

**CENTRAL SCOTLAND GREEN NETWORK**

---

**PARTNERSHIP BOARD MEETING**

**9 MAY 2013**

**BRE VISITOR CENTRE, RAVENSCRAIG, MOTHERWELL  
1.30 – 4.00pm**

**LUNCH WILL BE AVAILABLE FROM 12.30pm**

**(Video Presentation by Katy Hunter, BRE, 1.00 – 1.25pm)**

---

**AGENDA**

1	Welcome & Apologies – Apologies received from Andrew Bachell, Cllr John McDowall	1.30 – 1.35
2	Minutes of Meeting of 21 March 2013	1.35 – 1.45
3	<a href="#">Matters Arising Paper (Paper 1)</a>	1.45 – 1.55
4	Chairperson's Report, including update on the Governance Review (Paper 2 – to follow)	1.55 – 2.15
5	<a href="#">Discussion paper - Presentation by David Liddell (NPF3 Team) and discussion on NPF3 (Paper 3)</a>	2.15 – 2.40
6	<a href="#">Discussion Paper - Report on Housing Short Term Working Group consultation event (Paper 4)</a>	2.40 – 3.00
7	<a href="#">Discussion Paper – CSGN Communications focus for 2013/14 (Paper 5)</a>	3.00 – 3.20
8	<a href="#">Decision Paper – CSGN Flagships and Demonstration Projects (Paper 6)</a>	3.20 – 3.40
9	Verbal report – Development Planning and Single Outcome Agreements	3.40 – 3.45
10	Verbal report – Early findings from the Employment and Training Market Research	3.45 – 3.55
11	Verbal report - Long Distance Access Network and Active Travel	3.55 – 4.05
12	Verbal report – Update on the John Muir Trail	4.05 – 4.10
13	Any Other Competent Business	4.10 – 4.20
14	Date of Forum and Next Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSGN Forum – 4 June 2013, Edinburgh Conference Centre</li> <li>• Board Meeting – 5 September 2013 at 1.30pm, GCV Green Network Partnership Office, Glasgow</li> </ul>	Close

**CENTRAL SCOTLAND GREEN NETWORK**

---

**Report to:** CSGN Partnership Board

**Date of Meeting:** 9 May 2013

**Subject:** Matters Arising

**Ref:** Paper 1

---

Item No	Matter	Action
3	Housing Paper to be brought to the May board following the stakeholder event in April.	See Paper 4
3 & 14	CSGNSU to see if it is possible to get a short presentation from BRE at the Board meeting.	Video presentation arranged.
4	KG to prepare an information note on Prof Stiglitz's talk	<b>KG</b>
6	Annual Report content – KG to discuss with the CSGNSU.	Discussed. Tender to be issued.
6	Work Plan to be completed	Actioned.
7	STWG, Gateway Review to be set up and a meeting arranged.	Actioned. KG, SR, RJ, NL, JB meeting on 1 May at JB's office.
7	SR to discuss the Gateway Review with the CSFT Board	Actioned
8	Abbreviated Risk Register - SG4 Governance Risk to be removed	To be addressed in the next update.
9	Flagship Projects Considerations paper to be brought to a future board meeting	See Paper 6
10	NPF3 Consultation event to be arranged.	Actioned. Event taking place on 18 June 2013 in Glasgow. Event planning underway.
11	KG to speak to Derek Mackay about SOAs	<b>KG</b>
13	Development Fund Award winners – NL will provide a list of winners when it is available	Actioned.

## CENTRAL SCOTLAND GREEN NETWORK

---

**Report to:** CSGN Partnership Board

**Date of Meeting:** 9 May 2013

**Subject:** CSGN in the National Planning Framework 3 Main Issues Report

**Ref:** Paper 3

---

### **Purpose of Report**

To provide information to Board members on what the NPF3 Main Issues Report (MIR) says about the CSGN and to invite discussion on this.

### **Recommendations**

The Board is asked to:

- note the publication of the NPF3 MIR and comment on the proposals related to CSGN within that; and
- confirm members wish to participate in a reconvened short-term working group to develop our response to the MIR.

### **CSGN in the Main Issues Report**

Previous papers to the Board have noted the timeline and process for the preparation of NPF3 and the content of the renomination of the initiative as a National Development. David Liddell from the NPF3 team in Scottish Government will attend the meeting to present on what the NPF3 MIR says on CSGN and to field questions.

The NPF3 MIR was published on 30<sup>th</sup> April and proposes that:

- The CSGN should be retained as a National Development;
- There should be a particular focus within the initiative on the development of active travel networks and bringing vacant and derelict land back into use;
- Projects should also be prioritised in areas of concentrated economic disadvantage and poor health;
- Stronger links to strategic transport infrastructure projects and the Metropolitan Strategic Drainage Scheme should be developed; and
- Strategic compensatory measures and enhancement opportunities should be viewed as a priority for the initiative and an opportunity to develop the network.

### **Short Term Working Group**

We previously convened a Board short term working group to inform the preparation of the renomination and would now suggest that we reconvene this to inform our response to the Main Issues Report. Confirmation from Board members that they are still happy to participate in a group would be welcome.

### **Stakeholder Event**

An event has been organised for the morning of 18<sup>th</sup> June at the Teacher Building in Glasgow to allow stakeholders an opportunity to discuss the CSGN elements of the MIR, and to help inform the response of the Partnership Board and the lead partners. Invitations have been sent to all 19 CSGN local authority Leaders and Chief Executives, key public agencies and NGOs, regional green network partnerships and greenspace organisations, plus a selection of projects that have received funding through the CSGN Development Fund. At the time of issuing this paper 25 people have registered to attend.

In addition, the Scottish Government is likely to arrange a series of meeting, seminars, presentations and workshops with interested parties throughout the process to allow them to input to the process.

### **NPF3 Preparation Timeline**

The Scottish Government has confirmed that the approximate timeline for the preparation of NPF3 is as follows:

- 23 July 2013 – End of consultation on Main Issues Report (and accompanying Environmental Report)
- Summer 2013 – Consideration of responses to the Main Issues Report
- Autumn 2013 – Publication of the Proposed Framework for 60 day parliamentary scrutiny
- Early 2014 – Likely publication and consideration of the Parliament's report on the Proposed Framework
- June 2014 – Publication of the final NPF3

### **Conclusion**

Board members are asked to note the publication of the NPF3 MIR, to comment on the proposals concerning the CSGN and to confirm whether they wish to participate in a reconvened short term working group to inform our response.

**Author: Neil Langhorn**

**Date: 2 May 2013**

## CENTRAL SCOTLAND GREEN NETWORK

---

**Report to:** CSGN Partnership Board

**Date of Meeting:** 9 May 2013

**Subject:** Report on Housing Short Term Working Group Consultation Event

**Ref:** Paper 4

---

### Introduction

This paper serves to update and inform the Board with regards to the workings of the Working Group considering open space around housing.

### Recommendations

The Board is asked to:

- Note the contents of the report
- Comment on the proposed next stages for this work

### Progress to Date

The Short Term Working Group (STWG) first met on 9 November 2012 and, at that meeting, refined the issue to be addressed as being 'Optimising the quality and utility of existing publicly accessible open space around public and private housing'. Whilst a slightly laborious title it does cover the key aspects of interest. Critically, it drew the focus down onto 'legacy' issues, i.e. those around pre-existing open spaces; it was felt that future open spaces would be shaped/influenced by future policies and practices.

That first meeting posed a number of fundamental questions including 'is there an issue in this area', 'what trends are there over time with regards to this' and 'does it matter'? The STWG commissioned greenspace scotland to carry out a rapid scoping study to consider these points. The report concluded that there was an issue (by unanimous agreement of all those interviewed for the study) and that yes it mattered on a whole series of social and economic grounds.

The STWG considered this report in February and agreed with its findings and, in addition, reached the conclusion that 'we know enough to act' (as one of the recommendations in the report was for further research). That view was based on the considerable volume of research that the report surfaced and pointed to. That then lead to the next question – 'if all of the above is true, why is nothing happening in this area'? That thought teed up a recent workshop held to consider that question and to think about how the issue might be taken forwards.

### Stakeholder Event held on 17 April 2013

Some 30 interested stakeholders attended a half day event to look at the barriers to activity in this area and possible solutions to these. Julie Procter of greenspace scotland presented her findings, Andrew Mickel looked at the issue from the private sector perspective. Focussed breakout groups then looked at the issue from 'social', 'political' and 'economic' angles.

Common themes emerging from the discussions are issues around the lack of a sense of community amongst residents (as distinct from people living in proximity to one another), ownership questions and the lack of understanding around the possibilities of what greenspace could be and the

contribution it could make to peoples' quality of life. In addition, there is a real sense that aspirations and expectations are very low in this area and that it is not a priority for residents, elected members or those buying somewhere to live. That lack of prioritisation is sharply reflected in public and private spending patterns. Within all this lies the source of the apparent intractability of the issue.

Suggested solutions to these barriers included: providing support to and building capacity within communities to tackle the issue; educating a wide range of stakeholders about the potential benefits of greenspace; and, in so doing, raise aspirations around availability, design, use and management.

There is a need to tie this agenda into wider interests, e.g. health and employment and training; and to address the political and societal priorities through enhancing the physical environment. We need to be careful with regards to our language and how we describe what we are seeking to achieve and we must look at any prescriptions with an eye on implications for long term management and maintenance. Much of what was discussed was not 'rocket science'; but making the next steps work might be closer to that.

### **Next Steps**

The outcomes from the stakeholder event will be shared with participants and the appetite for developing solutions with a new small working group comprised of interested stakeholders will be assessed. That group, if formed, will seek to develop an approach which tackles the barriers raised in a manner which is sufficiently attractive to be able subsequently to seek funding for a pilot model to develop and refine that methodology. Potentially from that learning we would then seek to win funds to carry out this activity at some scale across the CSGN in future. It is worth noting at this point that the Lottery has supported significant levels of activity in this area in England for this kind of work.

### **Process Observation**

In considering this area we are tackling, as noted above, an issue which in many ways exists because it has been difficult to address in the past. As a consequence, it appears pretty intractable. In going down this route, we potentially might fail but is this better than pursuing routes others are already working on and where there would be a questionable amount of added value?

### **Conclusion**

Using this methodology has provided a route for Board members to become more directly engaged with a recognised issue and to look at that issue in some depth. It has thrown up a number of areas to consider and opportunities some of which at least will allow us to take this work further. The problem itself has existed for some time – if we are to develop the CSGN as originally envisaged then we must begin at least to make some inroads in this area.

**Author:** Simon Rennie

**Date:** 22 April 2013

## CENTRAL SCOTLAND GREEN NETWORK

---

**Report to:** CSGN Partnership Board

**Date of Meeting:** 9 May 2013

**Subject:** CSGN Communications focus for 2013-14

**Ref:** Paper 5

---

### **Purpose of Report**

This paper updates the Board on communications efforts and sets out for discussion a possible approach to more coordinated communications effort working with CSGN Regional Advisory Forum (RAF) members over the next year or so.

### **Recommendations**

The Board is asked to consider this approach and, once available, comment on the suggested audiences, themes and messages.

### **Introduction**

The Chair and the Board have asked for communications efforts to be focussed on outcomes. In addition Regional Advisory Forum members, at their meeting in December, identified communications as a common theme emerged around communications and the need to develop strong messages which could be tailored for use nationally, regionally and locally and be used by the Lead Partners, the SU and RAF members as appropriate.

It was decided to hold a facilitated workshop, which took place on 23 April, to look at communications and what might be common areas in terms of audiences, themes and messages which could (in whole or part) be worked up and delivered over 2013/14.

The workshop notes are being written up. Initial findings from the day are covered later and we will distil the notes and table these at the Board.

### **Background**

The Communications Strategy was launched in August 2011. It sets out our overarching communications strategy to provide direction for engagement and communications work. It includes the following objectives:

#### Communication Objectives

- Lever recognition and understanding of what the CSGN is, its scale and what it seeks to achieve
- Distil and explain the planned impact of the Vision and what this means to targeted audience segments
- Demonstrate visibly how it can add value to, and is already benefitting, other related existing and pipeline initiatives
- Facilitate channels whereby wider stakeholders can easily access and share information about CSGN and its projects

- Ensure timely communication of key deliverables is achieved and learning realised, so that the CSGN is regarded as a centre of excellence

### Stakeholder Engagement Objectives

- Secure and maintain political (national and local) support and ownership
- Enthuse and excite key stakeholders about the opportunities and outcomes that can be realised through the CSGN
- Break down barriers and facilitate interaction with key target segments
- Promote understanding with key target segments about how their activities contribute to CSGN, and how working towards the CSGN can support and add value to their actions
- Engender CSGN activity

The Strategy also identified a list of eight priority stakeholder groups for engagement. This list was reviewed by the lead partners and the support unit and updated in 2012. The current priorities for engagement are:

### Priority Stakeholders

- Ministers and MSPs
- Scottish Government – civil servants
- Development Management Planners
- LA Heads of Service
- LA Council leaders and key committee members
- Business Intermediaries
- Environmental NGOs

### Communication priorities

Looking ahead, we believe that communications efforts will need to be focused around the emergence of recent guidance to local authorities on shaping Single Outcome Agreements, the drafting of National Planning Framework 3, our own work plan and the governance review. Possible messages would be around:

SOAs – health, regeneration and climate change

NPF3 – place-making, sustainable economic growth

CSGN work plan activities which identify communications effort – VDL, E&T, business case studies, John Muir Trail, Active Travel and Active Travel case studies, community growing, LIFE+ application

Governance Review – that this inward-looking focus is not impacting on work plan delivery or support to partners

### **Communications Workshop**

With facilitation by staff from the Big Partnership, participants from the RAF, the lead partners and the SU were asked to work together to consider audiences, themes and key messages.

At the outset, objectives for the session were identified as:

- Agreeing common Audiences and Themes for 2013/14 which CSGN/RAF officers could work together on to create and roll out a coordinated PR plan.
- Fleshing out messages
- Considering what might be the first theme to develop
- Considering how outcomes from communications efforts could be measured and evaluated.
- Exploring the willingness to establish a CSGN communications group to co-ordinate action.

Outputs from the session were:

- Audiences were identified. There was strong correlation with CSGN audiences but others were also identified
- Themes were identified. These had good fit with CSGN themes and with NPF3 in terms of place-making and economic growth. However a new, cross-cutting or overarching area emerged around demonstrating value for money and wise use of resources
- Messages developed for three audiences were mainly expressed as what CSGN / CSGN partners could do to deliver that stakeholder's needs rather than making an 'ask' of that stakeholder.

The notes from the workshop sessions are being written up to share with the delegates.

Outcomes from the session:

Towards the end of the day, we explored what might form the focus of a first shared communications effort. GCVGNP offered up their new campaign "Better Places – Design and Delivery" as a ready-made 'product' which could be expanded west and east by other RAF partners and promoted through CSGN into Government and national agencies.

It was also agreed that the RAF would dedicate one meeting a year to communications to flag issues, plan future action and share learning.

### **Next Steps**

The SU is writing up the post-its, flipchart sheets and discussion captured on the day and this will be made available in its 'raw' form to all delegates.

We will then distil the content to identify the priority audiences, themes and messages and will compare these with our current lists. Variances will be flagged to the Board along with suggestions on any amendments to our audiences, themes and messages.

The Big Partnership has been asked to develop the shell of a CSGN-wide communications campaign based on the GCVGNP campaign, including how this should be evaluated.

The Big Partnership will also investigate whether CSGN press cuttings can be shared with RAF members (this may require a change to our licence agreement and incur additional cost) as several were not aware of the breadth of press cover.

### **Conclusion**

We are seeking to focus and improve the impact of communications efforts. A recent workshop has provided the context in which we can begin to consider the shape of the coming year's activities.

**Author: Sue Evans**

**Date: 24 April 2013**

## CENTRAL SCOTLAND GREEN NETWORK

---

**Report to:** CSGN Partnership Board

**Date of Meeting:** 9 May 2013

**Subject:** CSGN Flagships and Demonstration Projects

**Ref:** Paper 6

---

### **Purpose of Report**

This decision paper sets out recommendations to the Board on the use of the term CSGN Flagship and the identification and promotion of a number of CSGN Demonstration Projects.

### **Recommendations**

The Board is asked to:

- Agree to the identification of a number of Demonstration Projects across the CSGN area.
- Agree the use of CSGN Flagship within the context of work plan activities.

### **Introduction**

The 2012-2015 Work Plan includes under SE1 Championing the Vision, the following Milestone:

*'Flagship projects have been identified, supported and promoted – Years 1 – 3'*

Work was begun in 2012 to look at what we might define as a flagship and to identify possible CSGN flagships. A paper on flagships was presented to the Board at its March 2013 meeting. The discussion on the paper, which is captured in the minutes of the meeting, was inconclusive with members not able to agree on what the term should be applied too (work plan actions v places on the ground), what features would be looked for in flagships, who should own them, or how they might be identified.

As a consequence, it was agreed that more thought was required and that a further paper should be prepared for this meeting of the Board.

### **Discussion with the CSGN Regional Advisory Forum (RAF)**

It was decided to seek views from the RAF members. The March paper was shared with them and then discussed when the Forum met on 9 April.

Through the discussion there was strong support for the need for places to show what the GN should look like but members raised a number of concerns about the use of the term 'Flagship' versus demonstration projects

Number/Scale/Distribution – There was support for good coverage of smaller scale, replicable projects across all 19 Council areas. Indeed it was felt that a few, very high impact projects being promoted as flagships could undermine efforts in some local authorities.

Innovation – We are likely to see best practice evolving and GN design, delivery, use and management improving over time. This means new demonstration projects will emerge and be promoted in preference to what exists now. The label of flagship could prove problematic if a few years down the line we want to promote different projects.

Longevity – RAF members asked if flagship status brought with it the resources to maintain sites over time. The risk that flagship sites might not be adequately managed and maintained in future was felt to be a clear risk which would undermine the flagship concept.

Given the above, the outcome of the meeting was general agreement for there to be a significant number of demonstration projects covering the CSGN themes across all of the CSGN area, and that organisations might, informally, use the term flagship when describing projects which demonstrate major elements of CSGN activity.

### **Flagship Activities and Demonstration Projects**

What was suggested by the RAF addresses a number of concerns flagged by the Board, particularly the concern about the lack of ownership by the Board of the projects identified. As was suggested at the last meeting, it would also enable us to be to identify major components of the work plan and to promote these as CSGN Flagships Activities.

Ownership of Demonstration Projects would not be an issue. We would seek to identify and promote projects which are: the best (or one of the first) of their kind in a particular area; deliver one or more of the CSGN 'place for' themes; encourage innovation; and embody some or all of the CSGN principles (grounded in nature, at scale, regenerative, life enhancing, connected, functional and resilient, locally distinctive and respectful of the past, harnessing the potential of the development, beyond carbon neutral and adding value).

In this we would not need to offer any further support to these projects and will use them to support communications efforts as long as they remain in good condition and/or until such time as new best practice emerges elsewhere.

### **Conclusion**

There is general agreement that we need places to show others what we mean by the Green Network. It is felt that best practice will change over time so new sites will come forward to replace what is currently considered as good practice. There is felt to be more benefit in identifying and promoting a number of demonstration projects across the CSGN area rather than on focusing on a handful of large-scale sites.

The use of the term 'Demonstration Project' frees up 'Flagship' to be applied to four or five significant components of the work plan which are being taken forward directly by the Board/Lead Partners or Support Unit.

**Author: Sue Evans**

**Date: 1 May 2013**