



Linking People and Places: Spatial and Community Planning

Executive Summary

There has been a perception that there is a disconnect between the processes, outcomes and priorities of spatial planning and community planning. The Scottish Government defines community planning as a “process which helps public agencies to work together with the community to plan and deliver better services which make a real difference to people’s lives”. Given this, RTPI Scotland has undertaken research exploring if there is a disconnect, and if so, how we can address this, and what the benefits of a greater connection between processes might be for all parties.

The research identified a number of opportunities that were highlighted by both spatial planners and those working in community planning:

- delivering outcomes;
- sharing processes;
- sharing resources; and
- sharing knowledge.

A number of barriers were also identified:

- timescales and statutory processes;
- reduction in resources;
- institutional barriers;
- understanding spatial and community planning;
- commitment to implementation; and
- culture.

The research has also led to a number of recommendations for taking work forward:

1. There needs to be recognition of the starting points to making links between spatial planning and community planning;
2. There are opportunities to align processes to help deliver spatial planning and community planning outcomes more effectively and efficiently;
3. Spatial planning needs to articulate to community planning what it can do;
4. Community Planning Partnerships need to recognise the need for, and role of, spatial planning in delivering community planning;
5. There needs to be more effective communication between spatial and community planning actors;
6. There is a need to improve spatial planners’ knowledge of community planning and where they can contribute;
7. There is a need to explore the landscape of plans for overlap and consistency;
8. There is a need to be clear about roles and responsibilities at different levels;
9. There is a need to explore how community-led approaches contribute to the deliver of both Community Plan and Development Plan outcomes; and
10. There is a need to ‘drill down’ further to explore practical opportunities and barriers.



Context

Public service reform in Scotland has been driven by the [Christie Commission](#) on the Future Delivery of Public Services, published in 2011, which set out the key objectives of a reform programme. It said that these must be to ensure that:

- public services are built around people and communities, their needs, aspirations, capacities and skills, and work to build up their autonomy and resilience;
- public service organisations work together effectively to achieve outcomes – specifically by delivering integrated services which help to secure improvements in the quality of life, and the social and economic wellbeing, of the people and communities of Scotland;
- public service organisations prioritise prevention, reduce inequalities and promote equality; and
- all public services constantly seek to improve performance and reduce costs, and are open, transparent and accountable.

In particular, the Commission said that any new arrangements should:

- lead to the achievement of better outcomes for the people and communities of Scotland;
- ensure that services are required to account to the people and communities of Scotland, both directly and through their democratically elected representatives, so that public confidence in and support for the delivery of services can be maintained; and
- support the local integration of service provision.

The outcome-focussed approach is delivered through Single Outcome Agreements (SOAs) and Community Plans. These are seen as key instruments in supporting the public sector to integrate its work so as to ensure that it makes best use of all of its resources and functions to support communities to improve and develop.

Spatial planning aims to create great places for people and this relies on communities, local authorities, public services and private sector organisations developing and implementing a clear vision for their area that meets its needs. This vision needs to set out the way a place will develop and how its services will be provided. Given this, RTPI Scotland has been keen to explore how the planning service contributes to SOAs and Community Planning, especially in light of anecdotal evidence that the link between spatial planning and community planning is weak, which in turn means that there is a disconnect between work.

This research has been undertaken to explore if this is the case and to find out what the opportunities are for, and the barriers are to, more effectively linking spatial and community planning. It looks at the processes, outcomes and priorities of spatial planning and community planning, how we can address this, and what the benefits of a greater connection between processes might be for all parties.

Research Aims

The research aim was to provide an evidence base on:

- the current position with regards to linkages between spatial planning and community planning, involving research into the legislative context, guidance and advice;
- the potential that more effectively linked spatial and community planning can have for planning authorities, Community Planning Partnerships and communities;
- perceptions on better linking spatial and community planning from key players in spatial planning and community planning;
- current barriers to, and opportunities for, better connecting spatial and community planning; and
- action that can be taken to make it easier and more effective to link spatial and community planning targeted at a range of players including Scottish Government, Community Planning Partnerships, planning authorities, Heads of Planning and others.



What is Community Planning?

The Scottish Government defines Community Planning as a “*process which helps public agencies to work together with the community to plan and deliver better services which make a real difference to people’s lives*”.

Community Planning was given statutory status through the Local Government (Scotland) Act 2003. Within the Act, core partners within the Community Planning Partnership (CPP) are identified as Health Boards, Enterprise Networks, Police, Fire, and Regional Transport Partnerships. In addition to these core partners, a range of other organisations are also involved, varying across the 32 CPPs in Scotland.

There is a clear link from the Scottish Government’s purpose “*to focus Government and public services on creating a more successful country, with opportunities for all of Scotland to flourish, through increasing sustainable economic growth*” to the 16 Scottish National Outcomes, and in turn to the 6 priority areas for the preparation of SOAs identified by the Scottish Government as:

1. Economic Recovery and Growth
2. Employment
3. Early Years
4. Outcomes for Older People
5. Health Inequalities and Physical Activity
6. Safer and Stronger Communities and Reducing Re-offending

The most recent SOAs were developed by CPPs in line with the 2012 [SOA Guidance](#), and were agreed in 2013 by Scottish Ministers and Council Leaders. This guidance to CPPs identified that SOAs should be prepared within the context of a “*clear understanding of place*”. This was a step change in the SOA preparation, demonstrating a clear understanding of local place, the priorities of these places, and the plan for the delivery of improved outcomes on these priorities. The SOA also deals with the public service reform agenda by setting out how the SPP aligns its approach with the four pillars of public service reform (prevention, local integration and partnership, performance improvement, and investment in people).

SOAs are produced with the Scottish Government purpose, the 16 Scottish National Outcomes and the 6 priority areas in mind.

The Community Plan is the collective means of delivering the SOA, agreed by Community Planning Partners and the Scottish Government.

What is Spatial Planning?

The Scottish Government describes the planning system in its [Guide to the Planning System in Scotland](#), 2009 as the way “*to make decisions about future development, and the use of land in our towns, cities and countryside. It decides where development should happen, where it should not and how development affects its surroundings [...] The planning system balances competing demands to make sure that land is used and developed in the public’s long-term interest*”.

Spatial Planning has a clear regulatory function, but also sets a vision at different levels (nationally, strategically and locally) for the future of spatially defined area, protecting and enhancing the existing built and natural environment, and looking to the sustainable economic growth of that area.

The legislative context for spatial planning is set out within the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 as amended by the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006.

At the national level, [National Planning Framework 3](#) (NPF3) and [Scottish Planning Policy](#) (SPP) set out a vision for planning derived from the Scottish Government purpose and Scottish Government 16 National Outcomes as:

“We live in a Scotland with a growing, low carbon economy with progressively narrowing disparities in well-being and opportunity. It is growth that can be achieved whilst reducing emissions and which respects the quality of environment, place and life which makes our country so special. It is growth which increases solidarity – reducing inequalities between our regions. We live in sustainable, well-designed places and homes which meet our needs. We enjoy excellent transport and digital connections, internally and with the rest of the world.”



From this Planning Vision, the four Planning Outcomes for Scotland are identified by NPF3 and SPP:

- *“Planning makes Scotland a successful, sustainable place – supporting sustainable economic growth and regeneration, and the creation of well-designed places;*
- *Planning makes Scotland a low carbon place – reducing our carbon emissions and adapting to climate change;*
- *Planning makes Scotland a natural, resilient place – helping to protect and enhance our natural and cultural assets and facilitating their sustainable use; and*
- *Planning makes Scotland a connected place – supporting better transport and digital connectivity.”*

Both NPF3 and SPP recognise that Community Planning sits alongside the planning hierarchy, below the national level, to deliver outcomes for Scotland. Both documents support the aspiration to better link Spatial and Community Planning, with NPF 3 stating *“National Planning Framework 3 should be considered by Local Authorities as they work with Community Planning Partnerships to take forward their Single Outcome Agreements as a binding plan for place”*.

SPP states that *“at the strategic and local level, planning can make a very important contribution to the delivery of Single Outcome Agreements, through their shared focus on ‘place’. Effective integration between land use planning and community planning is crucial and development plans should reflect close working with Community Planning Partnerships.*

Other Issues

Other changes being made to the Scottish public policy environment will rely on Spatial Planning working collaboratively with Community Planning and vice-versa. For example, the Community Empowerment Bill, which is currently being scrutinised by the Scottish Parliament looks to reinforce the outcomes based approach and the role that communities can play in influence the design and delivery of services, and the decisions that arise from these.

Also, the Historic Environment (Scotland) Act 2014 and the approach to be taken by the new body Historic Environment Scotland very much look to mainstreaming the way we promote, manage and fund approaches to the historic environment.

Research

The following research was carried out to gather context, opinion and best practice examples.

- Desk based research aimed at gathering context in terms of legislation, guidance and good practice;
- Primary research: Interviews / meetings with 17 people (see acknowledgements page for list of participants);
- Primary research: A short online questionnaire, and meetings / interviews with a number of key players. 27 local authorities and 1 Strategic Development Planning Authority responded to the survey (35 spatial planners and 20 people working in community planning responded to the survey.
- Primary research: A “Call for Evidence” on the RTPI website yielded 8 responses from a range of stakeholders (see acknowledgements page for details)
- A poll on the RTPI website asked “should spatial planning work closer with community planning in Scotland”?

Initial conclusions and recommendations were tested through a roundtable discussion with a range of stakeholders identified as the key organisations to take forward these recommendations, or to be engaged in further discussions on better linking spatial and community planning. This included the Society of Local Authority Chief Executives in Scotland (SOLACE), the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA), Heads of Planning Scotland (HoPS), local authority spatial planning, community planning, Improvement Service, SURF, PAS and Scottish Government spatial and community planning representatives (see acknowledgements for full list of attendees).



Perceptions

Through the primary research we explored the awareness of current links between spatial planning and community planning, and good practice examples of links, together with information on opportunities for, and barriers to, better linking the two. Evidence showed that better linking spatial and community planning is seen as a good idea. 89% of respondents to the RTPI website poll answered “yes” to the question asking if spatial planning should work closer with community planning in Scotland.

Reflecting on the conversations, meetings and survey responses from spatial planners and those working in community planning, it is apparent that there is a drive to provide clarity and transparency on who we are doing this for, and why we are doing it. The desire and drive to better link spatial and community planning does not come simply from the perspective of sharing services to make better use of reducing public sector resources. Rather, these come from an understanding that both spatial and community planning are essentially all about creating better places for people, with community planning focusing on reducing inequalities and delivering services for people in places, and spatial planning looking at the protection, enhancement and future development of places for people. It is clear that better linking spatial and community planning could have considerable benefits for people and place, making places work for people.

It is clear that people are concerned with how their place works, how it can be made better, how it will change over time, where services are located and how they can access them. Communities do not necessarily distinguish between spatial and community planning, but look at how their place works for them as a whole. This means that there is a need to guard against silo-based working, and separate statutory functions. There are opportunities for different professions and disciplines to work better together to deliver better places for people.

It is apparent from the respondents to the survey that some links do currently exist between spatial and community planning, with 80% of all spatial and community planners reporting that they are aware of some current alignment. Often these links are at the officer-to-officer

level, and while these bottom-up approaches should be nurtured, they are highly dependent on the individual to see the opportunities or potential, and make the links themselves. In other cases local authorities are actively joining spatial planning and community planning under one department with shared leadership (as in Angus and Shetland Islands Councils), and in some cases the embedding of the SOA and community planning outcomes within the Development Plan vision or objectives (as in TAYplan, The Highland Council). It is these Corporate Management led approaches which may make the biggest inroads in better linking spatial and community planning in a longer-lasting way that is organisation-led rather than individual-led.

The next two sections of the report start to drill down into the opportunities and barriers to better linking spatial and community planning based on the evidence gathered from the primary research.

Opportunities

One of the key aims of the research was to find out from those working in spatial planning and community planning what the perceived opportunities and barriers are to better linking spatial and community planning. This section of the report identifies the key opportunities in better linking the two processes.

Delivering Outcomes

Planning is all about outcomes, and a key opportunity identified through the research was to link spatial and community planning to deliver shared outcomes for people. Following the Christie Commission, the outcomes agenda has become more embedded at national, strategic and local level, and has become the focus for delivering public services.

The priority areas for Single Outcome Agreements (SOAs) are derived from the Scottish Government 16 National Outcomes, and the Community Plan is the mechanism for delivering the outcomes set within the SOA. Therefore Community Planning has an outcome focused approach at its heart. Spatial planning is also becoming more outcomes focused, with National Planning Framework 3 (NPF3) and Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) setting out the links between the Scottish Government 16 National Outcomes, and four key planning outcomes at the national level.

Our research has highlighted that there is an opportunity for spatial and community planning to adopt more of a shared agenda, pulling together to share the same outcomes, mutually reinforcing and complimenting one another, rather than contradicting one another.

A Shared Vision

The SOA maps out the vision for an area in terms of the collaborative strategy for delivery of services, and this is taken on board within the Community Plan. The spatial vision for the area is set out within the Strategic/Local Development Plan (SDP / LDP). Respondents felt that there is an opportunity for spatial and community planning to articulate a shared vision, and for spatial planners and those working in community planning to work together to deliver that shared vision.

There are existing examples of shared visions between SDP/LDPs and the SOA/Community Plan. Below are a small number of examples of existing initiatives to share visions between spatial and Community Plans, these are not an exhaustive list of all existing initiatives:

- East Ayrshire Council has embedded the vision of the Community Plan within the emerging Local Development Plan, shaping the direction of the entire Plan;
- The Shetland Local Development Plan 2014 sets out within its Vision Statement the link between the LDP / planning and the strategic vision for the Shetland Islands as stated within the SOA; and
- TAYplan Strategic Development Planning Authority derives its Strategic Development Plan vision and outcomes directly from the SOA and Community Plan outcomes.

Our research also showed that budgets can provide the levers to Community Planning which in turn help to deliver outcomes. A current drive in Community Planning is for partners to work together to tackle the challenges of those families currently costing the public sector £1million per year in terms of health, criminal justice, antisocial behaviour, benefits etc. The research identified an opportunity for spatial planning as having a role to play in helping this, by setting out a spatial vision for an area that supported efforts to tackle these issues. Spatial planning can express this opportunity, understanding the role of place in achieving outcomes for people; tackling inequalities or health and wellbeing outcomes.

It is considered that the visioning process highlights an opportunity for alignment. It presents Planning Authorities and Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) with the opportunity to have a conversation about the connections between the Development Plan and SOA delivered by the Community Plan. This is not a suggestion of a change to statutory processes, but rather an opportunity to work within the current shape of the Development Plan and Community Plan / SOA processes.

A Shared Agenda

The research suggested that there may be opportunities to make better use of specific starting points, or inroads, to better link spatial and community planning. These could be in delivering on health and wellbeing, or ageing



population outcomes, or regeneration projects where place based approaches have worked effectively with people. An example of this is the Equally Well and Thriving Places projects in Glasgow that are delivering positive outcomes for communities on health and wellbeing outcomes. The commitment by both spatial and community planning to share visions, processes, as well as resources and knowledge are being seen to make a significant difference.

Regeneration is about facilitating change. To be successful, regeneration requires both spatial planning (the physical change) and community planning (the social change) to work together and impact on social, economic and environmental issues. There is therefore an opportunity to see regeneration as a starting point to better link spatial and community planning to deliver on regeneration in places for people.

The way in which we design and deliver places can have powerful outcomes for people. Given this, the research has shown that there is an opportunity for spatial planning to identify areas of cross-over between work streams and policy directions such as open space policy, and to develop a shared agenda between spatial and community planning to deliver outcomes for people.

Connected Plans

The Scottish Government expects CPPs to deliver a “*shared plan for place*” ([SOA Guidance for CPPs](#), 2012) through the SOA. There is an opportunity to achieve this aspiration through shared outcomes and priorities between spatial and community planning, with community planning focussing on public service delivery to achieve outcomes for an area, and Spatial Planning providing the spatial articulation of the Community Plan.

At a local level there is an opportunity to examine the range of outcomes set by both spatial and community planning, and assess where there is overlap in what these outcomes aim to deliver. This could and perhaps shall lead to shared outcomes between the SDP or LDP and Community Plan. This will require spatial planning better articulating how it integrates with the SOA outcomes and aspirations.

This is already articulated in a number of Development Plans which acknowledge the link within their vision between the two. The Shetland Local Development Plan, for example, acknowledges the role of the Plan in delivering wider outcomes: “*the Single Outcome Agreement mechanism should be a powerful vehicle for change in the Islands because it brings together stakeholders and the Scottish Government to make sure undertakings are carried out. The Shetland Local Development Plan should therefore be consistent and effective in supporting the objectives of the Agreements and becoming a method for promoting their delivery in spatial planning.*”

Sharing Processes

A key opportunity in better linking spatial and community planning emerging from the research was the opportunity to better align and share processes. This could help to achieve a more integrated approach that shows the spatial dimensions of many public sector initiatives and programmes.

It was suggested that there was a need to drill down further into current good practice to demonstrate the benefits of improved communication between spatial and community planning actors and communities and the sharing of processes between the two. These could include sharing visions, engagement processes, stakeholder involvement, and the process of monitoring and review of both spatial and community planning.

As detailed in this section, the research identified a need and opportunity for sharing the visioning process between spatial and community planning. Our research highlighted that developing a shared vision that underpinned both the vision of the Development Plan and Community Plan required agreement on what role there is for each of them based on their strengths, and how they are framed to complement one another. Given this, community and spatial planners should be engaged at the start of the process to agree the vision and roles and responsibilities.

Community Engagement and Stakeholder Involvement

Spatial planners are becoming more creative in engaging with communities and have developed a range of tools and techniques supporting



people to engage in, and influence how, their places develop over time. Given this, the research has highlighted that there are opportunities for collaboration during formal consultation processes such as the Main Issue Report for Development Plans. This would help to discuss and address key issues for communities early in the process.

A starting point could be raising awareness of the various engagement processes being undertaken in both spatial and community planning within the area. In Aberdeenshire Council for example, planners consulting on the most recent Aberdeenshire Local Development Plan have been working to ensure that engagement events are carried out in the right locations for communities, as well as ensuring that there are no clashes with community planning events. Also, recent East Lothian Council consultation on the Main Issues Report (MIR) of the Local Development Plan was broken down into six areas which are closely matched to the six community planning Area Partnerships. This resulted in six area plans being formed by the MIR, better identifying key issues for local areas, in line with community planning aspirations.

PAS (formerly Planning Aid for Scotland) has created an engagement model thinking differently about people and places. The [PAS Charretteplus™](#) approach to community and stakeholder engagement is specifically designed to link spatial and community planning with the regeneration and community empowerment agendas to build greater capacity within Scotland's communities, and enabling SOAs to better focus on place.

There is an opportunity to develop an integrated approach between spatial and community planning in the progression of the Place Standard. Following on from the publication of [Creating Places](#) in 2013, the policy statement on architecture and place for Scotland, the Scottish Government is currently developing the Place Standard tool for engagement, together with Architecture + Design Scotland and NHS Scotland.

Monitoring and Review

A more joined up and corporate approach to the process of monitoring and review of both spatial and community planning could allow for more effective ways of measuring progress and for

identifying what interventions, by whom, have had the greatest impact. There are tools such as Development Plan Action Programmes that can be usefully fed into monitoring processes. The monitoring of the SOA / Community Plan could / should address and measure progress on "place" development.

Sharing Resources

Emerging from the research were opportunities to share resources. It was felt that there are opportunities for more joined up thinking and working, which could deliver efficiencies for local authorities.

Preventative Spend

Our research highlighted that, in line with the findings of the Christie Commission, preventative spend was a key issue for community planning. It further highlighted that spatial planning can have a significant and influential role in achieving preventative spend, particularly given its longer term perspective, its aim of integrating approaches, and its perspective in looking to the ramifications of decision making beyond the immediate area and on the broader social, environmental and economic context.

Sharing Data

The research found that respondents felt that sharing data could contribute to better aligned priorities and processes. Extensive use has been made of [SIMD](#) (Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation) and Neighbourhood profiling by those working in community planning already. Current trials are ongoing by the Improvement Service for "[Viewstat](#)", a data set that utilises existing data at a neighbourhood level. There is potential for spatial planners and people working in community planners to collaborate on collecting and using data which could, in turn, lead to more integrated outcomes.

Sharing Work Environments

A number of local authorities are currently sharing resources by physically sharing work environments. This could provide an opportunity to integrate approaches to placemaking and achieve shared outcomes. While this is not happening in the majority of authorities, The Highland Council, Shetland Islands Council and Angus Council have institutional structures which appear to contribute to shared resources with spatial and community planning sitting



within the same department, with a shared leadership. Sharing resources can be aided by sharing work environments – the research highlights that by placing spatial and community planning side by side, better integrated approaches and processes could be produced.

Sharing Knowledge

Spatial planners and those working in community planning each have unique skillsets. It was seen to be potentially useful to utilise these skillsets to help towards delivering more targeted approaches to achieving outcomes, by sharing knowledge, for example with spatial planners bringing their ability to think and articulate some community planning outcomes in a spatial way.

There was an opportunity identified to share evidence between spatial and community planning which could be used to inform the Development Plan, and the Community Plan, and the shared visioning process previously suggested. This evidence may currently be collected and analysed separately by spatial planners and those working in community planning, possibly using different sources/interrogation bases. It is important, therefore, that these are aligned to ensure a collective view is taken on the area's opportunities and challenges so as to provide a robust analysis to underpin the vision. This could also provide efficiency savings.

A more robust and joined up evidence base would also help to provide a corporate viewpoint to inform local politicians of key issues, opportunities and possible approaches to be taken in communities.



Barriers

Key to achieving a better link between spatial and community planning is understanding the current perceived barriers to linking the two processes. There is a degree of overlap between the identified opportunities and barriers, with some barriers also being opportunities and vice versa. The following barriers were identified:

Timescales and Statutory Processes

The main barrier to better linking spatial and community planning was identified as the timescales and statutory processes within which spatial planning and community planning each operate.

All 32 Community Planning Partnerships (CPPs) in Scotland produce Single Outcome Agreements (SOAs). All CPPs had to produce a new SOAs by June 2013. By comparison, Strategic Development Plans (SDPs) for the four City Regions, and Local Development Plans (LDPs) for the 32 planning authorities and two national park authorities must be revised on a five yearly cycle. However, different plans are at various different stages of the process and they will not all be published simultaneously or by a set date. This means that for any particular location in Scotland there could be an SOA, SDP and LDP within that area (along with a number of other plans), none of which adhere to the same timescales of preparation, and for which the Development Plan and SOA fall under separate statutory processes.

The research also told us that reducing public sector resources is leading to both spatial and community planning becoming more focused in their scope. Given this, it is likely that spatial planning will focus more on the statutory functions of planning such as Development Planning, Development Management and Enforcement. At the same time, community planning is becoming more focused on key outcomes for deprivation and inequalities where the most difference should be made. However, the research identified that some of the areas where most impact may be achieved will be through non-statutory or by taking more creative approaches, including more partnership working and joined up thinking.

Ironically, this is happening at a time when a number of our respondents are of the view that linking spatial and community planning could help to provide more effective approaches to these very complex issues. Given this, it was felt that there is a need for spatial and community planning to understand each other better and to understand the benefits of working together.

It is also considered that there may be a need to explore the landscape of plans for any overlap or where one can compliment another. Spatial planning can be seen as the spatial articulation of the Community Plan, with both working towards shared visions of delivering outcomes for people. It is appreciated that there is not an appetite for legislative change, so rather than producing more statutory obligations and plans, the solution should be to work more creatively within the existing policies and frameworks of the current systems.

Reduction in Resources

The research highlighted that closely linked to the barrier of timescales and statutory processes is the issue of continued austerity and reduction in public sector resources. This was identified as a key barrier by those working in both community and spatial planning.

Public sector bodies are under continued pressures with reduced staffing, resulting in increased pressures for people working across the board in local authorities, including in spatial and community planning. It often leads to increased workloads and a broadening of the scope of work to be undertaken and span of responsibilities.

It was pointed out by some respondents that spatial planning is seeing a reduction in the number of specialisms within planning authorities, therefore requiring the planning officer to expand the reach of their role.

Institutional Barriers

The research has shown that the issue of silo based working across the public sector still exists and can be a barrier to linking spatial planning and community planning. With separate legislative frameworks and timescales, spatial and community planning have often existed as mutually exclusive processes. However, it was recognized that there are



opportunities to increase communication between spatial and community planning actors, and share resources, knowledge and processes to move away from silo working, to a better linked and coordinated way of working.

There are a range of plans that aim to provide a vision for a place, or which set out how a programme or funding stream is to be implemented. A perceived lack of consistency in messaging, and overlap in plans emerged from the research.

Understanding Spatial and Community Planning

A common thread emerging from the research is the complexity of both spatial and community planning processes. Many spatial planners do not have a great understanding of what community planning is, what it does, and how they should interact with it, and vice versa. This lack of understanding perpetuates silo based thinking and could be a barrier to linking spatial and community planning.

The language of both spatial and community planning is often complex and acronym based, and can be perceived as impenetrable by a lay person, or a professional in another field. This must be addressed to allow for a degree of crossover and integration between the two processes.

Commitment to Implementation

Our research showed that there are inconsistencies across planning authorities and CPPs on how, and if, spatial planning are working together. It was generally seen that a link between the two was desirable and useful in helping to deliver priorities and outcomes of the Development Plan and the SOA / Community Plan, but some CPPs and planning authorities were more committed to this.

Given this, there needs to be consistent messaging about the importance and value of coordinating tasks and efforts to link spatial and community planning. This is not a one size fits all approach, and it is acknowledged that different approaches should and will be adapted to fit local circumstances.

Culture

Leadership

Leadership was identified as key to delivering a better link between spatial and community planning. There is a growing drive and commitment for joining spatial and community planning, and a recognition that place-based approaches through planning can help to maximise impact.

The large majority of Heads of Planning in local authorities sit within the third tier of the organization, and are therefore not always involved directly in Corporate Management teams. This can mean that there is a gap between Head of Planning and Corporate Management level. Given this, spatial planning needs to explore how it can be more effective in communicating and sharing the value that it can bring to the SOA and CPPs.

The research has shown that there is a leadership role for Scottish Government, Corporate Management in Local Authorities and Heads of Planning and that this role could be more effective than it currently is; a continued culture change is required.

Communication

A perceived lack of communication was identified as a further barrier to better linking spatial and community planning. A culture change in starting up or continuing an ongoing dialogue and discussion between spatial planners and those working in community planning is key to making this work.

There may be specific triggers to ensure consultation between disciplines. Communication in the form of sharing successes and talking about progress can help to encourage cooperation between spatial and community planning which in turn highlights the merits of alignment. Sharing success can help to inspire new ideas and new ways of thinking outside the conventional procedures that Local Authorities undertake. Combining experiences and discussion of practices can help to nurture a culture of integration and collaboration.

Recommendations and Way Forward

The research has led to a number of recommendations for taking work forward:

Recommendation 1 – There needs to be recognition of the starting points to making links between spatial planning and community planning.

A drive and commitment for joining up spatial and community planning and growing recognition that place-based approaches through planning can help to maximise impact emerged from the research. For this to happen effectively CPPs and planning departments should examine opportunities for alignment through identifying key inroads on priority issues. Our research has identified a number of issues where more joined up approaches have been taken including health and wellbeing outcomes, ageing population outcomes, and regeneration.

Recommendation 2 – There are opportunities to align processes to help deliver spatial planning and community planning outcomes more effectively and efficiently.

Our research has shown that, despite some barriers in terms of legislative timeframes, there is potential to align processes. These include visioning exercises for plans, community engagement, and stakeholder involvement processes.

Recommendation 3 – Spatial planning needs to articulate to community planning what it can do.

There is a lack of understanding of the roles, responsibilities and benefits of spatial planning amongst those working in community planning, and vice versa. This can be compounded by the fact that the very large majority of Heads of Planning in Local Authorities sit within the third tier of their organisation and so are not always directly involved in Corporate Management teams. This points to a need for spatial planners to strive to be seen as a key part of Corporate Management through expressing the expertise,

resources and added value that they can bring through their work.

Planning is all about creating great places for people, and there is an opportunity here for spatial planners to see themselves as 'place leaders', to articulate clearly to community planning how spatial planning can add value, and help to achieve outcomes better and faster.

Recommendation 4 – Community Planning Partnerships need to recognise the need for, and role of, spatial planning in delivering community planning.

The research showed that there are inconsistencies across Scotland on how, and if, spatial and community planning are working together. Generally such a link is seen as desirable and useful in helping deliver the priorities of each plan. Given this, it is considered that if alignment is to take effect there needs to be consistent messaging about the importance of coordinating tasks and efforts to link spatial and community planning. This will help to ensure missed opportunities and gaps in alignment are mitigated and addressed.

It is recognised that this should not be a one size fits all approach and that approached should be adapted to fit local circumstances.

Recommendation 5 – There needs to be more effective communication between spatial and community planning actors.

The research has highlighted that a significant barrier to forming links between spatial and community planning is lack of communication. There is therefore a need to address communication links between spatial and community planning within local authorities. This could be addressed through sharing processes, sharing successes, and sharing working environments.

Recommendation 6 – There is a need to improve spatial planners' knowledge of community planning and where they can contribute.

It is evident that many spatial planners do not have a great understanding of what Community

Planning is, what it does, and how they should interact with it. There are different interpretations and perceptions of spatial and community planning. Often the complexity of language and different jargons can add to this lack of understanding. Given this, it is thought that there may be a need for training and awareness raising to help spatial planners and those working in community planning to better understand what one another does, and where they can complement their work.

Recommendation 7 – There is a need to explore the landscape of plans for overlap and consistency.

There are a range of plans that aim to provide vision for a place, or which set out how a programme or funding stream is to be implemented. These appear to have distinctive roles but there may be opportunities to better join these up to ensure that they are all pulling in the same direction.

It is appreciated that there is not an appetite for legislative change, so rather than producing more statutory obligations and plans, the solution should be to work more creatively within the existing policies and frameworks of the current systems.

Recommendation 8 – There is a need to be clear about roles and responsibilities at different levels of leadership.

Our research has shown that leadership is important in taking this issue forward. However there are different leadership roles to be played at different levels, and so there needs to be clarity on who needs to do what.

Scottish Government has a key role in continuing to provide clarity on the roles and purpose of community planning and links with spatial planning. Scottish Government has shown a leadership role in revising guidance on community planning and spatial planning which should support better linkage, and this must be monitored.

Corporate Management in local authorities and across Community Planning Partners should recognise this need for joining up community and spatial planning and act to ensure this is done. They can also help to identify and

showcase the benefits achieved.

Heads of Planning should articulate the important roles that spatial planning can play in supporting community planning and the added value and resources that it can bring to the table. Resource allocation will provide an opportunity to show the commitment to, and value of, spatial planning's role in community planning.

Recommendation 9 – There is a need to explore how community-led approaches contribute to the delivery of both Community Plan and Development Plan outcomes.

Spatial planning has an important role in engaging communities to establish a vision for their area. This could be an extremely valuable part of the community planning machinery. Key to this will be making the link between the future development of an area (mainly through the Development Plan) and the provision of services in an area (mainly articulated through the Community Plan). The research highlighted opportunities for collaboration between spatial and community planning during formal consultation processes, and in making best use of less formal engagement mechanisms.

Recommendation 10 – There is a need to 'drill down' further to explore practical opportunities and barriers.

Emerging from the research is a need to 'drill down' to explore the practical barriers and opportunities to linking spatial and community planning, building some case study examples of good practice and lessons learned from the experienced of planning authorities and Community Planning Partnerships.

This further study could identify a 'routemap' for planning authorities, Community Planning Partnerships and Scottish Government, outlining the key steps to take and pitfalls to overcome in establishing better linkages between spatial and community planning at the local level.



Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all participants in this research project, including planners and people working in community planning who responded to the online survey, or replied to the Call for Evidence. We would also like to thank the participants in the Roundtable Discussion, and agreed to speak to us in the course of carrying out the research over the telephone, and in person.

Interviews / Meetings:

- Irene Beautyman – City of Edinburgh Council
- Scott Dalgarno – The Highland Council
- Eric Dawson – Architecture + Design Scotland
- Pam Ewen – TAYplan Strategic Development Planning Authority
- Emma Hay – Improvement Service
- John Inman – City of Edinburgh Council
- Diarmaid Lawlor – Architecture + Design Scotland
- David Littlejohn – Heads of Planning Scotland
- Colin Mair – Improvement Service
- David McAllister – PAS
- Carron McDiarmid – Highland Wellbeing Alliance
- David Milne – Scottish Government
- Fiona Simpson – Scottish Government
- David Thompson – DPT Urban Design
- Carrie Thomson – Scottish Government
- Nick Wright – Nick Wright Planning

Roundtable Discussion:

- Petra Biberbach – PAS
- Douglas Chisholm – The Highland Council
- David Cooper – Heads of Planning Scotland / City of Edinburgh Council
- Etive Currie – Glasgow City Council
- George Eckton – COSLA
- Emma Hay – Improvement Service
- Sophie Humphries – Aberdeenshire Council
- Bill Lindsay – Fife Council
- Colin Mair – Improvement Service
- Andy Milne – SURF
- David Milne – Scottish Government
- William Munro – SOLACE
- Carrie Thomson – Scottish Government



RTPI Scotland

mediation of space · making of place