

Bringing 'neighbourhood' centre stage in Wales

Report on a 24-hour event for Welsh local
authorities and their partners

Hosted by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation
and the Welsh Assembly Government,
Wales Millennium Centre, Cardiff Bay

12 July, 2006

Mel Witherden



**JOSEPH ROWNTREE
FOUNDATION**

Event summary prepared by:

Mel Witherden
Wales Facilitator, JRF Neighbourhood Programme
Manager, Community Projects Centre
Pontypool NP4 8AD
01495 769000

mjw@c-p-c.freerve.co.uk
August, 2006

Introduction

The purpose of this event was described as “to consider the strategic role of local authorities in linking the needs and priorities of neighbourhoods to broader agendas such as economic development, service delivery, and the work of democratically elected local representatives”. Ten county and county borough councils were represented, some by their leader or chief executive. The voluntary sector was represented by Wales Council for Voluntary Action and community organisations taking part in the Neighbourhood Programme in Wales. The Welsh Assembly Government and the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) also participated. Lord Richard Best, Director of JRF, chaired the event.

The event included keynote speeches from Assembly Government ministers Edwina Hart and Sue Essex. There were also presentations on engaging communities in regeneration activity from the perspectives of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation’s Neighbourhood Programme (by Mandy Wilson of the programme’s evaluation team), and Wrexham County Borough Council (by Council Leader Aled Roberts) and on the Communities First Programme in Wales (by Dave Adamson of the University of Glamorgan). There were five simultaneous workshops in the afternoon with presentations and discussions on:

- using community strategies to connect policies;
- the implications of the Beecham Review;
- the Welsh Local Government Policy Statement and its impact on neighbourhoods;
- community partnerships and neighbourhood practice;
- community and town councils and neighbourhoods.

To encourage an open debate of the issues the discussion was under ‘Chatham House rules’. The programme and the attendance list are attached.

The neighbourhood agenda in context: an overview

Time to bring neighbourhoods centre stage: Lord Richard Best, Director of the JRF, welcomed delegates and suggested that the timing of the event was fortuitous, falling between the launch of the Beecham Report (*Beyond boundaries: Citizen-centred local services for Wales*) on local government service delivery and the forthcoming Public Sector Leadership Conference. The day’s discussions were about engaging neighbourhoods and communities, and what was known as ‘double devolution’ in England (which might be called ‘triple devolution’ in Wales). The outcomes of the JRF Neighbourhood Programme would have key lessons to contribute.

Change in Wales: Other contributors throughout the day in plenary and workshop sessions highlighted the significance of the ‘neighbourhood agenda’ in the context of evolving Welsh Assembly Government strategies and policies, and forthcoming changes in the governance of Wales. Issues referred to included:

- Welsh Assembly Government's new legislative powers;
- the Welsh Local Government Statement (due in March 2007);
- the Beecham Review (July 2006) and the full policy response (November);
- the Cambridge Policy Consultants' review of the Communities First Programme, Welsh Assembly Government guidance on future funding priorities, and steps to bring additional deprived communities into the programme;
- the potential impact of the Wales Spatial Plan as region-based partnerships are established;
- Assembly elections in May 2007. (Some dates have been updated since the event.)

New roles for communities: There was general agreement among delegates that it is now essential for local communities to be given new roles by central and local government in formulating strategies, decision making and the delivery of services. The difficulty in achieving these objectives was reflected in presentations that described the shortcoming in existing practice and the obstacles still to be overcome (especially by speakers associated with the JRF Neighbourhood Programme). At the same time, and sometimes from the same speakers, there were up-beat accounts of what could be achieved when appropriate strategies and support are in place. It was emphasised that the word 'community' is more widely used and understood in Wales than 'neighbourhood', but in the context of regeneration and tackling deprivation the terms are synonymous.

The importance of 'a sense of place': The themes of challenge and opportunity were also reflected in presentations by two Assembly ministers, Edwina Hart AM, Minister for Social Justice and Regeneration, and Sue Essex AM, Minister for Finance, Local Government and Public Services, who both stressed the importance of communities.

- Edwina Hart described the Communities First Programme as an important and increasingly successful part of the Assembly's work to bring power closer to communities, addressing the needs of deprived areas, and encouraging people to challenge traditional structures.
- Sue Essex suggested that communities give many Welsh people their sense of identity; she agreed that applying the Beecham Report in practice will involve public bodies in working with communities in a much more open way than in the past, but she warned against "doing nice things with small pots of money" when what is really needed is often to create fairness, confidence, opportunities and jobs.

Issues arising: Rather than providing a sequential account of the event, the following description brings together some of the common threads in the wide-ranging topics that were addressed in the presentations, contributions from the floor and the workshop groups. These are:

- the 'implementation gaps' revealed by
 - the conclusions from the Neighbourhood Programme and JRF research;
 - the challenges and barriers faced by the Communities First Programme;
 - other barriers to community engagement;

- positive lessons from experience – drawn from the Neighbourhood Programme and other good practice in Wales;
- the challenge of acting on the Beecham Report proposals;
- new roles for councillors and community and town councils.

The implementation gap 1: JRF research findings

The Neighbourhood Programme: The four-year JRF Neighbourhood Programme was outlined by Lord Best and a member of the programme’s evaluation team, who described a project that:

- involved work with 20 community-based regeneration organisations – 4 in Scotland, 12 in England and 4 in Wales (Caia Park Partnership in Wrexham, Gellideg Foundation Group in Merthyr Tydfil, Llanharan Community Development Project in Rhondda Cynon Taff and Ty Sign and Local Communities Partnership in Risca);
- offered each group modest amounts of grant aid with minimum controls on how it was spent, and guidance and support with a flexible ‘light touch’ approach to help them to achieve their plans;
- offered brokerage and mediation between different local organisations and between local organisations and power holders;
- created the opportunity in return for JRF to learn about the impact of local politics, what can go wrong, and the benefits of supporting the delivery of services at a community level;
- ensuring that groups are able to share their experiences and learn from one another through networking.

Key findings: Mandy Wilson of the Neighbourhood Programme evaluation team showed how failures in the implementation of government policy on neighbourhood renewal, community empowerment and user engagement are obstructing the work of community-based regeneration organisations. The findings, which are based on the Neighbourhood Programme and many other research studies, are reported in the JRF paper *The importance of neighbourhood: Tackling the implementation gap* by Mandy Wilson and Marilyn Taylor.

- Although there are many examples in the best authorities of councillors and officers working effectively with communities, the Neighbourhood Programme shows this is not always the case, and changes in government policy are meaningless to community organisations unless there is also a genuine change in the culture of government at a neighbourhood level.
- The community groups tend to have similar experiences, irrespective of their size and age.
- Three key messages emerge from the research on the status of local communities, the way new initiatives are introduced, and the power gap between community groups and public authorities: these are detailed below. The reported experience of the Communities First partnerships and other comments and examples from delegates throughout the day provided confirmation of these ‘implementation gap’ issues.

Putting neighbourhoods on the map:

- **Defining communities:** There is a need for the definition of community areas to be meaningful to the people who live there – because this is where people experience services and where change can take place. Sue Essex pointed out that different things define and unite local communities in Wales – history, culture, language, employment – and the strengths of bonds vary. But it can be dangerous to ignore them. The example of Aberdeen was quoted where local residents have been encouraged by the council to identify their own neighbourhoods.
- **Integrating communities:** If poorer communities are not properly involved in the production and implementation of wider economic strategies they may not benefit from them, and they could actually be further disadvantaged. It was suggested by Sue Essex that this might have happened in some regeneration schemes in parts of Wales.
- **Spreading the benefits:** Although disadvantaged areas need more financial resources, the Neighbourhood Programme and work by some local authorities show that it is not only deprived communities that benefit from positive approaches to community engagement.

Getting the context right:

- Damage is sometimes done by new initiatives coming in on top of existing projects without considering their impact. Speakers said there was evidence that this happened in some places when the Communities First Programme was introduced.
- New programmes need to be kept simple and given time to work. The Communities First programme was praised for its guaranteed 10-year lifespan, but its confusing and frustrating bureaucracy was described as a burden for community groups.

Closing the power gap by supporting communities: It was argued that JRF research showed the need for a major culture change in the relationship that council officers and councillors have with local communities. Senior officers are sometimes keen to take risks in their work with communities but have difficulty persuading their staff to do the same – with the result that there is an over-dependency on a few individual creative officers for demonstrating good practice. Even large authorities are admitting they don't know how to do it, said the JRF Evaluator. Another speaker referred to the severe frustrations in Communities First partnerships when their plans are constantly referred back and they never seem to make progress because of "institutional inertia among middle managers in local authorities". Suggestions for closing the power gap by improving support to communities include:

- 'community audits' – to understand how residents see things;
- pump-priming 'neighbourhood empowerment grants' to enable people to organise themselves so they can have a voice, perhaps based on the tenancy empowerment grants in England to form tenant management organisations;
- having realistic expectations of communities, for example, by avoiding putting too much pressure on fragile groups before they are ready;
- supporting networking between similar groups in different neighbourhoods;
- providing support to volunteers and less well-resourced groups to help them learn about government policy and how to communicate their views;

- providing more people skilled in mediation and brokerage to bridge the gap between communities and power holders and to ensure that everyone's voice is heard – creating a formal role for this in government.
(Ideas for changes to the roles of councillors and community councils are considered below.)

The implementation gap 2: Communities First

Communities First in context: Speakers and delegates recognised the central role in community engagement, capacity building and community-led regeneration that is being played in Wales by the Communities First Programme. Edwina Hart warned against expecting too much too soon: "After 30 years when people have had no voice it takes a long time for them to go from a whisper to something louder", she said. Even so, concerns were expressed (in particular in a speech by Dave Adamson, one of the original architects of the programme) about the implementation and management of Communities First, and by several delegates about recent announcements from the Welsh Assembly Government about its future.

Concerns about Communities First management: As well as the reported frustrations of Communities First partnerships, the Wales Audit Office had also expressed concerns about:

- serious problems with recruiting and retaining staff;
- failures in addressing training needs;
- a burden of sometimes heavy-handed and complex bureaucracy;
- lack of 'bending' of existing funding streams and mainstreaming;
- poor strategic links to other programmes.

Barriers to delivery: The following issues were criticised as barriers to delivering Communities First effectively:

- a lack of integration among departments of the Welsh Assembly and of local authorities that is at odds with the encouragement for communities to take a strategic overview;
- a 'top-down institutional culture' that leaves communities struggling with experts who try to tell them what to do, rather than work in partnership with them;
- the need for improvements to council services before communities will be prepared or able to work in partnership with their local authorities;
- although there is evidence of good practice in Communities First, organisations in Wales have so far failed to disseminate it effectively.

The new guidance: The Welsh Assembly announcement that from 2008 only capacity building, and not the projects that are generated by that capacity, will be funded through Communities First was a major concern to a number of local authority and community delegates. It was pointed out that capacity in community organisations, once developed, cannot survive in a funding vacuum. There are worries that the policy may lead in some places to capacity building for its own sake, while well-established projects that no longer need this type of help could find their

progress halted and sustainability in doubt. A Wrexham councillor pointed out that youth and social services projects in the county borough were now heavily dependent on Communities First funding, and it would be exceptionally difficult for the council to bridge the gap after 2008.

Other barriers to community engagement

'Devolution blindness' in Westminster: Several speakers and delegates referred to the Assembly's lack of powers (even with the new legislation) to prevent the benefit system from acting as a major obstruction in people's transition from benefit to work. Concerns about changes in the Probation Service were also mentioned by a council representative. Sue Essex indicated that although this had not happened consistently enough in the early days of devolution, the Welsh Assembly Government and the Wales Local Government Association would increasingly be identifying any undesirable impacts of non-devolved policies with their colleagues in England and seeking measures to address them.

Inadequate investment: Speakers highlighted the very low levels of financial investment in the neighbourhood agenda in Wales, where the talk is often about 'programme bending', compared with the many millions of pounds that are spent on regeneration projects in England. Delegates recognised the vulnerability of funding for the Communities First programme and said they needed reassurance from the Assembly in the context of:

- proposals to extend Communities First to cover additional disadvantaged communities with apparently no increase in resources;
- the advice that programme bending should increasingly help to meet the financial needs of partnerships;
- the potentially dangerous knock-on effect for other community regeneration organisations if local authorities divert funding from existing schemes to sustain Communities First partnerships;
- uncertainty about what will happen to the most disadvantaged communities when the 10-year programme comes to an end.

The uneven impact of community strategies: A workshop discussion about the way community strategies are developed by local authorities showed that, although they can be an extremely effective mechanism when used well, they can produce uneven results. The chief executive of a Welsh local authority found some consensus when he suggested that:

- community strategies are part of a hierarchical model that tends to be top-down and involve partnerships at too many levels to be easy to work with;
- there is no formal route through these levels to enable national policies to be implemented at a local level;
- these procedures dissipate the community energy and cause frustration;
- there is little evidence that community strategies have an impact on Welsh Assembly Government strategies.

Achieving amazing things: some lessons from experience

The emerging impact of Communities First: Edwina Hart and Dave Adamson both gave encouraging reports of the improvements that the Communities First programme is already making in many disadvantaged communities – by building confidence and more positive attitudes, providing facilities and diverting young people from anti-social behaviour. This shows that engaging with communities can be successful, although it was too early to see this reflected in deprivation statistics. Edwina Hart said she wanted to learn from the evaluation work that had been carried out, and gave an assurance that the programme would have a lifespan of at least 10 years, as originally promised.

The light touch approach: The enormous impact for community groups of very modest levels of funding and support was cited as the most important outcome of the Neighbourhood Programme, and one that needs to be replicated more widely. With support, “community groups can achieve quite amazing things”, one speaker concluded. The case for small grants with minimal restrictions was also made indirectly by a councillor for a Communities First ward who mentioned a council estate where the environment had been transformed using small grants from the Communities First Trust Fund. He urged the retention of the Fund.

The advantages of community engagement for local authorities: Wrexham Council Leader Aled Roberts showed through a series of examples how his own local authority had benefited from involving residents in setting up and running local services. This experience also demonstrated that there is no single model of neighbourhood regeneration because communities are best placed to decide how it should be done.

- Examples of successful council/community engagement include:
 - a community was able (thanks to earlier community development work) to carry out a consultation exercise for the council when they received only two days notice of a major funding opportunity; this led to grant aid for important new community facilities;
 - the transfer of the freehold of a previously disused leisure centre to community control will enable residents in a severely disadvantaged area to attract investment for a desperately needed new health centre and pharmacy;
 - an attempted press campaign against a project, supported by the council, to renovate an old chapel backfired when residents protested that this was what the community wanted – and they had carried out a consultation exercise to prove it.

Taking the community seriously: There was also a warning against ignoring the local knowledge of community regeneration organisations like the one in Caia Park in Wrexham, which may be able to provide some services more effectively than the council. Isolated council departments, micro-management by cabinet members and a fixation with performance indicators can lead to duplication and inferior services.

Positive use of community strategies and local partnerships: A senior member of the Welsh Local Government Association described an innovative alternative approach to developing a community strategy that avoids the gap between councils and residents in multi-layered partnerships that can be created when councils rather than communities decide what their 'common purpose' is. In his own council area the strategy has been developed interactively on the internet, allowing different communities to identify their own common interests. This can have the benefit of allowing good practice to be shared more easily with neighbouring areas and to become part of the county-wide strategy (as in the case of a fresh food co-op) – although delegates pointed out that communities without ready access to the internet will miss out. Delegates agreed that community strategies could be one of the best procedures for creating integrated community engagement, but only if they are developed properly.

Regeneration through community arts and culture: There were strong pleas from local authority representatives to recognise the value of community arts and culture projects in regeneration work, and agreement that this can have an important role to play as an 'entry point' for community development activities. Examples were referred to in Swansea, Merthyr Tydfil and Wrexham. Heritage projects can also provide a focus for community action and regeneration.

Challenge of the Beecham Review

Introducing the Review: A workshop presenter from the Assembly's Local Service Delivery Secretariat provided an overview of Sir Jeremy Beecham's review of local government service delivery that had been published only two days earlier. The main points arising were:

- The review starts with questions about how to get good quality services across Wales, and about the relationship between local authorities and Welsh Assembly Government, and with the assertion that high quality services cannot be delivered from Cardiff.
- Public servants are working in silos in both Welsh Assembly Government and Welsh local authorities, in separate teams with separate inspection regimes, grants and targets, and often with ring-fenced funding. This all contributes to a complex system that is difficult to negotiate and understand.
- Another reorganisation of government structures was ruled out by Beecham. It is more important to think about how the existing structures can be made to work better.
- Beecham says we need to look at capacity – the quality of the people we have, plus the management they receive.
- The culture of looking to the voluntary and private sector to deliver public services is underdeveloped in Wales. The public sector may be too insular.
- It is important to have the confidence to have an open discussion in Wales and not to be too defensive (of devolution, for instance).

Implementing Beecham – the Local Government policy statement: A parallel workshop presentation by an officer from the Assembly's Local Government Policy Division described how the Beecham proposals would relate to policy development in the Assembly over the coming months:

- **the list of actions** emerging from the proposals amounts to a very substantial amount of work – on public service delivery, performance reporting, engagement across sectors, communication, ensuring partnerships work, scrutiny, demonstrating efficiency, minimum standards and leadership;
- **the local government policy statement**, which is expected in March 2007, will address partnership working (potentially including a duty to cooperate), accountability for performance that focuses on outcomes, inspection and the regulatory framework, representing Welsh people, getting rid of competing bureaucracies and programmes, focusing on citizen satisfaction, workforce planning, monitoring policy implementation, what the Assembly needs to do to change, and perhaps financial issues too;
- **research** is under way on the roles and numbers of councillors in Wales, which delegates anticipated will raise controversy;
- **potential benefits for communities**: these changes are expected to achieve better local coordination of services, less prescription but more accountability, more powers for community councils, and perhaps the devolution of power to the level of local estates.

The obstacles: Delegates generally welcomed the Beecham recommendations, but identified some of the obstacles that will need to be overcome to put them into practice. These include the reluctance to provide information to compare schools, local authorities etc (leaving people to obtain it under the Freedom of Information act and then interpret it for themselves), difficulties with involving health organisations in partnership with councils, the Assembly's own lack of consistency across ministerial portfolios and its inappropriate inherited Whitehall model.

Creating more 'holistic' government: It was suggested in one workshop that residents would welcome new opportunities for involvement because they want a say in the services that affect their lives (especially transport, health and education). Delegates in another discussion group agreed that a more holistic, partnership approach is needed by central and local government. Suggestions included:

- a mature debate about central/local government relationships and functions;
- getting key officers involved, not just political leaders and chief executives;
- opening up lines of communications from neighbourhoods to the local authority and from the local authority to the Welsh Assembly Government;
- feeding what is learned about communities upwards so it can influence policy;
- piloting Partnership Action Contracts (PACts) that are suggested in the Beecham Report.

The role of communities in the Beecham agenda: The practical challenges of the Beecham agenda for central and local government in relation to community engagement were also raised powerfully by speakers during the morning session. Edwina Hart acknowledged that the different departments of government need to work together for Communities First to be effective. Another speaker said that the Beecham Report's dramatic call for "transformation in the culture, capacity and processes of government" would involve training for council officers to understand that there

can be “incredible gains in efficiency” when communities take part in delivering services. The JRF evaluator ended her presentation with a series of challenging questions for government bodies:

- Is there enough community development support to enable community groups to engage effectively in neighbourhood working?
- Do we have the right structures in place to ensure that services can respond to the plans and priorities of local communities?
- What arrangements are there for joint training and informal dialogue between communities and power holders, and what can be done to ensure people understand one another better?

New roles for councillors and community councils

Criticism and uncertainty for local councillors: There was strong criticism of some councillors from the community’s perspective. A speaker said that, although in some wards councillors lead from the front, represent their communities to the authority and achieve results, in others they “harass Communities First coordinators and make their lives impossible”. But there was also concern from several local authority representatives that councillors can feel threatened and uncertain as a result of continuing changes in local government – perhaps indicating that their role needs to be more carefully defined.

The new ‘mayors’: There was widespread agreement that councillors have an important job supporting and promoting the neighbourhood agenda. One council leader suggested councillors could have an enabling role linking community groups to appropriate officers and vice versa. Elected members are commonly regarded as ‘the authority’, but they are not professionals and should be seen more as “the community representative”, she said. Another delegate defined the councillor’s role as helping to build pride and enthusiasm in the community, working to overcome ‘us and them’ differences by getting local people more involved in deciding priorities, winning back their trust and getting partnerships moving. But he added that in the end this must be led by the council.

A delegate urged councillors to regard themselves in a new role as ‘mayors’, acting as spokespeople and representatives for the wards they represent.

Dilemmas: Discussions in the plenary sessions highlighted some of the pitfalls if communities rely on councillors to be their champions. They could, for instance, become potentially damaging if they took a position against the community. Lord Best raised the question of community representatives who are political opponents of their elected ward councillors. A council officer also expressed concern that councillors who work with community organisations are usually not aware of the priorities across all the departments of their local authority. There is a lot to do, perhaps with training, to make councillors effective brokers between the community and their councils. A delegate also warned that it was necessary to be clear about the roles of different bodies in developing partnerships, and to avoid duplication.

The place of community and town councils: A workshop session was devoted to exploring the role of community and town councils in addressing the needs of communities. Key points to emerge in this and other discussions were as follows.

- **A tier of government in the right place:** The 730+ community and town councils are the most local level of government in Wales and serve 70% of the population. For this reason they are well placed to identify community needs (in conjunction with the communities), represent their views to others, encourage community development, work in partnership with principal councils, and provide services in response to needs. They are also in a position to build relationships with unitary authorities through delivering effective local services. Community councillors can be sensitive to very local priorities, and able to make rapid interventions on issues such as small-scale environmental problems. A delegate speaking on behalf of town and community councils in Wales argued that members of this grass-roots tier of government had a real role to play in the sustainability of Communities First partnerships.
- **Limitations:** The roles of town and community councils are necessarily limited by the gaps in their coverage (including places where they have been voted out of existence by the community), the likelihood that many councils will not want to change their ways of working, and the fact that they are not seen as representative or democratic (since councillors are frequently co-opted). Funding issues such as double taxation could also be a major obstacle, and councillors and officers would have to be committed to real practical partnership working (not simply taking part in talking shops). It was also pointed out that it could be difficult to make the important decision about the right level at which to engage with the community.
- **Overcoming the limitations:** Several suggestions were made to minimise these issues:
 - reviewing the number of councils and councillors in some areas;
 - receiving support from principal councils to boost their capacity;
 - organising appropriate training for councillors and officers;
 - where no town or community council exists, there may be a role for a local community board to be set up to enhance the role of ward councillors in unitary authorities, possibly with budgeting powers.

Annex 1: Programme and delegates

Programme: Wednesday 12 July 2006

- 11.00 am **Opening plenary**
Chair: Lord (Richard) Best, Director, Joseph Rowntree Foundation
- 11.05 am **Welcome**
Edwina Hart AM MBE, Minister for Social Justice and Regeneration
- 11.15 am **Speakers**
Mandy Wilson, Evaluator, Joseph Rowntree Foundation Neighbourhood Programme
- 11.30 am Councillor Aled Roberts, Leader, Wrexham County Borough Council and housing spokesperson for the Welsh Local Government
- 11.45 am Professor Dave Adamson,
Director of the Programme for Community Regeneration, University of Glamorgan
- 12.00 noon **Question and answer session**
- 12.40 pm **Address**
Sue Essex AM, Minister for Finance, Local Government and Public Services
- 1.45 pm **Workshop groups**
Workshop Group 1:
Using community strategies to connect policies

Workshop Group 2:
The implications of the Beecham Report

Workshop Group 3:
The Welsh local government policy statement and its impact on neighbourhoods

Workshop Group 4:
Community partnerships and neighbourhood practice

Workshop Group 5:
Community and Town Councils and neighbourhoods
- 3.15 pm **Closing remarks**
Lord (Richard) Best
- 3.30pm **Close of event**

Delegates

Nigel Acott	Prestatyn Town Council
Professor Dave Adamson	University of Glamorgan
Andrew Barnett	Joseph Rowntree Foundation
Colin Berg	Monmouthshire County Council
Lord (Richard) Best OBE	Joseph Rowntree Foundation
India Bourke	University of Oxford
Councillor Gerald Clement	City and County of Swansea
Paul Dear	Welsh Assembly Government
Sue Essex AM	Welsh Assembly Government
Carys Evans	Welsh Assembly Government
Cllr David Evans	Powys County Council
Philip Graham	Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council
Cllr Cheryl Green	Bridgend County Borough Council
Edwina Hart AM MBE	Welsh Assembly Government
Alison Hill	Caia Park Partnership
Phil Jarrold	Wales Council for Voluntary Action
John Low	Joseph Rowntree Foundation
Ian Miller	Denbighshire County Council
Lee Owens	Welsh Local Government
John Palmer	Welsh Assembly Government
Stephen Phipps	Welsh Assembly Government
Aled Roberts	Wrexham County Borough Council
Ken Sawyers	Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council
Cllr Aaron Shotton	Flintshire County Council
Jill Shuker	Merthyr Tydfil County Borough Council
Cllr Peter Stock	Pembrokeshire County Council
Vivienne Sugar	Joseph Rowntree Foundation
Cllr Derek Vaughan	Neath Port Talbot County Borough Council
Colette Watkins	Gellideg Foundation Group
Simon White	One Voice Wales
Mandy Wilson	Joseph Rowntree Foundation Neighbourhood Programme
Mel Witherden	Community Projects Centre
Louise Woodruff	Joseph Rowntree Foundation
Cllr Rhiannon Wyn Hughes MBE	Denbighshire County Council

© Mel Witherden 2006

Published by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, The Homestead, 40 Water End, York YO30 6WP. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation has supported this project as part of its programme of research and innovative development projects, which it hopes will be of value to policy-makers, practitioners and service users. The facts presented and views expressed in this report are, however, those of the author and not necessarily those of the Foundation.

All rights reserved. Reproduction of this report by photocopying or electronic means for non-commercial purposes is permitted. Otherwise, no part of this report may be reproduced, adapted, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise without the prior written permission of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Other formats available. Tel: 01904 615905, Email: info@jrf.org.uk

Joseph Rowntree Foundation
The Homestead, 40 Water End, York YO30 6WP
Tel: 01904 629241 Website: www.jrf.org.uk

