

Development Models for Diverse Communities: *Subsidiarity, Partnerships and Accountability*

A Paper presented at the New Zealand Planning Institute and Planning Institute of Australia Congress 2006. Gold Coast Convention and Exhibition Centre, Queensland Australia.

Richard Dunbar
CityScope Consultants Ltd
Auckland.

Caveat:

The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Auckland City Council or its officers.

Abstract

This paper deals with some difficulties encountered in pursuing the social well-being objectives of planning. These objectives are linked to concepts of community self-determination, resilience, cohesiveness and social inclusion, concepts commonly used to describe social capital and sustainable communities.

The area of public consultation is a key area where there may be strong mutual benefits for social and physical planning. Consultation on physical planning can be used to develop more sustainable forms of community engagement, establishing more permanent links between councils and community based groups who are actively trying to be heard by councils.

Two sets of tools are provided for considering these issues. One is a model of community engagement first developed by Glen (1993) that outlines approaches to community engagement. The other is a set of “enablers” of community sustainability. The model is used to argue for a culture change from a service delivery to more of a partnership approach with communities.

The paper presents some specific suggestions for implementation from a recent study in Auckland. The paper argues that sustainability is not just about planners representing the interests of future generations. Strengthening a community’s capacity for self-determination is itself an important part of the sustainability process.

The Problem

This section outlines the problem faced by planners in reconciling current approaches to physical planning with an increasing interest community development. The policy balance at present strongly favours physical planning and its associated consultation

processes yet policy directions for the future suggest more emphasis is required on community development. The move towards greater demands for community self sufficiency (a component of community development) are, in part, a consequence of the Local Government Act 2002 which gives greater powers to local authorities at the same time as making them more accountable to their constituents.

The approach is to examine some of the policies guiding the planning processes for sustainable communities in New Zealand. The issues are illustrated by examples from two suburbs in Auckland City where CityScope worked with Auckland City Council on a Community Needs Assessment in 2005 (CityScope Consultants 2005).

Local Government Act 2002

The “new” Local Government Act represented a change of approach to local government from prescriptive to enabling. In providing a virtual power of general competence to councils, the Act strengthened accountability to the community through the processes of consultation, planning and reporting it requires. One consequence of this is to offer “communities” in local authority areas greater control over their destiny. The Act reflects similar moves in the UK which are based on principals of “subsidiarity” and the need to encourage a “whole-of-government” approach to the so called “wicked” or “cross-cutting” issues like social inclusion, public health and employment creation. Local areas are best placed to bring together the agencies that can work together on these problems.

“ Subsidiarity is the principal that states that matters ought to be handled by the the smallest (or the lowest) competent authority. The Oxford English Dictionary defines subsidiarity as the idea that a central authority should have a subsidiary function, performing only those tasks which cannot be performed effectively at a more immediate or local level.” (Wikipedia definition of Subsidiarity)

This approach contrasts with managerial approach to local government of the 80s and 90s where the focus was on core business. This resulted in strong accountability for prescribed areas of responsibility and a silo approach to service delivery.

The Act requires Councils to consult with their communities and identify “community outcome” priorities to further the 4 well-beings of social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being. It further requires them to identify their own role and the roles of other parties in pursuit of these outcomes and provides for a 10 year planning process through the Long Term Council Community Plan.

Sustainable Development

The Government introduced The Sustainable Development Programme for New Zealand in January 2003. This is the policy that underlies all Government decision making that relates to development. It includes the principles of managing the 4 well-beings for current and future generations.

This policy includes the Sustainable Cities policy with the overarching goal:

“...our cities are healthy, safe and attractive places where business, social and cultural life can flourish.” (Sustainable Development for New Zealand. Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. January 2003 p19)

The programme of action for sustainable communities is covered under 2 headings:

- *Cities as centres of innovation and growth*
- *Liveable Cities that support social well-being, quality of life and cultural activities.*

The need for partnerships is recognized as a means of implementation and the policy specifically mentions the need to work collaboratively with Auckland businesses, communities and local government to address the cross-cutting, hard to tackle social development issues that are a priority for the region.

Sustainable Communities

The Government’s approach to sustainable communities is outlined in a discussion paper from the Department of Internal Affairs (Loomis 2002). This paper advances subsidiarity further by encouraging principals of self-sufficiency in community development at the neighbourhood level. Sustainability requires communities to pursue a balance between economic development and social development.

The paper addresses concepts of social cohesion within the context of social institutions operating in a community. Indeed, the conditions for social connectedness are about the efficient functioning of these institutions rather than the commonality of values and opinions among community members. The institutions referred to include the family, education, the market, and local and central government. These institutions are seen as facilitating the connections between individuals. The institutions also need to provide mechanisms for disagreements to be aired and resolved.

Characteristics of a “strong community” are identified as those that:

- Give people a sense of belonging through shared values
- Are adaptable and able to respond to adversity
- Have capable, enterprising leadership
- Promote social trust, participation and mutual responsibility
- Generate resources from inside and outside the community
- Foster a stable, innovative local/regional economy that provides employment opportunities and generates wealth, and

- Protect and effectively manage their local environment.

The building of strong communities requires a shift from a deficit (needs based) model to an asset based (capability) approach to community development. Asset based community development revolves around social capital and the resources a community has at its disposal (Cavaye 2004). The link between strong social capital and strong economic success is now widely recognised (Putnam 1993b, Productivity Commission 2003).

The implication is that building strong communities should not be seen as a separate from economic development but integral to it.

Local communities are increasingly seeking greater control over the decisions that affect their lives (Loomis 2002). Examples in Auckland include migrant communities and local community action groups. Other writers (McKay 2003) have suggested that a renewed interest in local communities derives from the loss of control in other areas of life related to global trends.

Despite the advancing of community self-sufficiency, Loomis' paper (Loomis 2002) acknowledges difficulties in implementation. These include a lack of coordination between agencies and some disenchantment with the consultation processes that has left some communities with "consultation burnout", and increasing skepticism about the motives and effectiveness of consultation.

There is a problem resourcing the strengthening of communities in an environment in which market philosophies still hold some sway, there are competing demands on council resources, and the institutional environment (and budgets) in local councils reflect a legacy of constructing and operating infrastructure and public facilities. There is also a risk that communities are encouraged to participate in capacity building by investing their own time and resources only to feel let down by a lack of required resources on the part of government.

Reference is made to a number of pilot partnership schemes underway which are testing the effectiveness of different initiatives. One of these initiatives (SCAF) is described in the next section.

Stronger Communities Action Fund (SCAF)

This experimental programme is run by the Child Youth and Family department of central government (recently merged with the Ministry of Social Development). Established in 2001, the fund aims to promote social cohesion in 7 pilot communities based on action programmes presented to the department by the community.

The programme acknowledges the indirect link between social capital and public health benefits, particularly for families. SCAF is intended to kick start the building of social capital and thereby promote a self-sustaining process.

“Social capital theorists describe a spiral upwards and downwards for the generation and degeneration respectively of social capital. For the upward spiral to operate, Coleman (1994) asserts that a threshold needs to be reached for the generation of social capital to be self-sustaining. Beyond this threshold, voluntary and spontaneous social organisation occurs. When stocks of social capital are below the threshold, the substitution of formal organisation is required to provide a kick-start to this process.” (Taylor.L. 2004)

One of the pilot studies is in Auckland City (Glen Innes) where a partnership has been established between Child Youth and Family, the city council (as fund holder and employer of the coordinator) and the community. The community is represented by a community organization called Ka Mau Te Wero (which translates as “rising to the challenge”). The goals of this project were originally established as:

- Enhancing community leadership
- Harnessing GI (Glen Innes) pride
- Strengthening community well-being, and
- Working together

This SCAF scheme is further evidence of the policy direction towards a community development approach to planning.

SCAF Case Study : GI Visioning Project

The community group Ka Mau Te Wero is active in the Glen Innes area promoting community development principals independently from the council planning process. The “GI Visioning programme” (Ka Mau Te Wero 2005) has political support at the highest level but is working outside of the established governance structure. This group is financially supported by central government and the city council but acts more as a community action group than as a partner with the council. The principals of self-determination are clearly the basis for their action.

Having established a good following in the community and prepared an Action Plan for the next 5 years this group is now at an interesting stage of its development. It has sought advice from councillors about how to engage with council officials. Council officials may have some difficulties with the legitimacy of this organization, however, due to the evolution of the group outside the usual governance process. It will be interesting to see how this relationship develops.

For the council, there should be a desire to encourage local self-determination and find a way of accommodating the GI Visioning project within the established governance structure. For KMTW, there must be a recognition of their own limitations. The group cannot set up a separate system of government in Glen Innes and may need to find a way

of integrating into the established governance structure but retaining its enthusiasm for community development.

This case study illustrates a wider debate about the difficulty faced by the new partnership models fitting in with established governance principles and accountability (Skelcher 2003).

Auckland Growth Management Strategy

This strategy was published in December 2003 and adopted a “compact city” approach to managing growth.

The strategy identified “Areas of Change” and Areas of Stability”. Population growth was to be managed following “smart growth” principles in the areas of change. The plan emphasises sustainability and the twin pillars of strong communities and a strong economy. Plans and policies that contribute to growth included:

- **Livable communities**—planning with communities for change and growth in their local area
- **Sense of Place**—reflecting the special natural and heritage character of a community
- **Strong Communities**—strengthening people and organizations to support change
- **Connecting People and Places**—organising transport and movements
- **Place of Opportunity**—encouraging economic and commercial development
- **Open Spaces**—maintaining parks, plazas and streets that support public life and activities
- **Greening Auckland**—enhancing the ecological and natural world.
- **Urban Design**—creating a quality built environment that is uniquely Auckland.

The plan is essentially a physical planning document. Despite the references to strengthening communities and planning with communities the plan does not explicitly take account of the work on sustainable communities outlined above. There is provision for community consultation over the Livable Community plans, but this is not identified as part of the sustainable communities programme.

This contrast between the Livable Communities approach and the pressure for a stronger emphasis on community development is the essence of the problem addressed in this paper.

Livable Communities

For each of the “areas of change” outlined in the Growth Strategy a Livable Community Plan is being, will be or has been prepared. The plans focus on an area within an 800 metre radius from an established suburban shopping centre. Included are 5 communities in the Tamaki area which also contains some major road proposals and substantial employment land use changes .

Smart Growth principles applied within the Livable Community Plans include medium density residential development and encouraging walking wherever possible. The plans anticipate that these higher density areas will become more viable for public transport and thereby reduce congestion and act against urban sprawl.

The process of community consultation is comprehensive. Genuine efforts are being made to balance the needs of current residents and the requirements of future growth. Inevitably, though, there have been clashes between the wishes of the current population and the planners’ preferred provision of future growth around town centres.

Public consultation in Glen Innes, for example, started in 1998 and the Livable Community Plan was produced in July 2004. By this time, some members of the community were feeling both over-surveyed and alienated by the process, and had begun to take control of their own destiny with the opportunity presented by the SCAF programme. Both Ka Mau Te Wero and the Auckland City Council produced Action Plans for Glen Innes in 2005. The different approaches clearly identify the challenges to planners to incorporate community development thinking into the planning process.

Community Needs Assessments

Council has a policy of preparing community needs assessments for one or 2 areas each year. The areas are based on Community Board areas, of which there are 10 in Auckland City. Community Boards comprise 5 members elected by constituents at the time of council elections, and between 1 and 3 councillors appointed by council. They are therefore the smallest level of representation covered by triennial local government elections and the established governance structure.

Traditional approaches to needs assessments have been based on facilities usage trends and population forecasts to estimate future demand for different types of facilities and activities, within specified catchments. Facilities include community centres, community halls, open spaces and sports facilities, community offices and libraries. This approach is focused on facilities and increasing utilisation rates – a market penetration perspective – rather than one that focuses first on determining public needs and identifying how they may be met, through current facilities and programmes, through their modification, or even through their replacement.

The brief issued to CityScope for the Eastern Bays and Tamaki community board areas differed in its emphasis on sustainable community principles.

The aims of the study were set out to :

“...identify community needs in these two localities and ways in which Council can better support strengthening the social fabric of communities in these areas. In a changing environment, communities of interest must continue to be adaptive, resilient and sustainable...”

This aim was set in the context of planning for community facilities. However, it reflected a shift in thinking that gave priority to community-defined needs and how these might be accommodated through policies on investment and operation of facilities. This sustainable community focus, though, was in addition to the physical planning requirements of a traditional facility-focused needs assessment. Underlying the exercise was still a need to make decisions about asset management plans and financial allocations for future investments.

Conclusions

This analysis of the policy background to a specific study highlights the pressure for change in the way local planning is conducted. It points to the difficulties facing the task of reconciling the requirements of planning with the community for sustainable communities with the continuing needs for physical planning, which ultimately is also focused on planning for the community.

The problem is most apparent in the consultation processes, where there is the potential for many well-meaning streams of consultation for central and local government to take place simultaneously in an uncoordinated manner.

The willingness of the community to participate in the process is critical both to the development of successful plans and for the building of community cohesion. However, this willingness to participate will disappear if there is no clear benefit. The processes established to assist communities may end up having the reverse effects as communities lose confidence in the institutions and their own ability to make a difference.

Theory and Possible Solutions

Having established that there is a problem to be dealt with, this section looks at a possible theoretical basis for a solution.

Council-community interaction can be described as one of 3 types; service delivery, community development or community action (Glen 1993). The 3 types are summarized in the table below:

Forms of Community Practice

	Community Services	Community Development	Community Action
<i>Aims</i>	Develop community orientated services and organisations	Promote self defined community	Campaign for community interests
<i>Participants</i>	Organisations/service users	Community defining and meeting its own needs	Oppressed (excluded) groups organizing for power
<i>Methods</i>	Maximising community and user involvement and interagency links	Cooperative processes found in capacity building. Action research	Mobilisation tactics on specific campaigns
<i>Support Roles</i>	Service managers providing services and transacting with users	Professionals/facilitators working in a non-directive way	Activists/organizers mobilizing for political action

Glen's description of community development is similar to the approach to building strong communities advocated in the sustainable communities discussion paper. It contrasts with the community service approach, which is the traditional mode of operation for local councils.

The culture of local and central government is based around service delivery, which differs from a community development culture. One of the main difficulties is that social capital (the end goal of community development) is difficult to measure (and understand), and is often seen as less important than bricks and mortar :

“The evaluation of service delivery is largely based on measuring clear inputs and outputs, has a focus on quantitative information, has quite specific performance indicators, and measures change over a relatively short time period (often based on funding cycles). In contrast, the measurement of community change and social capital attempts to assess relatively ill defined outcomes based on flexible processes. It relies on largely qualitative information with differences seen over long periods of time.” (Craig 2002)

Community action has been a part of local democracy since the earliest times, and will continue to be so. Perhaps, with the shift from community services towards community development, the significance of community action will change. Rather than being seen as an awkward interruption to service delivery processes, it may be seen as generating new sources of community leadership.

The issue of community action also highlights the importance of dispute resolution procedures within communities, which is also a fundamental part of building social

capital. Social capital is strengthened where conflicts associated with diversity can be resolved within the community.

While there are elements of all 3 forms of community practice evident in most council activity, the emphasis is strongly on service delivery. What is needed is a shift in the balance between these three in favour of community development. Part of this shift means welcoming community action and questioning of the preference for community service provision in the light of growing acceptance of the principle of subsidiarity as the governance principle.

While the Glen framework helps us to understand the different strategies available to solve the problem, other ideas are needed to look for the solutions. The indicators or “enablers” of sustainable communities (Loomis 2002) point to some of the tools to be considered in moving towards a community development approach. Earlier references to the need for an *asset based* approach to community development is further expanded here.

Assets to be developed by sustainable communities include:

- Community identity, pride, participation and self-determination;
- Skilled leaders and capable organisers
- Access to resources, including funding, skills, services and technology;
- Access to information about innovative approaches developed within their own and other communities;
- The capability to build partnerships and develop linkages within their own community and with other communities;
- Access by all parties to advice, information and research;
- An appropriate regulatory environment and a sustainable approach to development
- Necessary local administrative infrastructure.

These are further expanded in an appendix to Loomis’s paper and provide a check-list or audit list for assessing the strength of local communities. Such an approach may have a role in future “community needs assessments” conducted in different neighbourhoods.

These enablers are considered further within the context of specific suggestions for areas of Auckland City in the next section of this paper.

The process of community development will inevitably need to be prioritized due to the additional resources required. The work of social capital theorists (eg Coleman 1994, Putnam 1993a), indicates the need to focus on areas of low social capital. The theory is that once the process is “kick-started” it will continue under its own steam, or at least with reduced demands on resources.

Conclusions

Difficulties in building sustainable communities relate to difficult concepts (eg social capital and social cohesion) and a traditional culture of service delivery. Moving to a community development approach requires a change of culture less preoccupied with control and more willing to offer indirect support for long-run processes of building social capital. It is also made more difficult by the need for both longer-term and more qualitative forms of evaluation than traditionally encompassed in the planning process.

The model of community practice provides a useful framework for considering the alternatives. Priorities for pursuing this new direction, guided by Loomis' list of enablers, will ideally favour areas currently suffering from low social capital, where there is a need for institutional investment to reverse a downward spiral.

Examples from an Auckland Case Study

The previous sections have outlined the pressure to embrace concepts of community development and sustainable communities, and some of the difficulties encountered. Ideas for progress have been presented in terms of a model of different types of community engagement and a set of sustainable community enablers.

This section looks at some of the recommendations from the community needs assessment for the Tamaki and Eastern Bays area in Auckland City (City Scope Consultants 2005) to illustrate these ideas.

Overall a move towards a more community-centric use of facilities and better resourcing of the councils presence in local areas is suggested. Examples of participation models that are more a part of the governance structure than traditional forms of consultation are also advanced.

Diverse communities

The study area included two areas with quite different characteristics. Eastern Bays is a relatively wealthy area, predominantly European New Zealanders, but with significant recent settlement by migration from North Asia. This is defined as an "area of stability" in Auckland's Growth Strategy. There are nevertheless experiences growth pressures from infill housing.

The second area, Tamaki, has significant Pacific Peoples and Maori populations, a high proportion of state housing, and a low score on the New Zealand deprivation Index. There are five areas identified as "areas of change" for significant population growth to be accommodated.

Tamaki is traditionally a blue collar employment district which is, however, beginning to see the intrusion of education, high tech industries and major retail developments and

with plans well advanced for the development of new areas of settlement and a major new regional retail mall in former industrial and warehousing areas.

Format for Community Engagement

Qualitative research conducted in Eastern Bays explored what processes of community engagement were most likely to succeed. The most popular processes were “citizens’ juries”, “community forums” and independent qualitative research (group discussions).

Citizens’ juries were described to the focus groups as:

“12 local residents, reflecting a cross-section of the community, coming along as a group to listen to experts debate the pros and cons of decisions that council has to make. The jury provides feedback in terms of how they see the issues. Jury members could perhaps be paid a nominal amount of money”.

Positive responses to this idea show the potential to build sustainability through a number of the enablers identified earlier (Loomis 2002):

- Volunteering to be part of the jury may help to identify community leaders.
- The networking opportunities provided by the jury members, the council and the audiences.
- The proceedings will provide access to advice, information and research.

There was some concern that this is a duplication of what the Community Boards do already, although very little is known about them.

Another popular concept was the community forum, described as:

“A community forum is where elected representatives and key council officers front up on a regular basis to present plans likely to affect the community and listen to the feedback from locals on these plans”.

This is different from consultation by survey or formal representation to statutory plans. It is seen to be a good way of involving the community in the democratic process. However, younger people (teenagers) were less enthusiastic, citing a lack of time for themselves and their parents as potential barriers.

Based on these results, some combination of citizens’ jury and community forums with a greater role for community boards would have some potential for helping to develop self determination within communities.

Repositioning community centres.

There are a number of different models for community centre management in the study area. The traditional methods of volunteer committees (often drawn from user group representatives) are gradually being replaced by full-time managers, employed by the council, or by remaining community centre volunteer committees. The operational model is a combination of “hall for hire” (independently managed activities) and programmes run by the centre management for a fee. Performance indicators are based on usage levels and financial returns. Where community centres fall into disuse and committee volunteers resign, the community centres often revert to hall for hire only with no on-premise staffing. This downgrading occurs more in the lower income areas of Tamaki than in Eastern Bays.

Community centres need to better reflect the needs of the community (a community-centric approach) rather than attempt to maintain a particular form and level of functionality across all areas (a facility- or asset-centric approach) Where the community resources are not available to maintain the traditional function of the community centre (experienced as a lack of demand), the facility can be redefined as a community hub with the objective of kick-starting the virtuous cycle of social capital accumulation.

The centres can be used to facilitate two-way communication between council and communities through a combination of approaches, including:

- A base for community advisers/community brokers.
- A place for display and explanation of development proposals affecting the area.
- A place where council and community can meet and network on a regular basis.

This networking will help promote sustainable communities through better information sharing, networking and facilitation of community initiatives.

The Council in the community.

The research identified a need for coordination of local and central government initiatives in a local area. Duplication and lack of awareness led to a waste of resources and potential confusion by community members about how to access services.

The relevant networks and institutions are mostly locally based, so that a community coordinator based in the community would be most able to remedy these problems. The community coordinators would be charged with promoting and coordinating the full range of community development initiatives, overseeing and advising on community engagement and acting as a catalyst and coordinator for local partnerships.

The main duties of a Community Coordinator were seen as:

- Provide a point of first contact and coordination between the council and community leaders for information relating to community development, planning and other matters;
- Represent and coordinate the roles of the relevant council departments
- Assist with the communication of council planning issues likely to affect the local community;
- Support local community leaders in their dealings with Council and Government Departments;
- Oversee council and community partnerships
- Facilitate coordination of related activities by local public sector and voluntary sector groups
- Promote and coordinate local community and agency partnerships;
- Use local knowledge, ongoing consultation, and analysis to identify and communicate community needs to council;
- Oversee and advise local council-community engagement;
- Facilitate community programmes and the use of community resources to support them.

From consultation to engagement.

In some areas there are signs of frustration from over-consultation, a dissatisfaction with the lack of feedback and the absence of tangible actions results from the consultation process. Consultation is required for a range of statutory and non-statutory planning processes, including:

- Liveable community plans.
- Major transportation projects.
- Community outcomes development.
- Community needs assessments.
- Specific development proposals.

Frustration about consultation coexists with an increasing interest in self determination (possibly they are cause and effect). This suggests the potential for a new look at governance structures and perhaps a shift from discrete one-off consultation exercises to the establishment of more permanent forms of community engagement. Components of this new engagement process would include:

- The new role for community centres as community hubs.

- The establishment of community coordinators.
- A strengthening of the role for community boards around citizens' juries and community forums.

The issue of community engagement is central to building strong communities. Active participation must lead to stronger feelings of confidence in the governance process. It has been argued (Catt 2005, Paton 2002) that confidence in the ability to be heard (internal efficacy) and confidence in the political system to take action based on community views (external efficacy) is a key component of building strong communities. If these commentators are correct, then the need to establish a new form of community governance where effective participation replaces traditional consultation must be a priority for local government reform.

The suggestions outlined above are presented as one possible solution.

Conclusion

This section presented examples from the consultants' work in Eastern Bays and Tamaki areas of Auckland City to illustrate some tangible actions that can be taken to cater for diverse communities and build strong communities.

The process of community engagement through community hubs, community coordinators and new forms of community engagement can largely replace traditional forms of consultation.

The benefit of increased participation in the process of local government will contribute to building confidence in the process and encourage a greater level of participation in other areas of society.

Summary and Conclusions

This paper has addressed the problems of incorporating the pressures for greater community self determination within the traditional physical planning processes of local government.

The need for a culture change away from service delivery and the deficit (needs based) approach to community planning towards a community development (asset based) approach has been outlined. Frameworks to assist with this process have been identified in terms of the broad themes of community engagement (Glen 1993) and the enablers of sustainable communities (Loomis 2002).

Examples from the case study in Auckland City highlight the need for a new governance structure for local government where survey-based consultation is supplemented by a more permanent community engagement structure. There is a need to develop a more community-centric approach to facility planning and create opportunities for increased community participation in decision making.

It is argued that this process should be built around the existing representative structure of community boards to maintain accountability.

An open process of debate and resolution is critical for balancing different viewpoints in the community.

As these processes become established, the process of physical plan preparation and consultation will be affected. There will be an expectation to use the new governance mechanisms, both in the preparation of plans and in providing feedback on decision making.

The paper acknowledges that this change will not occur overnight. Rather, the introduction of a community development approach, alongside existing service provision, will be necessary. In time, a new hybrid will develop which will incorporate the best aspects of both approaches.

The change will require resources. Some resources may be available from partnerships with central government or other institutions. However, there will still be a need to make judgement calls regarding priority areas for attention. The work of Callahan (1994) and Putnam (1993b) suggests that the process of social capital building can sustain its own momentum once a critical threshold is reached. This suggests a need to focus on areas of low social capital in the first instance.

Indicators of social capital are suggested (Loomis 2002), although there is more work to be done in this area of partnership working and identification of priority areas for action.

References:

Catt, H. (2005) *Now or Never-Electoral Participation Literature Review. Children and Young Persons as Citizens*. Conference Paper. NZ Electoral Commission.

Cazvaye, Dr.J. (2004) *Social Capital: a Commentary on Issues, Understanding and Measurement*. Cavaye Community Development, Australia. Observatory PASCAL-Place Management, Social Capital and Learning Regions. Hot Topics Paper May 2004.

CityScope Consultants, (2005) *Community Needs Assessment; Eastern Bays and Tamaki Wards*; Auckland City Council

Coleman, J. (1994) *Foundations of Social Theory*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Craig, G. (2002) *Towards the Measurement of Empowerment: The Evaluation of Community Development*. Journal of the Community Development Society 33:124-146

Glen, A. (1993) *Methods and Themes in Community Practice*, in Butcher, H; Glen, A; Henderson, P and Smith, J: (1993) *Community and Public Policy*, London, Pluto Press

Ka Mau Te Wero (2005) *Glen Innes All-Together*. Ka Mau Te Wero . Auckland

Loomis, T (2002) *A Framework for Developing Sustainable Communities*, Discussion Paper. Department of Internal Affairs.

McKay, H. (2003) *The Wrap: Understanding where we are and where we've come from*. McKay Research Sydney

Paton, Dr.D. (2002) *Modelling Community Empowerment to Manage Community Change and Development*. Auckland City Council

Productivity Commission (2003) *Social Capital: Reviewing the Concept and its Policy Implications*. Commission Research Paper. Productivity Commission, Australian Government Canberra.

Punam, R (1993b) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. (1993a) *The Prosperous Community. Social Capital and Public Life*. The American Prospect (spring): 35-42

Skelcher, C. (2003) *Beyond the Sovereign Council: The New Governance of Local Communities*. Institute of Local Government Studies, University of Birmingham. England

Sustainable Development for New Zealand. Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. January 2003

Taylor, L. (2004) *Building Strong Communities through Devolved Decision-making: The Stronger Communities Action Fund*. Social Policy Journal of New Zealand. Issue 21. March 2004.