URBAN II Evaluation
Case Study: Bristol
1.0 Introduction

Bristol is a large city in the south-west region of England with a population of 421,300 (as of mid-2008). The Bristol URBAN II programme operated in a series of neighbourhoods including Knowle West, Hartcliffe, Withywood, Hengrove and Whitchurch Park in the South of the city. With an overall population of 37,041, the programme covered nearly 9% of the city's population and received an allocation of 22.6 million euros of URBAN II funds.

Bristol’s strategic port side location stimulated its early growth which was predicated on trade links established along shipping routes and ship building during the 14th century. The later influx of imported produce such as grain, sugar cane, cocoa and tobacco led to Bristol becoming the second largest UK city by the 18th century. Whilst the importance of the port to the city's economy then declined, subsequent engineering investment and industrial growth revived the development of the wider area, and lead to residential development of the city beyond the dock area. Although the port still retains a prominent function in the distribution of goods, the cities economic base has more recently been underpinned by the development of the financial and business sector (accounting for 59,000 jobs in the city), as well as the hi-tech (including microelectronics and silicone development) and aerospace sectors.

However, growth and productivity within some economic sectors is partnered with instances of persistent multiple deprivation across a number of neighbourhoods in the South of the city. At the outset of the programme, the five main wards included in the target area were all within the 25% most deprived wards in Bristol, and amongst the 12% most deprived wards in England (UK Governments Indices of Deprivation, 2000).

Background to the URBAN II Programme and its target area

The specific target area for the URBAN II programme covered a number of mainly residential areas falling contiguously across the majority of 5 wards and incorporating a small portion of 2 additional wards. The intervention area boundary put forward in the original bid for URBAN II funding was determined by local stakeholders and community groups from the voluntary and third sector. This was achieved through initial discussion and meetings between stakeholders with specific involvement of representatives from Network South Bristol (a forum of local community organisations). This meant that local need was the main factor in determining where the intervention area boundary should fall, rather than ‘official’ neighbourhood or ward boundaries.

1.1.1 Nature of Deprivation in the Target Area

Economic challenges, and specifically long term unemployment, had emerged in the target area since the restructuring of the manufacturing base and decline of the city’s traditional industries. At the outset of the programme, the unemployment rate in the target area was 6.4%, which was double that of the national rate (3.2%) and above the city-wide level of 4.7% (Claimant Count Feb 2000). The loss of

---

1 A ward is a political and administrative boundary for a geographical area encompassing one or several neighbourhood areas.

2 The Government Indices of Deprivation is a National data set for the UK which uses a range of indicators to assess the degree of deprivation within areas, either for combined or individual ‘domains’.
employment in traditional male dominated manufacturing sectors was reflected in the higher proportion of women in employment (53.3% target area, 50.3% city-wide) than men (46.7% target area, 49.7% city wide). Within this, long-term unemployment was 13.8% with claimants of employment related benefits accounting for 5.4% of the population. In 2000, 194 people in the target area were recorded as unemployed for over one year. The proportion of the population that were economically inactive was 41% against a national average of 39% and city-wide rate of 38.3% (1991 National Census data). A relatively high level of welfare-dependency had emerged combined with high levels of incapacity benefit claimants amongst those not working on account of illness and disability. An above average proportion of residents had a long term illness or disability (14.4%) which had further exacerbated social exclusion amongst residents. Whilst this has reduced the employment opportunities available, especially to South Bristol’s working class neighbourhoods it had in turn also affected the opportunities and expectations for young people in terms of educational achievement. There was low-educational attainment in the target area with less than 15% obtaining a A*-C grade pass in GCSE (General Certificate of Secondary Education, National Key Stage 4) compared to 32% for Bristol as a whole and 48% nationally³. This was a symptom of social exclusion amongst the young people within the target area, whilst also restricting the development of an appropriate skills base to support the growth of local employment opportunities. The relative deprivation within the target area neighborhoods have been reinforced by geographical isolation from the city centre on the basis of poor quality transport links. The neighbourhoods included within the URBAN II boundary are briefly profiled in the table below as to their main characteristics:

| Knowle-West | Residential neighbourhood comprised mainly of council housing constructed in 1930’s, with half of the 5,500 dwellings now privately owned. 2 miles from the city centre within Filwood ward. Suffers from a multiple deprivation and a negative image. (see Figure 1.2). |
| Hengrove | Hengrove ward contains a large amount of terraced housing, but the area falling within the target area contains only a small amount of residential development. Includes Hengrove Park development site which involves large scale proposals for physical redevelopment⁴. |
| Whitchurch Park | The whole ward area falls within the URBAN II boundary. Encompasses mainly residential areas as well as the Hawkfield Business Park, Hartcliffe school and open space to the south of the intervention area at the edge of Bristol Urban area. |
| Hartcliffe | The URBAN II area encompasses the whole of this district. Mainly comprised of Council housing dating from 1950’s development. A disused tobacco factory and offices have been subject to a number of physical regeneration proposals. A main symptom of multiple deprivation in the area is social exclusion, reinforced by low levels of investment in the area. |
| Withywood | This neighbourhood falls within the Hartcliffe ward and comprises a residential estate built in the 1950’s. (see Figure 1.3). |

³ 1999 Bristol City Council, Public Examination Results.
⁴ The proposals for the site include a new Community Hospital, skills academy, leisure centre, offices, residential development and park space, and have been the subject of long-term delays and have stagnated since 2008 as a result of the economic recession. Whilst early plans and proposals for URBAN funded projects prior to 2000 took into account the proposals for the Hengrove Park site, it has transpired that development and private sector investment has not come about to the degree expected.
1.1.2 Nature of the Programme Intervention

The South Bristol programme was distinct from other URBAN II programmes and preceding regeneration interventions in the area on account of its involvement of local young people. The programme elected to place young people between 10 and 30 years old at the centre of the programme decision making processes, and also set out to support projects which had a strong focus on the development of opportunities and provision for youth. This tied in with the baseline context for the target area which highlighted that there were limited opportunities and expectations for young people, manifested in low educational attainment and issues of neighbourhood crime. The focus on young people constituted the ‘theory’ which underpinned the programme approach and was an emphasis forged at the beginning of the bid writing process. The means by which this was achieved was mainly through having young people on the Urban Programme Committee (the Steering Committee for the programme) and given the responsibility for making choices about the project selection and the development of the programme. The involvement of Network South Bristol in the initiation stage of the programme helped to ensure that the programme was community-led. Through the selection of projects that aligned with selected themes, over 40 projects were given funding support in accordance with the vision, priorities and objectives outlined in Figure 1.4 (below). It was noted at the outset of the programme that involving young people in the management of the programme would directly impact on a limited number of individuals. The focus was therefore extended to ensure that funding was allocated to projects where young people were beneficiaries, or were involved in the design of the project. For example the Archimedia project set about designing a replacement media centre through involving young people on a design team along with commissioned architects.
1.1.3 Has this programme theory been realised on the ground?

Evidence emerging from the stakeholder interviews and programme review documentation supports the assertion that the programme retained its originally articulated focus on empowering young people as decision makers. To some degree, the singular vision for the intervention helped instil a strong focus and motivation into the programme delivery process. Instead of being diluted over the course of the programme, it can be seen that this central theme gained momentum as the programme progressed. This can be attributed to two main factors;

- **Strength of management personnel:**
  Firstly, the 'personalities' of those most closely involved with the programme at grass roots level have emerged as extremely important in levering and retaining interest from young people in the programme. For instance, the project manager has been credited by a number of stakeholders as having gone to great lengths to streamline and simplify the content of UPG meetings in order to ensure that young people would feel comfortable with the proceedings and in order to maximise their input. There is nothing to suggest that this was at the expense of the quality of organisational or monitoring requirements. Rather it seems that whilst a number of young people 'drifted in and out' of the process over the 6 years, the relationships that had been built between the key programme personnel were crucial in attracting young people to take part or 'reappear' at meetings.

- **Public Profile of the Programme:**
  Secondly, the vision for the programme and the innovative approach of focusing on young people built a credible profile for the intervention amongst the local community and stakeholders as well as amongst European Commission stakeholders. Once this was established, there was a sense that the programme needed to live up to expectations to effectively involve young people. It can be seen from a range of anecdotal evidence that the programme went beyond simply engaging or consulting young
people in the programme processes, instead, the committee structure of the UPG actively respected them as 'knowing what young people need in the community' enabling them make programme decisions on this basis. The structure of mentor support on the UPG has been found central in giving rise to a process whereby young people were enabled and assisted at a one-to-one level.

Despite the above, it has been identified that in a number of cases projects overstated the degree to which youth would be involved in the running or design of actual projects, in an attempt to secure funding. A case in point was Youth Moves which proposed to involve young people in designing the youth services available in Filwood ward, and which was regarded by the Programme Manager not to have fulfilled expectations in terms of the degree to which the input of young people was levered.

One negative aspect of having young people feature prominently in the management and organisation of the programme was that the progression of UPG proceedings could at some points become stilted as young people would not easily be able to commit for the entire duration of the programme given school commitments for example. However, the negative impact of having young people 'float in and out' at different stages of the programme was counteracted to a certain degree by having a consistent membership of core adult representatives on the UPG.

2.0 The Impact of the Programme

This section of the case study assesses the direct and indirect outputs and impacts of the URBAN II intervention.

2.1 How has the target area changed?

Two key areas in which the programme has made a real impact is in the areas of educational achievement and crime.

Educational Attainment

The low levels of educational attainment within the target area were key feature of the baseline context and informed the youth engagement focus of the programme. A number of the programme's original aims related to this priority in terms of seeking to raise the skill levels and access to jobs for young people, to improve their local environment and facilities as well as promoting their active involvement in the community. The theory of change here was that raised confidence amongst young people would spur them on define their like goals and obtain the skills they needed. Projects deployed in line with this theory of change included the following, a number of which addressed educational attainment directly, but to a greater degree were focussed on leveraging involvement from, and providing positive activities and support for young people;

'Just CHIL' – which trained and empowered young people to overcome barriers to education and support their peers to do the same;

Youth Development Worker – which helped to coordinate youth mentoring and buddy schemes;
Hartcliffe and Withywood Teenage Parents Project – helped teenage parents to break the negative link between teenage parenthood and under-achievement;

TALENTS (Towards a Learning and Enterprising Society) – worked in schools and youth clubs to encourage enterprising behaviour in young people;

Employment Works Phase 2 – Raised skill levels and increased access to job opportunities for young people;

Room 13 – encouraged and rewarded young people for taking an interest in art, teaching or business; and

Project WHY – co-ordinated better support services for young people in Hartcliffe and Withywood (aged 8-17).

There is evidence to suggest that URBAN II supported initiatives had an impact on educational attainment on the basis of the stakeholder interviews, the programme level evaluation and the updated baseline statistics for the area.

‘out of my involvement…I got a lot of self-esteem and confidence, but I also went into work, because I gained those qualifications that enabled me to feel confident enough to go for an interview….so that was a big step up for me, because I didn’t think I’d get there’ (Rebecca Jenkins, Young Person, Teenage Parent’s project);

‘because of Archimedia, my confidence improved and so I managed to get into college and that was what I was most scared of. So I got into college and I decided that……what I want to do in life is be a teacher’ (Davina Froom, Young Person, Archimedia Core Group).

Local statistics show a positive change in the area of educational attainment, for which the areas of Hartcliffe/Withywood and Knowle West (used as a proxy for the URBAN II area) indicated that the number of pupils achieving 5 A*-C grades at secondary school examination level (GCSE’s or General Certification of Secondary Education) had doubled between 2005 and 2007. For Hartcliffe and Withwood the proportion changed from 20.8% to 45.1% (18.8% in 2001) and for Knowle West the proportion changed from 15.3% to 32.1% (11% in 2001) over the 2005-2007 period. This change in conditions compared favorably to the results for Bristol overall which saw an increase from 35.3% to 45.6% in the same period.

A number of stakeholders are convinced that URBAN II helped contribute to conditions which fostered educational attainment through raising aspirations and encouraging young people that they were able to achieve academically. Whilst the initiatives largely addressed this issue indirectly, the time period of the statistical changes and lack of other identifiable educational initiatives in the area at the time support attribution of the changes to URBAN II. However, as the statistics show a large improvement across all pupils, it is unlikely that the programme was wholly responsible for the change as it cannot realistically have reached all of the pupil cohort. Whilst knock-on effects achieved through peer influence may have had an impact, there is no evidence to suggest this.

Crime

A more straightforward theory of change related to crime reduction, where the programme set out to address crime under a discreet measure 'tackling crime and drugs' through diversionary activity, direct anti-crime initiatives, youth worker run activities to boost social/personal development and citizenship in young people and anti-domestic abuse campaigns/initiatives. Projects such as 'Activity Zone' for young people deployed under 'Employment, Skills and Training' and projects such as Local Education Access
Project which delivered courses and employment advice/support for adults may also have acted to divert young people and adults from offending. There are challenges in isolating and quantifying the contribution of such initiatives to a reduction and crime. The crime statistics baseline update supports an improvement toward the end of the programme as between 2005/6 to 2007/8 the total crime in the target area fell by 16% in Hartcliffe and Withywood, 28% in Knowle West whilst falling only 6% in the same period in the city overall. The improvement in the crime statistics can be linked to levels of raised expectation and diversionary activity for youth as part of the project activity.

**Benefit Claimant Levels**

...training and employment guidance and advice to adults to address issues of unemployment and low skills. As such, for benefit claimant data, improvements were shown to have taken place in Filwood Ward whilst no real change is identified as having taken place in Hartcliffe and Whitchurch Park Wards between November 2004 and November 2007. Whilst the Index of Multiple Deprivation national data set for overall deprivation statistics (incorporating different domains) shows no marked improvement in conditions over the period, decline in conditions for some specific domains indicate worsened deprivation. The strong output of 3589 people receiving employment advice and guidance against a target of 1000, and overachievement in terms of jobs created and young people assisted into jobs points to URBAN's positive impact. However the full extent of the interventions may not yet have been realised or translated through to claim data. Whilst stakeholders can cite anecdotal evidence to support the contribution of URBAN II they are unsure about the degree to which positive baseline changes can be attributed to the programme. One difficulty of attribution highlighted by stakeholders was the partial overlap of the Objective 2 intervention with that of URBAN II in terms of geographical area as well as timing.

Outlined in the table below are the final outputs, results and impacts of the programme as of the end of 2007 (as reported in the Annual Implementation Report 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator &amp; Output</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. SMEs assisted</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No people receiving training in childcare skills</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. young people getting self-employment, start-up or youth enterprise support</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. receiving employment advice and guidance (of which receiving information only)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>3589</td>
<td>358.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ex-offenders gaining employment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>283.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No alternative curricular employment/education initiatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No young people assisted into employment</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No short term or temporary employment opportunities created</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Environmental Improvement Schemes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 Green Spaces Improved</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>62238</td>
<td>103.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 public areas created/improved</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>37361</td>
<td>124.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Buildings Improved</td>
<td>80000</td>
<td>1311.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Diversionary Schemes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Anti-Crime Initiatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. local media campaigns supported</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. visits to schools or youth organisations addressing bullying, drug use or offending behaviour</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of young people aware of URBAN II</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2761</td>
<td>2761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. young people involved in accredited mentoring and buddying and volunteering</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No community groups assisted</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of the achievement of the outputs, results and indicators an extremely high level of success was realised by the programme. To be noted is the relatively high level of success in all of the target areas directly relating to benefits for young people (such as the number of youth organisations supported) which was a key focus of the programme. There was also particularly high achievement in measures addressing the symptoms of crime such as physical regeneration and anti-crime initiatives, again which aligned with a key priority area for the programme.

There were two areas where the targets were not achieved, interestingly both relating to the employment priority. Whilst implied, this does not indicate a lesser success rate for employment related measures in general but is a reflection of the type and wording of the targets set. For instance, as there was a time lag for example between young people beginning further and higher qualifications and completing them – there were not sufficient courses completed in time to be counted as an output. Also, the particular requirement to fulfil 'jobs created' involved demonstration that a new role had been retained for 26 weeks and proved problematic with delays in physical incubator space provision (which

5 N/A indicates that data was not collected for these areas. The Project Manager has outlined that for these areas, the measurement of impacts proved very difficult, with European Commission subsequently advising that this section of the final report need not be completed,
was proposed as part of the Archimedia project) and the timing of key employer opportunities (such as the major chain supermarket which in opening in 2007 did not allow sufficient time for the target to be realised). There were limited target areas which addressed structural economic issues, for instance measures linked into the stimulation of economic market circumstances beyond the provision of advice or work space to start-up businesses. This (along with stakeholder consultation) indicates that the programme had success in addressing social exclusion by focussing intervention on young people, prior to entry into the job market. There was a lesser focus, and associated degree of success in addressing the supply and demand of employment and wider labour economy insufficiencies of the area. However, it should be acknowledged that the programme never set out to confront this particular issue, but instead chose youth deprivation as its priority. Whilst the Project Manager acknowledges that other issues could have been addressed, focussing the programme on a single priority area has in fact proved key to the success of the programme.

Whilst the stakeholder interviews did not suggest that targets were generally set too low, there are several instances where the Programme Management considered that more challenging targets could have been set. For instance, the Withywood Centre was focussed on 'kickstarting the delivery of services from the new facility' and therefore the targets attached to the revenue funding were not as onerous as they might have been. Otherwise, the following factors have been identified as contributing to the realisation of targets:

Knowledge of the field amongst community agencies; Those members of the Programme Management responsible for negotiating targets with projects meant that there was a realistic expectation of what projects could reasonably achieve on the basis of local experience of regeneration over a number of years.

Efficiency of Reporting Mechanisms; Whilst a number of projects found the monitoring requirements stringent, the Programme Manager and PMC were proactive in providing support and advice with respect to the technicalities involved. This was achieved through close monitoring of projects during the first claim period and close working between the monitoring staff and the Project Manager in this period. This meant that any problems with respect to the interpretation of monitoring requirements could be smoothed out early on in the programme through members of the PMC directly contacting the PMC. This helped the projects to keep abreast of monitoring and target achievement feedback and aided the overall Programme Manager and PMC in building up a clear picture of the target realisation rates. For instance, when the Activity Zone project had realised its targets three months prior to project close, the Programme Manager was able to reallocate some additional funding to support the continuation of this successful project.

A direct output of the programme commonly referred to by stakeholders taking part in the evaluation were the buildings enabled through URBAN's capital funding allocations. These included the following:

- The Knowle West Media Centre (Figure 2.1); This replacement media centre digital media and arts training centre resource for young people came about through the Archimedia project which involved young people in the design process of an environmentally-friendly building through working directly with the architect. Capital funding also supported the build of the Centre along with a number of match funding.
• The Withywood Centre (Figure 2.2); a Community centre providing activities and facilities for all sectors of the community. The building, which also incorporated a health centre, youth centre, café and church was partly funded by URBAN II monies as part of a cocktail of funding from other sources.

Despite a delay in the build of the Knowle West Media Centre, the capital funded projects have proved a successful output in terms of the quality of the facilities which have resulted. The Withywood Centre was an excellent outcome of effective cross-funding through a number of national, local and European level funding. However, there is a clear lack of oversight in a number of programmes which involved the provision of a facility, the continued running of which is now under threat due to a lack of alternative funding or additional support streams. This is particularly the case in the Withywood Centre whilst the the Knowle West Media Centre and Activity Zone projects have developed some degree of commercial operation which is helping to ensure their survival rate. However, a main frustration amongst Programme Management was the amount of time it took most projects to realise that forward business planning needed to carefully consider the opportunities for generating alternative income stream. URBAN II revenue funded a two year post for the Withywood Centre to support youth service provision at the centre. The impact of this element of the funding was not effective in stimulating the use of the Youth Café facilities to full advantage as the post was occupied for only one year of the two year remit. Partly because of this and the limited engagement from Bristol's Statutory Youth Service (likely linked to capacity issues) this part of the facility is not fully successful in operational terms with a positive impact on the young people of the area failing to be realised.

2.2 Indirect Impacts

By virtue of the programme's emphasis on youth empowerment and decision making, the indirect impacts of the intervention are mainly related to the changes to the young people involved in the programme or to the wider culture of involving young people in local decision making. The programme was seen to impacts on young people directly involved in the co-ordination of URBAN but also
extended to project beneficiaries and those within the wider community. The URBAN II evaluation\textsuperscript{6} recognised the impact on young people as relating to the following areas;

- **The positive impact for young people in terms of confidence, self esteem, aspirations and employment opportunities:** As a key issue within the area had been the low aspiration amongst youth, reflected in the low educational attainment, the programme helped people realise that they could make a difference. In this respect, a key impact of the programme, in the words of the Project Manager was the change 'that took place between the ears of those young people involved in the programme'. The young people involved in the management of the programme on the UPG have largely retained their involvement in various community schemes and activities. One young person that sat on the UPG as chairman now occupies a flexible workspace within the Knowle West Media Centre and is pursuing a business venture in digital art and film making. For instance, the Activity Zone project ran activities for young people from across a number of deprived neighbourhoods. In taking part in outward team activities or developing archery skills for example, the young people taking part were seen to develop in confidence in skills that they never thought they would have a chance to develop. For 5 young people, their skills and aspirations were raised such that they were able to gain employment in the outdoors activity sector. This reflects the role of URBAN II in helping young people turn their interests into career opportunities, directly through their experience in managing the programme or as project beneficiaries.

- **The positive impact on the reputation of young people within and outside of their communities.** At the outset of the programme, stakeholders contributing to the evaluation identified that young people were often regarded as a problem within their neighbourhoods - this sector of the community suffered from a bad reputation within the target neighbourhoods. However, the profile of young people within the target neighbourhoods was raised through the positive contribution made by a number of young people in the co-ordination and management of the URBAN II programme, and the facilities and activities provided for young people through funded projects.

The other main indirect benefit of the programme is the degree to which the regeneration culture of wider Bristol has been changed given the fresh approach to intervention brought about under URBAN II. This has been seen to 'bend mainstream' to a recognisable degree with statutory agencies such as the Council's Regeneration team now regarding the involvement of young people in the design and development of regeneration programmes to be a firmly embedded practice in Bristol. Stakeholders traced this directly to the legacy of the URBAN II programme. Related to this was the degree to which URBAN II acted to strengthen the capacity of the voluntary and community sector organisations in the area. This occurred as the strong positive profile of the programme helped to gain recognition for those third sector (community and voluntary) organisations working in South Bristol and promoted joint-working between different organisations as well as mutual understanding of the different agency roles.

\textsuperscript{6} The Urban II Evaluation 2008 (Bristol City Council, Knowle West Media Centre) – undertaken by Dr Roz Hall.
3.0 Links with Other Programmes and Policies

Bristol had been the recipient of a number of previous European and UK government fund allocations and area-based initiatives, several of which overlapped with the target area for URBAN II activity (see Figure 3.1). Allocation of funds to South Bristol under URBAN I (similarly managed through the Council) had a clear bearing on the bid process and delivery of the URBAN II programme as the bid procedure and reporting mechanisms of the programmes were similar. This meant that the technical experience gained under URBAN I could be implemented under this second programme. A further linkage was established between URBAN II and the wider regeneration programme context through the positioning of the URBAN II programme management within the same Council directorate which was responsible for delivering Objective 2 (ERDF) and Neighbourhood Renewal Funding (central UK government funding). This helped to ensure that these programmes were 'joined up' and led to shared experience and approaches across key management and finance team personnel, especially in areas such as monitoring technicalities. It also helped to ensure that the URBAN II programme was aligned to the overall strategic direction of regeneration across Bristol more widely. A particular force in forging links with the Objective 2 funding was through close working with URBAN II Programme Management and the Government Office for the South West (GOSW) which linked the local programme to the overarching European level. However, this commitment in part reflects the personal interest and commitment of the GOSW Objective 2 Officer to the focus of the URBAN II programme. There was close liaison and coordination between URBAN II and the Bristol Objective 2 Action Plan. This included cross referral of project proposals and work to ensure that there was no duplication of European Commission spend between the two programmes. One project, Archimedia, which has won a number of national and regional awards, did receive investment from both Objective 2 and URBAN II (for different elements of the project). There was also a sharing of EU project management expertise between these programmes.

In addition, stakeholders involved with the evaluation identified links between the URBAN II programme and Single Regeneration Budget (5 and 6), essentially built up as both programmes were managed through Bristol City Council. This meant that joint working between the personnel involved with programme co-ordination took place which gave rise to consistency in delivery across these two programmes. In particular, the links with SRB, Objective 2, Neighbourhood Renewal Funding and URBAN I have helped to maximise the value of the individual intentions and ensured synergy to a certain extent through shared knowledge and resources.

Having said this, it is very difficult to see that the focus of the URBAN II programme fitted closely into a wider strategy for Bristol's regeneration. So, rather than delivering part of a pre-agreed agenda, the programme identified and then addressed a gap in existing provision. The City Council representative for regeneration considers that this was because the 'the idea of focussing a major regeneration programme around young people in a relatively small area was new to Bristol'. The programme was 'stand alone' in that its innovative approach presented a diversion from existing regeneration activity which tended to focus on tackling regeneration issues across a number of different thematic areas and sections of the community. As such, issues of legacy and the impact on the culture of regeneration in the city are important (and are considered in section 7). In operational terms, a number of stakeholders identified that URBAN II might have been easier to operate at a community agency level if the target
area boundary had been drawn contiguous with that other programme areas, such as SRB 6 for instance (which had roughly the same operation period).

4.0 Factors of Success

Bristol’s URBAN II programme displayed a high degree of target realisation as well as securing a range of indirect benefits and recognisable legacy. The main reasons for this are the following:

- **Innovative Focus:** The stakeholder interviews were clear that the youth focus for the programme helped to lever in support and profile (at the local and European level) that it would not have achieved otherwise. The ‘experimental’ approach paid off in this respect this acted to attract attention and helped to attract innovative projects which levered interest from the third sector. The fact that the programme was pioneering was crucial to securing stakeholder investment. There was stakeholder agreement that this emphasis was the main reason for the Bristol’s bid being successful.

- **Community Stakeholder Involvement:** Involvement especially from the community and voluntary sector was very visible. Network South Bristol was a lead partner from an early stage and acted as a catalyst for the development of credible programme arrangements. The commitment of a number of key local figures were identified in stakeholder interviews as the main drivers of the programme and involvement for the duration of the project ensured consistency in this respect.

- **Programme Management Personnel:** A number of stakeholders involved in the evaluation highlighted that the commitment of the programme manager and key UPG mentor figures were very important in building and retaining the interest of young people in the management of the programme. The retention of the Programme Manager for the duration of the programme was not an achievement realised by many other programmes but was a critical success factor in terms of providing consistency for beneficiary projects. This ensured that the expertise of the Project Manager was not lost mid-way through the programme – which would have had negative resource implications in terms of recruitment and retraining.

- **Past Experience of European Funding:** The history and experience of previous European funded projects in Bristol meant that stakeholders did not enter into the URBAN II programme naïve about the procedures and requirements associated with European funding programmes. This was due to the shared knowledge between monitoring and programme management staff within Bristol City Council but also an awareness amongst community organisations that had previous direct, or second hand experience of URBAN I, SRB or Objective 2 funding. As the use of previous European Funding was recognised by stakeholders as having played a crucial enabling role in the regeneration of Bristol, a ‘can do’ attitude emerged amongst stakeholders from the outset.

- **The Identification of a Particular Baseline Characteristic:** The programme’s focus on young people emerged from the identification of low educational attainment as a key issue within the baseline context of the target area. The programme was tailored to addressing this baseline issue through a range of targeted interventions. The critical mass of projects reflecting this theme and concentration of resources in this area is regarded as being the main reason why the baseline context has
improved in this area. Whilst the Project Manager is of the opinion that other issues such as the geographic isolation of South Bristol's neighbourhoods could have been addressed through URBAN, a widened focus on tackling additional issues would have acted to spread the resources too thinly, thus undermining the degree of progress made in youth provision and educational attainment.

5.0 The Integration of the Programme.

The Bristol programme had a high proportion of projects which took social regeneration as their theme. Despite this, there was wide recognition amongst stakeholders taking part in the evaluation that the programme supported a range of physical and economic interventions in tandem with the social emphasis, resulting in a holistic and balanced programme. This was because:

- A number of projects supported were integrated in their approach to regeneration such as the Archimedia project which incorporated physical and social interventions. This has had economic benefits given that the venture has developed as a commercially viable project;

- The programme featured a cross-cutting environmental theme across projects which was secured through effective communication of the environmental aims of the programme to projects at the outset and the involvement of the Environment Agency.

- Training delivered to the young people on the UPG by mentors and bodies such as the Environment Agency ensured that the young people involved with the management of the programme had a good knowledge and understanding of different regeneration approaches. This helped the young people to select projects that were varied.

There were a number of barriers affecting the level of integration, particularly those that influenced the programme to be wary of physical regeneration activity. URBAN II had a relatively lesser degree of success in physical regeneration which stakeholders identified as being due to:

- The knowledge that physical interventions require a high level of capital investment usually requiring a long delivery period, relative to other interventions. This meant that there was deliberately steered away from investment in major physical regeneration projects given the difficulty foreseen in achieving outcomes within the programme period.

- The Regional Development Agency not being prepared to match fund projects under £1 million in value. This meant that support for small scale economic and physical development projects, otherwise aligning with the RDA's aims, was not forthcoming;

- Delay in a large scale physical regeneration project (Hengrove Park) which was proposed near to the programme area had a negative impact on the programme's achievements in physical regeneration. This was as some URBAN II activities and output areas were tied in with the Hengrove
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Park development, ultimately not delivered within the timescales of the URBAN II programme. However, this factor was out of the control of the URBAN II programme management.

6.0 Programme Management

The overall responsibility for the programme was lodged with the Government Office for the South-West (GOSW) which is responsible for representing the UK Government’s agenda in this region of England. The management of the URBAN II programme was provided through the Local Authority Bristol City Council which was the accountable body responsible for the employment of programme staff and the financial probity of the programme. The decision for Bristol City Council to take on responsibility for the management of the programme was partly based on its previous experience in running URBAN I, Objective I and II funded programmes and also its willingness to address the risks associated with the funding regime. Whilst Network South Bristol was initially keen to take on responsibility for the programme given its links with other regeneration activity within the target area, the City Council was regarded as the authority best placed to shoulder any financial costs levied in the case that oversights were made (with monitoring technicalities for example).

The Project Management of the Bristol Programme was identified by stakeholders involved with the evaluation as particularly successful which can be attributed to the following main factors:

- **Management of the Programme through the Council:** The position of the programme management within the Council meant that strong organizational links could be made with the managers and finance staff of alternative regeneration programmes also based and managed through the Council. In addition, the statutory status of the Council meant that it was able to broker communication with key statutory organisations, such as the Regional Development Agency to a greater degree than would have been achieved by community organisations;

- **The Visibility of Community Organisations:** Whilst the management of the programme was technically managed by the Council ‘in-house’, community organisations were seen to take an active lead in stimulating provisions for the bid arrangements and subsequent programme management provisions. This was primarily through their visible representation of community organisations on the Programme Monitoring Committee (Network South Bristol) and the Urban Programme Group (which included a representative from training delivery organisation Hartcliffe and Withywood Ventures);

- **Approach of Key Personnel:** The operational, 'hands on style' of the Programme Manager proved a main factor in securing commitment from young people for the UPG and ensuring the prominence of the community and voluntary sector organisations within the programme. In being half employed by the Council, the Programme Manager regarded himself as loyal to the Council but also 'employed by URBAN'. Whilst stakeholder interviews suggested that this exposed an ideological divide on occasion, it meant that Programme Manager was able to balance due regard for the European Commission level funding requirements with the statutory processes of the Council. This proved to
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be a healthy tension and there were benefits associated with the community not seeing the Programme Manager as a 'city council puppet'.

A major shortfall in terms of the management of the programme was the lack of representation of statutory organisations on the Programme Monitoring Committee. Those initially credited as having expressed commitment to the programme included statutory organisations such as the Learning and Skills Council (UK Government agency), Children's Services from the Primary Care Trust as well as local services or agencies such as the City of Bristol College, the Citywide Youth Forum or 'Bristol Means Business'. Stakeholder consultation was largely unanimous in identifying that the PMC achieved sustained representation from very few elected stakeholders. Those regularly represented on the Committee included those from the Environment Agency and Network South Bristol. The programme had adopted an overall environmental sustainability approach and the support offered by the Environment Agency, undertaking roles such as providing training the young people on the UPG, proved invaluable to performance in this field, and the subsequent environmental legacy of the programme. However, this seems to have been stimulated by a complaint lodged by the Programme Manager earlier on in the programme, that insufficient support was being received to this end.

One strength of the programme was exchange visits whereby young people from the UPG visited areas which had benefited from regeneration funding, both as part of, and independent of the URBACT network. These visits were arranged by PMC members and by virtue of taking the young people out of their immediate community, acted to raise their aspirations for the programme. The success of these visits can be traced to a high value being placed on field visits and experiential learning by the Programme Manager and a key member of the PMC.

7.0 Sustainability and Legacy

The main legacies of URBAN II in South Bristol include the following:

- **Physical Facility Provision:**
The URBAN II funding supported a number of projects through capital support, particularly in funding or part funding the physical development of buildings. The stakeholder interviews exposed that there was a degree of political pressure exerted at the beginning of the programme advocating the use of URBAN II funding 'to build buildings, in order that a definite legacy can be seen at the close of the programme'. Physical building provision is therefore the most tangible legacy of the URBAN II programme, and although this is a common of regeneration programmes in general, the South Bristol programme is somewhat distinct in terms of the nature of the buildings that the funding has supported. The best example of this is the Archimedia project which designed a media centre offering training and activities for young people and the wider community in Knowle West. This project placed young people at the centre of the design and procurement processes and has therefore been extremely successful in promoting a sense of ownership over the facility (as well as the wider neighbourhood). A number of young people involved at the outset of the project in 2000 are still actively involved in the work and development of the media centre today. The building is 'cutting-edge' in that it has built environmental sustainability into the design and build of the facility, incorporating features such as sustainable urban drainage systems.
• **Organisational Capacity and Partnership Working**

There is evidence to suggest that the URBAN II programme did more than previous regeneration initiatives in the city in terms of stimulating joint working between agencies and stakeholders. For instance, a project co-ordinator for the Withywood Centre commented that ‘URBAN II certainly did strengthen the infrastructure in the area. The fact that we (community organisations) were all working locally under the same fund necessitated us working together to attain targets. It also alerted organisations to what local organisation's business plans were and increased awareness of which organisations provided family support for example’. The main factor identified behind the strengthened community capacity specifically for URBAN II relative to other initiatives was that the profile and youth focus of the programme drew in stakeholders and organisations that might have otherwise have stood on the margins. The other factor was the synthesis provided by the cross-agency alliance of third sector community agencies, Network South Bristol. The network brought together representatives from various local community groups and can be regarded as the starting point for the preparation of the URBAN II funding bid for South Bristol.

• **Mainstreamed Provision and Funding**

Whilst the majority of projects have not been continued by mainstream funding agencies, a number have continued in their own right. For instance, the Activity Zone project which provided outdoor activities and training for young people is now running activities for schools children as a commercial operation and is self-sustaining in this respect. The Knowle West Media Centre is renting its flexible workspace units and has diversified in offering evaluation and media services to the immediate community and wider area.

• **Youth Focus within the Culture of Regeneration**

URBAN II was seen to empower local young people to make positive changes within their community and feel confident that their views matter. The achievements of the programme meant that stakeholders, regeneration agencies and the wider community came to see the benefits of this model of youth engagement and community involvement in bringing about change. As such there is an expectation on current and future projects in the city to live up to the high standard set by URBAN II by 'rolling' out this model. The main agencies and partners working on Bristol's regeneration are now committed to ensuring that young people are seen and see themselves as the solution and not the problem. This is because URBAN II acted as a trailblazer in demonstrating that young people had skills and knowledge to bring to decision making processes concerning their community. The programme has embedded this approach into the wider culture of regeneration approaches within Bristol. On the basis of the profile of the programme and potential dissemination of good practice, South Bristol URBAN II stands to impact practice in the wider region, but also at a national and European Commission level. More broadly, current and future regeneration approaches in the city (and beyond) are more likely to be fit for purpose, as community members have themselves been involved in identifying issues and appropriate interventions for the area. The programme has therefore demonstrated the ultimate 'bending of mainstream', not having simply changed the way an agency addresses an issue, but rather changing the city's culture of decision making, whereby power and influence is devolved to community stakeholders. This can be considered a main achievement, an excellent legacy of the programme.

However, the legacy of the programme has been undermined by limited strategic oversight at project level in terms of the sustainability of funding sources. At programme level, there was a requirement to develop Business Plans to lay out such considerations. Furthermore, the Programme Manager
emphasised the importance of developing a long term sustainability strategy, in his communication with individual projects. However, the degree to which this was practically built into project arrangements was limited. This can be attributed to the fact that small community organisations delivering projects were often occupied with the responsibilities of day to day delivery and monitoring requirements. Project delivery staff were usually community or field workers, often lacking the skills of business 'culture' required for effective forward planning. Future programmes should carefully consider how structured practical assistance can be built into programmes in order to develop the forward business planning skills amongst funded projects.