.5-6, 2000, p.1022.

[15] Based on K Brown and R Keast, 'Citizen-government engagement: community connection through networked arrangements', *Asian Journal of Public Administration*, vol.25, no.1, 2003, pp.107-131.

[16] The use of the term in its current sense is 1st attributed to René Lenoir, a minister in a conservative government in France, in 1974.

[17] Michael Geddes, *Local partnership: a successful strategy for social cohesion?*, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Dublin, 1998, p.19.

[18] Geddes, p.19.

[19] The local partnership model is a reflection of a trend in public policy management to focus on 'place', a focus which can divert attention from wider societal processes that affect excluded people wherever they live. See Paul Chatterton and David Bradley 2000, 'Bringing Britain together? The limitations of area-based regeneration policies in addressing deprivation', *Local Economy*, vol.15, no.2, July, 2000, pp.98-111; Neil Brenner, *New state spaces: urban governance and the rescaling of statehood*, Oxford University Press, Oxford OXF, 2004, pp.272-274.

[20] The involvement of businesspeople is a means of bringing market disciplines to the joint venture.

[21] Geddes, p.22.

[22] Geddes, p.15.

[23] Brenner, p.269.

[24] Glen Searle, 'The Redfern-Waterloo Authority: Sydney's continuing use of development corporations as a primary mode of urban governance', paper to the 2nd State of Australian Cities conference, Brisbane, 30 November – 2 December 2005.

[25] See, for example, the 'classic' polemical piece on this matter in Australian sociology, Lois Bryson and Martin Mowbray, 'Community: the spray-on solution', *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, vol.16, 1981, pp.244-256.

[26] Tim Reddel and Geoff Woolcock, 'From consultation to participatory governance? A critical review of citizen engagement strategies in Queensland', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol.63, no.3, September 2004, p.82.

[27] The term 'civil society organization' is sometimes used, but usually by NGOs walking the corridors of international institutional politics, and, as with the term 'community sector', any claim by some NGOs to represent all of civil society (a contested and contingent phenomenon anyway) is presumptuous and substitutionist.

[28] Frank and Smith, p.73.

[29] Jane Nelson and Simon Zadek, *Partnership alchemy: new social partnerships in Europe,* Copenhagen Centre, Copenhagen, 2000, p.14.

[30] Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 'English Partnership's main responsibilities and functions', online at <www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_urbanpartnerships.asp>, viewed 11 February 2004.

[31] English Partnerships, 'Housing', online at <www.englishpartnerships.co.uk>, viewed 11 February 2004; English Partnerships, 'A guide to the Housing Partnership', London, n.d.

[32] The Single Regeneration Budget program was merged into a funding program for regional development agencies in 2002-03. Note that this program (the SRB) was an initiative of a Conservative government; the Labor government extended themes, like partnership and regionalism, from programs that had preceded it (Kevin Morgan, 'The new regeneration narrative: local development in the multi-level polity', *Local Economy*, vol.17, no.3, 2002; Charlie Johnstone, Chris McWilliams and Gerry Mooney, 'Urban social policy in the new Scotland: a new beginning or "old hat"?', paper to Regional Studies Association international conference, 'Reinventing regions in the global economy', Pisa, 12-13 April 2003).

[33] Joyce Liddle, 'RDAs, sub-regional partnerships and local regeneration', *Local Economy*, vol.16, no.4, November 2001, pp.312-323.

[34] Liddle (p.320) comments that the criteria for representation seems to be ability to contribute resources to the objectives of the regional economic development strategy, rather than on constituent representation.

[35] English Partnerships, 'Housing action trusts', online at <www.englishpartnerhips.co.uk>, viewed 12 March 2004.

[36] See Castle Vale Housing Action Trust, 'About Castle Vale HAT', online at <www.cvhat.org.uk/about.html., viewed 3 March 2004.

[37] English Partnerships, 'Innovate, implement, inspire', English Partnerships, London, n.d. (November 2002); English Partnerships, 'Urban regeneration companies: regenerating our cities and urban communities', London, n.d.; English Partnerships, 'Urban regeneration companies: coming of age', London, n.d.; Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, *Urban regeneration companies policy stocktake: final report – May 2004*, London, 2004. And see <www.urcs-online.co.uk>, the website maintained for urban regeneration companies by English Partnerships.

[38] Cabinet Office, *A new commitment to neighbourhood renewal: national strategy action plan*, report by the Social Exclusion Unit, London, January 2001.

[39] Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 'Neighborhood Renewal Fund', Neighborhood Renewal Unit, online at <www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/nrfund.asp>, viewed 3 March 2004.

[40] Cabinet Office, p.45; Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 'Local strategic partnerships', Neighborhood Renewal Unit, online at <www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/partnerships.asp>, viewed 3 March 2004; Audit Commission for Local Authorities and the National Health Service in England and Wales, *Policy focus: neighbourhood renewal*, London, 2002.

[41] Mike Geddes, 'Limits to local governance: recent experience in the UK', paper presented to seminar, Centre for Public Policy, University of Melbourne, 19 September 2003, pp.6-7.

[42] Geddes, 'Limits to local governance', p.14.

[43] Geddes, 'Limits to local governance', p.9.

[44] Geddes, 'Limits to local governance', p.14.

[45] Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, *Making connections: an evaluation of the Community Participation Programmes*, Neighbourhood Renewal Unit, Research Report 15, March 2005, p.4.

[46] Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 'Community Empowerment Networks', Neighborhood Renewal Unit, online at <www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/cnetworks.asp>, viewed 3 March 2004.

[47] A number of commentators have observed that regeneration programs come and go with new names and targeting the same stressed neighborhoods with little to show. See John Diamond, 'Managing change or coping with conflict? Mapping the experience of a local regeneration partnership', *Local Economy*, vol.16, no.4, November, 2001, pp.272-285.

[48] Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, *Making connections*, p.36.

[49] The central government at the time was the British government, Scotland not having regained (limited) autonomy over (some) internal affairs until 1999.

[50] Greg Lloyd, John McCarthy and Keith Fernie, 'From cause to effect? A new agenda for urban regeneration in Scotland', *Local Economy*, vol.16, no.3, September 2001, pp.221-235.

[51] Roger Tarling, Andy Hirst, Ben Rowland, John Rhodes and Peter Tyler, 'An evaluation of the New Life for Urban Scotland Initiative', *Development Department Research Programme Research Findings* no.70, Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, Edinburgh, 1999, online at <www.scotland.gov.uk/cru/resfinds/drf70-00.htm>, viewed 10 February 2004.

[52] Tarling, Hirst, Rowland, Rhodes and Tyler. And see Andrew McArthur, Annette Hastings and Alan McGregor, 'An evaluation of community involvement in the Whitfield Partnership', *Environment Research Programme Research Findings* no.2, Scottish Office Central Research Unit, Edinburgh, 1994, online at <www.scotland.gov.uk/cru/resfinds/drf02-00.htm>, viewed 10 February 2004; and William Roe Associates, 'An evaluation of community involvement in the Ferguslie Park Partnership', *Environment Research Programme Research Findings* no.3, Scottish Office Central Research Unit, 1994, online at <www.scotland.gov.uk/cru/resfinds/drf03-00.htm>, viewed 10 February 2004.

[53] England and Scotland shared a common domestic government until 1999, and the social inclusion focus followed the election of a Labor government in Britain in 1997. Scotland has had a Labor–Liberal Democrat coalition government since 1999. Some commentators have suggested that despite the change from Conservative to Labor (and Labor–Liberal Democrat) governments in Scotland, there has been a continuity in their focus on the private market and neoliberal social and economic programs (Johnstone, McWilliams and Mooney; Chris McWilliams, 'Including the community in local regeneration? The case of Greater Pollok Social Inclusion Partnership', *Local Economy*, vol.19, no.3, August 2004, pp.264-275).

[54] University of Dundee, 'Social inclusion for urban regeneration in Scotland', Geddes Centre for Planning Research, University of Dundee, December 1998.

[55] Michael Chapman, Karryn Kirk, Michael Carley and Alison Brown, 'Community participation in social inclusion partnerships', *Development Department Research Programme Research Findings*, no.117, Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, Edinburgh, 2001.

[56] Cambridge Economic Associates, *National evaluation of the former regeneration programmes,* Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, Edinburgh, 2001, p.36.

[57] McWilliams, p.274.

[58] Robina Goodlad, 'Social exclusion, regeneration and citizen participation', UFP issues paper 1, Urban Frontiers Program, University of Western Sydney, December 1999, p.5.

[59] Scottish Executive, 'Better communities in Scotland: closing the gap – the Scottish Executive's community regeneration statement', Edinburgh, June 2002; Keith Fernie and John McCarthy, 'Partnership and community involvement: institutional morphing in Dundee', *Local Economy*, vol.16, no.4, November, 2001, pp.299-311.

[60] City of Edinburgh Council and Capital City Partnership, 'The Edinburgh Partnership: Edinburgh's regeneration outcomes agreement 2005-8', c.2004, p.37.

[61] Scottish Executive, *Urban regeneration companies: a consultation paper*, Scottish Executive, Edinburgh, August 2003.

[62] Charles Sabel, *Ireland: local partnerships and social innovation*, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris, 1996.

[63] The website of the network of these 38 local economic development partnerships is <www.planet.ie>.

[64] The tripartite corporatist model dates back to the early 1960s (Jenny Muir, 'The representation of local interests in area-based urban regeneration programmes', paper to the Housing Studies Association conference, University of Bristol, 9-10 September 2003, p.4).

[65] The Northside Partnership established a firm, Speedpak (in short-run, contract packaging and subassembly), to hire and train unemployed people and then 'graduate' them into jobs in other companies (Sabel, pp.59-62). And see <www.northsidepartnership.ie>.

[66] Muir, pp.9-10, 14.

[67] Muir, p.3.

[68] Policy Link, 'Equitable development toolkit: beyond gentrification', online at <www.policylink.org/EquitableDevelopment/>.

[69] Their national peak body is the National Congress for Community Economic Development: see <www.ncced.org>.

[70] Christopher J Walker and Mark Weinheimer 1998, *Community development in the 1990s*, Urban Institute, Washington, 1998; Christopher Walker, Jeremy Gustafson and Chris Snow, *The effect of the National Community Development Initiative on community development systems*, Urban Institute, Washington, 1998; Mark Weinheimer, 'Boosting the capacity of CDCs', *Shelterforce Online*, no.104, March/April 1999, online at <www.nhi.org/online/issues/104/weinheimer.html>, viewed 4 March 2004.

[71] Nancy Nye and Norman J Glickman, 'Working together: building capacity for community development', *Housing Policy Debate*, vol.11, no.1, 2000, pp.163-198. The national peak body for the CDPs is the Community Development Partnership Network: see <www.cdpn.org>.

[72] Harlem CDC, 'About us', 2003, online at <www.harlemcdc.com/aboutus.htm>, viewed 4 March 2004.

[73] Tracey A Rutnik, 'Comprehensive Community Initiatives attract funders, challenge evaluators', *Housing Facts and Findings*, vol.1, no.3, fall 1999, online at <www.fanniemaefoundation.org/programs/hff/v1i3-community.shtml>, viewed 13 January 2006.

[74] Geddes, *Local partnership*, p.24, 30. There is an argument that the new governance-models of government are incarnations of corporatism, rather than the flexible and innovative and inclusive 'anti-government' model the discourses around it imply.

[75] Geddes, *Local partnership*, p.59.

[76] Geddes, *Local partnership*, p.140.

[77] Geddes, *Local partnership*, p.105.

[78] Frank and Smith, p.6.

[79] [79] Louise Kjaer, ed., *Local partnerships in Europe: an action research project*, Copenhagen Centre, Copenhagen, 2003, p.39.

[80] Kjaer, p.39.

[81] Prime Ministers's Community Business Partnership, 'Community business partnerships', 1 January 2006, online at <www.partnerships.gov.au/cbp/cbp.shtml>, viewed 13 January 2006.

[82] Brown, Gyde, Renwick and Walsh, p.54. Brown and others categorize government–NGO sector partnerships as a sub-set of *public–private partnerships*.

[83] Conway, p.15.

[84] Geddes, *Local partnership*, p.151. This list does not use the categories as expressed in Geddes's own words, because of their different meanings outside of a European Union policy context (such as Australia), for the reasons given above.

[85] Michael Carley, Mike Chapman, Annette Hastings, Karryn Kirk and Raymond Young, 'Urban regeneration through partnership: a critical appraisal', May 2000, online at <www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/foundations>, viewed 10 February 2004. This document is a summary of a report, *Urban regeneration through partnership: a study of nine urban regions in England, Scotland and Wales* (Policy Press, 2000).

[86] Chapman, Kirk, Carley and Brown, p.2.

[87] John McLeod, *The partnerships analysis tool for partners in health promotion*, Victorian Health Promotion Foundation, Carlton South, n.d. (c.2005).

[88] Each member of a partnership might not have equal influence but they could reasonable expect to have influence proportional to their contribution to, or stake in, the partnership (Robert Anderson, 'Citizen involvement in partnerships for urban regeneration', conference paper for Innovations in urban governance conference, Oslo, 22-23 April 1999, p.2).

[89] In the redevelopment of the Holland Park estate at Kensington in Melbourne in the early 2000s (and current), about a thousand people were relocated before demolition of walk-up flats in 2000-02. Four in 5 households were able to be relocated within 5 kilometers of Kensington. Four in 10 households would have preferred to have stayed on the estate during redevelopment if that had been offered. However, about 5 in 10 households said they were better off in their new place than when they lived on the estate. Half of the current tenants in the remaining high-rise towers would have liked, in retrospect, the opportunity to move out of their flats during the refurbishment of those towers. (Kath Hulse, Tania Herbert and Karyn Down, 'Kensington estate redevelopment social impact study', Institute for Social Research, Swinburne University of Technology, August 2004, p.xii, xiii)

[90] Hulse, Herbert and Down, p.xii, xiv.

[91] Judith Stubbs, Bill Randolph and Bruce Judd, *The Bonnyrigg Living Communities baseline survey*, CityFutures, Faculty of the Built Environment, University of NSW, July 2005, p.15.

[92] Shelter NSW, 'Consulting residents about regeneration of public housing estates: suggestions for better practice', 1st edn, Shelter NSW, Sydney, November 2003; online at <www.shelternsw.org.au/publications.shtml>.

[93] Bill Randolph, 'Beyond place management: why partnership matters', paper to the National Housing Conference, Homebush Bay, Sydney, 29-30 November 1999, p.16.

[94] Kathy Arthurson, 'Neighbourhood regeneration: facilitating community involvement', *Urban Policy and Research*, vol.21, no.4, December 2003, p.369. The Parks is a 500-hectare estate in northern Adelaide, which had 60% public housing; regeneration began in February 1999, managed by a private sector property developer on behalf of the South Australian government.

[95] Taylor, p.1025.

[96] Taylor, pp.1026-1028.

[97] Colin C Williams, 'Developing community participation in deprived neighbourhoods: a critical evaluation of the third-sector approach', *Space and Polity*, vo.7, no.1, 2003, pp.65-73. And see Martin Mowbray, 'Beyond community capacity building: the effect of government on social capital', Observatory PASCAL Hot Topics paper, December 2004, online at <www.obs-pascal.com/resources/mowbray2004.pdf>, viewed 13 January 2006.