

RESPONSE PROFORMA

Transforming places; changing lives: A framework for regeneration

Respondent Details:

Name: James Caird

Organisation: Institute of Historic Building Conservation

Address: IHBC Business Office
Jubilee House
High Street
Tisbury
Wiltshire
SP3 6HA

Telephone: (01584) 876141

Fax:

e-mail: consultations@ihbc.org.uk

Please return by: **Friday 31 October 2008** to:

Email: RegenFramework@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Or by hard copy to:

**Roger Wilshaw
Regeneration Strategy Division
Communities and Local Government
Floor 3, Zone G10,
Eland House,
Bressenden Place
London,
SW1E 5DU**

Is your response confidential?

Yes **No**

Comments:

Provision is made throughout this questionnaire for you to provide additional comments. If, however you wish to provide more detailed comments on any aspect of the consultation then please feel free to append additional materials and supplementary documents, clearly marked and cross referenced to the relevant questions, as necessary.

Organisation type (tick one box only)			
Architects	<input type="checkbox"/>	Neighbourhood Manager	<input type="checkbox"/>
Commercial Developers	<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-Departmental Public Body	<input type="checkbox"/>
Consultancy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other non-governmental organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Housing Association (Registered Social Landlords)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Private individual (unaffiliated)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individual in practice, trade or profession	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research/academic organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Journalist/media	<input type="checkbox"/>	Specific interest or lobby group	<input type="checkbox"/>
Local authority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Third sector	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manufacturer	<input type="checkbox"/>	Trade body or association	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Other (please specify):	<input type="checkbox"/>

Questions in Chapter One

Q1. Is this analysis right?

Yes **No**

Comments: The analysis is well structured and compelling. We have no reason to disagree with it.

Q2. What further analysis is needed to ensure the needs of different demographic groups are properly reflected in our regeneration priorities?

Comments: The Institute has no view on this.

Questions in Chapter Two

Q3. Are the outcome measures proposed helpful? Will they ensure regeneration benefits the poorest people and places in society?

Yes **No**

Comments: The Institute is cautious about targetting regeneration in such a narrow way. It seems to us that a broad and inclusive approach is required which will foster increasing interest in deprived places from all strata of the community.

Q4. Have we proposed the right measures?

Yes **No**

Comments: The Institute recognises that the measured outcomes need to be comparable with generally available statistics. However, the National Indicator 171 is a very general one and we do not expect it will reveal much about physical improvements to the quality of a place. The Government rightly makes much of its "place making" agenda, but there is little evidence as to in the consultation document as to how it could be utilised in improving the levels of private sector investment in deprived areas. The Institute believes this is a key issue.

Q5. Should we measure the scale and rate of private investment in deprived areas, and how could we do so?

Yes **No**

Comments: It would be right, as suggested, to measure this if possible, but putting in place the building blocks to allow it to happen is to us axial to the issue. Private investment will be slow to arrive in places that are not building in quality on their heritage and local assets.

Q6. What can central Government do to give communities a stronger voice in shaping regeneration? How can other agencies help?

Comments: The Institute does not wish to express a view on this.

Q7. What else can we do to ensure regeneration is responsive to environmental change?

Comments: The Institute does not wish to express a view on this.

Q8. How can we further strengthen sub-regional partnerships to deliver regeneration outcomes?

Comments: The Institute would like to see partnerships at all levels deliver quality outcomes in terms of buildings and infrastructure. We believe that regeneration cannot be made to become self-sustaining until there is wider economic and social interest in the area. This emphasises the importance of the "place-making" agenda. Physical improvement and high-quality environments, particularly where these build on local heritage, usually build public and community confidence.

Questions in Chapter Three

Q9. Is the criteria based approach a helpful way of ensuring greater consistency in prioritising regeneration investment?

Yes **No**

Comments: The Institute feels that this is unlikely to be effective. A great deal of time can pass between the intigation of regeneration proposals and measurable outcomes in the way proposed. Confidence will not be built on these but on many much softer impressions of the qualities of an area. By this we mean the sort of aspects that give rise to NI171 responses. It seems to us that there should be room for more opportunistic approach that has greater potential for community involvement and feedback.

Q10. Should we ask regions to develop regional regeneration maps? What are the disadvantages of that approach?

Yes No

Comments: These would be useful to generate interest and involvement. The Institute feels that it is important not to spread resources too thinly, or their effects will not be evident to the public. Maps can be a way of showing how the focus will be achieved..

Q11. Should we go further? What else can be done to align national Government investment behind local and regional priorities?

Yes No

Comments: Government investment should follow the pattern of local and regional priorities. Local communities are unlikely to value a programme of Government investment that is unaligned with local priorities.

Q12. Will this approach give the private sector confidence and unlock long-term investment? If not, what would?

Yes No

Comments: If there are step-changes in the quality of places, private sector investment will follow.

Q13. If there is a case for central government still identifying some specific neighbourhoods and targeting particular assistance at them in future in order to learn lessons, as we have done with NDCs?

Comments: No. See above. Priorities should be set locally

Questions in Chapter Four

Q14. Taken together, do these new and enhanced roles for different agencies equip them to deliver the expectations in the framework?

Yes No

Comments: The Institute is concerned that the framework is too general to be regarded as equipping the various agencies that will be involved. We think that the most specific and useful part of the framework is Annex F and we particularly approve of the approaches set out in paragraphs F8 - F21. But these are in outline only and much more capacity building, perhaps through Cabi, will be needed to make this a reality for the generality of places.

Q15. What would be the costs and benefits of this approach?

Comments: If adequate resources are available (and at present The Institute thinks they are woefully inadequate) benefits arising from improved urban design, masterplanning and community placemaking will begin to emerge.

Q16. How should this framework be implemented in London given London's unique governance arrangements?

Comments: The Institute has no view on this.

Q17. What would be the impact of this approach on different groups, according to:

- gender and gender identity;
- disability;
- race;
- age;
- religion/belief; and
- sexual orientation

Comments: The Institute has no view on this.

Further Information

We would be grateful if you could provide us with the following information to feed into the full Impact Assessment:

How are the regeneration priorities, you deal with, currently decided? Are these communicated clearly?

How much time do you currently spend on negotiating regeneration priorities?

To what degree is the local community in your area engaged in this process?

What would be the likely cost of doing this if it is not done already?

What analysis do you currently undertake to support regeneration policy?

Are the analytical proposals in the Framework additional to what you are currently undertaking?

Will the proposals set out in the consultation document lead to a more focussed approach?

And better value for money? If so, how?