

## Big Local: Reflections on ‘resident led’ change (Paper One)

Angus McCabe, Mandy Wilson and Rob Macmillan

### Introduction

The term ‘resident led’ is integral to any description of the Big Local programme. It is used as a convenient short-hand to signal what differentiates it from many other place-based initiatives. ‘Resident-led’ suggests that Big Local is not:

- a top down initiative,
- led by professionals,
- delivered by external agencies,
- target, output or outcome driven, or
- moulded by central or local government agendas which may, or may not, coalesce with the priorities of local communities.

As such, therefore, Big Local fits well with a range of current policy initiatives which stress a more ‘bottom up’ approach to change in which residents, particularly in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, are integral to place-based solutions to the challenges facing local communities. For example:

- The Government’s Community Integration Green Paper (2018) argues that individuals and community groups have a key role to play in developing. *‘Tailored local plans and interventions [which] are needed to tackle the issues that are specific to a particular place (p.13),*
- Similarly, HM Government’s Civil Society Strategy (2018) emphasizes that *‘people taking action is the bedrock of a strong society...where people have a sense of control over their future and that of their community...the 21<sup>st</sup> century needs ‘people power’ more than ever’* (Executive Summary and p.31).

These themes of ‘people power’ are echoed in other relevant strategies and enquiries – from the Big Lottery Fund’s [‘People in the Lead’](#) strategic framework (2015-2021), to the [Civil Society Futures](#) (2017-19<sup>1</sup>) inquiry, IVAR/Local Trust’s [Future for Communities](#) (2018<sup>2</sup>) and Locality’s Findings from the [Commission on Localism](#) (2018<sup>3</sup>).

It is therefore pertinent to explore how ‘resident led’ is understood and illustrated in Big Local areas. Interpretation of ‘resident led’ has raised contentious issues in many partnerships throughout the [Our Bigger Story](#) evaluation<sup>4</sup>. Questions and debates have surfaced around who identifies and ‘qualifies’ as a resident, the implications of residents playing multiple roles in the community, the role of residents vis a vis other stakeholders with a legitimate interest in the locality, and the role of other key Big Local actors, such as Reps, Locally Trusted Organisations (LTOs) and Local Trust. Learning from the 15 case study areas demonstrates a variety of ways in which

dilemmas of 'resident led', and questions of who is in control, are played out at the local level.

Based on material from workshops, interviews with external strategic stakeholders, diaries written especially for the evaluation and analysis of film material<sup>5</sup>, this paper raises questions about local decision making and, to some extent, challenges the rhetoric around 'resident led'. Beyond the 'tick-box' assumption of residents enjoying a majority on a Big Local partnership, a more complex picture emerges.

### **Understandings of 'resident led'**

Local Trust emphasises residents being in control as the experts about where they live. One of the councillors interviewed stated that Big Local had reinforced her view that residents should be driving and delivering change.

The simplest definition of resident is anyone who lives within a Big Local area. As one area expressed it – *'70% of the partnership is residents, so more than the 51% required [by Local Trust]. So we are resident led'*.

For one of the Our Bigger Story diary keepers though, this apparently simple answer raises more complex questions:

*Is it the composition of the partnership? Is it the number of residents that turn up to activities/events? Is it the number of residents volunteering? Is it the number of people following/responding to social media? Is it the number of new projects? Is it the number of residents that respond to consultation? Is it that the LTO only works in the parish, not part of a larger organisation, and has residents as employees and trustees? Is it gaining support from local groups and councils? Personally I feel ALL OF THE ABOVE!*

These two perspectives exemplify the very different understandings of the meaning and implications of resident led action. 'Resident led' invites questions over who counts as a 'valid', or 'authentic', resident, and what is it for a programme of local action to be led by them? There are wide ranging views 'on the ground' and amongst different external stakeholders across the 15 areas involved with Our Bigger Story. One council officer suggested that resident led is about *'residents being able to make genuine decisions – and being in the driving seat regarding how the money is spent. Underneath this, people need real opportunities to get involved – structures need to facilitate this. People need to feel comfortable with this'*.

### **Who identifies as a resident?**

The Big Local programme is predicated on the assertion that people have a connection with where they live, and that through making connections with others, alongside some financial and support resources, they can develop a shared confidence to create tailored responses to local needs and issues. Our Bigger Story,<sup>6</sup> however, has discovered that this connection is not always as strong as it might be, and that geographical boundaries can exclude as well as include.

Some Big Local areas raised questions about residents who may live in a Big Local area – but may not feel a sense of belonging, primarily, within that locality. For Northfleet, this included the emerging Roma, Czech and Slovak communities *‘who don’t feel confident, have a lack of English and don’t identify with Northfleet’* (Local Historian interview) - they work elsewhere and associate more with communities of identity than place.

In rural communities, these issues were expressed slightly differently, and related to the strength of identity of new in-comers who out-commute and may actually spend very little time (or, indeed, money) within the locality (such as Three Parishes or Radstock and Westfield).

Similarly, in areas where different geographical communities have been brought together to form one Big Local (such as Grassmoor and Hasland; and the five areas that comprise Growing Together Big Local), residents defined themselves in terms of the village or estate where they lived – rather than the Big Local boundaries per se.

A final dimension, mainly in urban areas, such as Blackpool Revue, was the very transitory nature of large sections of the local population and whether these people identified in any way with the locality, or the concept of resident led change in the neighbourhood they were ‘passing through’.

### ***Who ‘Qualifies’ as a Resident?***

For some, however, the issue of whether someone lived within the Big Local area was less important than whether they had a stake in, and were contributing to, that community; for example, a long serving head teacher or a housing officer. As noted, one of the Our Bigger Story diarists reflected that how to measure whether Big Local is ‘resident led’ is subject to interpretation.

This issue of ‘who qualifies’ as a resident was further debated in the Birmingham and London workshops where participants questioned whether the term ‘resident’ was too one-dimensional. Where a person lived was not the only factor which defined them, certainly in terms of contributing to the partnership. Partnership members may be residents but they often wear multiple hats. They may also be councillors, define themselves (and their contribution) more in terms of their professional practice rather than residency and they may also be paid workers with Big Local – as well as residents.

Here, the most contentious issue was whether councillors ‘qualified’ first and foremost as local residents or as elected members (see 2018 film, [Big Local: talking about resident led change](#)). Some Big Local areas had taken the conscious decision to exclude councillors from the partnership decision making process as they were deemed to be *‘too politically motivated, [they] have their own agenda’* (Resident, London Workshop). Others welcomed their contribution as a means of ensuring residents’ voices could be heard in wider decision making processes. However, even those Big Local areas which adopted more of a stakeholder model for their partnership urged caution in terms of the potential impact on the principle of resident led:

*It's about who shapes the conversation, not just who takes the decisions. [We were] conscious that if invited on, councillors, voluntary sector [people] etc. - they are the people used to sitting around tables, putting forward an argument, persuading others towards their own position. For [a] majority of the partnership it was the first time they had been in this position. These people are now really good scrutinisers, good at challenging, good at lateral thinking but at the beginning would have kept quiet' (Worker, London Workshop).*

Although there was no consensus, a compromise position was proposed: that *'there are two types of Councillors. Those that are the voice of town hall in the community – and those that are the voice of the community in town hall'* (Partnership member, London Workshop).

Other interviewees and focus group participants raised questions related, in part, to the nature of Big Local boundaries. Could someone living (just) outside the Big Local area – but working or accessing services within it – 'count'? Indeed, a worker from one Big local area explained that they had a particularly broad interpretation of who qualifies – it could be someone who lives there, someone who works there, someone who goes to school, a church or a pub there, someone who is travelling through.

#### ***'Active' and 'inactive' residents***

In reflecting upon the term resident led, however, two common themes emerged – irrespective of how Big Local/the partnership operated locally, or the particular issues faced. First, the challenge of engaging the wider community in decision making: how many residents need to be involved to make a Big Local 'resident led'; and, second, the related challenge of accountability to the wider community.

Describing their annual general meeting, which had been widely publicised both through leafleting and 'street discussions with residents, one diary keeper reflected: *The only thing we didn't have on the day were actual residents. We actually spent twenty minutes out front trying our hardest to get one or two people to come along!*

They continue: *'I have to say it was very disheartening, I really did feel like we had a good chance of reaching some new residents and recruit for the partnership. It is difficult not to get upset or feel disappointment, people want things to get better but we are inviting them and asking them to tell us how, and then there is no one to be seen! There seems to be an expectation that we will just wave our lottery funded wand and magic the area better, there doesn't seem to be the realisation that without their input, and dare I say, effort, the area will remain how it is. If people won't give of their time and effort to make it better, how will it? Without developing relationships and making a community we will all still be self-serving and the area will remain in decline. I don't know how to get people to care enough to dare to do something'*

Part of the challenge of developing resident led models of change is the responsibility partnership members feel for managing Big Local resources – and, more critically, being **seen** to be accountable<sup>7</sup>. This is becoming more acute as areas move further into delivery or are approaching the final, spend up, phase. Being seen to be accountable involves formal ways of operating which can be alienating to some. However, partnership meetings needed to be both accountable and resident

led in the decision making process. Indeed, meetings were frequently described as 'boring' and risked being highly technical or procedural and, therefore, exclusive:

*[The partnership] was more informal when first started. We weren't thinking about agenda in a formal fashion. People could come on whatever level and understand what was going on. Now it's very complex – working on a completely different level, and new people may not grasp it. We are asking them to come into formal complex meetings'* (Partnership member).

A Big Local worker reflected on the similarities between partnership meetings and attending a parish council meeting with very few members of the public in attendance and *'how difficult it can be to get people involved and engaged, especially when there is such a formal process, as well as the public impression that these organisations and institutions, whether they be council or community, are there to do stuff for them – a clear divide between the doers and receivers. I feel like resident led should blur the lines at the very least, even if the ideal of every resident taking an active part of decision making is more aspiration than a practical possibility'*.

### **Notions around the 'authentic' resident**

The responsibilities of being accountable raised further questions for participants in the evaluation – beyond the frequently repeated distinction between 'active' and 'inactive' residents. One such question centred on whether the 'right kind' of residents in the lead. The 'right kind' from a Big Local programme perspective is understood as a partnership which is reflective of the community in which it sits, and where active residents are inclusive and welcoming. For many of the Our Bigger Story residents though, partnerships needed to be articulate advocates, familiar with formalised decision making and ways of working and able to negotiate complex structures and processes, in order to be effective (or perceived as effective). This has tended to attract older, more middle class residents with professional backgrounds who may not be 'representative' of wider, more deprived, communities.

One chair reflected on this theme: *Whether it's .... enough resident engagement..... We need to be doing things that are priorities for residents, whether they're actively engaged or not... The sort of partnership where it's made up of residents who then take the decisions, is the right one, but I do worry about who those residents are. It's a bit like parish councils, they're basically self-appointed people and we try very hard to get a mix of people ... but should those people be typical residents? I'm not a typical resident who should be a beneficiary of Big Local. Is it fine that people like me are involved?... You want something that works. I think it's very, very important that whatever you do does work because if it doesn't work, you lose everybody's respect and patience... I'd like agencies to learn that it's worth listening to ordinary people about what they want.*

This struggle with notions of the 'authentic' resident was picked up by a community worker based in a Big Local area, who made the point that *'I've not seen too many of the poorer end of the estate getting involved in decision making'*; but countered this with: *'[But] even then, the money .... wasn't given to the poor people of [Big Local area], it was given to the whole community. So the fact that it's the majority of the people around the table live [here] I think ticks that box'*.

Similarly, a Local Government Officer was *'saddened that the people active in Big Local weren't those who needed to benefit'*, and believed the responses to local needs have sometimes, in consequence, been inappropriate. A voluntary and community sector commentator in another area pointed out that whilst decisions are predominantly made by the more middle class people living in the area, this would still qualify as resident led.

### ***Resident structures for negotiating life and living in a Big Local area***

Big Local areas can become the basis for competition for the limited funding available through the Big Local programme, and this can fuel tensions between residents. These can also arise over the nature of the area itself and the issues it faces. One partnership member was clear that resident led did not mean *'residents dictating to the partnership'*, especially where those residents were pursuing the sectional interests of a particular part of the community or a *'pet project'*. Rather, the role of residents on the partnership was to interpret often competing community needs, balance these in the interest of the wider community, give residents a voice on the issues they raised but also provide feedback to residents on how, or whether, those needs could be met and how these fitted with the wider priorities of, for example, the local authority. In short, in the words of one partner: *'the partnership is an executive [committee] for residents'*: acting as a broker, or conduit, between residents and between residents and external agencies.

In these areas resident led is equated to the (often) small number of residents actually involved in the partnership. The community is consulted, but ultimately all key decisions (on priorities and expenditure) are made at the partnership level. Others, however, have a more dispersed model, or interpretation, of resident led. Decisions may be devolved to specific working groups addressing the issues that are important to them and therefore involve a wider pool of residents. In still other localities the focus is on developing broad community leadership where individual residents and groups 'lead' on developing particular activities or services, supported by the partnership, but with little reference to the formal decision making processes of that partnership<sup>8</sup>.

### **Maintaining the resident led ethos, and practice**

People active in Big Local areas appear to be exercised about whether they are 'getting it right' - hence the discussions noted above about who qualifies as a resident, authenticity, etc. But there are broader questions around the conditions required for residents to organise and exercise some control over the identification of local needs and potential responses; the extent to which external agencies interact with this; and the way in which Local Trust and its programme partners support or get in the way of 'resident led' development.

### ***The conditions for resident led development***

One resident described Big Local as 'a catalyst' for further resident led development: *'...a start to help us move on'*. The evaluation research in the 15 case study areas points to the following as enablers in creating the conditions for residents to make a difference to where they live:

- Financial leverage**

As highlighted in the Our Bigger Story 2015 – 2016 evaluation report,<sup>9</sup> where we illustrated how Big Local areas were not only delivering their own activities to meet community needs but also influencing other service provision through commissions, ongoing research has highlighted the confidence that the money brings. Partnership members talk about having something to ‘take to the table’ and the power to make things happen.
- A ‘credible’ resident led structure**

Whilst some people talk of how their meetings can be boring, and that formality can be off-putting, there is a conviction amongst the vast majority of partnership members that they need to organise in a formal but transparent manner in order to illustrate due process. This breeds confidence that residents know what they are doing, and that they are doing it ‘properly’, because a) they are acting in the interests of a much large group of people, b) they are using public money, and c) informal ways of working are very vulnerable to criticism by other local interests and power holders who felt that such ways of working lacked transparency. It is the perspective of the Local Trust team that this also reflects the confidence of the partnership themselves, the skills of the worker/rep/LTO to support the partnership to do something that is different from what the perceived good practice might be.
- Opportunities for knowledge and skill development, including effective community engagement and growing community leadership**

The accompanying paper two (focused on community leadership) highlights the value of a central support system which also provides on the ground support. In addition, the longevity of the Big Local programme has enabled people to learn from peers and from their own experience; *‘were novices, over the years have learnt a lot’* (Partnership member).
- Physical space for residents to meet and organise**

14 out of the 15 case study areas have opened, or have pursued the idea of, a ‘community hub’ (see [Westfield Big Local AGM](#) and [Growing Together](#) gardening club films). These are used for meetings and community activities, and in several examples, provide an opportunity for individuals and community groups to organise their own activities independently of Big Local. Community spaces are seen to be a visible representation of Big Local in the community, and can be a neutral space in areas (such as Birchfield) where meeting places are attached to particular faith based buildings.
- Connections and networks across the community and with external agencies**

Opportunities to build relationships between residents are central to a collective sense of identity and belonging (when asked what is changing in the area, a common response is that it *‘feels’* better); collaborative working between community groups illustrates a bigger voice and a sum greater than its parts (e.g. Ramsey); stronger connections with other power and

resource holders has furthered resident aspirations in Big Local areas like Whitley Bay and Lawrence Weston.

- **A trusted brand**

Trust and a known brand were identified as helping to make Grassmoor Hasland Big Local successful, by residents and agencies alike. Agencies are aware of Big Local and it is trusted to deliver; '[they] *are shocked by what we are capable of doing*'.

- **Time to reflect and change course as necessary**

Big Local demonstrates that it can take several years to 'form, storm, norm and perform'<sup>10</sup>. Growth of effective structures and ways of working has been a bumpy ride, even for those Big Local areas that appear to be on a progressive and upward journey now. Local Trust requires regular reviews of Big Local plans but the most significant reflections are often connected more to relationships and structures within the partnership, or the detail of how a particular action is delivered. The luxury of time to get it right is crucial.

### ***External contributions to resident led development***

An accompanying third paper (forthcoming), 'Reflections from the Outside In', shares perspectives on Big Local from external stakeholders in the Our Bigger Story case study areas. As stated in that paper, Big Local does not exist in a vacuum: it is influenced by local history and memory, the prevailing national and local policy context, and the range of other services and initiatives at community level. Some local agencies have the scope to 'make or break' a supportive environment for resident influence.

A range of external stakeholder perspectives were evident. Some were actively involved in enabling Big Local to flourish, and others wanted to be seen to support Big Local (even if their understanding was limited, or they were keen to criticise it). Some equated Big Local with the plethora of other community groups; namely the Big Local group was deemed to be important to civil society, but not necessarily instrumental to real change. And there were those for whom Big Local was not on their radar at all.

However, it is difficult to identify their involvement and influence in practice. For example:

- where partnerships comprise people from external agencies, it is almost impossible to determine who has influenced decision making, i.e. decision making may effectively lie with those who shape the discussion rather than those who have a vote. This begins to complicate the idea of resident led action;
- service providers are generally very happy when communities fill gaps in provision but they are not always so comfortable when there are conflicting priorities. Several council respondents have stated that residents do not see the bigger picture, thereby implying that the council knows what is best;



- in some Big Local areas, residents may have developed effective relationships with local agencies but it is private sector developers who are really driving change;
- seemingly positive relationships between agencies and Big Local may not be about residents at all - rather, they may rest with the Big Local worker. In other words, the ethos here is not about resident led, it is about one professional working with another.

These examples all relate to issues of power, and where power lies. The Our Bigger Story research has uncovered some of the complexities of resident led change, but future work may focus more on the subtleties of power relationships.

### ***Internal stakeholders, and the role of Local Trust and its partners***

**Big Local paid workers:** All the case study partnerships have at some point taken a decision to pay for worker support. In the majority of cases this has proved a harmonious, supportive and productive relationship, a finding supported by the Big Local workers' survey, Local trust 2018. The key issue in relation to maintaining a resident led ethos is as described above - perceptions by others about who is leading change and who is in control of that change.

Paid workers at the London workshop discussed how they can be seen as figureheads for Big Local because they are visible and interact with residents and other 'professionals' on a day to day basis. They take on, variously, administrative, management and/or developmental roles and become the face of their Big Local. Partnership members reflected on the often low profile of the partnership. A partnership chair, and separately a Big Local worker, suggested that it can sometimes feel that partnership members are meeting just to be informed about what the employed staff members have been doing on their behalf:

*When [you] have projects delivered by paid staff, it's sometimes difficult to know exactly what the members of the partnership can actually do...*

The challenge of how paid staff 'lead from behind' requires further exploration.

**The Big Local flexible support model:** The programme aims to free residents from bureaucratic procedure and provide support when needed, for example through Big Local Reps, LTOs, and offers around training and consultancy. Our evidence shows variations in how Reps and LTOs interpret their roles. Some reps play a listening and advisory role, whilst others are more proactive in shaping plan design and delivery. Likewise, some LTOs are pro-active in working with Big Local partnerships, seeing their role as, at least in part, developmental. Others are more 'hands off', acting as arms-length accountable bodies. All, however, take the financial risk of managing the Big Local area's money and in some cases risk management for buildings, events, paid staff, etc.

There has been criticism that the model gives too much influence to the LTO, and thereby detracts from the resident led ethos. It was argued that the partnership takes reputational risk, but ultimately the LTO has liabilities and has to exercise due diligence. This creates the '*potential for a massive veto over decisions that the partnership might want to take ...[the] danger that comes with it is the power and the*

*influence that you give to the LTOs because of the risk that they're taking'* (Voluntary sector worker). LTOs can also confuse who has 'ownership' of local developments e.g. one LTO described a particular Big Local project as 'theirs'.

Variations in roles reflect the flexibilities built into the Big Local programme; it means that the inter-play between the various flexible support roles of the LTO and others are often negotiated at the very local level rather than consistently across the programme.

Perhaps a more fundamental question, drawing on Our Bigger Story evidence to date, is how the core functions of Reps, LTOs, Local Trust and, to a degree, paid workers, promote and pursue the resident led ethos overall. Some of these also play a monitoring, or policing, role on spending, governance and operations. In reality these very different functions are constantly negotiated, mediated and moderated. What, however, happens when the model breaks down, when resident led gives rise to resident conflict or there is tension with the LTO (as outlined in Paper 2 on Community Leadership)? Who takes on the 'leadership' role, and is the dual role of promoter and 'regulator' always tenable in terms of promoting resident led change and community leadership?

## **Conclusion**

The implied underpinning theory of resident led change is that it involves local ownership and control, devolved decision making and, consequently, better community outcomes. It invites a binary view of whether something is or is not resident led:

*We are not a council, it is led by residents who want to see change, and be in charge of change themselves.* (Partnership Chair)

*The most important thing about this group is that you have community ownership which gives you more weight than outside agencies coming in... you achieve more when people feel empowered to do things and influence is in the community and not led from the top...it's community led from the floor up in a way that a council can never be* (Councillor).

'Resident led' is not quite as straight forward or as rosy, as it might first appear, to residents or to policy makers. Learning from the 15 case studies exposes the constraints and tensions around the idea of resident led, and highlights some of the frustrations that people in Big Local areas experience. Resident led development is in reality a negotiated process into which power dynamics, the local context, history and structures need to be factored. This learning raises further questions around fundamental limitations around the concept of resident led and where hyper local-decision making 'sits' with broader political forces and processes. And whilst the ethos of resident led is significant, there are ongoing concerns about how it can be sustained – and measured.

In Big Local: Reflections on Community Leadership (Paper Two) we take the idea of 'resident led' further forward through a focus on the notion of community leadership.

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Civil Society Futures (2018) *Civil Society Futures: Interim Research Report*. Civil Society Futures, London – available at [https://cdn.opendemocracy.net/civilsocietyfutures/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2018/04/CSF\\_1Year\\_ResearchReport.pdf](https://cdn.opendemocracy.net/civilsocietyfutures/wp-content/uploads/sites/6/2018/04/CSF_1Year_ResearchReport.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Baker, L. and Taylor, M. (2018) *The Future for Communities: Perspectives on power*. IVAR/Local Trust, London – available at <https://www.ivar.org.uk/research-report/the-future-for-communities-perspectives-on-power/>

<sup>3</sup> Locality (2018) *People Power: Findings from the Commission on the Future of Localism*. Locality, London – available at <https://locality.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/LOCALITY-LOCALISM-REPORT-1.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> McCabe, A., Wilson, M. and Macmillan, R. (2017) *Big Local: Beyond the Early Years: Our Bigger Story: the longitudinal multi-media evaluation of Big Local: 2015-2016*. Third Sector Research Centre, Birmingham – available at <http://ourbiggerstory.com/reports.php>

<sup>5</sup> See appendix for further detail of the data collection methods.

<sup>6</sup> See previous Our Bigger Story reports and films available at <http://ourbiggerstory.com/reports.php> and <https://vimeopro.com/ourbiggerstory/residents-stories>

<sup>7</sup> These issues have been discussed in more detail in the previous Our Bigger Story evaluation report – *Big Local: Beyond the Early Years*, available at <https://vimeopro.com/ourbiggerstory/residents-stories>

<sup>8</sup> The concept of broader 'community leadership' is explored further in Paper Two.

<sup>9</sup> McCabe, A., Wilson, M. and Macmillan, R. (2017) *ibid*

<sup>10</sup> Tuckman, B. (1965). "Developmental sequence in small groups". *Psychological Bulletin*. 63 (6)

This paper can be read in conjunction with, Paper Two, Reflections on Community Leadership, and can be viewed alongside the film material from workshops in Birmingham and London where local residents, partners and Big Local workers reflected on the connected issues of power and community leadership:



## Appendix: Methodology

This paper draws on:

- Filmed workshops with partnership members, residents and other stakeholders in three Big Local areas (Birchfield, Grassland Hasmoor and Ramsey) with 63 participants
- Two workshops, in London and Birmingham, with 31 participants from 12 Big Local areas – both partnership members and workers. A composite film of all workshops is available here
- Material from Our Bigger Story diary keepers in six Big Local areas
- Discussions at the Local Trust Community Leadership event at the University of Warwick
- Discussions with partnership members, workers and Big Local Reps in Bountagu, Birchfield, Catton Grove, Grassland Hasmoor, Growing Together, Ramsey, Revoe, Northfleet, Lawrence Weston, Radstock and Westfield, Three Parishes and Whitley Bay
- An analysis of filmed material in seven areas (Catton Grove, Grassland Hasmoor, Lawrence Weston, Three Parishes, Westfield, Whitley Bay and Northfleet)
- Data from 70 interviews with external strategic stakeholders – see profile in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Profile of External Stakeholders interviewed**

<b>Position</b>	
MP	5
Councillor - Primary Authority (Unitary/County)	10
Councillor – District/Borough Council	5
Councillor – Town/Parish Council	3
Local Government Officer - Unitary	14
Local Government Officer - District	4
Local Government Officer – Town and Parish	2
Non-Departmental Public Body	2
Other Statutory (e.g. Clinical Commissioning Group/School Head)	6
Voluntary Sector	12
Faith group	2
Private sector/social business	3
Other (universities with connections with Big Local)	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>