



# Members of the Regeneration and Economy Improvement Committee

---

## Membership of the Regeneration and Economy Improvement Committee

<b>Conservative</b>	<b>Labour</b>	<b>Liberal Democrat</b>	<b>Green</b>
Greaves	Slater (Chair)	Briggs	Hawarun Hussain
McCabe	Ikram		

Alternates – Supplementary list of members, entitled to attend a particular meeting in place of the appointed member

<b>Conservative</b>	<b>Labour</b>	<b>Liberal Democrat</b>	<b>Green</b>
Binney	Shabir Hussain	Middleton	Ford
Hill	Khadim Hussain		

PORTFOLIO HOLDER: Cllr Andrew Mallinson

### CONTACT FOR ENQUIRIES

Caroline Coombes

Acting Performance Co-ordinator

Email [caroline.coombes@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:caroline.coombes@bradford.gov.uk)

Tel (01274) 432313

# Contents

---

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
Chair's Foreword	4
Chapter 1 – Introduction	5
Chapter 2 – Summary of Background Information and Evidence	6
Chapter 3 – Conclusions and Recommendations	8
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix 1 – Terms of reference	13
Appendix 2 – Hearings and witnesses	16
Appendix 3 – Log of evidence considered	17

## Chair's Foreword

---

On behalf of the Regeneration and Economy Improvement Committee I am pleased to introduce the report of our scrutiny of the Governance of Area Based Regeneration Schemes.

Bradford District has a long history of area based regeneration. During our investigation we have been pleased to discover many instances of good practice and innovation, in particular when seeking to find ways of involving and engaging communities.

Ensuring that local people are confident in the governance arrangements of regeneration schemes and their successor arrangements in the area in which they live is vital, and key to this is the need to maintain transparency and accountability. We have made seven recommendations for action by the Council which we believe will make a significant contribution to securing this. Our final recommendation is that a conference be held, organised in conjunction with our partners, to disseminate our findings and share the learning that has taken place during our investigation and I am looking forward to playing an active part in that event.

Finally, I would like to thank council officers, elected members and representatives from external organisations who have enthusiastically supported our work.

Cllr Val Slater  
Chair, Regeneration and Economy Improvement Committee  
July 2006

## Chapter 1 – Introduction

---

1. This scrutiny has been carried out in accordance with the arrangements detailed in paragraph 2, Part 3E of the Constitution of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
2. Following a resolution of Council made on 6 December 2005, the Committee agreed Terms of Reference (**Appendix 1**) at its meeting on 13 December 2005. The aims and objectives of the scrutiny were:
  - (1) To identify good practice models for the governance of area based regeneration schemes and successor arrangements to area based regeneration schemes;
  - (2) To identify the best ways of ensuring community confidence in the governance of regeneration schemes and successor arrangements;
  - (3) To identify the best ways of ensuring that the community is effectively involved in the governance of regeneration schemes and successor arrangements;
  - (4) To recommend models for the governance of area based regeneration schemes that will provide efficient and effective governance and maintain transparency and accountability.
3. On 31 January 2005 the Committee held a seminar to prepare for the scrutiny at which they received presentations providing background and contextual information from Council officers, Bradford Vision and the University of Bradford.<sup>1</sup>
4. During February and March 2006 the Committee held two ‘hearings’ style sessions (13 February 2006 and 6 March 2006) where we took evidence from a number of Council Departments and, among others, Government Office Yorkshire and Humber and Bradford Trident. Cllr Simon Cooke (Portfolio Holder) and Cllr David Ward (Chair of Bradford North Area Committee) also attended. In addition, a written submission was received from Birmingham City Council as they were unable to attend a ‘hearing’ session. **Appendix 2** gives details of the hearings and witnesses and **Appendix 3** is a log of evidence considered.
5. This report presents our findings and conclusions and makes seven recommendations for action by the Council.

---

<sup>1</sup> Copies of the presentations are available on request from [shelly.stephenson@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:shelly.stephenson@bradford.gov.uk)

## Chapter 2 – Summary of Background Information and Evidence

---

### Area Based Regeneration

6. There is an extensive history of area based regeneration activity in Bradford District<sup>2</sup>. Programmes / funding streams have included:
  - Comprehensive Community Programme
  - City Challenge
  - Single Regeneration Budget (SRB)
  - New Deal for Community (NDC)
7. The individual focus of programmes has ranged from improvements to public sector housing stock to seeking to address the needs of young people in a particular area. Organisational structure, governance arrangements and the extent of community involvement required has varied, as has the amount of funding attracted; e.g. £4m in the case of Round 5 SRB, £50m for NDC.
8. For many (but not all) programmes or schemes, the Council has acted as the ‘accountable body’; that is: the legal entity that receives the funds. This means that the Council is responsible for the finances of the programme and for ensuring value for money and financial probity throughout its lifetime. Despite the fact that the nature of Central Government funding for regeneration activity is currently evolving away from an area based to a more ‘theme’ based approach, it is likely that the Council will continue to fulfil this ‘accountable body’ role on into the future.
9. In many cases, once the original life-span of a programme or scheme has come to an end, a forward strategy and the creation of some form of ‘successor’ body or arrangement has been developed. Again, these arrangements have and will continue to be varied in both ambition and structure.
10. A number of issues emerged as being of particular concern during the course of our investigation. These included: the composition and capacity of partnership Boards, the Council’s dual role in partnerships, and community involvement, especially with regard to governance and successor body arrangements<sup>3</sup>.

### Boards

11. Points raised included:
  - Composition of Boards: selection / election, voluntary / paid – how best to achieve a balance of skills and ensure learning and expertise is not lost to the District when programmes end
  - Often pressure is exerted on Boards to get projects off the ground quickly, start spending and achieving outputs
  - Training for Board members needs to be on-going and not a ‘one-off’

---

<sup>2</sup> ‘Community Regeneration in Bradford: Context Document’ produced by the Department of Regeneration and Housing (2006) is available on request to [shelley.stephenson@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:shelley.stephenson@bradford.gov.uk)

<sup>3</sup> See **Appendix 3** - log of evidence. Copies of all evidence considered, including full transcripts and/or summaries of the ‘hearings’ sessions are available on request to [shelley.stephenson@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:shelley.stephenson@bradford.gov.uk)

## **Accountable body and the Council's role in partnerships**

12. Points raised included:

- No clear, definitive definition of the role of the 'accountable body'
- The Council has considerable expertise and capacity in the 'accountable body' role but there is a potential conflict with its other role as a necessary partner in the delivery of regeneration programmes
- Tensions created around responsibilities of 'accountable body' and enabling partnerships by devolving power and supporting innovation and consequently some amount of risk

## **Community involvement**

13. Points raised included:

- Bradford District is considered to be at the forefront of trying new ways of engaging the community (Government Office, Yorkshire & Humber)
- Possible mismatch between Council / accountable body focus on the lifespan of the funding / programme and local peoples' longer-term aspirations
- There will be 'peaks' and 'troughs' of community engagement with a programme throughout its lifespan

## **Governance**

14. Points raised included:

- Need to address how we deal with "inappropriate" behaviour by Boards if it occurs
- Practice elsewhere has included resident Board representative participation in project appraisal panels
- Good governance requires robust systems, but bringing people forward to be part of governance is also important

## **Successor bodies**

15. Points raised included:

- Some concerns about long term accountability – management and maintenance of public assets
- Need to keep going the idea that residents have a say and involvement in services
- Are there possible roles for Area Committees or the Parish Council model?

## Chapter 3 – Conclusions and Recommendations

---

In the course of conducting our investigation, we have found many examples of good practice in area-based regeneration schemes in Bradford District which are outlined in the evidence we collected. This good practice has been recognised by Government Office and others. Our aim in drawing our conclusions and making our recommendations is to build on this and ensure that organisational learning occurs.

Across the District, many individuals and organisations have developed considerable skills and expertise as a result of their involvement in Area based initiatives, PACTs etc. We are concerned that this talent has the potential to be lost.

***Recommendation:***

***That a District-wide ‘pool’ of this Board level expertise be established and maintained, to be accessed by new bodies or initiatives at their inception, and that members of the ‘pool’ be encouraged to participate in national initiatives, such as Guiding Lights<sup>4</sup>***

***Action: Director of Regeneration and Housing***

***Timescale: Ongoing***

### **Community involvement**

The Committee wishes to express its view that, with regard to efforts to secure the engagement and involvement of communities in area-based regeneration and planning that these recommendations are made in the context of this being an area of strength rather than weakness for Bradford District.

We recognise that there are inevitable ‘cycles’ or ‘peaks and troughs’ in the levels of community engagement with, and involvement in, regeneration schemes throughout their lifetimes.

It is evident to the Committee that there is a need for a far greater degree of coherence and clarity in community planning, starting with neighbourhoods and up through various levels of area and district, to regional and national strategies. There is a danger that moves towards further devolution will bring yet more complexity and could in fact make it more difficult for communities to become involved appropriately and effectively.

---

<sup>4</sup> Guiding Lights is .....Available on request to [shelley.stephenson@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:shelley.stephenson@bradford.gov.uk)



**Recommendation;**

***That mechanisms be identified and adequately resourced which ensure that stakeholders, (particularly relevant community groups) receive information, utilising existing networks where possible, clearly setting out the full range and implications of the options and possible models of community governance or involvement currently available to them. This should build on the mechanisms and expertise that already exist both within the whole of the Local Authority and its partners organisations. It should also be recognised that communities may quite legitimately choose not to adopt any of the available options.***

***That partnerships or other bodies formed to provide area-based regeneration schemes be required to have formal and robust community involvement and engagement strategies for the lifetime of the programme.***

***Action: Director of Regeneration and Housing and Director of Policy and Performance***

***Timescale: July 2006***

**‘Accountable Body’ role**

Over a number of years, Bradford MDC has amassed considerable experience and expertise in fulfilling the ‘accountable body’ role. In addition, it is becoming apparent that the Council is likely to continue to be called upon to fulfil this role even as new funding streams and frameworks such as the Local Enterprise Growth Initiative (LEGI) replace more familiar schemes such as SRB.

The Council is, necessarily, a major partner and participant in regeneration and economic development that takes place across the Bradford District; this requires the Local Authority and its staff to provide particular support and functions to support this role. At the same time it also often acts as the ‘accountable body’ for schemes or initiatives, a role that requires an emphasis on carrying out systems audit and ensuring financial probity. In effect, we find that there is a danger that the Council is attempting to ‘be everything for everybody’ and this dual role gives rise to the potential for confusion and difficulty. This is compounded by the fact that there is no clear and widely understood definition of the ‘accountable body’ role.

A number of additional tensions in the role also exist. We acknowledge that the Council must act to put in place and implement procedures that ensure probity and prevent fraud. However, it is also important that innovation be encouraged; and that, in this context, a realistic degree of risk be accepted by the Local Authority.

The Committee also accepts that, inevitably, there will be occasions when it will be necessary for the ‘accountable body’ to intervene in programmes, schemes and projects when problems have been identified or legitimate questions arisen. In these instances, we believe that it is especially important that the ‘accountable body’ learn from recent experiences and be sensitive to the possible consequences of its intervention for individuals and stakeholder groups. The ‘accountable body’ must undertake to communicate in a clear, timely and sensitive manner with all concerned, and appropriate feedback must be provided to communities on the outcomes of any investigations or interventions.

**Recommendation:**

***That the Local Authority's dual roles in regeneration schemes in the District be clearly separated, and, as a matter of some urgency, that a concise and understandable definition of the 'accountable body' role be developed. This must set down expected levels and means of communication with all interested parties and affected communities.***

***Action: Director of Regeneration and Housing and Director of Finance***

***Timescale: July 2006***

## **Boards**

The role of the Board in ensuring the success of area-based regeneration is vital. We believe that Board membership should ideally be diverse and include representatives of the local community and will therefore be formed and operate using a variety of models or approaches. We do not wish to specifically comment on the operational detail of individual boards. However, we also find that Boards must be able to attract and retain members who bring much needed skills, expertise and local knowledge. On occasion, this expertise needs time to develop, and Boards at this stage may wish to access the 'District-wide pool' we have already suggested be developed.

Boards as a whole must also develop partnership working and conflict resolution skills if they are to operate effectively on behalf of communities. While we are aware that training has on occasion been provided to Boards or 'shadow boards' we find that there is scope for more support to be made available and that investment in this could go some considerable way to addressing some of the problems we have heard about.

**Recommendation:**

***That, in addition to 'a District-wide pool' [referred to in paragraph 2], work be carried out, led by the Local Authority, to develop a package of support to be provided to boards or shadow boards of regeneration partnerships, and where appropriate, boards of successor bodies. Consideration should be given to approaches such as mentoring and assisting boards to develop community engagement and communications strategies and conflict resolution skills. The establishment of peer networks should also be considered so that learning and good practice can be shared.***

***Action: Director of Regeneration and Housing and Director of Policy and Performance***

***Timescale: Ongoing***

## **Successor bodies**

We share the concern of communities that the regeneration and improvement of areas must continue once the lifetime of a particular scheme or funding stream has come to an end. It is therefore often the case that there is a need for some form of successor arrangement to be established.

We are aware that the Council, in its 'accountable body' role (whereby it is required to ensure that value for money and probity is achieved in the use of public funds and assets), has developed an 'Organisational Assessment Criteria'. It is the view of the Committee that a number of the criteria and the guidance on potential evidence, as set down in the assessment are inadequately defined and that this has the potential to cause difficulties not only for successor bodies, but also for the 'accountable body'. Indeed, as part of the day to day work of the Committee, we have experienced first-hand some of the problems this lack of clarity has, in part, caused.

The Committee is firmly of the opinion that organisations must be left in no doubt as to the criteria that they are expected to meet and how this should be evidenced. While this process could, in part ensure community confidence in the governance arrangements of successor bodies, it is also important that communities are clear as to what the role and exact nature of successor bodies is. There is also an important role here for the Council to facilitate ongoing community involvement and engagement.

**Recommendation:**

***That immediate steps be taken by the Council to ensure that the 'Organisational Assessment Criteria' be more clearly defined and robust so that it be 'fit for purpose' and able to properly assist the 'accountable body', successor bodies and local communities in establishing confidence in the governance of ongoing regeneration activity in areas.***

***Action: Director of Regeneration and Housing, Director of Policy and Performance and Director of Finance  
Timescale: June 2006***

With regard to models of 'successor arrangements' to area-based regeneration schemes, our opinion is 'keep it simple'. At the current time we remain unconvinced, and in some cases concerned, as to the suitability of some of the options for successor arrangements that have been proposed.

**Recommendation:**

***That the Council, in consultation with its partners, undertake an evaluation and review of models and options for successor arrangements. This should include consideration of best practice from within the District, regionally and nationally. The findings of this work should be referred back to the Regeneration and Economy Improvement Committee, and then be used to inform and assist partnerships and communities.***

***Action: Director of Regeneration and Housing  
Timescale: October 2006***

## **Area Committees**

Although not within the remit of our investigation, issues surrounding the roles and responsibilities of Area Committees have, to some extent inevitably, been raised in the course of our work. While we will not be making a formal recommendation therefore, we would wish to see the Council, and in particular the Department of Regeneration

and Housing together with the Area co-ordinators, consider this matter in some detail (in the light of emerging government policy on devolution) including consideration of any possible role for Area Committees in the governance arrangements for regeneration schemes and successor arrangements.

### **Organisational learning**

Finally we feel that it is important that there is full organisational learning based on the good practice identified and from the work carried out by our scrutiny both for Bradford District and also nationally. We feel that it would be beneficial to launch our findings by way of a conference or seminar on this issue.

***Recommendation:***

***That the Council works with partner organisations, for example Bradford University, to organise a conference to launch the findings of this scrutiny and to share key areas for learning as widely as possible.***

***Action: Director of Policy and Performance and Director of Regeneration and Housing***

***Timescale: July 2006***

# Terms of Reference

---

## Governance of Area Based Regeneration Schemes

### 1. Introduction

A number of area-based regeneration schemes have been implemented within the Bradford district over the past twenty years. These have often been the result of different Government regeneration programmes, including City Challenge, Single Regeneration Budget programmes New Deal for Communities, European funded projects.

Each has had different ways of involving the local community and different governance arrangements, both during the period of grant funding and after funding has expired.

In most cases, the Council has fulfilled the role of “accountable body”.

There is now a wide range of different locality regeneration projects. This study will seek to learn from experience within the district and elsewhere in order to recommend improvements in the governance of area based regeneration projects.

The review may consider all types of area based regeneration schemes regardless of the funding source and which Council department is responsible for their management.

### 2. Background

In addition to the Committee deciding to undertake this exercise, Council approved the following resolution on 6 December 2005:

“This Council believes that;

1. The community should be involved in regeneration.
2. Involving the community has benefit to the social capital of the city as well as the personal development of individuals and communities of interest.
3. This City has some award winning examples of community-led regeneration programmes.
4. That this involvement should be from all sections of the community and that the Council and it’s partners should work hard to develop the capacity within the district to allow everyone to take part in and benefit from regeneration.

This Council is concerned at the recent decision to minimise residents involvement in decision-making in community based regeneration projects and therefore calls upon the Chief Executive and Portfolio Holder to:

1. Re-establish as soon as possible the inclusion of local people in meaningful decision-making in community based regeneration projects such as Regen 2000, whilst ensuring that the programmes deliver the agreed benefits to local people in employment, training, environmental improvements and recreation.

2. Recognise the ongoing work of the Regeneration and [Economy] Improvement Committee in this area and ask that the foregoing issues be considered by the Committee as part of this work including a report advising members on how inclusion of local people is to be achieved.”

### 3. **Aims and objectives of the study**

The primary objectives of the working group are

- To identify good practice models for the governance of area based regeneration schemes and successor arrangements to area based regeneration schemes.
- To identify the best ways of ensuring community confidence in the governance of regeneration schemes and successor arrangement.
- To identify the best ways of ensuring that the community is effectively involved in the governance of regeneration schemes and successor arrangements.
- To recommend models for the governance of area based regeneration schemes that will provide efficient and effective governance and maintain transparency and accountability

In order to achieve these objectives, the working group will:

- Learn from good practice in Bradford and elsewhere
- Take evidence from those involved in area based regeneration in Bradford
- Seek advice independent of the district on the most effective arrangements

### 4. **Interested parties**

An indicative list of interested parties/ key stakeholders is provided below. This list will develop and be further refined as the study progresses:

<b>ORGANISATION / DEPARTMENT</b>	<b>NAME</b>
Department of Regeneration and Housing	Patrick Wiggins, Roz Hall, Tim Whitfield
Legal and Democratic Services	Gerry Danby and appropriate staff
Other Council departments / service areas	Neighbourhood Support Service
Executive Portfolio Holder	Cllr. Simon Cooke

Area Committee	Cllr. Andrew Mallinson (Keighley) Cllr. David Heseltine(Shipley) Cllr. David Ward (Bradford North) Cllr. Michael Johnson (Bradford South) Cllr. Arshad Hussain (Bradford West)
Ward Members	TBC
Area based regeneration schemes	Board Members, Chief Officers
Successor Accountable Bodies	Members
Neighbourhood Forums and other mechanisms of engaging with local communities	
Bradford Vision	

## 5. Timetable

It is intended that the working group will conduct its study between December 2005 and April 2006, report to the Regeneration and Economy Improvement Committee in April 2006. An indicative timetable is detailed below:

DATE	EVENT	COMMENT
13 December 2005	Terms of Reference considered by REIC	
31 January 2006	Context setting meeting	
February	Evidence gathering meeting (1)	Details TBC
February 2006	Evidence gathering meeting (2)	Details TBC
Early March 2006	Working Group Deliberation	Consider evidence Identify main issues Draft recommendations
March 2006	Agree draft report	Circulate for comment
April 2006	Consider draft report at REIC	

This is potentially a very time-consuming project. The Committee will seek to gain all the information necessary to draw conclusions through a context setting meeting, two evidence-gathering meetings and written submissions. This will enable the Committee to meet the challenging target of reporting in April.

## Hearings and Witnesses

---

Monday 13 February, Carlisle Business Centre, Bradford

**Alison Biddulph**, Director, European Directorate, Government Office Yorkshire and Humber, **Tim Whitfield and Krystyna Lyons**, Department of Regeneration and Housing, Bradford Metropolitan District Council, **Steve Hartley**, Chief Executive, Bradford Trident Ltd. , **Michael Buck**, Project Manager, Manningham and Girdlington Youth Partnership.

Monday 6 March, Committee Room 3, City Hall, Bradford

**Cllr Simon Cooke**, Regeneration and Culture Portfolio Holder, Bradford Metropolitan District Council, **David Melling** and **Rachel Edmonds**, Department of Policy and Performance, Bradford Metropolitan District Council, **Tony Dylak**, Chief Executive, Royds Community Association, **Cllr David Ward**, Chair, Bradford North Area Committee, Bradford District Metropolitan District Council.

*Copies of all written and transcript evidence are available on request to [shelley.stephenson@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:shelley.stephenson@bradford.gov.uk).*



## Log of evidence considered

Number	Title	Comments
1	Submission by Birmingham City Council	Prepared by Development Directorate
2	Evidence from Bradford Trident	Provided at hearing on 13 February 2006
3	Governance of Area Based Schemes in Bradford – Government Office Yorkshire and Humber reflections	Presentation at hearing on 13 February 2006
4	Models of Community Participation	Prepared by University of Bradford: presentation at seminar on 31 January 2006
5	Improving Neighbourhoods Through Planning	Prepared by Neighbourhood Support Service and Bradford Vision: provided at seminar on 31 January 2006
6	Locality Planning Framework	As above
7	Parish Council Charter	
8	Regen 2000 Programme: future delivery arrangements	Report to Bradford North Area Committee 17 November 2005
9	Agreement for the continued use of assets at the end of the scheme between CBMDC and Newlands Community Association and Newlands Partnership	
10	Community Regeneration in Bradford Context Document	Prepared by the Department of Regeneration and Housing
11	Click! Sandwell Review: a report of the External Affairs and Partnership Scrutiny Panel	
12	Summaries of transcripts of hearings held on 13 February 2006 and 6 March 2006	