# City Research Online

## City St George's, University of London

**Citation:** Stanton, J. (2012). Local sustainable development: Lessons learned from the New Deal for Communities. Environmental Law Review, 14(1), pp. 26-43.

This is the published version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

**Permanent repository link:** https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/5066/

**Copyright and Reuse:** Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to City Research Online policy.

City Research Online: http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/ publications@citystgeorges.ac.uk

**Environmental Law Review**

2012

# Local sustainable development: lessons learned from the New Deal for Communities

John Stanton

**Subject:** Environment. **Other related subjects:** Planning

**Keywords:** Public policy; Sustainable development; Urban regeneration

***Env. L. Rev. 26** **Keywords:** Sustainable development, New Deal for Communities

**Abstract:** Sustainable development has, in recent times, come to feature prominently on the government agenda, particularly in respect of local communities. In line with this, the New Deal for Communities programme was established to work towards the regeneration of some of the most deprived neighbourhoods in England. Now that the scheme has reached its conclusion, this article evaluates the extent to which it met with the government's policies for 'building sustainable communities' as set out in the Strategies on Sustainable Development 1999 and 2005.

## INTRODUCTION

In 1999, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister[1] launched the New Deal for Communities[2] scheme as part of the government's National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal.[3] It was an area-based programme designed to 'turn around' deprived communities[4] and give local people greater influence over the way in which funds are used to achieve neighbourhood renewal.[5] Whereas previous regeneration programmes had seen monies being paid to central and local government bodies for the purposes of regeneration, typically focusing on specific outcomes,[6] the NDC scheme involved monies being allocated directly to particular neighbourhoods for them to manage, under the direction of a Partnership Board, chiefly made up of local representatives.[7] It was area-based rather than outcome-based. This ensured a more community-focused attitude to neighbourhood renewal and helped to lay the foundations for what was intended to be a community-led, bottom-up regeneration programme. The rationale for the programme was that it would 'empower ***Env. L. Rev. 27*** local communities to shape a better future for themselves'.[8] Indeed, the *National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal* considered that the programme would 'bring together local people, community and voluntary organisations, public agencies, local authorities and business in an intensive local focus to tackle problems such as: poor job prospects; high levels of crime; a rundown environment; and [having] no one in charge of managing the neighbourhood and coordinating the public services that affect it'.[9]

The 39 NDC programmes across the country were, over a ten-year period, expected to engage in partnership with these various local bodies to achieve certain objectives necessary in each given community.[10] Partnership became an important aspect of the scheme and whilst having local residents playing a part was important in terms of participation, the partnership expected of these NDC initiatives meant that other bodies and agencies were also having a say in the operation of the schemes. This shows that though promising increased participation for local citizens, this came at the price of having to negotiate with local bodies and agencies as to the best way forward. Despite this, however, the bottom-up approach of the NDC schemes meant that particular local objectives could be met more successfully. Indeed, as a result of the way in which these objectives differ between communities, localised bodies working to meet these aims would be likely to be more effective at tackling local issues than any centralised decision-making authority. As the *National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal* stated, 'the key to the New Deal for Communities is that it is flexible and very local. There will be complete flexibility on what programmes can cover … the very local focus will allow communities to identify closely with the programme and be actively involved'.[11]

The tackling of local deprivation was at the heart of the NDC programme with the 39 schemes being in some of the most deprived areas of the UK.[12] With an average of £50m of funding per programme, the NDC was designed to transform these deprived communities and improve the lives of, on average, some 9,900 people who were accommodated within each area.[13] This transformation took place on the foundation of six key objectives[14] all of which did much to emphasise the community-led

nature of the scheme and its focus on local people and the areas in which they live and work.

The NDC's ten-year period, however, has now drawn to a close and 2011 saw the expiration of the programme. It is the purpose of this article, therefore, to analyse the success of the scheme in terms of its achievement of local sustainable development. It is structured first to define sustainable development and to outline the UK Government's policies relating ***Env. L. Rev. 28*** to its achievement. Next, within this context, the article analyses the NDC scheme, considering the extent to which it met with the Strategies for Sustainable Development and created sustainable communities.

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, THE UK GOVERNMENT'S SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES AND THE NEW DEAL FOR COMMUNITIES

Sustainable development is a key principle of environmental law both in the UK and throughout the international community. Though many argue that it is a vague, ambiguous and unclear concept,[15] some guidance is provided by the Brundtland Report[16] which defines it as 'development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'.[17] Holder and Lee consider the extent to which this has been built on and added to over the years, most prominently by the Rio Declaration[18] and the Johannesburg summit.[19] Whilst the Rio Declaration emphasised the importance of placing human beings at the centre of sustainable development,[20] it is the Johannesburg summit and its Declaration on Sustainable Development[21] that plays the most significant role in understanding the nature of the principle. Though not the first to develop what has come to be known as the 'three-pillar' approach,[22] it was notable in affirming its importance across all levels of governance stressing, in Principle 5, the significance of 'the interdependent and mutually reinforcing pillars of sustainable development - economic development, social development and environmental protection - at the local, national, regional and global levels'.[23] The acceptance of this 'three-pillar' approach, in ***Env. L. Rev. 29*** assisting in the understanding of sustainable development, is similarly evident in various academic considerations of the principle.[24]

Sustainable development, therefore, has become widely accepted as a key principle of international law and it is there that the principle has its roots. This article, however, is concerned with sustainable development's application at the national and local community levels.

Whilst the Johannesburg Declaration has already been quoted as noting the importance of sustainable development at the national and local levels,[25] it is Agenda 21 that provides the most probative authority here.[26] This acknowledges the importance of local community involvement in the pursuit of sustainable development, considering that 'the participation and cooperation of local authorities will be a determining factor in' achieving sustainable development in the aftermath of Rio.[27] Indeed, Paterson and Theobald note that Agenda 21 'forms the basis of … national sustainable development strategies' and embodies the notion of subsidiarity.[28] Sustainable development, therefore, is equally important at the national and local levels, where it can be used for the benefit of communities. On this level, the UK government has sought to implement the 'three-pillar' approach that, following Johannesburg, 'seems to be emerging as a new international "definition" ',[29] as will be seen upon consideration of the UK government's Sustainable Development Strategies, below.

## UK GOVERNMENT SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES 1999 AND 2005

Though there were, over a number of years, various attempts at and forms of the UK's pursuit of sustainable development,[30] the 1999 Strategy for Sustainable Development, *A Better Quality of Life,* is perhaps the most significant place from which to start. Identifying both the 1999 and 2005 Strategy's aims and policies for sustainable development will enable a consideration of the rationale behind the NDC programme and an examination of the extent to which it met the government's policies and strategies on sustainable development as well as wider objectives of the principle.

***Env. L. Rev. 30*** The 1999 Strategy states that sustainable development involves 'the simple idea of ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and for generations to come'.[31] Though this has clear echoes of the Brundtland report,[32] it is the 'three-pillar' approach that lies very much at the heart of the government's strategy considering, as it does, the need 'to achieve economic, social and environmental objectives'.[33] The government also laid down a number of indicators which help to measure progress through categorising key issues relating to quality of life.[34] These all fall within the 'three-pillars' of sustainable development and assist in linking up the key objectives of the sustainable development principle with the government's policies.

Upon this foundation, the strategy identifies ‘priority areas for action … [setting out] action that the government has already taken and further initiatives that are planned’.[35] One such area relates to ‘building sustainable communities’. The main objectives here fit within the ‘three-pillar’ approach and emphasise the need to involve communities in sustainable development.[36] This was further developed by the 2005 Strategy, *Securing the Future: The UK Government's Sustainable Development Strategy,* [37] which stated that the sustainable communities policy would ‘improve people's lives by delivering better neighbourhoods; cleaner, safer, greener, healthier communities; homes for all; stronger neighbourhood engagement’.[38] Still founded on the ‘three-pillars’, the strategy stated that the ‘aim is to create sustainable communities in England that embody the principles of sustainable development at the local level:[39] balancing and integrating the social, economic and environmental components of their community; meeting the needs of existing and future generations; and, respecting the needs of other communities in the wider region or internationally to make their communities sustainable’.[40] This, perhaps more than anything, demonstrates the link between the established definitions of sustainable development, elucidated at Brundtland and Johannesburg and the UK Government's strategies.

***Env. L. Rev. 31** The aims of sustainable development, therefore, are very much at the heart of the government's sustainable communities policy. With this in mind, the 2005 Strategy states that:

‘Sustainable communities should be:

• Active, inclusive and safe - fair, tolerant and cohesive with a strong local culture and other shared community activities

• Well run - with effective and inclusive participation, representation and leadership

• Environmentally sensitive - providing places for people to live that are considerate of the environment

• Well designed and built - featuring a quality built and natural environment

• Well connected - with good transport services and communication linking people to jobs, schools, health and other services

• Thriving - with a flourishing and diverse local economy

• Well served - with public, private, community and voluntary services that are appropriate to people's needs and accessible to all

• Fair for everyone - including those in other communities, now and in the future’.[41]

These objectives, outlining the fundamental details of the 2005 Strategy's sustainable communities policy, mark the culmination of the government's vision for what a sustainable community should be, developing as they had from the 1999 Strategy. They have at their heart the fundamental aims of sustainable development and consider how they might best be reflected on the ground in local communities. As such it is against these objectives that the NDC will be tested in considering the extent to which it met the Strategies' policies, created sustainable communities and achieved sustainable development.

It is, of course, important to note that the NDC programme preceded both the 1999 and the 2005 Strategies. The sustainable communities policy as outlined in the 2005 Strategy however, represents the fully matured policy that the government - the same government that established the NDC - had in mind as regards the vision for sustainable communities and, as such, it is this that should mark the standard of assessment for the NDC. Indeed, the NDC scheme was identified, in the 1999 Strategy, as being one of the key areas of action necessary in extending the opportunity for the building of sustainable communities.[42] It stated that:

The New Deal for Communities is a major new programme to fund regeneration of some of the poorest neighbourhoods … It will promote innovative local solutions, supporting partnerships of local people, community and voluntary organisations, public agencies, local authorities and business. … The Government has asked partnerships to take account of sustainable development.[43]

The NDC scheme, therefore, stems from an identification by the UK Government that one of the most effective ways in which sustainable development can be achieved in local communities is through working with the communities themselves. Indeed, as the 1999 Strategy continues, the ‘Government

cannot do the job alone. We need to work together, forging partnerships with … local authorities and voluntary groups'.[44] In forging these partnerships, therefore, and through setting up the NDC scheme, the government was ensuring that the objectives of sustainable development, as laid down in its strategy, could be achieved at the local level through the building of these sustainable communities.

## *Env. L. Rev. 32 HOW THE NDC MET THE GOVERNMENT'S STRATEGIES FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Thus far, this article has defined sustainable development and, in view of this, identified the government's policies for 'building sustainable communities'. Furthermore, in the context of these strategies it has introduced the NDC, a government initiative designed to regenerate deprived communities across England. It is the purpose of this next section, however, to analyse the extent to which the NDC met the objectives of the government's sustainable communities policy, set out above.[45]

The NDC scheme, whilst having its fundamental aspects prescribed via the DCLG, cannot be said to have been the same in any two areas due to the individual issues that each community would have been tasked to consider. Indeed, as CRESR stated:

Partnerships have had to tackle different sets of problems. An inner London NDC with ethnically mixed populations will be facing particular difficulties in relation say to housing, environmental perceptions and fear of crime, but relatively less acute problems with regard to health and education. Alternatively, an NDC located in a predominantly white, social housing project, on the outskirts of a northern town or city is likely to have different priorities arising from large numbers of people with long term illness or disability, poor educational attainment figures and poor health.[46]

It is necessary, therefore, to identify one example as providing a case study for this article, a role that is fulfilled by the scheme operating in the EC1 area of London. The EC1 NDC was awarded £52.9m for the period 1 April 2001 to 31 March 2011 and was tasked with making improvements in the Bunhill and Clerkenwell areas of the London Borough of Islington.[47] It sought to regenerate this deprived community on the basis of self-set objectives, with the aim that the EC1 community would become stronger and more sustainable, cleaner, safer and greener and healthier, wealthier and with more skills.[48] In achieving these objectives, the partnership worked to ensure that improvements were sustainable beyond the end of the NDC programme,[49] which, coupled with the nature of these improvements, demonstrates a clear dedication to sustainable development within the EC1 area. To ascertain the extent to which the EC1 NDC met with the government's sustainable communities policy, it is necessary to consider it alongside the criteria, outlined above, laid down in the 2005 Strategy.

### ACTIVE, INCLUSIVE AND SAFE

This first criterion of a sustainable community is linked to the social development aspect of the 'three pillars' of sustainable development, above.[50] It is best envisaged through the idea of community cohesion which is a term 'used to describe a state of harmony or tolerance between people from different backgrounds living within a community. It is *Env. L. Rev. 33 linked to the … idea that if we know our neighbours and contribute to community activity then we are more likely to look out for each other [and] increase cohesion'.[51] Indeed, it is integral both to the successful development of an area and the sustainability of that development that local people feel a part of and belong to a community.

One way in which the NDC has worked to create 'active, inclusive and safe' communities, and developed what the CRESR calls the 'Community Dimension',[52] is through the adoption of 'a rich diet of initiatives to engage with residents and to enhance community capacity'.[53] The NDC 'actively [sought] … to engage the wider community … [through] dedicated community engagement or involvement teams; [and through] constructing new … community facilities'.[54] An example of such a facility is the EC1 Connect project which worked to address the needs of local people throughout the area.[55]

This involved advisors knocking on residents' doors to identify those in need of support or advice.[56] Through contacting and communicating with local residents in this way, the EC1 NDC provided an avenue through which the issues and concerns of local citizens could input into the scheme. It brought local residents and service providers together to combine local experience and expert knowledge to tackle local problems and rectify issues that were troubling both individuals and the

community. Through this, local issues could directly inform the decision-making process meaning that the needs and desires of local citizens could be met more easily. More fundamentally, however, it provided a facility that enabled the community to be brought together. Going around and offering help and advice to citizens displays signs of an active community that cares about its residents and that is keen to promote a safe and inclusive environment.

The EC1 Connect scheme, therefore, provides an example of the way in which the programme has sought to develop the social aspect of sustainable development and improve community cohesion. The success of this is reflected in an Ipsos MORI Household Survey, conducted in 2008,[57] which reports that 89 per cent of those actively involved in NDC activities thought that local people were friendly; 72 per cent believed that people from different backgrounds got on well together; 69 per cent felt that neighbours looked out for one another; 58 per cent considered that they knew a large number of people in the area; 42 per cent felt that they could influence decisions, and, most importantly, 65 per cent felt a part of their community.[58] These factors all point towards the satisfaction of community cohesion and epitomise a community that is a happy, active, inclusive and safe place in which to live and work.

## *Env. L. Rev. 34 WELL RUN

The requirement that a sustainable community be well run is also connected with social development requiring, as it does, that leadership is effective in bringing a community together with a common aim which, in this instance, is sustainable development.

This criterion highlights the importance of effective and democratic decision making in the pursuit of sustainable development. Though representation will be considered, below, participation is an established principle of environmental law, with the Rio Declaration,[59] the Aarhus Convention[60] and the Johannesburg Summit[61] all providing authoritative support for the important role that it plays within the spheres of international law.[62]

Indeed, as the Johannesburg Summit recognised, ‘sustainable development requires … broad-based participation in policy formulation, decision-making and implementation at all levels’,[63] a view that is similarly reflected in academic considerations of the principles. Holder and Lee state that environmental decisions, such as those relating to sustainable development, ‘rest on values as well as expertise, taking those decisions without democratic involvement is untenable in terms of either a good decision or a good process … ‘experts’ have no monopoly on judgment’.[64] Furthermore, Achterberg argues that participation in the decisions which affect one's own life is a central political value of democracy, the required changes of lifestyle connected with a shift to sustainable development can never be lasting if they are imposed in an authoritarian way.[65] ‘A commitment to participation is embedded in the rhetoric of sustainable development itself’,[66] and it cannot be achieved without the participation of those whom it affects.

The 2005 Strategy's acknowledgement, therefore, that ‘the drive to improve neighbourhood participation … at the local level is at the heart of the Sustainable Communities agenda’,[67] gives effect to one of the core aspects of environmental decision-making and *Env. L. Rev. 35 encourages democratic involvement and engagement in the processes of local sustainable development.

Though citizens were able to participate in the NDC programme through a wide range of activities and initiatives, the most significant way in which local citizens contributed to the leadership and decision-making of the NDC programme was through the Partnership Boards which oversaw the day-to-day operation of a programme and which were, in part, made up of local residents. Indeed, noting the aforementioned link with social development and recalling CRESR's acknowledgement that the NDC has worked to develop ‘a rich diet of initiatives to engage with residents and to enhance community capacity’,[68] one of the ways through which this was achieved is through involvement on the Partnership Boards with, according to CRESR, community residents making up at least 50 per cent of the membership of 31 partnership boards in 2008.[69] More widely, evidence contained within CRESR's Final Report shows that, over a four year period, some NDC boards contained as few as 31 per cent of local residents, whilst others had as many as 83 per cent.[70] This reflects the extent to which participation played a part in local decision-making and shows that, in some areas, the majority voice was given to those living in the communities.

These residential board members, then, appointed in some schemes and elected in others, provided a link between the board and the community, ensuring that information and advice on the day-to-day quality of life in the neighbourhood was input into the decision-making process.[71] Having local

residents participating and sitting on the board meant that decision-making powers were being exercised at a community level by those who experienced, at first hand, the issues and concerns prevailing in the local area. This is important in terms of leadership because it meant that the scheme could be more readily able to tackle and satisfy the needs and desires of local people and to make responsive decisions as regards the operation of the NDC programme.

The effect of this involvement is reflected in another survey, which shows that 91 per cent of resident board members felt able to challenge other board members and that their opinions were listened to and appreciated; 89 per cent felt that their local knowledge was valued whilst 83 per cent thought that they had made a difference in their local community.[72] Furthermore, 54 per cent of resident board members participating in the survey said that the most positive thing about working on the board was 'being able to help/influence/make a difference/be involved in the community'.[73] What this shows, therefore, is that a substantial number of those participating and contributing to the leadership of their NDC programme felt that their involvement was valued and had a positive effect on the operation of the scheme and the achievement of sustainable development.

This, therefore, demonstrates the true value of residential board members. First, recalling that participation is a vital part of sustainable development, the notion of residential board members actively involving themselves in local community decision-making is consistent with this. Indeed, the statistics demonstrate that, in practice, residents' participation in this way directly enhanced the achievement of sustainable development. Decisions on all  aspects of local life were made in view of, and in response to, local issues and concerns which gave rise to a community that was more in line with the needs of existing generations. Furthermore, the area is much more cohesive with a large number of citizens now feeling that they are a part of their local community, thus demonstrating improvement in respect of the social aspect of sustainable development. Secondly, and following all this, participation of local residents in this way meant that the community was 'well run'. The NDC's decisions were democratic, encouraging the participation of local citizens who could, in turn, effectively represent the community. This meant that they could be responsive, taking into consideration issues and concerns which affected the local community. As a result, the achievement of sustainable development would not only have been enhanced but also as a result of the direct benefit of the participation of local people.

A final point to note is that, whilst participation is the most obviously democratic method of decision-making, this criterion from the 2005 Strategy also suggests that a sustainable community should involve representation. In respect of resident board members, this representative element is satisfied by, in some places, the elected nature of the Partnership Board. Though some NDC programmes, including the EC1 scheme, appointed residents to the board, in others these were elected by the local community.[74] Where the local community elects its board, there is a clear representative element to the system as, whilst the elected are local citizens participating in the process, they also carry a local mandate, representing the local people and the community on the board.

The success of the NDC in providing participative, representative and, therefore, democratic leadership is clear. It is not enough, however, that the scheme overseeing the development of an area be democratic; this must be maintained beyond the expiration of the NDC and continue in the years to come. Though ways in which the EC1 NDC has worked to ensure its developments and initiatives continue beyond 2011 are discussed below, it is necessary at this point to identify those aspects which demonstrate the continued participatory and representative leadership in the local community. The main way in which the EC1 NDC ensured that democratic leadership would be maintained is through setting up a Neighbourhood Steering Group which 'will enable residents and partner organisations to continue to work together to improve local service delivery'.[75] The EC1 NDC stated that 'this will be similar to the NDC board as it will bring together residents and partners, [however] … it will have a much broader membership and partner representatives will be more involved at the local level'.[76] Through this, therefore, the EC1 NDC has looked to continue the democratic, participatory and representative leadership that was utilised in developing the local area, in such a way as to ensure such democratic and effective leadership continues to ensure the growth and development of the local area.

## 'ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE' AND 'WELL DESIGNED AND BUILT'

The article deals with these two criteria for a sustainable community simultaneously as, whilst requiring different objectives, they both involve similar aspects of the NDC initiative. They relate to the

environmental aspect of the 'three pillars' of sustainable development, though, as will be seen, creating well designed and well built communities also has the effect of improving both the economic and social aspect of local life as well. ***Env. L. Rev. 37*** Improving the physical environment of a community has been at the heart of the NDC since the beginning.[77] The scheme adopted a wide range of initiatives to improve and develop the physical environment which included, *inter alia,* supporting the modernisation of social housing and improving the residential environment, including cleaning up public spaces, remodelling residential environments in a bid to design out crime, and introducing more green spaces, improving gardens and alleyways.[78] In addition, demolition and reconstruction has occurred in some areas to remove unsafe properties and to allow the creation of more public space and the construction of new housing.[79]

A report, published in August 2010, reflects on the changes made to the physical environment by the EC1 NDC, noting that it has 'invested in the redesign of parks, streets and social housing landscaping … the area has been relandscaped and … planting revitalised'.[80]

Considering, briefly, the justification for such change in the area, before the EC1 NDC programme began, 'many of the estates …were … unsafe following years of piecemeal intervention and a failure to adequately maintain … communal spaces'.[81] Development was needed, not only to improve the quality of built and natural environments, but also to improve cohesion and safety within the area - two broader objectives that lie at the heart of sustainable development. Leaving the community in such a state could have given rise to further issues and deprivation. As CRESR state, 'environmental improvements … address what one NDC employee referred to as the 'broken window' syndrome: the view that if a window is seen to be broken, people are more likely to think that a building is uncared for and more likely to vandalise it', leading to further problems and an aggravation of deprivation.[82]

The report focuses on a number of particular projects that the EC1 NDC oversaw between 2004 and 2010. These included the redesigning of local roads to reduce vehicle dominance, an increase in 'green areas' and play areas, landscaping of local parks encouraging greater use by citizens and pedestrians and a push to increase the number of tree-lined pathways.[83] These gave rise to an 'air of calm' and a new sense of neighbourliness with the area no longer looking or feeling like a sad council estate and feeling 'more alive'.[84] In addition, these changes had the effect of creating a safer environment; one in which children are happy to play and to be a part of. 'Prior to the work, children were rarely to be seen. Since it was completed, an elderly resident has mused: "I had no idea so many children lived here until the playground opened. It's been like a cork bursting out of a bottle" '.[85]

Focusing on a couple of specific projects, however, the report notes that one area, Spa Fields, 'was barely used before the improvements. It was mostly a scene for antisocial behaviour'.[86] Following its redesign, however, 'you will see children, elderly people, ***Env. L. Rev. 38*** families, office workers at lunchtimes and people walking or jogging through'.[87] This provides a first-hand account of the benefits derived from the environmental changes. Not only is the local area much nicer and aesthetically pleasing but, in addition, people feel safer being out and about in the community, are happy to make use of the communal public spaces and clearly treasure and value their local environment.

Furthermore, in another project-area in the EC1 district, prior to the NDC 'the pavement at the eastern end of Old Street was just gloomy and felt unsafe, frequented by street drinkers and drug addicts'.[88] Following consultation with local people as to how this busy area might be developed, 'there is now new seating, paving, flower beds and [a] promenade of trees and lights'.[89]

The success of changes made to the physical environment is reflected, once again, in a survey, which shows that, across a six-year period from 2002 to 2008, there was an 11 per cent increase in the number of people said to be satisfied with the local area; almost a 5 per cent drop in the number of people that said they wished to move; a 7 per cent increase in satisfaction with accommodation; and more than a 25 per cent increase in the number of people thinking that the area was improved as a result of the NDC.[90] Though this says positive things about the success of the improvements generally, one reason why they were perhaps so well received by members of the local community is because they were, where necessary, consulted and involved as to the form that developing changes should take. It has already been noted that citizens were consulted in relation to the way in which the Old Street development took shape.[91] In addition, though, and in respect of the Spa Fields project, 'local residents were heavily involved in the new look. [The NDC] wanted young people to be fully catered for and some of those who had previously made the park feel like quite a threatening area were deliberately involved in the design and implementation process. Thirteen of these young people took up the opportunity of training and work experience during the works and three were subsequently offered full-time work by the contractor. Now young people use the space, but there are

far fewer problems'.[92]

This is significant because, as the Brundtland Report itself observes, it is important that sustainable development meets the needs of existing generations.[93] Through involving and consulting local people, the changes made in the EC1 area were in line with what members of the community wanted, meaning that they would subsequently be more inclined to make use of them, thus demonstrating an improvement in the quality of the local environment, in line with the needs of the community.

The EC1 NDC, therefore, concentrated a great deal on improving the quality of the local environment, striving to provide a pleasant place in which to live and work and one that is considerate both of local needs and concerns and, also, environmental issues more generally. The effect of these changes is clear. The quality of life is much improved, both in terms of the built and natural environment, but also in terms of the cohesiveness of the community. People are much happier with the EC1 area and are able to enjoy its facilities and spaces as a community. The success of this has been, in great part, as a result of the involvement of and communication with local people getting their views across as ***Env. L. Rev. 39*** regards how the neighbourhood might be improved. If the changes introduced were not in line with what the community needed or desired, then citizens would have been disenchanted and dissatisfied with the local area, something which would have been reflected in the survey.

## 'WELL CONNECTED' AND 'WELL SERVED'

Public service provision is central to local community life and many of the changes and initiatives supported by the EC1 NDC had an effect on this. It is sensible, therefore, to deal with these two criteria simultaneously.

The EC1 NDC offered and developed a broad range of services. These focused on, *inter alia,* the provision of education to children and adults and the protection of citizens' health. Indeed, the EC1 NDC stated that:

The provision of services in the area has increased in quality and quantity. This includes new or expanded services for children and young people such as the EC1 Music Project and the community sports coach, enhanced family support and childcare services through Children's Centres, a new adult learning service at Three Corners, and innovative outreach services. The quality of existing services in the area has improved in several ways. There is an established and successful Safer Neighbourhoods Team, people find it easier to see their doctors and a much broader community offer at the St Luke's Centre as it begins to work with the full range of communities in the area, and establish itself as a neighbourhood anchor organisation.[94]

This demonstrates development and improvement in respect of two particular criteria, namely education and health. In terms of education, statistics provided by CRESR demonstrate an increase in the number of people with qualifications and a drop in the number of people needing basic skills.[95] Whilst, in respect of health, fewer people smoke cigarettes, more people do at least 20 minutes worth of exercise and there is an increase in the general satisfaction with family doctors and GPs.[96] The services that the EC1 NDC has developed, therefore, show that citizens are better connected to the facilities available to them which, in turn, are starting to give rise to real improvements in the local community.

A particular example of a specific service, which is accessible to all and appropriate to the needs of the community, is EC1 Connect. Discussed above in respect of the criteria for an 'active, inclusive and safe' community', EC1 Connect was available to anyone who needed it, existing primarily to enquire as to and meet the needs of the community.[97]

The EC1 NDC, therefore, greatly improved and developed the provision of local public services in the area. These not only gave rise to improved educational opportunities and results and a more efficient local health service but, more widely, through the activity of specific services, such as EC1 Connect, it provided a way in which local needs and issues could be listened and responded to.

## THRIVING - WITH A FLOURISHING AND DIVERSE LOCAL ECONOMY

This criterion falls within the economic development aspect of the 'three-pillars' of sustainable development. A flourishing and diverse local economy is dependent on a ***Env. L. Rev. 40*** number of things, chief among which include the operation of local businesses and the employment of local people within those businesses. Local businesses give rise to the potential for people to contribute

financially to the local economy, helping the businesses to develop and for the local area to thrive. Similarly, the employment of local people within these businesses, whilst also addressing broader issues relating to worklessness, means that local people are able to contribute to the local area through making it possible for these businesses to operate and flourish. Indeed, if a community has a low number of businesses and a high unemployment rate, then it is not going to flourish and thrive and the local economy is going to suffer.

One way in which the EC1 NDC programme sought to improve both employability and the state of the local community's economy is considered in the aforementioned report which discusses improvements on Whitecross Street, a market area within the EC1 district.[98] Prior to the scheme, Whitecross Street 'had fallen into decline, with 40 per cent of the shops empty and the market itself reduced to five traders selling their goods from plastic boxes on the ground'.[99] This neither promoted nor was conducive to a thriving economy. With so many shops empty, local trading would have suffered as potential customers would have been forced to go elsewhere to purchase items. More widely, though, this would also have resulted in a decline in community cohesion and hindered social development in the area. Referring back to the aforementioned 'broken windows theory',[100] with so many shops empty and in an untidy state, the local area would have become rundown and people would have been less inclined to visit the shops that were still open. This, in time, could have given rise to increased crime levels and contributed to the social deprivation of the community.

As a result of the EC1 NDC programme, however, a new 'trading strip' was designed which created 50 new stalls on market days and new and improved shop fronts.[101] Increasing the number of shops and markets, in this way, would have dramatically improved local trading and would have strengthened the local economy. More widely, though, it would also have had the effect of reducing worklessness within the area, giving more people an opportunity both to seek employment in local shops and to do business on their own. Indeed, as the report points out, 'unemployed local residents have taken the opportunity to begin trading. One resident … sells cakes [that are] made in his flat'.[102] These results are supported by a survey which shows that, over a six-year period from 2002 to 2008, the unemployment rate in the EC1 area dropped by 1.5 per cent, whilst the number of households with a weekly income below £200 fell by 7 per cent.[103] This shows the extent to which the economy has improved. People are working more and earning more money, meaning that they are in a better position to contribute to the local economy. More widely, though, all this also has an effect on community cohesion, evidenced by one local pub landlady observing that 'there's life to the street now and a real sense of community'.[104] As a result of the NDC, therefore, the EC1 area has the opportunity to thrive, with an increase in shops and markets and a reduction in the number of empty shop fronts, meaning that the area is less run down and more cohesive.

## *Env. L. Rev. 41 FAIR FOR EVERYONE, NOW AND IN THE FUTURE

The final requirement of the 2005 Strategy's sustainable communities' agenda is much broader than those that precede it. Simply, it goes to the very heart of the sustainable development principle, ensuring that communities make improvements in line with all citizens' needs and in line with any potential need that future generations might have. In addition, it suggests that the services established as part of the EC1 NDC scheme and lasting long after its expiration should be open and available to all who might need them.

In terms of fairness, the changes implemented and developed under the EC1 NDC have been far reaching, affecting, in some way, almost everyone within the local community. Every local resident and worker, for instance, will benefit from the Old Street development and the Whitecross Market, demonstrating the fair and all-incorporating approach that was adopted. Where necessary, however, the EC1 NDC's specific projects consulted those likely to be most affected, ensuring that changes were fair and sympathetic to their needs rather than redesigning in such a way as to push them away from the area. The Spa Fields and Old Street projects provide evidence of this.

The need to ensure developing changes provide for both existing and future generations is linked to the notion of sustainability. The main ways in which the EC1 NDC has worked to ensure sustainability, particularly now that the programme has reached its termination, is by setting up further bodies and charities to foster the developing changes made and to nurture them and ensure their continued operation. By way of just a couple of examples, prior to its termination, the EC1 NDC set up a Neighbourhood Steering Group which will be similar to the Partnership Board and will bring together residents and partners to continue the NDC's work beyond the end of the programme.[105] In addition, and as discussed above, when the EC1 NDC ended, the EC1 Connect scheme was continued and is

now a charity, entitled ‘Help on your Doorstep’ which operates more widely across the Islington area. [106]

Furthermore, a fundamental way through which these changes can be sustainable is through citizen participation. If citizens can continue to take advantage of participatory opportunities, then they can involve themselves to ensure that standards and achievements attained by developments are maintained. This could be achieved in a number of ways such as, for instance, continued consultation as to the changes introduced in the community, involvement in community events and activities and more permanent involvement through sitting on local boards and councils. Above and beyond specific initiatives designed specifically to maintain the changes introduced by the NDC, therefore, citizens within the EC1 area, simply by participating positively in the life of the community will be contributing to the sustainability of improving development.

The EC1 NDC programme operated in a way that ensured changes and improvements were introduced fairly and for the benefit of all those they would affect. In addition, it laid the foundations for its work to continue into the future and for its developing changes to be built upon so as to continue satisfying the needs of local citizens as well as providing, in time, for the needs of future generations.

## *Env. L. Rev. 42 CONCLUSION: THE EC1 NDC AS A ‘SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY’?

This article, then, has tested the workings of the EC1 NDC against the government's 2005 Strategy for building sustainable communities. Citing various reports and analyses, it has demonstrated the extent to which the local community has been developed and improved. The fact that improvements were made and citizens happy with these improvements is unequivocal. The important point to consider, however, is whether the improvements fully satisfy the government's sustainable communities' agenda and, as a result, whether it can be said to have achieved sustainable development. Each of the criteria has been considered individually and, in respect of each, schemes and initiatives were identified which exemplified the EC1 NDC's contribution.

Through engaging members of the local community and providing a range of facilities, the EC1 area can now be said to be active, inclusive and safe, providing citizens with and connecting them to a range of local services, the most notable of which was the EC1 Connect scheme. The foundations have been laid for the local economy to thrive and flourish, through actions taken to improve local trading and reduce the unemployment rate. Most significantly, however, substantial changes have been made to the quality of the local environment with a number of projects that have focused on the redesigning of local spaces and the regeneration of roads and buildings. All of these developments have been overseen by the Partnership Board which, crucially, was made up in part by a number of local residents. The success of each of these points is supported by surveys and research carried out by CRESR and Ipsos MORI as well as by the report into the specific environmental projects. These show that local people felt that the EC1 area was a more pleasant and enjoyable place in which to live and work. They commented that they now feel more a part of the community and are able to make a difference; that the local areas now feel ‘more alive’ [107] with a greater number of people making use of public spaces; and, finally, that there is real life on the streets again and a sense of community. The changes, therefore, have had a huge impact on those who they were designed to benefit - the local citizens. As a result, the EC1 NDC can be said to have satisfied the criteria for a sustainable community, as laid down in the 2005 Strategy.

In terms of the objectives of sustainable development itself, it has already been identified where the changes fell within the ‘three-pillars’. Environmental changes are constituted by the redesigning of local spaces and the regeneration of roads and buildings; whilst economic development occurred as a result of the revitalisation of local trading and the regeneration of shops and market-areas. Social development is much broader and can, on the one hand be said to underlie many of the changes that have been introduced - improving the quality of the environment, for instance, and increasing the number of shops and markets have both had the effect of improving community cohesion. On the other hand, though, specific initiatives, such as EC1 Connect and those encouraging the involvement of citizens, also have the effect of bringing local people together as a community and satisfying the social aspect of sustainable development. In addition and aside from the ‘three-pillars’, sustainable development also requires the needs of the people to be met and for changes to be sustainable. The various mechanisms through which local citizens can involve themselves in community decision-making and activities have the effect of inputting local needs and concerns into the process and, also, of giving citizens the opportunity to maintain them, ensuring sustainability. The fundamental *Env. L. Rev. 43 elements of sustainable development, therefore, are embedded within the

sustainable communities policy and are satisfied by the EC1 NDC programme.

The general effect of this is clear. As Hazel Blears, the then Secretary of State for the DCLG stated in 2008, 'NDC projects are transforming areas that for too long have been blighted by the cycle of deprivation. For some people NDCs have helped, it is the first time that they have felt proud of where they live, getting involved with and feeling part of their local communities'.[108] The EC1 NDC has developed and regenerated a previously deprived area of London and, through the making of environmental, economic and social changes to the community, alongside the engagement of local people, it can be said successfully to have achieved sustainable development, at the same time as laying the foundations for successful development in the future.

Lecturer in Law, Kingston Law School, Kingston University, Kingston upon Thames, KT2 7LB, e-mail: j.stanton@kingston.ac.uk. I'd like to express my thanks to Dr Javier Oliva for his assistance and to Professor John Alder, Professor Matthew Humphreys, Dr Ole Pedersen and two anonymous reviewers for their comments on earlier drafts.

Env. L. Rev. 2012, 14(1), 26-43

---

1. Hereinafter 'ODPM'. This is now the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG).

2. Hereinafter NDC.

3. Centre for Regional, Economic and Social Research, Sheffield Hallam University (CRESR) (commissioned by the DCLG), *The New Deal for Communities Programme: Achieving a Neighbourhood Focus for Regeneration, The New Deal for Communities National Evaluation: Final report - Volume 1* (2010) at 11. Available at: http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/downloads/general/Volumeöne¨-Ächievingä¨neighbourhood¨focus¨for¨regeneration.pdf, last accessed 30 November 2011. See further: Social Exclusion Unit, *Bringing Britain Together: A National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal,* Cmd Paper 4045 (1998).

4. See Social Exclusion Unit, ibid. at 48.

5. House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, Thirty-eighth Report of Session 2003-4: *An Early Progress Report on the New Deal for Communities Programme,* 2004, HC 492 (2003-4) at 3.

6. See further M. Adebowale, 'Towards a Socially Inclusive Sustainable Development Research Agenda', in M. Eames and M. Adebowale (eds), *Sustainable Development and Social Inclusion: Towards an integrated approach to research* (Joseph Rowntree Foundation: York, 2002) 5.

7. House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, see above n. 5 at 3.

8. Tony Blair, in Social Exclusion Unit, above n. 4 at 2.

9. Above n. 4 at 48.

10. Above n. 5 at 3. Examples of these objectives are provided by the *National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal,* see ibid.

11. Above n. 4 at 49.

12. *New Deal for Communities: National Evaluation, NDC Evaluation Overview.* Available at: http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/ndc_evaluation.htm, last accessed on 30 November 2011. For a full list of all 39 NDCs see: http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/ndc_partnerships.htm.

13. CRESR (commissioned by the DCLG), *The New Deal for Communities Experience: A Final Assessment. The New Deal for Communities Evaluation: Final report - Volume 7* (2010) at 5. Available at: http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/downloads/general/A¨finalässessment.pdf, last accessed on 30 November 2011.

14. Ibid. at 5. These objectives were stated here as being: (i) to transform these 39 areas over ten years by achieving holistic change in relation to three place-related outcomes: crime, community, and housing and the physical environment (HPE), and three people-related outcomes: education, health and worklessness; (ii) 'close the gaps' between these 39 areas and the rest of the country; (iii) achieve a value-for-money transformation of these neighbourhoods; (iv) secure improvements by working with other delivery agencies such as the police, Primary Care Trusts (PCTs), schools, Jobcentre Plus (JCP), and their parent local authority: the Programme is fundamentally rooted in partnership working; (v) place the community 'at the heart of' the initiative; (vi) sustain a local impact after NDC Programme ceased.

15. Ross considers that 'the exact meaning of sustainable development remains unclear' (A. Ross, 'Modern Interpretations of Sustainable Development' (2009) 36(2) *Journal of Law and Society* 32 at 34) whilst Bosselmann argues that the term provides little guidance as to the way in which it should be interpreted, offering two potential understandings which

highlight its ambiguity (K. Bosselmann, *The Principle of Sustainability: Transforming Law and Governance,* (Ashgate: Farnham, 2008) at 55).

16. This is the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, entitled 'Our Common Future'. It is known as the Brundtland Report after the chair of the World Commission, Gro Harlem Brundtland, who was, at that time, the Prime Minister of Norway, and, later, the President of the World Health Organisation (Volker Hauff, Chair German Council on Sustainable Development, *Brundtland Report: A 20 Years Update* (Key note speech European Sustainability, Berlin 07 (ESB07), 'Linking Policies, Implementation, and Civil Society Action', Berlin, 3-5 June 2007).

17. World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future,* (OUP: Oxford, 1987) at 43.

18. Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (1992) Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (31 ILM 874). The Rio conference 'produced several important legal outputs, including … "Agenda 21", which provided detail on the implementation of sustainable development … [It also set] out many of the enduring features of sustainable development, including some of the key environmental principles that underlie environmental law, as well as the instruments to be deployed to achieve sustainable development' (J. Holder and M. Lee, *Environmental Protection, Law and Policy* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2007) at 220-1).

19. See www.un.org/events/wssd/ as cited in Holder and Lee, ibid. at 217.

20. M. C. Cordonier Segger and A. Khalfan, *Sustainable Development Law: Principles, Practices and Prospects* (OUP: Oxford, 2004) p. 20. Also see Rio Declaration, above n. 18 at Principle 1.

21. World Summit on Sustainable Development, *Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development* (2002) Johannesburg, South Africa, (UN DocA/CONF.199/20).

22. Holder and Lee note that this 'three-pillar' approach appears in UK and EU documents, in some cases predating the Johannesburg summit (see Holder and Lee, above n. 18 at 237).

23. See Johannesburg Declaration, above n. 21 at para. 5 - cited in Holder and Lee, ibid. at 217 and 226.

24. Bosselmann, wary of the ambiguity of the sustainable development principle, considers that the 'mix of environmental, social and economic goals' constitute one of the interpretations of the concept (see Bosselmann above n. 15 at 55). Ross states that 'most interpretations of sustainable development work within the Brundtland formula, but vary in relation to the emphasis placed on each of the three components of sustainable development: economy, environment, and society' (see Ross above n. 15 at 34). Finally, Humphreys, in the context of local communities and the NDC scheme, considers that 'regeneration initiatives are the implementation of environmental, social and economic improvements to an area of deprivation while ensuring such improvements are sustainable' (M. Humphreys, 'Leaseholder Charges and Urban Regeneration' (2006) *Journal of Planning and Environmental Law* 1625 at 1626). Regeneration initiatives are one of the most prominent ways in which sustainable development is pursued at the local level with the NDC programme being one example of such an initiative.

25. Above n. 21 at para. 5.

26. Agenda 21 is the United Nation's action programme, published in the aftermath of the Rio Declaration (see United Nations, *Agenda 21: The United Nations Programme of Action from Rio* (United Nations, 1992).

27. N. A. Robinson (ed.), *Strategies Toward Sustainable Development: Implementing Agenda 21,* (New York: Oceana Publications Inc, 2004) at 467.

28. A. Paterson and K. S. Theobald, 'Sustainable Development, Agenda 21 and the New Local Governance in Britain' (1995) 29(8) *Regional Studies* 773 at 773. They there define subsidiarity as 'the decentralization of decision making to the most appropriate level' (at 773).

29. Holder and Lee, above n. 18 at 237.

30. See, further, *The Development of a Sustainable Development Strategy for the UK* (available at: http://aggregain.wrap.org.uk/sustainability/sustainability_in_construction/uk_sustainable.html, last accessed on 30 November 2011) and Ross, see above n. 15 at 34 and 35, and generally.

31. Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions, *A Better Quality of Life: A Strategy for Sustainable Development for the United Kingdom,* Cm 4345 (1999) at para. 1.1.

32. *Our Common Future,* see above n. 17.

33. See *A Better Quality of Life,* above n. 31 at para. 1.10. The strategy lays down four objectives, which according to the government, must be met if sustainable development is to be achieved. These are: (a) social progress which recognises the needs of everyone; (b) effective protection of the environment; (c) prudent use of natural resources; and (d) maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment (at para. 1.8).

34. Ibid. at Chapter Three. These indicators relate to: economy, investment, employment, educational qualifications, life expectancy, housing, crime, climate change, air pollution, road traffic, rivers, birds, re-using previously developed land and waste.

35. Ibid. at para. 1.11.

36. In 1999 the government's agenda for building sustainable communities involved: strengthening regional and local economies; meeting people's social needs; promoting better health, housing and access to services and recreation; improving local surroundings through the revitalisation and regeneration of local areas; reducing crime and the fear of crime; addressing problems of poverty and social exclusion in the most deprived communities; making it easier for people to get involved and coordinating policies to bring these objectives together (ibid. at Chapter 7).

37. The 2005 Strategy was published following the government having taken account of changes that had happened in respect of regional bodies, local government and, internationally, at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 (see Department of Education, Food and Rural Affairs, *Securing the Future: The UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy,* Cm 6467 (2005) at 3).

38. Ibid. at 120.

39. ODPM, *Sustainable Communities: People, Places and Prosperity* (2005). Available at: www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/corporate/peopleplacesprosperity, last accessed on 30 November 2011; and ODPM, *Sustainable Communities: Homes for All* (2005). Available at: www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/corporate/homesforall, last accessed on 30 November 2011. Both cited in *Securing the Future,* above n. 37 at 121.

40. Ibid. at 121.

41. Ibid. at 121.

42. See above n. 31 at para. 7.16.

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid. in 'Summary' at 2.

45. Above n. 37.

46. CRESR (commissioned by the ODPM), *New Deal for Communities 2001-2005: An Interim Evaluation - Research Report 17* (2005) at para. 13.10. Available at: http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/downloads/reports/New_Deal_for_Communities_2001-2005_An_Interim_Evaluation.pdf, last accessed 30 November 2011.

47. *EC1 New Deal for Communities 2001-2011: Final Evaluation* at 1. Available at: www.renaisi.com/2011/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/Eval_rep4.pdf, last accessed 30 November 2011.

48. *EC1 New Deal for Communities, EC1 Beyond 2011.* Available at: www.renaisi.com/index.php/ec1-new-dealfor-communities-2001-2011-final-evaluation/, last accessed 30 November 2011.

49. See above n. 47; and *EC1 Beyond 2011,* ibid.

50. Above n. 23.

51. Institute of Community Cohesion, *The Nature of Community Cohesion: How the concept of Community Cohesion has developed.* Available at: www.cohesioninstitute.org.uk/Resources/Toolkits/Health/TheNatureOfCommunityCohesion, last accessed 30 November 2011.

52. Above n. 13 at para. 2.5.

53. Ibid. at para. 2.5.

54. Ibid. at para. 2.5.

55. EC1 Connect was set up as a pilot project by EC1 NDC in 2005. (See further: 'EC1 Connect' (18 September 2008) *Regeneration and Renewal: Awards 2008* at 20). The EC1 Connect scheme has continued beyond the expiration of the EC1 NDC. It is now a charity, entitled 'Help on your Doorstep' (HOYD) which operates more widely across the Islington area and is set up with a mix of local authority councillors and a number of local people as trustees (see further: www.helponyourdoorstep.com/).

56. Ibid. at 20. Advisors could then make referrals, if necessary, to public and voluntary sector agencies to provide further help with a wide range of services and issues, including employment advice, childcare, small business support, housing advice and health support (ibid. at 20).

57. See CRESR (commissioned by DCLG), *Involving Local People in Regeneration: Evidence from the New Deal for Communities Programme: The New Deal for Communities National Evaluation: Final report - Volume 2,* (2010) at 55 and Figure 4.5. Available at: http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/downloads/general/Volume¨two¨-Ìnvolving¨local¨peopleïn¨regeneration.pdf, last accessed 30 November 2011.

58. Ibid. at 55 and Figure 4.5.

59. The Rio Declaration states that 'environmental issues are best handled with participation of all concerned citizens, at the relevant level. … [E]ach individual shall have appropriate access to information concerning the environment … activities in their communities, and the opportunity to participate in decision-making processes'. (Rio Declaration, above n. 18 at Principle 10).

60. Art. 1 of the Aarhus Convention states that 'in order to contribute to the protection of the right of every person of present and future generations to live in an environment adequate to his or her health and well-being, each Party shall guarantee the rights of access to information, public participation in decision-making, and access to justice in environmental matters' (Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, Aarhus, Denmark, 25 June 1998, Article 1).

61. At the Johannesburg Summit 'the principle of participation received significant support and was taken into account in many different aspects of the sustainable development agenda' (Cordonier Segger and Khalfan, above n. 20 at 164) and it was stated that 'sustainable development requires … broad-based participation in policy formulation, decision-making and implementation at all levels' (Johannesburg Declaration, above n. 21 at para. 26).

62. Noting the focus this article places on local communities, however, these sources are of equal significance in respect of the NDC. Indeed, sustainable development must be tackled at 'the lowest level of public authority consistent with effective action' (United Nations, *Agenda 21: The United Nations Programme of Action from Rio* (United Nations, 1992).) at para. 8.5(g)).

63. See *Johannesburg Declaration,* above n. 21 at para. 26.

64. See above n. 18 at 85 and 87.

65. W. Achterberg, 'Can Liberal Democracy Survive the Environmental Crisis? Sustainability, Liberal Neutrality and Overlapping Consensus', in A. Dobson and P. Lucardie (eds.), *The Politics of Nature: Explorations in Green Political Theory* (Routledge: London, 1993) 82, (as cited in S. Baker, M. Kousis, D. Richardson and S. Young (eds.), *The Politics of Sustainable Development: Theory, Policy and Practice within the European Union* (Routledge: London, 1997).

66. M. Lee and C. Abbot, 'The Usual Suspects? Public Participation under the Aarhus Convention' (2003) 66(1) *Modern Law Review* 80 at 83.

67. See *Securing the Future,* above n. 37 at 120.

68. See *The New Deal for Communities Evaluation: Final Report - Volume 7,* above n. 13 at para. 2.5.

69. DCLG, *The 2008 Partnership Survey: Evidence from the NDC Programme* (2009). Available at: www.shu.ac.uk/_assets/pdf/cresr-2008-partnership-survey.pdf, last accessed 30 November 2011, cited in ibid. at para. 2.5.

70. See *Involving Local People in Regeneration,* above n. 57 at 30 and Figure 2.4.

71. Ibid. at para. 2.3.5(a).

72. Ibid. at 48 and Figure 4.1.

73. Ibid. at 52 and Figure 4.3.

74. It is not the purpose of the article to weigh up the arguments for or against an elected or appointed NDC board. See, further, K. Shaw and G. Davidson, 'Community Elections for Regeneration Partnerships: A New Deal For Local Democracy?' (2002) 28(2) *Local Government Studies* 1-15.

75. See *EC1 Beyond 2011,* above n. 48 at 6.

76. Ibid. at 6.

77. See CRESR (commissioned by DCLG), *Making Deprived Areas Better Places to Live: Evidence from the New Deal for Communities Programme: The New Deal for Communities National Evaluation: Final Report - Volume 3* (2010) at 5. Available at: http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/downloads/general/Volume¨three¨-¨Making¨deprivedäreas¨better¨places¨to¨live.pdf, last accessed 30 November 2011.

78. Ibid. at para. 2.41.

79. Ibid.

80. *EC1 New Deal for Communities - Before and After Transformations.* Available at: www.hortweek.com/news/1021460/EC1-New-Deal-Communities---transformations/, last accessed 30 November 2011.

81. Ibid.

82. See *Making Deprived Areas Better Places to Live,* above n. 77 at para. 2.23.

83. See *EC1 New Deal for Communities - Before and After Transformations,* above n. 80.

84. Ibid.

85. Ibid.

86. Ibid.

87. Ibid.

88. Ibid.

89. Ibid.

90. *New Deal for Communities: Core Indicators, By NDC Partnership: 2002 to 2008* (April 2011). Available at: http://extra.shu.ac.uk/ndc/ndc_data.htm, last accessed 30 November 2011.

91. Above n. 89.

92. Above n. 80.

93. See *Our Common Future,* above n. 17 at 43.

94. Above n. 47 at 3.

95. See *Core Indicators, By NDC Partnership,* above n. 90.

96. Ibid.

97. See 'Active, inclusive and safe, above.

98. Above n. 80.

99. Ibid.

100. Above n. 82, and *Making Deprived Areas Better Places to Live,* above n. 77 at para. 2.23.

101. Above n. 80.

102. Ibid.

103. Above n. 90.

104. As quoted at *EC1 New Deal for Communities - Before and After Transformations,* above n. 80.

105. See *EC1 Beyond 2011,* above n. 48 at 6.

106. Above n. 55.

107. Above n. 80.

108. DCLG, *New Deal for Communities is Turning Around England's Most Deprived Areas* (2009). Available at: webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.communities.gov.uk/news/corporate/694120, last accessed 30 November 2011.

© 2014 Vathek Publishing

Westlaw UK