

No. 91

**PARTNERSHIPS AND NETWORKS AS NEW
MECHANISMS TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE
URBAN REGENERATION**

Begoña Vilaplana
December 1998

Working Paper No. 91

**PARTNERSHIPS AND NETWORKS AS NEW
MECHANISMS TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE
URBAN REGENERATION**

Begoña Vilaplana

December 1998

**Begoña Vilaplana
Development Planning Unit
University College London
9 Endsleigh Gardens
London WC1H 0ED**

**Tel: + 44 171 388 7581 Fax: + 44 171 387 4541
Email: dpu@ucl.ac.uk**

PARTNERSHIPS AND NETWORKS AS NEW MECHANISMS TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE URBAN REGENERATION

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
1. THE CHANGING WORLD ECONOMY AND URBAN RESTRUCTURING	1
1.1. Economic Change, Global Restructuring and its Impact on Cities	1
1.2. New Approaches to Urban Regeneration	2
1.3. A Sustainable Future for Regeneration	3
2. FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS. METHODOLOGY	3
2.1. Sustainability and Sustainable Development	4
2.2. Urban Regeneration	4
2.3. Partnerships	5
2.4. Networks	6
3. ARGUMENTS FOR URBAN REGENERATION PARTNERSHIPS	6
4. REGENERATION STRATEGY AS A PROCESS OF NEGOTIATION	7
4.1. Synergy	7
4.2. Transformation	8
4.3. Budget Enlargement	10
5. THE IMPLICATIONS OF NETWORKS AND PARTNERSHIPS	11
5.1. Representation in Networks and Partnerships	11
5.2. Resources Implications of Memberships	11
6. THE IMPACT OF PARTNERSHIPS ON DIFFERENT ISSUES WITHIN REGENERATION PROGRAMMES	12
6.1. Motivations and Expectations	12
6.2. Organisational Structures and Arrangements for Partnerships	13
6.3. The Decision-making Process	14
7. PARTNERSHIPS AS A SUSTAINABLE MECHANISM TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE REGENERATION	15
8. CONCLUSIONS	18
BIBLIOGRAPHY	20

This paper is taken from a dissertation written to satisfy the requirements of study towards the award of a Master of Science at the Development Planning Unit.

PARTNERSHIPS AND NETWORKS AS NEW MECHANISMS TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE URBAN REGENERATION

INTRODUCTION

The 1990s has brought a new framework to the process of urban regeneration. Social issues have returned to the planning agenda with a general concern about the quality of life and especially the conditions and culture of deprived neighbourhoods, emphasising the importance of acknowledging the diversity of social needs, and the potential that the dominant cultures of the public and private sectors have in influencing the values of others. Consequently, urban regeneration strategies have developed a wider approach: regeneration is about improving the physical, economic and social aspects of disadvantaged areas. At the same time, there is a growing consensus that previous approaches to regeneration have found extremely difficult to generate long-lasting solutions, and tend to offer only temporary answers.

This has led to the creation of new institutional forms to develop and deliver regeneration programmes. Approaches to regeneration are now dominated by ideas of 'partnerships' and 'networking' which are perceived as beneficial as they will help to bring together the multiple parties with an interest in regenerating a particular area. These new approaches are thought to have the potential to enable a high degree of participation in urban policy, by developing structures of accountability. The main argument here is that the use of partnerships, by taking the leading role away from the public and/or private sectors and by providing a more integrated approach which includes community and voluntary groups, can increase the chances of developing long-lasting sustainable solutions to the problems of deprived areas. This paper will try to analyse these ideas by examining the actual practice of partnership and networks in regeneration programmes.

1. THE CHANGING WORLD ECONOMY AND URBAN RESTRUCTURING

1.1. Economic Change, Global Restructuring and Its Impact on Cities

In the last three decades, cities have experienced big changes, many of which have been beyond the control of decision-makers and planners. Technological change has led to eclipse of traditional methods of manufacture and distribution. This has led to a consequent reduction of heavy industry capacity, leaving dereliction, pollution and mass unemployment in their wake as well as accelerating urban decay (ECSC, 1993).

These changes have resulted in different urban responses. Successive programmes have tried first to support existing industry and employment and

subsequently to assist with redevelopment. City planners have tried to shift the economic base of cities from manufacturing towards service, media, distribution and process industries (Thake, 1995; EEC, 1993; Fox-Przeworski et al., 1991). Central governments (usually working with the private sector) have cleared and developed derelict sites. They have also tried to bring new industry and commerce to these cities. These initiatives were mainly directed towards the physical and economic upgrading of industrial and city centre areas that were in decline.

Initiatives for the economic and physical regeneration of these areas must be placed in the context of the globalisation of the economy. The process of globalisation has, as a main characteristic, an increasing competition for mobile capital world-wide, with new competitors coming up, as newly industrialised countries emerge everyday. What this process brings about are less demanding planning and pollution requirements, lower wage levels and less-organised labour movements, in order to be more competitive in the global market. We can say that the new global economy has emerged precisely because cities are performing well. Of course, not all cities perform equally well, and there are inequalities and disparities within particular cities that often generate political and social tensions (Sassen, 1991).

Cities are not homogeneous entities. Cities at large comprise a number of districts, each of them with its own qualities and in a different stage of development. These districts represent the informal structures of cities, some of them with clear boundaries, some of them less easy to define (Thake, 1995). The differences between these districts have grown up over many generations, and residents often feel them more accurately than newcomers. There are some patterns of differentiation, such as: level of development, economic activity in which they specialise, welfare level, and other administrative characteristics (postcodes, phones, etc.). These characteristics place residents in a geographical hierarchy often determined by tenure, class, race or religion (Hastings et al, 1996). Furthermore, the uneven development between districts (in a city) emphasises the local dimension and the distinctive mix of relative (dis)advantages possessed by each area, that enables them to benefit from each distinctive type of regeneration (Coombes, 1992).

The importance of the informal structure is, normally, not recognised. In many instances, it is the informal structures and processes that enable cities to function (Skelcher et al, 1996; Hastings et al, 1996; Taylor, 1995). As an example, the informal economy gathers pace in those marginalised neighbourhoods that are increasingly pushed beyond the boundaries of the

formal economy. In some neighbourhoods, where ethnicity, religion, regional or work cultures remain strong, extended family, work and faith networks can remain intact and strong enough to mobilise people (Thake, 1995; Carley, 1995).

Within these neighbourhoods the private sector existed as a source of employment, but it has collapsed. Beyond the boundaries of the neighbourhood, large-scale companies have closed their gates with devastating effect on the employment prospects of the local inhabitants. The loss of employment represents little disposable income, deteriorating services, dependence on benefit support regimes. More important than anything else is the loss of existing structures and habits, as well as the loss of access to workplace benefits such as trade union membership, social clubs and leisure facilities. As a result, the residents of these deprived neighbourhoods have less choice and feel they have lost control over every aspect of their lives (Thake, 1995; Taylor, 1995; Robinson & Shaw, 1991)

People have been damaged by these experiences with consequential loss of confidence on the promises given by the public sector which have not been fulfilled. Although the cost of rebuilding the physical damage can be measured in monetary terms, it is almost impossible to put a cost on the social damage caused by economic and social decline; such as violence, communal depression, etc.

1.2. New Approaches to Urban Regeneration

The essence of regeneration is the pursuit of economic growth designed to secure greater wealth and a higher standard of living, and by implication and increased volume and standard of goods and services. But, the regeneration process inevitably exploits certain sectors of our society helping to maintain the existing inequality already explained. Therefore, in the new context of the 1990s, the argument is not whether we should pursue regeneration, but 'how' we should secure the delivery of long-term social, economic, and environmental programmes with benefits that reach every single resident in an equal manner (Docklands Forum, 1996). The delivery of more equal and sustainable outputs from urban regeneration programmes requires not just an agenda with wider objectives, but also the reinforcement and extension of regeneration mechanisms in order to make them more accountably formed and steered (Docklands Forum, 1996; Hastings, 1995).

The objective of urban regeneration in the context of the 1990s is a wider one. Skelcher (1996) presents the main approaches to the new urban regeneration agenda:

- enhancing the physical condition of localities (these involves environmental improvement, development and redevelopment of land and property);

- stimulating the local economy with activities such as training and enterprise support to business in order to increase the skills of the unemployed;
- tackling social and community issues such as community safety, adult literacy and health promotion;
- developing the longer term future of the locality by strengthening the community's potential for self-government (community capacity building, emphasis on community based organisations) and by sustainable urban regeneration (this is particularly about the governance structures that emerge, and also about the types of activities that are undertaken within the more mainstream areas of urban regeneration).

The consequence of all these is a perspective in which almost anything to do with a locality experiencing economic and social deprivation becomes integral to urban regeneration.

Urban regeneration involves both policy goals and programmes of activity. The ways in which these are defined influence the organisational arrangements that are created to manage the regeneration process (Skelcher, 1996). Many of the new urban regeneration initiatives involve the creation of new organisational arrangements. Such institutional reform happens in an institutional context characterised by fragmentation and disorganisation. Coombes (1992) declares that in the case of local economic development policy, this became confused by different agencies experimenting with different programmes. Much of this situation was the result of the 1980s period; the accumulation of functions from local authorities and from arms of central government to specialist bodies have played a key role in the proliferation of local agencies, initiatives and players that the government is now trying to coordinate, in order to avoid duplicated or misdirected programmes (Peck & Tickell, 1994). Although the land and building top-down strategies of the 1980s have shifted to a more co-ordinated bottom-up approach, Peck and Tickell (1994) confirm the lack of optimism among the different actors involved regarding how much radical and substantial changes the new approach to urban regeneration can bring.

The urban regeneration process of the 1990s is built around linkages between a range of stakeholders. The widening urban policy agenda and changes in the structure of the public sector mean that a variety of community, public, private and voluntary groups are now brought into a working relationship which focuses, in particular, initiatives and programmes. Some of these linkages are informal contact and voluntary effort, while others are more formalised with a management structure and paid staff.

These new approaches try to be an answer for the failure of many of the early regeneration initiatives. Those initiatives tended to be single issue oriented, focusing solely in housing, training, environmental improvements, etc., delivered by a single minded

agency and often operated top-down, in isolation both from other local programmes and those they were intended to assist (Thake, 1995). It is important not to forget that urban regeneration strategies have to address a complex mix of local needs and opportunities (Bemrose & Mackeith, 1996). As said before, it was in this context that programmes were developed to allow a corporate approach through mutually supportive partnerships.

1.3. A Sustainable Future for Regeneration

The new agenda for 'urban regeneration' is not just about enhancing the physical conditions of localities, but also about improving the economic conditions and unemployment of the area in question; tackling social and community issues; and, developing the longer term future of the locality by strengthening the community's potential for self-government (thus community capacity building and emphasis in community based organisations)(Skelcher, 1996). After a decade of antagonism to local government, local authorities have been given some central role for the establishment of area-based strategies. At the same time, the recognition of the failure of the 'trickle down effects' has represented the recognition and rediscovery of the community (Lowndes et al., 1997). There are signs that over the 1990s, people's sense of society and social responsibility is becoming stronger. The existence of social exclusion and neglect, as well as the wasted human potential, offends many people's natural feeling of social justice (Taylor, 1995). In consequence, the new development strategies of the 1990s are changing their agenda, working towards a sustainable future, where development is secured for the wider public interest (Docklands Forum, 1997; Bemrose, 1996; Hastings, 1996).

Sustainable development is seen as a concept that links economic and environmental conservation, working in conjunction with social justice for both present and future generations, whilst incorporating and understanding market processes (Docklands Forum, 1997). Therefore, there is the need to think of cities in a more organic and holistic way (recognising the interrelationship and linkages between different problems and opportunities), where success can be measured in the opportunities they give for the growth and fulfilment of human beings, and for commercial and social enterprises.

If we are to pursue the delivery of social justice and long-term environmental sustainability as well as economic benefits, then the regeneration mechanism used must be accountably formed and steered. To ensure that the regeneration process is successful the needs of all groups must be represented and taken into account.

Experience has shown that the answer in urban regeneration is not leaving the initiatives either to the

private or the public sector to try to do it all on their own. Rather it involves creating partnership and community networks (Bemrose, 1996; Hastings, 1996; Skelcher, 1996) and promoting regeneration over a period of years in order to achieve a balanced incremental development (Badshah, 1996).

Therefore, there is the need for a 'paradigm shift' that reflects understanding of the longer-term nature of the regeneration task. This is to tackle aspects of organisational development for regeneration and call for innovation and examples of good practice (Carley, 1995).

Nevertheless, the development of individual partnerships is often constrained by tensions arising from political cultures or by pressing political issues and relations between central-local government, the private sector and the community sector. At the same time there are suspicions over motives and the methods used by other potential partners agencies. If partnership is to be fostered and regeneration to succeed such suspicions must be gradually overcome (Carley, 1995).

2. FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this study will be mainly descriptive of the new issues, ideas and present literature that are evolving around the process of urban regeneration, especially in the 1990's. As seen in Section 1, the process of urban regeneration has faced major changes in the 1990s, a consequence of the process of globalisation, which has changed the historic context of the 1970s-1980s, bringing new challenges. There has been a movement away from national sovereignty to a more globalised world; national economies are becoming more linked, with the largest corporations being bigger than some nations. These corporations are planned in a global scale and with high mobility and power. At the same time, there is an emerging interest moving towards localism or communitarism: "More and more people are starting to adopt new approaches to work outside established economic and political structures" (Docklands Forum, 1996).

Sometimes the information about urban regeneration found are just statements of conclusions about the nature of effective mechanisms to bring about urban regeneration. Fewer answers are given about what the process of partnership should consist of, or what it is expected to achieve as a result of the interaction of a dynamic between partners (Hastings, 1995). Many authors claimed the lack of accurate and high-quality information in the field of urban regeneration, essential for maximum effectiveness and replicability (specially in new schemes using the partnerships and networks mechanism). Good information is vital in order to be able to make accurate assessments, to devise

appropriate strategies, to monitor progress and revise already implemented initiatives.

The main difficulty when analysing contemporary urban regeneration is the complexity of the process itself: urban regeneration is a multi-agency and a multi-sectoral process. This situation brings inherent problems in assessing any policy initiative which involves a number of agencies or actors with competing interests and agendas. Multi-agency and multi-sectoral partnerships embody and give prominence to the process of negotiation and compromise inherently in the production of policies and strategies. Therefore, a method is required that recognises the competing and conflicting interests and the varying interpretation of success which can result (Hastings & McArthur, 1995). Pluralistic evaluation is an account of the policy process which attempts to understand and analyse the potentially competing and subjective viewpoints of the key interest groups, through a multi-dimensional analysis. Central to the conceptual framework on which pluralistic evaluation depends is the argument that success is a pluralistic rather than unitary measure (Hastings & McArthur, 1995; Mackintosh, 1992).

In order to shed light on the actual framework of regeneration, some examples will be presented. However, the most important task now is to define the main concepts used in the framework of analysis.

2.1. Sustainability and Sustainable Development

The emerging concept of Sustainable Development provides a framework. The centrepiece of the Earth Summit was the Agenda 21 Report which addressed the aim of 'sustainable development' initially established in the 1987 World Commission on Environment and Development Report or 'Brundtland Report'. It defined 'sustainable development' as that which "meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet their own needs". However, in an urban setting, 'urban development' describes the potential of a city to reach qualitatively a new level of social-economic, demographic and technological output which in the long run reinforces the foundations of the urban system (Nijkamp, 1990).

In this paper, sustainability is used to describe the need for initiatives to be designed in a way that leaves lasting benefits. As defined by Thomas (1994) sustainability implies that 'the management of development efforts should have a much more long-term focus rather than simply to ensure the successful implementation of development projects'. Although Thomas' definition does incorporate long-term forms, it is not the same as the environmental sustainability initiatives associated with Agenda 21. This conception of sustainability tries to go beyond environmental issues, to broadened its scope to focus on a beneficial interaction between economy, environment and social development.

Consequently, following this argument, sustainable regeneration could be defined 'as producing healthy, thriving communities and will necessitate explicit policies to achieve linkages between physical, economic and social regeneration'(Nevin & Shiner, 1995).

There are several aspects that made the concept of sustainability develop from the environmental concerns to a broader agenda. As suggested by Carley (1996), these aspects are:

- first, the awareness that today's initiatives should work in the long-term to reduce the chances for poverty, social alienation, and urban dereliction to affect future generations;
- second, the recognition that a sustainable society requires a sophisticated interaction between public, private and voluntary sectors; this means the need for an 'enabling framework' which allows the interaction between bottom-up knowledge and the experience drawn of what works and does not produced by each partner;
- third, the emerging focus on processes of participation, decision-making and management as mechanisms needed to achieve a sustainable society.

Taking into account these aspects, Carley defines 'sustainable development' as:

"A continuing, participative process of management and mediation among economic, social and environmental needs which results in positive socio-economic change, and which does not undermine the social and ecological systems upon which healthy communities and societies are dependent".

The acceptance of the 'sustainable development' concept as defined above has added opportunity for a new kind of consensus to emerge. A consensus developed in the present by all the players in the scheme, but working also for the future. It is important not just to sustain the outputs of any programme or urban regeneration initiative, but also to maintain the mechanism used to achieve them.

2.2. Urban Regeneration

Following from the definition of 'sustainable development', urban regeneration faces a new perspective. 'Urban regeneration' is no longer the accomplishment of visual or aesthetic landscapes. Several authors and agencies manifest that 'urban regeneration should lead to economic, environmental and social benefits (Docklands Forum, 1996; Bemrose, 1996; Hastings, 1996; Skelcher, 1996).

Regeneration, as defined by Taylor (1995), is about developing and putting into operation strategies to turn around areas with above average indicators of deprivation or which are seen by residents and outside agencies as being in need of positive action to rebuild

confidence in the area. In consequence, the word regeneration suggests a 'repair work': the physical, economic and social reintegration of disadvantaged areas.

Processes of regeneration have tried to address their agendas in different ways, depending on the political culture of the moment. As Steward (1994) suggested, in Britain three main phases can be identified in urban-regeneration: the 1970s was a period of local authority-led regeneration, typically based on major physical regeneration activities. The 1980s announced the rise of bilateral public and private partnerships, and the emergence of new physical regeneration agencies created by central government -the urban development corporations. In the 1990s multilateral partnerships of public, private, voluntary and community sectors have developed.

The globalisation of regeneration initiatives has given way to regeneration processes which provide greater local focus to the specific economic and social balance of a particular area. These initiatives have emerged from local imperatives and debates about building healthy and sustainable communities, and stimulated by central government programmes (as it recognises that government cannot act as the only implementing agency; it does not have enough capacity for that). Therefore, the new strategy of the 1990s calls upon partnerships and networks. Hence, the process of regeneration can be perceived as a way to foster innovation, which implies adapting the management techniques to the new context, and 'learning from doing' (Carley, 1995). Even further, Chanan (1996) suggests that the new process of regeneration can be seen by the residents of disadvantaged areas, as the means to achieve a better relationship with the rest of the society.

Urban regeneration partnership and networks need to be seen within the context of developments in urban policy (Lowndes et al., 1997). This is as a response to the call from the Rio Conference of environment and development in 1992 and Habitat II (1996) about the need to create sustainable communities, and to ensure that developments are more sustainable. The outcome of these two conferences was that this sustainable future can just be achieved through partnerships. This approach is based on the notion of locality, and the stakeholders which form part of the local environment. Without addressing (or trying to address) the needs of all the stakeholders, the areas regenerated will always show some kind of disadvantage for some of those working/living in them.

But in exploring participants' experience in the process of 'urban regeneration', it is useful to distinguish between "networks" and "partnerships" as two main categories of relationship, with different issues arising for participants in each case.

2.3. Partnerships

The concept of partnership contains a very high level of ambiguity, with its potential range of meanings subject to conflict and renegotiation. Partnerships can be defined as any schemes with funding or involvement from more than one agency. It can also be defined as just cooperation between actors working together towards some economic development objective. But, if partnerships are to achieve sustainable regeneration, a different criteria is needed. Therefore, partnership will be defined as (multi-agency) sustained joint working ventures which produce additional 'social' benefit which could not have been generated by a purely public, commercial or charitable project (Mackintosh, 1992). It is defined as multi-agency as it assumes that each actor by itself has not the required resources (financial, knowledge, experience, etc.) thought essential to achieve a successful regeneration initiative.

The use of 'additional social benefit' criteria by Mackintosh (1992) is based on two theoretical assumptions she draws from the literature on partnerships. These are:

- first, the scope for partnership is defined by the existence of synergy arising from different partners. This refers to the additional benefits of actors working together rather than separately.
- second, the assumption that multi-agency partnerships are distinguished by complex and potentially competing objectives: by involving the local stakeholders into the partnership, the local needs will be addressed (eg. upgrading of the local commercial activity) and, as consequence the social needs of the area.

Yet, one needs to be careful with the concept of partnership. Partnership is not just the simple action of putting together skills, energy and resources. Partnership poses major challenges and raises high expectations, such as empowerment of the community. If these expectations are taken seriously, they will require the change of organisational procedures and working cultures, with some degree of transformation.

Partnerships can be characterised as follows (Lowndes et al., 1997; Skelcher, 1996): they involve organisational relationships, which may arise voluntarily or imposed. Partnership will tend to have a formal basis, involving such devices as a company structure or partnership board. Consequently, it will have a clear boundary of who its members are. The operation of the partnerships will tend to be formalised through boards, minutes of meetings and agreements. The prerequisite for a successful partnership is a commitment and active involvement of all the sectors and ability to compromise. In order to achieve successful outcomes, frequent contact, trust, respect, credibility, openness and honesty are essential (Docklands Forum, 1996 and 1997). However, all these principles are difficult to accomplish, and it is easy to be critical about them. As implied by Peck & Tickell (1994), it is necessary to examine both the institutional

and political balance of power that underpins different kinds of partnership, and what the different partners are bringing to the table.

2.4. Networks

Networks arise from, and are sustained by, the relationships between individuals over some shared concern, belief or value (Lowndes et al., 1997). One of the characteristics identified in networks include its voluntaristic nature (individuals join the networks they wish). In comparison with partnership, networks are not formally constituted entities and, therefore, their boundaries are indistinct. They are also dynamic because of the nature of the individuals involved in the network, and their fluid and changing relationships with other networks. Finally, the level of formalisation within networks tends to be low.

Networks have their own internal structure that can be hierarchical in nature given that members have differential access to the scarce resources of information, money and time and authority. Some networks, not associated with any particular agency, have no budget and therefore they are invisible for the local authority or other public bodies (Lowndes, 1997).

Lowndes introduces an important question related to the 'representativeness' of the members of a network: up to what extent the members of a network represent, in their own personal characteristics, the nature of the locality or interest of the community from which they come. Questions about the legitimacy of networks come from managers and politicians, challenging those in representational roles.

Networks are seen as '*open systems of governance which enhance participation and challenge established hierarchies*' (Gilchrist, 1995, quoted in Skelcher et al., 1996). It is as if, in the 1990s, network has replaced 'community' as the term equated with good. However, individuals in networks operate within a wider context of organisational, political and economic forces. Their ability to act will depend on the financial and other resources of the agencies involved, political priorities, and commitments and the legacy of past organisational relationships.

Networks and partnership are proposed as two ways of managing the urban regeneration process that co-exist. Indeed, networks provide the basis from which partnership often develops (Lowndes et al., 1997; Skelcher et al., 1996; Hastings et al., 1996). However, the network only supplies the potential for this to happen. Both require processes of networking if they are to work effectively.

Networking has the potential to enable a great degree of participation in urban policy, as it is a process characterised by a high degree of trust, cooperation and mutual advantages (Skelcher, 1996). A key

characteristic of networking is that it cannot be formalised into rules or procedures; it is essentially an activity undertaken by individuals and reliant upon their motivations and skills (Lowndes, 1997)

The experience shows that the existence of something called a 'network' or a 'partnership' does not guarantee the presence of networking as a distinct mode of social co-ordination or governance. In fact, what is interesting is the mix of different modes of co-ordination present with current regeneration initiatives. Research into the governance of urban regeneration is interesting for the light it throws upon the growing significance of networking, and the ways in which networking coexists with other, more established forms of social coordination (Lowndes, 1997).

3. ARGUMENTS FOR URBAN REGENERATION PARTNERSHIPS

Urban regeneration partnerships are now widespread and advocated on a number of grounds. There is a set of main arguments in support of these new approaches to urban regeneration which are in relation with the policy context of the 1990s: a multi-sectoral partnership of public, private, voluntary and community sectors (Lowndes et al., 1997; McArthur, 1995; Skelcher et al., 1996).

The experience in the field of urban policy has brought an emerging consensus, comprising a number of different elements. On the one hand, the recognition that previous approaches to urban regeneration have failed to improve the economic and social conditions of residents of deprived neighbourhoods. On the other hand, the conception that interventions without participation are unsustainable, in the sense that they will not respond to local needs. In consequence, they will just achieve a short-term response (Bishop & Bonner, 1995; Thake, 1995). The first argument for partnership is that the involvement of those affected by an urban regeneration initiative, will enable it to be more sensitive to the local needs and achieve greater economic and social benefits, moving away from the central government paternalistic approaches or the profit maximisation objectives of the private sector (Lowndes, 1997; McArthur, 1995; Skelcher, 1996).

The second argument supporting partnerships is that they allow implementation to be more effective by drawing on resources from the different sectors or/and individuals involved. The resources available are not just financial, but they also include skills, information, political access and people (Thake, 1995). The assumption is that the involvement of the different sectors in the regeneration initiative at this level helps to built up commitment to the objectives and releasing means to achieve them. But this argument is especially important when related to community involvement. It is argued that local people are more likely to guard and protect the improvements made when they 'take

ownership' (Carley, 1995; McArthur, 1995). In this way, regeneration becomes more sustainable and cost-effective, both of them high profile political concepts in the 1990s.

But it is important not to forget that the involvement of the community in regeneration initiatives is more than just drawing resources, commitment to the objectives and cost-effectiveness. It is about community development and resident empowerment, developing a lasting local capacity in the form of strong and ongoing community organisations (Nevin & Shiner, 1995; Carley, 1995; Robinson & Shaw, 1991).

Finally, partnership presents a pluralistic model of urban regeneration, which tries to be representative of all the stakeholders, in order to create a consensus about what the problem is and the way to resolve them. This will legitimise the decisions and actions taken in the absence of formal democratic mechanism (Lowndes et al., 1997; Carley, 1995). Correspondingly, decisions should be prepared by a city-wide forum which includes a cross-section of stakeholders working in partnership.

Confronting these main arguments, individuals or/and agencies react in different ways, depending on their attitude towards partnerships and networks (Skelcher, 1996):

- the enthusiastic feel that partnerships and networking have opened institutions, enabling new approaches to develop;
- the activists who see networks and partnerships as a tool to meet strategic goals and deliver services in a integrated way;
- the pragmatists see them as a necessary part of the new funding environment and adopt an instrumental view of their purpose; and
- the opponents who perceive networks and partnerships as an attack on local democracy.

4. REGENERATION STRATEGY AS A PROCESS OF NEGOTIATION

The process of partnerships is not a simple one. As Mackintosh (1992) suggested, partnership is a concept in policy context that contains a high level of ambiguity with its potential range of meanings subject to 'conflict and renegotiation'. There is also the danger that partnership's models can posit a false consensus countered with 'compromise by conflict' (Bishop & Bonner, 1995).

The use of partnerships and community involvement is a difficult one. Mainstream planners need innovatory approaches to deal with these new organisational landscape, in settings where stereotyped constructs in the vein of planner works with local community are far too simplistic, maybe even a diversion (Hastings, 1995; Mackintosh, 1992). It must be clear than the shift taken towards partnerships, as a process where consensus

among all the stakeholders has to develop, demands the development of approaches that can demonstrate consistency within common principles, and adaptability to a whole of situations.

But, it is important to realise that there is not a blueprint for partnership: there is no single model. In this respect, Mackintosh (1992) puts forward a good framework for unravelling the meanings of partnerships. She distinguishes between '*synergy*', '*transformation*' and '*budget enlargement*' as three models of processes potentially at work within partnerships. These models are not alternative types of partnerships. On the contrary, elements of each of them can be present in different partnership's schemes.

4.1. Synergy

The synergy model might be called the ideal partnership or the public face of partnership. Synergy is based on the idea of mutual reinforcement or complementarity, where the action of two or more partners, working together, will achieve an effect greater than the sum of their individual effects¹, thus 'two plus two equal five' (Christie et al., 1991). As expressed by Christie these interactions of individuals and organisations working in partnership can lead to information exchange, transfer of skills and a form of creative 'brainstorming' that creates 'synergy'. Moreover, it is also important to bring into consideration the notion of distinctiveness developed by Mackintosh (1992): 'synergy is the product of the distinctiveness of partners working together'.

This notion of distinctiveness of partners, suggested by Mackintosh in her understanding of synergy, offers two important dimensions to the concept of partnership (Hastings, 1995). On the one hand, partnerships are suggested to be a process based on cooperation and coordination over the spending of resources, with the outcome of increased effectiveness or efficiency. Hastings conceives this type of synergy as '*resources synergy*', which is one of the main arguments when supporting partnerships and networks in regeneration. On the other hand, there is the perception that partners have different perspective on problems, due to their distinct cultures and objectives. The benefit that synergy brings at this level is the potential to set innovative policies or solutions. Hastings considers this type of synergy as '*policy synergy*'. This idea of policy synergy is also developed by Christie (1991) by suggesting that partnerships allow member organisations to enter each other's networks of contacts, which is also a potential source of synergy and the development of new ideas. He follows with the argument that via partnership individual organisations can gain access to networks of leaders in local communities and gain a city-wide or

¹ Based on the definitions of 'synergy' and 'synergism' taken from the *Universal Dictionary* (1994), The Reader's Digest Ltd., London.

regional perspective which they could not otherwise obtain.

Following the line of argument established by Hastings, the conception of partnership will depend on whether participants interpret the partnership process as policy synergy or as resource synergy. The first one involves giving more value to the inclusion of different partners, devising a more democratic framework. The second one, by contrast, suggests a more exclusionary framework with political implications more difficult to assets as it is not itself ideologically supported.

Furthermore, Hastings suggests that this differentiation between resource and policy synergy could help to reveal that each partner in the partnership have a different set of priorities or interest. Based on the experience, it can be said that many partnerships and programmes are driven mainly by the idea of resource synergy rather than policy synergy, since it focuses on maximising the effectiveness of resource expenditure and programme coordination. As seen in previous sections, one of the main motivations of the local authority towards its inclusiveness in partnerships, is the objective of creating a more co-ordinated environment, developing relationships between the different agencies (institutional or not), in order to foster integration between policies and coordination over the spending resources. The private sector, in principle, is also driven by resource synergy as its main argument (defending partnerships approaches in urban regeneration) is based on the idea of 'directing resources in the most effective way and without delay'. As suggested by the public and private partners, partnerships are just thought in fiscal terms. Consequently, the conception of partnership as a creative process, where the contrasting perspectives of each partner would be combined to produce innovative ideas and solutions to problems, is not likely to take place.

By contrast, in the case of the community sector involved in partnerships, they value more the potential to generate new policies or programmes that will respond to the real needs of each locality or residents, rather than just the concentration of resources. Still, there are more important reasons for the community sector to take this position. As it was suggested before by Hastings, a model of partnership based exclusively on financial terms, tends to be more exclusionary. Since the community partner is usually not able to contribute with financial resources to the partnership, their potential influence as a partner will be of a limited degree. On the contrary, a model of partnership based on policy synergy gives a more optimistic framework for the community sector to be consider as an influential partner, by looking forward to the innovation that the unique and different perspective of each partner can bring to partnerships and regeneration initiatives. However, will partnerships premise on policy synergy really develop into a more inclusive and egalitarian political agenda? Will the community sector be involved in the decision-making process with the same

power and potential influence over policies as the other partners? These ideas will be studied in depth in following sections.

4.2. Transformation

Mackintosh's model of transformation is a process whereby partners are trying to work with each other and find common ground for mutual benefit. But "each (partner) is also trying to move the objectives and culture of the other more towards their own ideas" (Mackintosh, 1992, pp.216).

Mackintosh uses the expression 'mutual transformation' meaning a reciprocal challenge made to the pre-existing culture and objectives of partners, who wants to learn and, at the same time, teach. She assumes that all the partners involve in the process will change at the same extent, in order to reduce differences. She brings up some examples²: through this model of partnership, the private sector is trying to bring a more entrepreneurial way of working to the public sector. They seek more market-oriented aims and to work more efficiently in its terms. And, simultaneously, the public sector is trying to push the private sector to adopt more social and long-term objectives. Each partner uses the same justification of working for the long-term public interest.

As with synergy, Hastings (1996) found new dimensions to the process of partnership described by Mackintosh. By analysing the above examples presented by Mackintosh, it can be said that her use of the word 'mutual' can obscure the real process of partnership transformation. These two examples tend to show a model where each other partner tries to impose its culture and working procedures onto the other. It is not perceived or explained by Mackintosh that each partners moves on each other strategy by a free will. It is on this respect that Hastings develops her perception of the partnership model of transformation. She suggests that partnerships can be uni-directional (as the examples above) or mutual, depending on how the different partners understand the partnership and what they want to achieve through it.

Hastings defines unidirectional partnerships as those where "one or more partners struggle to modify or to change another partner in their own image". Partners do not accept the need to change themselves" (Hastings, 1995, pp.:263). The benefit, in Hastings words, of this process is that the partners use differences to generate innovation (policy synergy). By contrast, mutual transformation is based on reciprocal challenges to the pre-existing culture and objectives of partners. Hence, in the context of mutual transformation, the less powerful players have the opportunity to play their role as there is not uni-directional imposition for change. But, Hastings argues that this less coercive situation

² These examples are based on Mackintosh (1992) work on public-private partnerships.

removes the possibility of policy synergy to occur, as mutual transformation tries, by principle, to reduce differences. Thus, whilst the process of mutual transformation is inclusive, it does not respect the differences of culture and objectives of the different partners involved in the process, and therefore help to maintain their differences. On this basis, a conception of partnership predicted on mutual transformation is less democratic than policy synergy. Therefore, it is important to distinguish between (1) the attitudes of individuals towards their relationships (do they perceive uni-directional or mutual); (2) by the balance of powers between partners when negotiating their own culture and objectives; and (3) the outcome of the process. As an example, there is the case of The Thames Gateway London Partnership (Bemrose & Mackeith, 1996), presented as a strategic partnership where decisions are made by consensus. But, it is the partnership itself who suggested that 'it is important to avoid areas of conflict at the early stage of the partnership, in order to firmly establish the partnership and to build up trust'. This affirmation brings up some question, such as which partner identifies a particular issue as conflictive and why? And how do you build strength by avoiding conflict? The answer to these questions is important as it will define the model of transformation the partnership will follow. I think it is important to remark that in this particular example the private sector is perceived as further advanced (at first, business companies where participating in cross sector task groups with the local authority), and the community forum falls far behind. Therefore, it is not difficult to guess which direction this partnership will take, specially taking into account that the community is facing financial constraints to fund its development.

In some cases, the private and community sector will use the transformation model of partnership as a mechanism to transform the traditional values of statutory bodies, by bringing a business dimension to a public sector approach or by using the partnership as a way of empowering the community, respectively. A successful example of these circumstances could be illustrated by the Stratford Development Partnership, a programme which arose out of a bid by the Newham Council and delivered through a partnership, in which the council did not have much interest and was a minority. The challenge in this stage was that the statutory body had to give some 'real' power to the other actors for the partnership to be successful; otherwise they would not feel involved and committed to it. To confront this problem, the community sector was given a grant in order to face the financial constraints to set an umbrella organisation. The Stratford partnership offers an example of a partnership established via the mutual transformation model: 'it recognises that there are many common interest between business and the community sector, but also many differences, and that solutions should come through mutual agreement' (Bemrose & Mackeith, 1996).

The reality is that most of the time, the sectors involved on a partnership show positive arguments about the challenging nature of the partnership, referring to it as 'a process that sometimes can be also edifying'. Nevertheless, usually none of the different sectors suggests that themselves should change in some way, in order to improve the outputs of the partnership initiative. Following Hastings line of argument, one example of uni-directional partnership is that of the local authority using the partnership as a mechanism to educate the community partner in the political realities they face in order to deliver social services (especially about spending and limited resources). As consequence of this transformation, the local authority is hoping that the community will be less demanding and more pragmatic. But, normally the local authority does not consider that (itself) could learn something through the interaction with community activist, specially if there is a strong community organisation that will offer challenges and insights to the other partners.

Nevertheless, the mutual transformation does not happen often as the more powerful players impose their culture over the weakest ones. As some of the examples drawn by Hastings in her article show, although the partnership gives the opportunity for community to be involved in a formal way in some parts of the decision-making, they are not thought to be involved in such an extent as to be able to generate ideas or shaping broad policies. As a consequence, the community develops lower expectations on what they can achieve through partnership. More than often, community and voluntary organisations perceive the partnership as uni-directional, where the potential of being a partner is giving and having an optimum level of information, in order to have a 'more accurate knowledge of the problem(s)' (Hastings, 1996). Although they perceive they have the potential to educate other partners on the local problems and needs of the locality, they assume they cannot change or influence the local officers or private sector. Furthermore, community organisations do not comprehend what they can learn from other partner's way of working, as more interest is put on the danger of being manipulated or coopted. (Hastings, 1996)

In conclusion, it can be said that the partnership model of mutual transformation tend to be less democratic because, by reducing differences between partners, reduce the changes of innovation and perpetuate inequality. Besides, it can be defended that it is more optimum to have at least an opportunity to interact with other partner, in some way or degree, than just accept the imposed culture of the leading partner with no right to have a say. I think it is important to remember that partnership needs a clear vision that has to be jointly developed and shared. This vision has to be translated into clear objectives, as a result of some kind of consensus. I will argue that the positivism of thinking in terms of 'mutual transformation' is to achieve the full inclusiveness of each partner in the partnership. It is assume, as impossible, to create policies that will fulfil

in all senses the needs of one partner without affecting in some way the needs of others. Partnership is a process of negotiation where everyone has to be flexible. And it is this flexibility that can be understood in terms of mutual transformation. Transformation that, in my believe, should not affect negatively the innovation character of policy synergy.

4.3. Budget Enlargement

This final model is based on the assumption⁴ that more partnerships are held together by a common external objective, of which the most frequent is the extraction of financial contribution from the other party(-ies) involved, or equally common a third party (Mackintosh, 1992). Indeed, the reality of the urban regeneration framework is that of the local authority facing money constraints and hard pressed budgets (severely limiting their ability to develop new and innovative programmes). The community sector and voluntary organisations seeking funds. And, on the other side, private companies with money which see the opportunity, but need some subsidy to make the risk worth taking.

Sometimes, where partnerships are seen as the agents of land and property development, they are often initiated and legitimised on the basis of leverage; that is relatively small amounts of public money to attract much larger amounts from the privates (Schaechter & Loftman, 1997). Where this private investment occurs, it is often predicated on the development potential of fragments of urban areas, such as city centers. But in the case of run down areas, with high concentration of poverty, property investment goes ahead if there are suitable and attractive opportunities for development and/or is heavily subsidised by the public sector, thus minimising private sector risk. Therefore, the model based on budget enlargement can be a common ground for a partnership to develop. For example, the European Community increasingly seeks a lead private company for large schemes, alongside local authorities involvement, to help to ensure effective project management and completion. For Peck and Tickell (1994) there is doubt that partnerships exist mainly as a key to unlocking competitively-allocated resources. They affirm that the new partnerships are simply finding themselves in competition with one another for public funding, inward investment and the like.

The case of Newham offers an example of the budget-enlargement model. The project arose from the recognition of the high level of unemployment among young black people. Its aim was to provide quality training and childcare to enhance further education and employment opportunity for the disadvantaged ethnic minorities in the area. The programme was carried out by the group called 'One Love Centre' which wanted to reform an old school building in Plaistow. The programme faced problems at the initial stage, mainly because of the lack of financial resources in order to

create a feasibility study and to develop a business plan. In this situation, there was a strong recognition among the member of the group that they needed Newham Council as a partner. The reason was not just because of their technical and financial resources (resource synergy), but also because of the funding system in the UK. As an example, the regeneration funding programmes known as the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB³) forces voluntary groups to seek partnership with other large organisations (Bemrose & Mackeith, 1996, pp.:20). As Lesley Seary⁴ argues: "all too often our strategy becomes dragged sideways by funding regimes: our funding becomes the strategy, instead of having a clear strategy for which we seek funding" (Docklands Forum, 1996, pp.49).

Although external objectives, such as funding programmes, have being a driven force behind some partnerships schemes, their implementation tend to make the partners take a short-term perspective. Programmes like SRB have a five to seven years implementation period. And most of the times, the regeneration job cannot be completed in this length of time. As expressed by Schaechter & Loftman (1997, pp.:10): "this raises a number of concerns about the long-term stability and viability of regeneration initiatives, and their ability to address the needs of the poorer people in our urban centres".

Interestingly, the idea developed in Belo Horizonte (Brazil) in 1993 of a 'participative budget', is perceived as a partnership created not to seek money, but to organise the city budget (Bretas, 1996). The initiative came from a new local government which had a programme based on a radical new agenda with new priorities: desire to support the poor and to promote people's participation. One of their first actions was to divide the city's investment budget into two, with half of the investment priorities being determined through a participative budget. This technique achieved two objectives : citizens' determination of new municipal priorities and the involvement of civil society in decision making and control of the state. Consequently, it helped to strengthen democracy, broadened citizens' awareness and increased the people's direct control over government. The important aspect of this model is that it leads to cultural change by creating new ways of thinking and education (emphasising policy synergy and transformation), as it demands a decentralised form of governance, creating a direct relationship between key government staff and the community. Nevertheless, Bretas (1996) argues that this is only made possible through an honest, open and critical dialogue between partners (government and its citizens). To have such dialogue, on the one hand government agents that were prepared to listen and discuss, and on the other hand, a

³ Some community regeneration organisations have claimed that this funding programme does not yet recognise that outputs related to such community development activities are valuable by themselves (Bemrose & Mackeith, 1996).

⁴ Head of the Regeneration and Partnership London Borough of Newham.

strong and organised civil society. The existence of these prerequisites allowed a shift away from the old 'clientelistic' schemes (based on the co-option of community leaders) and the authoritarian imposition of public investment (based on state personnel and with large bureaucratisation of the state). In conclusion, this is also a good example to demonstrate that the different partnerships' models, presented in this section, are not exclusionary, but complementary.

5. THE IMPLICATIONS OF NETWORKS AND PARTNERSHIPS

Partnerships and networks have been presented, so far, as important devices to achieve better regeneration strategies. This is the result of putting together the differential advantages of each partner. Yet, the practice of partnerships and networks has shown the importance of taking into consideration two aspects, implicit in the practice of these two tools. These are:

- representation in networks and partnerships;
- resource implications of membership.

5.1. Representation in Networks and Partnerships

The discussion of networks and partnerships is driven by pressures for both of them to be representative. As Lowndes suggests (1997), the question of representativeness has two aspects. First, the extent to which members of the network reflect, in their personal characteristics, the nature of the locality or interest community from which they come. Second, the extent to which relevant interests are party to discussions and have someone to speak for them. On the one hand, there is a genuine desire of engaging the community, voluntary and business companies in the delivery of urban regeneration programmes; but on the other hand, these actors will see the legitimacy of their representational role being questioned by managers and politicians.

This issue is specially important in the case of networks. Networks face the problem of ensuring that a plurality of views are heard and that any decisions made are seen as legitimate by the stakeholders involved (Skelcher et al., 1996). This is the problem of representation, since the informality of networks leave open the possibility for individuals to be included or excluded from the process. The ability to include and exclude can happen at different levels. This ability can be used as a powerful tool of what essentially is a political relationship; in other words, it is about whose urban regeneration values are accepted as legitimate and valid, and whose are rejected. One method to avoid this problem is to increase the formality of networks by turning them into partnerships (Lowndes, 1997). This clarifies which interests are going to be represented and how decisions will be made.

The increased number of initiatives, agencies and fora involved in urban policy also raises the problem about inclusion and exclusion. At the organisational level, exclusion of one of the partners may be functional in terms of the tasks to be achieved (Skelcher et al., 1996). The process of inclusion and exclusion is particularly relevant when individuals and groups, operating at the local level or in relation to a particularly community of interest, seek to link with those agencies that are shaping and making urban regeneration policy. At this point, questions about the legitimacy of residents' representativeness, is used as a mechanism of power by the most powerful partners to exclude them from the stages of the partnership in which they do not want the community to be involved.

The result of this situation is a huge amount of time wasted on representativeness issues instead of trying to build a strong network that will support the structure of the partnership. As Hastings suggests (1997), insisting that the community partner demonstrates that it is representative might not reflect that genuine interest for more democratic structures. It may be just a tactic used by other participants who are not happy with the implications of community involvement (issues of empowerment and transformation of cultures) and are not really committed to it. Therefore, Hastings proposes that a more realistic view of the process is needed, thus to maximise accountability of the community partner and the information flows between it and the wider community, without compromising the role they play in the partnership.

Partnerships are processes based on relationships between different partners with different agendas and priorities. Each partner may have views that conflict with those of other partners and press for policies at odds with government policy or that other partners are unwilling to support. In these situations, other partners bring questions about the representativeness of other participants, whether for concern on democratic structures or for more cynical reasons (Hastings et al., 1996). This is especially important in the case of the community partners, as it can create conflicts of loyalty towards the community leaders about which group or set of interest they represent, undermining their credibility as consequence. Here there is the double problem of 'representing' the partnership to the community, and at the same time, representing the views of the community to the partnership.

5.2. Resource Implications of Membership

Being part of a partnership or a network puts much responsibility, in terms of money and time upon members. Investing in a network or partnerships imposes short-term costs in the hope of long-term benefits. The ability of individuals from the community or voluntary sectors to engage in a network is determined by the resources available to them. Reduction in core funding and project-based contracts

affects their ability to devote enough time and energy into the process. The same issues can be used with small enterprises, in part because an investment from any individual business will be marginal at best (Skelcher, 1996).

Individuals and agencies will be forced to make economic decisions about their participation as networking becomes more significant. Sometimes, they could be asked to manage services that have challenged far more experience and better-resourced agencies. This requires a high level of commitment from the participants. Activist can become isolated from their communities by constant demands of their time from the partnership, imposing also human (such as free time and space), and financial costs. This is especially important in the case of small organisations that do not have enough resources to invest in the process. Networks and partnerships take time to be established and more to be maintained. But, as Skelcher (1996) explains, just a few or any get pay for it, and it is not normally seen as a specific organisational objective. This causes tensions since the current urban policy context requires investment in network development.

Networking can be seen as an act, trying to balance the possible monetary and human cost of involvement against the possibility of uncertain long-term benefits. Furthermore, networking asks for the balance between the idea of sharing information for mutual advantage and the need of confidentiality in a competitive environment. The cost of establishing a partnership can be facilitated by the existence of community-based networks in which investment can be undertaken. The idea is to take advantage of the community infrastructure already there, instead of starting from point zero. Some examples can be: building an information exchange and mutual support network, or to use the new communications technologies such as the Internet and e-mail to link the different agencies. They offer the possibility for rapid and effective networking without reliance on face-to-face meetings, speeding the negotiating process and reducing bureaucratic structures (Lowndes, 1997; Skelcher, 1996). It is important to acknowledge that engaging networks and partnerships can be costly to undertake, but even more costly to ignore. Otherwise there is a high possibility to miss what is going to happen next in your area.

6. THE IMPACT OF PARTNERSHIPS ON DIFFERENT ISSUES WITHIN REGENERATION PROGRAMMES

Urban regeneration networks and partnerships are located in a complex political, institutional and resource environment context. These two processes are highly topical in the agenda of urban regeneration as a way of getting a more sustainable future. But partnerships and networking are complex processes easy to jeopardise, specially when related to the community and voluntary sector. On one hand, partnerships and networks can be

presented as the modern day form of democracy. The problem is that they can easily be used as a tool to co-opt the communities involved in regeneration initiatives, as the true intention behind the other partners can be to impose authoritarian structures on the neighbourhoods involved. On the other hand, there is the tendency of elected members to perceive resident's participation as a threat to their position (as less support and more critics against the government performance comes from the community sector). If participants show these attitudes towards partnership, they will just represent a process directed towards resource synergy and a uni-directional transformation.

Partnerships and networks need to appreciate the potential contribution of residents' involvement. This requires to take some important questions into consideration such as (McArthur, 1995): what organisational arrangements are going to be necessary for the external agencies to engage with the community? Do the different partners realise that this means changing working cultures and opens their priorities to wider debate? Do partnerships bring any difference to the process of regeneration?

From the partners side, the success of partnerships will depend on (1) their commitment to sharing power, (2) their experience in working with other partners, (3) their definition of what partnership means and (4) the extent to which they have the power to address the issues they have defined (Taylor, 1995).

6.1. Motivations and Expectations

As known, partnership and networks are about bringing together different partners each of them with different objectives and agendas. And it is also about creating some kind of consensus within stakeholders themselves, as community is not a homogeneous body, with different groups in itself (as the question about 'representativeness' have shown). Consequently, each partner will develop different motivations towards partnerships and diverse expectations of what it will be achieved.

In the case of the local authority, their motivation is mostly based on the point of view of sharing risk, thus to achieve an agreement on where resources will be secure to deliver the programme (resource synergy). This motivation is related to the general agreement that the public sector alone cannot meet the needs and aspirations of the whole population. The motivation of the public sector matches closely with the private sector perspective: the maximisation of benefits with minimal risks. Therefore, their main motivation, towards the use of partnerships and networks in urban regeneration schemes, is basically 'directing resources'. The partnership model they will apply will be based on 'resource synergy'. Normally, they are not interested in bringing innovation into the policy process and even less about transforming their own culture. When talking

about the community, public and private sector's efforts are directed towards ensuring a skilled labour force, improving education levels and service delivery (which the community is expected to manage itself).

Evidence has been given by the experience, that while there is an agreement about partnership and the involvement of the community sector as a partner, there is no consensus about the purpose of the community partnership exercise. As Taylor (1995) reports, there are plenty evidence of resident's involvement in projects, but not that many about their involvement in the development of the strategy. The purpose for external agencies and elected councillors for partnership is usually about service delivery issues: coordination for a more effective delivery of social services. As McArthur (1995) suggests, the role of the community is virtually seen as providing the support for local people with services that will suit better the local needs. Through these relationships and actions, government aim to enable others in the private and community sector to carry out important tasks of urban management. The problem is that sometimes the government uses this mechanism to avoid full responsibility. Although it has been suggested that local communities can better target the needs of their localities, this does not imply that they can do all by themselves. It is important to remember that the essence of partnerships is to support each other in their respective limitations.

Sometimes, agencies and departments directly linked to central government and in social issues (housing, health, training, etc.) become involved in a partnership more because of political directions such as: Agenda 21 and the obligation on local authorities to consult local communities on plans for sustainable future. And sometimes they perceive they 'must be seen' to be engaged in partnership's initiatives.

In the case of community representatives, they respond to different motivations. Their motivation is to influence the proposed development strategies, ensuring maximum benefit for the locality. When community refers to partnership they do so thinking of an authentic two-way consultation process with good communication, mutual respect among participants, and evidence of participation at all stages, as expressed by the London Regeneration Network (LRN) (Bemrose & Mackeith, 1996). But, as mentioned before, the existence of community organisations prior to the initiative gives a different framework. When an area has a strong community organisation, community leaders in the partnership will place more intensity on the quality and match of services to the local needs, than on inter-agency coordination. Partnership is perceived as an opportunity for local people of having a say of what happens in their area. Networks based on working cultures, family, religion, etc, will be provide the basis for a partnership to develop. But, the main problem is that the existence of networks and partnerships in an area does not guarantee the presence of networking.

Networking is a process defined by the motivations and skills of each partner. Besides, networking suppose to enable a great degree of participation in urban policy. As seen previously in this section, this definition does not much with the motivations why the public and private sector joint in a partnership in the first place. They do look for some kind of coordination, in order to coordinate expenditure and direct financial resources. But, it is not appreciated as a distinct mode of social coordination or governance. The community sector is the only partner that tries to establish some kind of networking in the understanding they have of what a partnership suppose to be about. Still, their main problem is how to organise their different networks in a way in which networking will coexist with other more established forms of social coordination.

6.2. Organisational structures and arrangements for partnerships

In the current urban agenda the stimulus to the creation of networks have often been new central government or supranational (coming from the European Union) funding regimes rather than independent local initiative (Lowndes, 1997). These organisational arrangements come in contrast to the changes taking place in the organisational structure of local authorities. These are developing proposals about shifting 'some' power to non-elected agencies, working in partnership (as it was the case of Stratford Development Partnership) (Skelcher et al., 1996). The problem is that these new bodies and the local authority have to operate within the framework set by the central government and the European Commission, creating vertical linkages⁵. The result of this hierarchical status, is a context characterised by Healey (1992) for the creation of two types of tensions. On one hand, there is the tension between a concept which presumes that the role of local authorities and local plans is to realise national policy intentions at the local level. On the other hand, one that perceives the local level as primarily responsible for the policy content of plans, but aware of national and regional policies. At this point, there are some authors, such as Lowndes, who argues that these organisational arrangements have as a result an imposed partnership: the central and European government set the context for the partnership, without being a partner themselves. Hence, local authority, and other agencies and organisations will have to deal with the problem of engaging in a partnership which follows an agenda already set (specially if the aim to get central government or European funds) and equally respond to the local requirements. In this situation, it is important to determine if the partnership in question is just acting as a channel or mediator to achieve funds or, if itself is the primarily implementing agency (Bemrose & Mackeith 1996).

⁵ Healy (1992) question this situation where the central government controls the system through the power to amend plans, to require conformity to national policies and to review decisions through.

Partnerships are about negotiation, and therefore it can be assumed that the organisational arrangements of the business sector are going to be the best skilled for the process. It will also be one of the most influential participants because of the range of financial and human resources available. As consequence, partnerships are more likely to follow businesslike structures given the private sector more chances of having a leading role.

In this context, the community sector must have to develop some organisational structures, for them to be able to compete in more equal basis with the other partners. This organisational structures are also required as pressures are put on the community to be representative of the local people, as communities contain many different social groups with different backgrounds and interest. As Taylor (1995) and other authors suggest, organising around communities of interest allows differences in the community to be expressed and can be essential to ensure that marginal groups have a voice (normally ethnic minorities and young people are excluded). The existence of an *'umbrella of community organisations'* with already established structures of representation and accountability is a powerful attraction for other partners (McArthur, 1995; Skelcher et al., 1996) and helps to set up basis for their involvement in partnership (Taylor, 1995). An umbrella organisation provides the basis for networking, as it is a form of social co-ordination of the different networks existing in a particular area. Although developing such kind of structure can be a difficult task, the lack of an umbrella organisation can have important negative implications such as: (1) conflict and competition can waste scarce resources, (2) community representation can become divorced from its constituency; and (3) activities can become very dependent on one or two individuals. In this case, an umbrella of organisations will help to maintain a strong coordination among the different groups in the community in order to avoid fragmentation and reconcile rather than reinforce divisions.

Problems with this mechanism can arise about the ability of the organisation to articulate grassroots intervention regeneration initiatives, or its need to restructure in order to facilitate the involvement of a broader range of local organisations (McArthur, 1995). Nevertheless, the success of resident's involvement in partnership will depend on several aspects: first, the history of community organisation in an area; second, the extent to which networks exist between local organisations; finally, the degree of turnover or stability in the area.

6.3. The Decision-making Process

The decision-making process in partnerships takes place mainly within its formal structures. These are structures that are going to be more familiar to some partners than others. The public sector and the business group are more familiar to follow bureaucratic procedures than the local activist, more used to protest and campaign.

By principle, the organisational change of the urban regeneration process in the 1990s, thus multi-agency partnership, requires some change in the working cultures and attitudes. If every partner is going to be fully involved in the process of partnership -specially relating to community networks and voluntary organisations- some new skills will be required. These include individual skills (working in meetings, keeping files and accounts, mediating and negotiating, raising funds), and organisational skills such as planning, managing staff, representativeness and accountability.

Evidence from experience has found that community representatives has difficulties on following the process of decision-making and to understand the technical language followed by the external partners in meetings (McArthur, 1995). As perceived, the process of partnership can be an unequal one as the most dominant partners (public and private sector) create potential blockages to the community networks to influence the process of decision-making. The Glasgow study on partnership offers some examples of these blockages (McArthur, 1995): on one hand, there was the perception, by some community representatives, that their involvement on discussion was not given the same status that the other partners. On the other hand, there was the suspicion that most deals were following informal decision-making structures, without the community sector involvement. More often than not, the public and business groups perceive community involvement in the partnership as just functional. They try to elude meetings with the local representatives in order to avoid delays, or because they do not want to wider discussions into issues they are not interested on. In practice, as Robinson and Shaw suggest (1991), community consultation often means *'tokenism'* (employing a single community liaison officer) or transparent partiality (consulting only with *'safe'* community groups) and denial of choice (allowing the community to comment on development schemes already accepted in principle). In promoting urban regeneration schemes, central government utilise the rhetoric of integrated activities and local consultation. Schaechter and Loftman (1997) closer inspection of the actual (English) proposals and strategies formulated, and the evaluation of their subsequent implementation, suggest that many are actually based on business models, stressing physical, economic and regeneration outputs and outcomes with vague notions of the community benefits involved in.

But, indeed, there is frustration expressed by some partners about delays and bureaucracy that the involvement of the community brings about. A further factor is that many community participatory models do not allow their community representatives to take individual decisions in the partnership's meeting on their behalf. They can only do it with the authority of the community organisation they represent. In this respect, community structures need to be accountable and accessible, trying to reach all the residents and relate to them. As already seen, in trying to conform to

the expectations and demands of partners, these community structures can become bureaucratic and inaccessible (Taylor, 1995).

Partnerships involve tensions that represent the process of negotiation and compromise that is taking place. A process of bargaining about the purpose of the initiative and its strategic priorities is not surprising at the beginning as regeneration programmes as suppose to be worked out between the partners. Tensions are expected given that transformation is one of the processes associated with partnership, and established views will be confronted between partners.

More important than the formal structure of decision-making, are the informal and behind the scene's relationships which exist (Hastings et al., 1995). This informal activity can be thought of as the main element in the decision-making culture of a regeneration initiative. Detailed bargaining and negotiation does not take place in large, very formal and often public meetings. Indeed, if partnerships and networks aim to be work efficiently they need informal structures, which cannot be formalised into rules or procedures. In other words, they need some kind of networking. The problem here, is that the informality (or networking) given by each partner does not have the same meaning. If networking is defined in relation with each partners' motivations and skills, their level of networking and the way to use it will be different. As seen, normally the stronger partners will build alliances and strike deals away from the partnership table in order to exclude the weakest sectors from the decision-making process. In conclusion, this process encourages exclusion. On the contrary, networking is suppose to enhance a high degree of participation in urban policy, as it is a process characterised by a high degree of trust, cooperation and mutual advantages. Typically, however, the community partner participates only in the formal, public part of the structure and does not take place in the informal arenas. This would seem to set considerable limits on the potential scale of the community's influence. However, in a minority of initiatives, the community partner has occasionally been able to penetrate the informal structures.

The view that it is the community partner and not other parties that needed to change in order to bring more effective community partnership is implicit in discussions with officials. The existence of this attitude is a barrier in the way of dynamic, constructive and productive community partnership. The result is an unequal power relationship between local communities and key partners agencies. In correlation, land and property development issues will be consider in isolation from social and welfare related issues, which directly affect disadvantaged groups, as the partners do not have chances of coming 'really' together.

7. PARTNERSHIPS AS A SUSTAINABLE MECHANISM TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE REGENERATION

As seen in this paper so far, there has been a shift in the responsibilities and roles of the public, private and community sector in relation to the economic restructuring of local economies and changes in the machinery of government both at the local and national levels (Bailey, 1995). In nearly, every country, policy shifts have given way to new forms of partnerships and cooperation between the various actors, with planning and development controls made more flexible, and negotiation being introduced in many instances (UN, 1989). While the practice of partnerships is being accepted and extended in many situations, there is still the need for a clear framework of public-sector support, thus the practice of government has to be rational to accommodate innovations which the process of partnership could conceive through processes of policy synergy or transformation. In previous sections, I have argued about the potential of partnerships as means to achieve a sustainable urban regeneration. This premise will be difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish if strategies do not work to enhance the partnership which must resource and implement the strategy. As Carley (1995) argued this is the indirect functions that any development strategy should accomplish. Conversely, he continues, 'strategies which do not enhance partnership are likely to be weak and difficult to implement'.

It has been proposed by different authors that, in this context, the public sector should take a leading role in promoting new trends, by expanding the number involved and assisting the mechanism of partnership. This is what the United Nations, in its Commission on Human Settlements (1989,10) identifies as 'broadening the range' and 'deepening the base' of relation between actors. Broadening the range involves the introduction of flexible modes of operation, new forms of intra-governmental co-ordination and joint work by different agencies, helping networking. Deepening the base of participation requires accountability in institutions and, a decentralisation of responsibilities and devolution of powers to the level where this accountability is more effective.

The recognition of diversity and difference between stakeholders has been argued to have many positive benefits (Healey, 1996): it helps individuals work out their identities, by giving them more opportunities for action and involvement. In the social arena, it helps to change practices to make them more sensitive to differences in cultures and expectations. In the economic field, it helps to understand the different needs of different firms, and their particular circumstances, and the same can be applied to the environmental context. But, yet there is still discrimination towards some of the actors involved in the urban regeneration process, as they found themselves excluded from partnerships and networks.

Sometimes, this discrimination is the result of the unbalanced nature of each partner, as they do not have the same level of resources (different language and style, skills, knowledge, experience; or financial capacity) and organisational structure. Accordingly, strategies towards urban regeneration will need to focus on some kind of 'capacity building'. This term has a potential and attitude that seems entirely appropriate to the ideas of building on existing skills, knowledge and power. Taylor (1995) proposes several capacities that need to be developed if the full potential of partnership is to be realised:

- Individual capacity: skills, knowledge, information, experience, confidence and expertise.
- Collective capacity: local organisation, networks and contacts with other agencies, mutual trust.
- Infrastructure: technical aid, training and information, networks or agencies to support local groups and activists.
- Institutional capacity: locally-based organisations capable of establishing a long-term presence.

However, it is fundamental to remark that capacity building should not be just directed towards resident's organisations and those working directly with community participation programmes, but to everyone involved in the process of partnership. It is true that some will need more than others, but still partnership is a new process that will present many challenges to everyone involved in it, specially if the result is transformation of working cultures and developing new policies. The important aspect is that it helps to create the conditions for a more egalitarian and democratic process.

Yet, the capacity that will permit an urban regeneration initiative to be sustainable will be a well developed and established 'institutional capacity', thus successor organisations that can carry the benefits of targeted interventions into the future (Taylor,1995). Some authors, such as Taylor, suggest that the best practice is to create a 'mainstreaming organisation' in an already existing local institution. This follows the argument that local government's democratic accountability and leadership role make it ideally placed to establish political consensus and community support for potentially controversial local strategies (UNCHS, 1996; Hirst, 1997). Other authors, such as Thake (1995), argue that the institutional capacity should be built in the community, especially within minority communities, as external agencies have changing agendas not always matching the community needs. Thus, strong community networks and umbrella organisations are indispensable to support any regeneration schemes. Thake uses the example of Community development Trusts. These are organisation that normally starts with a single focus, for example housing, and as they establish a strong, stable organisation with its own assets and experience, they are able to become a base for other activities.

Furthermore, Thake identifies some characteristics that could make a partnership sustainable:

1. Permanence of the partnership. In order to obtain the long-term commitment, the partnerships needs to demonstrate its effectiveness, accountability and its relevance for the regeneration and maintenance of an urban area. As seen above, it is also important to build up the organisational infrastructure, assets and trust base that will enable the specific partnership to make a significant input.

2. Financial independence, which will allow the partnership to continue in operation when external grants are withdrawn (not to forget that some schemes are based on a budget-enlargement model of partnership). The partnership needs to have a strategy that will enable them to become financially self-sufficient. It is argued that regeneration approaches should take an entrepreneurial approach and be structured to generate surpluses, in order to be sustainable. These will keep the regeneration programme among their original developers and allow replicability of initiatives.

3. Multifunctional. Nowadays most of the urban regeneration schemes have a fundamental commitment to bring about substantial economic, social and physical improvement to a deprived area. But this does not imply that the initiative in question through partnership will tackle the whole issues at the same time; most initiatives have chosen to develop incrementally. Nevertheless, these broad terms of reference are important as they will provide the framework for future developments. In the same basis, these fosters continuous innovation, which implies 'learning by doing' or adaptative management, with systematic monitoring and adjust of strategies (Carley, 1995).

4. Engaging with the wider political/economic level. Partnership opens the possibility of linking local initiatives -normally field of work for voluntary and community organisations at micro level- with the wider (macro) level of urban policy, where public and private sector work. Partnership tries to find integration by processes of dialogue and negotiation between these two levels, via networking(Galle & Diallo, 1997). These give more chances of making a significant impact upon neighbourhoods.

5. Enabling. It is important to understand that most investments, activities and choices, which affect the process of urban regeneration happen outside government. Therefore, there is need for 'enabling policies' which recognise that participative and democratic government structures are not just only goals, but also means to achieve goals. For this purpose, new skills and behaviour need to be developed to enable a 'whole' response and to put the community purpose before professional or departmental loyalties (Wheeler, 1997).

These new perspectives towards regeneration will need an organisational approach, which is related to some kind of 'partnership transformation'. This implies a broader community development initiative, meaning community coming together on regular basis to define their interests and priorities for regeneration strategies, and to convey that there is an effective way to institutionalise this perspective (Carley, 1995). As suggested in earlier chapters, some options will be needed in the partnership: first to be broadly representative and effective; and second, to generate a degree of consensus about what the problems are and the way to resolve them. The combination of this two requisites, Carley suggests, bring internal and external legitimisation to the process of partnership and networks, building commitment among partners and creating the basis for the institutionalisation of the different stakeholders, who require strict and formal accountability of organisations.

Partnership and the wider agenda of urban regeneration, which try to tackle social inequality and social needs, pose many challenges and raise high expectations that require what some call 'reinvention' of government (Skelcher, 1996). Other argue that a more fundamental way of addressing these issues would be to examine the urban policies and practices. These will make the system of planning regulatory sensitive to the diversity of values with which people address their environment (Healey, 1992). One way is to make the system more accessible and more responsive to what different groups have to say. Consequently, one of the new ideas of the 1990's agenda is the transformation of the established practices of public participation and consultation in the planning field, in ways which allows more voices to be heard and which give the citizens equivalent rights to the land developers or the public officer to challenge the planning policies (main objective of community networks).

However, as perceived by Healey (1996), identifying and acknowledging diversity and more dimensions of differentiation arises problems to the management of collective affairs. As argued, partnership has been presented as a new instrument to pursue collective interest, with long-term result, always thought as positive. Some of the benefits are: increases in efficiency, the invention of new management techniques, social justice etc.... But the main problem that this theoretical line of thought finds is the lack of initiative to institutional change. Healey continues saying that what is lacking is an institutional context that could sustain and spread the benefits of partnership's initiatives. What is needed is not just an institutional resource to manage collective concerns, but also an institution framework which encourages a creative environment, building up relations of trust among different groups, situation that will enable knowledge to flow from around the various networks, facilitating processes of policy synergy and transformation. This ideal situation can be achieved through 'consensus-building' practices, which have as

an important result the generation of three types of shared capital (Innes et al., 1994, pp.ix-x; quoted in Healey, 1996): *social capital*, in the form of trust, norms of behaviour and networks of communication, creates the potential for serious discussions to take place among otherwise conflicting stakeholders. *Intellectual capital*, in the form of shared problem definition, and mutual understandings, etc... which provides a common basis for discussion and moves the players towards agreement on policies issues. And *political capital*, in the form of alliances and agreements on proposals that provides mutual gain, creates the possibility that proposals will be adopted and implemented. What Innes suggests is that the most important part of a partnership (or any collective interest initiatives) is to foster an interactive and collaborative capacity building that will help to institutionalise co-ordinated action for a long-term. In conclusion, Innes realises that for partnerships and networks to be effective there is a need for networking to happen, thus new forms of co-ordinated action for a long-term that will coexist with other already established.

Partnerships are formulated as a new instrument towards sustainable urban regeneration as (1)they offer an arena for communication and collaboration which, supposedly, give access to all those who have a stake in the issue; (2)facilitates a way of shifting decisional power as close as possible to those with experience; and (3)it fosters styles of discussion that allows the different points of view of diverse stakeholders to be opened up and explored (Healey, 1996). It is more that discovering new actors to participate in the urban regeneration process, partnership is about developing a collaborative capacity building, through which people learnt to communicate with others with very different backgrounds, ways of thinking and ways of valuing. The precise form of the processes which arise will be invented. Still, the institutional context must encourage such collaborative encounters.

As argued by Healey (1996), partnership should address three constitutional elements: rules, rights and resource flows. Following her line of argument, the rules in partnerships should be to push people towards each other, to recognise their have a right in the issue. This right means that every partner have the right to be listened to and rights to challenge decisions made on their behalf. These two elements should be present in any partnership-negotiation scheme, forcing the powerful to listen and pressing for accountability and representativeness of each partner. What I argue here, is that partnership should not be just about redirecting resources (resource synergy), but also about some rules and the rights of the less powerful (policy synergy through mutual transformation).

These ideas about partnership focus on ways of reconstructing the meaning of a democratic practice, away from the paternalistic and trickle-down notions, to more participatory forms based on 'inclusionary argumentation'. By this term is implied 'public reasoning which accepts the contribution of all

members of a political community and recognises the range of ways they have of knowing, valuing, and giving meaning' (Healey, 1996, pp.:219). In conclusion, the need to have networks in any regeneration scheme in order to ensure a plurality of views. From the informality of networks some formal structures will develop into partnerships but processes of networking will be essential in order to make sure that partnerships still being inclusive and accountable for any party involved in the regeneration process.

8. CONCLUSIONS

The wider urban regeneration agenda of the 1990s present multiple challenges, specially with the introduction of new mechanism: partnerships and networks. These two tools have been proposed as an alternative approach in answer to urban problems, based on concepts such as participation, inclusion, community empowerment, sustainability and incremental development. The dissertation proposed the hypothesis that sustainable and long-lasting perspectives needed to adopt a partnership and networking approach. Urban problems have become too complicated for a single-agency's capabilities to be enough to deal with any obstacles; even more, any proposal will just address part of the problem, as those initiatives will merely apply to that agency motivations and agenda. Partnerships and networks introduce a different model which tries to represent and respond to the needs of all the stakeholders, implementing an integrated approach. The use of networking helps to enable a great degree of participation and introduces new forms of social co-ordination. Partnerships and networks offer the possibility of creating a first link between the local initiatives developed by community and voluntary groups, and public and private sectors. This link is originally created to bring in different kind of resources from the diverse partners, but at the same time creates information flows which will help to develop more accurate solutions to the defined problems of an area. The sustainability of these solutions is result of a common developed strategy (result of a process of negotiation) which tries to fulfil every stakeholder's expectations. If the partnerships proves successful, it will provide the basis for replicability of future developments by fostering innovation among partners (policy synergy) and adjusting strategies to the changing urban context. Besides, the permanence in time of the partnership (demonstrating its effectiveness and accountability), plus the commitment of the various partners, to bring about substantial improvement to the area, increase the prospective of a sustainable regeneration. Nevertheless, this sustainable regeneration initiatives can only be possible if partnerships, networks and their supporting structures are equitable formed and accountable.

Indeed the reality of partnerships and networks has proved different. Actually, partnership and the use of networks do allow better planning and implementation

to be more effective as result of 'resource synergy' and consultation. Even, the use of networking in regeneration schemes has facilitated this process, as it has allowed communities to come together and express their views about the regeneration of their areas. However, most of the times, community organisations and voluntary sector have found out that this perception it not shared with the rest of the partners. This dissertation has demonstrated that although public and private sector show a willingness in involving the community sector in partnerships, they expect its involvement to be restricted to only certain aspects of the regeneration process. As seen, usually community networks are excluded from decision-making processes. Commonly, actors or agencies involved in a partnerships do not expect to transform their own working cultures, and even less having the weakest parties influencing the policy framework.

Moreover, partnerships and networks have many implicit problems which can affect significantly the process of regeneration. For example, it has been illustrated that the involvement of many partners does not accelerate the implementation process. On the contrary more bureaucracy has been created. Even, the growth of partnerships raises concerns about the probability of increasing those problems of poor coordination and organisational proliferation which the partnership model is supposed to solve (Peck and Tickell, 1994).

This dissertation has shown that although it is becoming widely accepted that partnerships can be accurate and effective in relating to local and small-scale urban regeneration schemes, it is difficult for them to function because of the lack of a clear framework of public and private support. Behind the rhetoric of partnerships and the holistic and community oriented approach to regeneration proposed, projects have merely continued with an ideological perspective that views private sector regeneration initiatives as inherently effective and desirable (Schaechter & Loftman 1997). The social aspect of regeneration is still mainly marginalised both in resources and policy making terms. Consequently, partnerships remain fundamentally unequal with in built mechanism that are geared at generating tokenism community representation rather than a shared and equal input into agenda setting and decision making.

What this dissertation proposes is that one of the main task for the new regeneration agenda will be to assists politicians and interest groups to achieve some kind of integration. The central procedural challenge is to convert the system from a hierarchical techno-bureaucratic practice to one which expresses local choices, in the context of potential challenge by all interested parties both to the content of plans and specific decisions (Healey, 1992). Healey suggests that although the planning system has a high degree of adaptability, the major weakness of the system lies in the limited power available to citizens to challenge political and administrative decisions. Usually it does

not acknowledge that partnership and networks are not just about money, but it is specifically about people and their efforts, innovation and new ways of doing things (Briscoe, 1997). Moreover, it has been suggested that a successful partnership necessitates some degree of mutual adaptation over objectives. This adaptation has been considered by Mackintosh (1992) and Hastings (1996), in terms of transformation, thus the opportunity to change the culture and style of urban practices. Therefore, partnerships and networks should be perceived in a different way, developing strategies from a process of 'mutual learning', giving rise to discussions and negotiations among partners and their contribution to resolve problems. Networking is important as politically and technically appropriate solution which arise out of inter-agencies discussions and debate (Carley, 1995).

Evaluations of partnership programmes must be done not just relating to which extent they have their own collective and individual objectives. The evaluation must also take account of wider policy issues, such as examining if the partnership has contributed to improve the social welfare of a deprived area in physical, social and economic terms. The key issues that any process of evaluation should take into consideration are: (1) up to which extent the decision-making process is accessible to every individual and groups in the affected community; (2) the extent to which different partners

have effective inputs and roles; and (3) the extent to which partners can work together over long periods and on detailed implementation issues (Jeffrey & Healy, 1997; Schaechter & Loftman, 1997).

To make partnership work Schaechter & Loftman (1997) propose basic criterias. Firstly, a set of common definitions, aims and objectives needs to be agreed by all the partners in order to ensure that there is a strong base from which projects can evolve. Secondly, there is a clear need to consider the power relations between the various participants within regeneration. Thirdly, the different partners must have a clear understanding of what partnerships involve, and the difficulties inherent to the process, such as: shifting partner organisations from an individual to a collaborative practice, which will require time to change established organisational structures; and recognising the limitations and constraints placed by the central government.

The hypothesis defended in this dissertation has tried to explain that partnerships in regeneration are not a panacea. By involving the different sector in regeneration schemes, more participative, sustainable and equitable environments do not by definition result. The introduction of partnerships and networks will help to create some 'room for manoeuvre', simply by presenting new context with implicit new challenges, as the urban context it is changing with new problems and new actors evolving. But, unless there is a 'paradigm shift' which reflects understanding of the long-term nature of the regeneration task and the need for coordination of the various actors in development, we will be reinventing policies that reinforce networks and partnerships' limitations of being sustainable mechanisms towards sustainable regeneration. Partnerships and networks can produce more sustainable policies if the policy system take advantage of the interaction of different stakeholders and the innovation that the negotiation process brings about.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Badshah, Akhtar A. (1996), *Our Urban Future. New Paradigms for Equity and Sustainability*, Zed Books Ltd, London.
- Bartelmus, P. (1994), *Environment, Growth and Development. The Concepts and Strategies of Sustainability*, Routledge Ltd., London.
- Bailey, N. (1995), *Partnership Agencies in British Urban Policy*, UCL Press Ltd., London.
- Bemrose, C. & Mackeith, J. (1996), *Partnerships for Progress*, The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Bennet, J and Patel, R. (1995), "Sustainable Regeneration Strategies", *Local Economy*, Vol. 10, No 2, August, pp 133-148.
- Berry, J., McGreal, S. & Deddis, B. (1993), *Urban Regeneration. Property Investment and Development*, E & FN SPON Ltd., London.
- Bishop, J and Bonner, A. (1997), "Participation, Partnership and Consensus-making 'Parts' into 'Wholes', *Town and Country Planning*, Vol. 66, No 6, August, pp 209-211.
- Bretas, Paixao P.R. (1996), "Participative Budgeting in Belo Horizonte: Democratization and Citizenship", *Environment and Urbanization*, Vol.8, No 1, April, pp 213-222.
- Briscoe, B. (1997), "How Shall We Live? The New Deal for Regeneration", *Town and Country Planning*, Vol. 66, No 4, April, pp 109.
- Carley, M. (1995), *Using Information for Sustainable Urban Regeneration*, Innovation Study No 4, Centre for Human Ecology, University of Edinburgh, July.
- Carley, M. (1995), "Participating in Something Sustainable", *Town and Country Planning*, Vol. 64, No 10, October, pp 266-268.
- Carley, M. (1995), "The Bigger Picture -Organising for Sustainable Urban Regeneration", *Town and Country Planning*, Vol. 64, No 9, September, pp 236-239.
- Commission of Human Settlements (1988), "Roles, responsibilities and Capabilities of Governmental and Non-Governmental Sectors in the Field of Human Settlements", United Nations, Colombia.
- DFID (1997), "Eliminating World Poverty: A Challenge for the 21st Century", White Paper on International Development, November, London.
- Chanan, G. (1995), "Regeneration. Plugging Gaps or Pushing Frontiers?", *Local Economy*, Vol.
- Christie, I., Carley, M, Fogarty, M. and Legard, R. (1991), *Profitable Partnerships. A Report on Business Investment in the Community*, Policy Studies Institute, London
- Coombes, M. Raybould, S. & Wong, C (1992), *Developing Indicators to Asses the Potential for Urban Regeneration*, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, HMSO.
- Docklands Forum (1996), *Millennium. Partnerships for Sustainable Regeneration*, London.
- Docklands Forum (1997), *Urban Regeneration: Partnerships for Success*, PLCR, London.
- EEC (1993), *Urban Regeneration and Industrial Change*, ECSC-EEC-EAEC, Brussels, Luxembourg.
- Fox-Przeworski, J., Goddard, J. & Jong, M. (1991), *Urban Regeneration in a Changing Economy: An International Perspective*, Claredon Press, Oxford.
- Gaye, M. and Diallo, F. (1997), "Community Participation in the Management of the Urban Environment in Rufisque (Senegal)", *Environment and Urbanization*, Vol.9, No 1, April, pp 9-29.
- Hastings, A. (1996), "Unravelling the Process of 'Partnership' in Urban Regeneration Policy", *Urban Studies*, Vol. 33, No 2, pp 253-268.
- Hastings, A., McArthur, A. & McGregor, A. (1996), *Less than Equal? Community Organisations and Estate Regeneration Partnerships*, The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Healey, P. (1996), "The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory and Its Implications for Spatial Strategy Formation", *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, Vol. 23, pp 217-233.
- Healey, P. (1996), "Consensus-Building across Difficult Divisions: New Approaches to Collaborative Strategy Making", *Planning Practice and Research*, Vol. 11, No 2, pp 207-216.
- Hirst, C. (1997), "DoE chief planner calls for openness in partnerships", *Planning Week*, Vol.5, No 4, 30 January, pp 3.
- Hirst, C. (1997), "Regeneration Partnerships Must Clarify Member's Role", *Planning Week*, No 1208, 7 March, pp 7.
- HMSO (1990), *US Experience in Evaluating Urban Regeneration*, Department of the Environment, London.

- HMSO (1995), *Aspects of Britain: Urban Regeneration*, London.
- Lowndes, V., Nanton, P., McCabe, A. and Skelcher, C. (1997), "Networks, Partnerships and Urban Regeneration", *Local Economy*, Vol. 11, No 4, February, pp 333-342.
- Mackintosh, M. (1992), "Partnership: Issues of Policy and Negotiation", *Local Economy*, Vol. 7, No 3, November, pp 210-224.
- McArthur, A. (1995), "The Active Involvement of Local Residents in Strategic Community Partnership", *Policy and Politics*, Vol. 23, No 1, January, pp 61-71.
- McCarthy, J. (1997), "Empowerment or Exclusion? John McCarthy questions the influential and widespread acceptance of the success of the Scottish urban partnerships", *Town and Country Planning*, Vol. 66, No 1, January, pp 20-21.
- Neary, S.J., Symes, M.S. & Brown, F.E. (1994), *The Urban Experience. A people-environment perspective*, Ed. E & FN SPON, London.
- Nevin, B. and Shiner, P. (1995), "Community Regeneration and Empowerment: A New Approach to Partnership", *Local Economy*, Vol. 9, No 4, February, pp 308-320.
- Nijkamp, P. (1990), *Sustainability of Urban Systems: A Cross-National Evolutionary Analysis of Urban Innovation*, Department of Economy, Free University, Amsterdam.
- Peck, J. and Tickell, A. (1994), "Too Many Partners...The Future for Regeneration Partnerships", *Local Economy*, Vol. 9, NO 3, November, pp 251-265.
- Robinson, F. and Shaw, K. (1991), "Urban Regeneration and Community Involvement", *Local Economy*, Vol. 6, No 1, May, pp 61-73.
- Sassen, S. (1991), *Cities in a World Economy*, Ed. Pine Forge Press.
- Skelcher, C., McCabe, A. & Lowndes, V (1996), *Community Networks in Urban Regeneration*, The Police Press, UK.
- Schaechter, J. and Loftman, P. (1997), "Unequal Partners. Partnership Agencies and Social Regeneration", *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy and Action*, Whose Millennium? Ltd., Vol. 8, December.
- Taylor, M. (1995), *Unleashing the Potential: Bringing residents to the centre of regeneration*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.
- Thake, S. (1995), *Staying the Course: The Role and Structures of Community Regeneration Organisations*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.
- Thomas, A. (1994), "What is Development Management?", *DPP Working Paper*, No 28, November.
- UNCHS (1996), *An Urbanizing World: Global Report on Human Settlements*, Oxford University press, pp 359-365; 407-409; 424-433).