

# Just Neighbourhoods?

## JN Working Paper #6: Community-led planning, engagement and the Pride in Place Programme: a review.

April 2026

### Introduction

This is the sixth in a series of working papers produced through the *Just Neighbourhoods?* research project (JN), which has been exploring neighbourhood scale planning activity across the UK, see: <https://research.reading.ac.uk/justclp/>

The paper sets out to highlight where and how plans and community engagement at the neighbourhood level correspond with the recently announced Pride in Place programme (PiPP) areas (phases 1 and 2a,b). This work sits parallel to the JN project and is intended to highlight how PiPP, as the latest in a long line of government funded regeneration initiatives, corresponds to pre-existing ‘community-led’ planning activity. This is pertinent given wider pressure to engage communities more effectively in local priority setting and is relevant to the JN work, given that the Pride in Place programme has positioned meaningful community engagement with residents at the neighbourhood scale has been set-out as a feature, along with the ‘co-production’ of PiPP regeneration plans.

### PiPP overview

The Pride in Place programme is the UK Government’s long-term neighbourhood regeneration programme launched in 2025. It claims to be the *“flagship communities programme which empowers local people to shape the future of their neighbourhood”* (MHCLG, March 2026). What this working paper seeks to explore is the extent which the programme responds to local need and reflects community input – asking to what degree ‘local’ people are involved, and how. This foreshadows wider questions of how residents can and are facilitated in shaping the future of their neighbourhood. This flows from the final *Just Neighbourhoods* report, which sets out a series of recommendations about neighbourhood scale planning and co-production, see: <https://research.reading.ac.uk/justclp/just-neighbourhoods/> in deprived areas of the UK.

The Pride in Place programme is a framework for neighbourhood-scale investment, described by government as a 10-year, *community-led* programme focused on places that have been “overlooked and left behind” with up to £20 million of funding per place and with governance routed through Neighbourhood or Town Boards working with local authorities and MPs. PiPP

has been set up to cover a total of 284 areas, with 40 new places announced in February 2026 and extension to the programme, see: [PiPP phase 2b extension](#) which joined the first tranche of 75 published in Spring 2025, see [PiPP phase 1](#) as a follow-on to the previous administration's targetting under the long-term towns fund and latterly, the [PiPP Phase 2](#) set of 169 areas, which were announced in September 2025. Our desk review below assessed the areas from PiPP phase 1 and 2a,b (England only at this stage), focussing on neighbourhood planning activity. We conclude the paper by highlighting the need to look at how pre-existing community-led activity has been keyed into PiPP.

### ***PiPP, Town Boards and involving the community in decision-making***

The way in which PiPP has been framed features a significant emphasis on community involvement. The PiPP prospectus recognises that:

*“communities know what changes they want to see... Everyone should have a say in the future of their area, particularly those that have previously felt left out of decision-making... To make this happen, Boards must lead organising across their community, carrying out extensive engagement with the people who live there and use a range of approaches to involve different people in decision-making in a way that works for them.”* (MHCLG, March 2026).

One of the features of PiPP is to convene town boards to oversee the programme in each area. Considerable weight is placed on the chair and board to take the associated PiPP regeneration plan forward. The board chair leads in the recruitment of the members of the board, but government have said they should be non-elected/non-political with typically 8-10 members, and at least 50% of members should live or work within the boundaries of the neighbourhood and should represent the range and diversity of the area.

As a minimum, the boards are expected to be made up of:

- Local councillors (at least one ward councillor)
- Parliamentary representatives (MPs)
- Policing representative
- Other representatives including from community groups, arts and culture; education; business; and community representation

The town boards are expected to submit evidence that shows they have delivered engagement which aligns with the following best practice principles:

- Engage from the start
- Effective community organising
- Focus on those less likely to be heard

- Build on existing assets and connections in the community
- Involve people in decision-making, taking a participatory approach
- Make time for meaningful engagement
- Actively listen to the local community
- Invite challenge and scrutiny
- Get out into the community and be creative
- Delegate roles to community groups (e.g. devolving budgets and delivery to community groups for neighbourhood priorities).

We argue there will need to be careful monitoring, as past initiatives have struggled with meaningful engagement and co-production. As we outline below, the process of considering how the PiPP resources are to be spent and why have been unclear, and the published process reiterates the idea of co-production, with the government updated guidance in [March 2026 PiPP guidance](#) stating that:

*“Neighbourhood Boards must work with local people and the local authority to draft a Pride in Place Plan. We know the challenges in places vary, and that it is the people living and working in these areas who are best placed to identify these challenges and inform the solutions...the Plan should outline the community’s overarching vision for change over the next decade to deliver the strategic objectives of the Programme, **developed through grassroots engagement to reflect local people’s priorities. This Plan must be co-produced by residents in the neighbourhood with meaningful community engagement** such as listening campaigns, community conversations, community workshops or resident forums” (MHCLG, 20 March 2026, our emphasis).*

MHCLG have expressed an aim for the PiPP / regeneration plans, that:

*“ **Residents will be supported to identify local needs and make decisions about the future of their neighbourhood**, and to develop local partnerships and achieve their goals. This will also help build communities’ confidence and skills to get involved with other initiatives, including opportunities in the Pride in Place Strategy and community funding in the future” (MHCLG, 2025b: para. 153).*

*“We want to amplify this work, strengthen partnership working with communities at both a local and national level, and **ensure communities have the support to take the lead on issues that matter to them**” (MHCLG, 2025b: para. 155).*

### **Brief history of neighbourhood regeneration funding**

The above aspirations for community involvement seem clear and ambitious. Over the past 60 years or so multiple attempts to direct resources to place-based regeneration have been formulated, with billions spent to variously address socio-economic

challenges. There remains persistent inequality, poverty and deprivation across the UK. Table one provides a brief summation of some of the key initiatives for England.

While much has been written on such initiatives, there has been a rather mixed picture of success and longevity of impact (see Table 1 and Tallon, 2021, p.53-55 for a review). Many areas that have benefitted from past funding still face persistent poverty and feature prominently against other Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) domain rankings. By 2011, and in reviewing past efforts, the Chief Executive of the Centre for Local Economic Strategies said that money *"had been thrown at a problem without due understanding of the connectivity and relationships that take place in any given locality"* (McInroy, 2011). This underscores a need to plan well prior to embarking on project spending and to recognise what is likely to be most impactful for communities and has a good chance of improving an area across IMD domain rankings.

**Table 1: Place based regeneration initiatives (England)**

Initiative	Dates	Funding / Focus	Target scale	Comments / evaluation
<b>Urban Programme</b>	1968-1977	Circa £2bn for local services ( health and welfare, child care, housing and education) and in 'immigrant communities'	Local Authority	Social pathology approach adopted and then seen as flawed (Harding <i>et al.</i> , 2015; Shapely, 2017)
<b>Urban Programme / UDCs</b>	1979-1992	UDCs and EZ – land remediation, market readiness; deregulation	Specially designated areas	Redevelopment, deregulation to encourage private investment – but labour markets did not improve (Harding <i>et al.</i> , 2015)
<b>City Challenge</b>	1991-1998	May 1991.central Government measure, designed to regenerate certain urban areas. £37.5m for each City Challenge area (x31)	Inner city neighbourhood scale	Some success due to combined area-focussed teams with social, economic and physical aspects taken together (Healey, 1998; Russell <i>et al.</i> , 2000)
<b>Single Regeneration Budget (SRB)</b>	1995-2002	£26bn Funding (different programmes across five govt departments) to support economic and social regeneration in deprived areas. Competitive bidding	99 most deprived LA areas (England); some funding to ward level.	SRB supported significant urban improvements, evaluations showed mixed results on whether the jobs and benefits truly reached the most deprived residents (Rhodes <i>et al.</i> , 2005)
<b>New Deal for Communities</b>	1999-2011	£1.9 billion spent over 10 years in 39 deprived neighbourhoods - each received approx. £50m. Aimed at empowering communities through	Neighbourhood (1000-1400 households).	Positive change reported in all 39 areas - biggest improvements were people's feelings about their neighbourhoods.

		partnership boards (with residents and representatives from delivery agencies) to develop local strategies tackling three place-related outcomes: crime, community, and housing and the physical environment (HPE), and three people-related outcomes: education, health, and worklessness.		However, little change in people-related outcomes such as unemployment and education. Criticism that partnership boards were unrepresentative of populations (Lawless <i>et al.</i> , 2010; Crisp <i>et al.</i> , 2016).
<b>UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF)</b>	2022-2026	£2.6 billion between 2022 and 2025. Aimed to reduce economic disparities by investing in local priorities such as community infrastructure, skills training, and employment support, empowering local leaders to tailor interventions to their communities' specific needs.	Local Authority scale to spend on local projects via a board	Evaluation is ongoing. Criticism involves: i. the tight delivery timeframe. ii. allocations are largely based on the previous EU funding model, and iii. relied on outdated data from the early to mid-2000s, iv. lack of clear, upfront monitoring guidance (MHCLG, 2025a)
<b>Town Deals and Levelling-Up</b>	2019-2024	The Towns Fund was a £3.6bn fund for: £25m each (some £50m) - focus was to target income, skills, productivity and deprivation indices.  Plus, Future high streets fund invested £830m for regen. high streets - Dec 2020 / May 2021.	Economic regeneration of deprived towns	centralised decision-making process, which some argued contradicted its emphasis on local empowerment (ICON, 2025).
<b>Pride In Place programme</b>	2025-2035	Ten-year programme allocating £20m over 10 years to each area. Total pot of £5bn.	284 neighbourhood areas (MSOAs) in 3 phases (75+169+40) Phase 2 and 3 targetted at neighbourhood scale.	Via town boards and regeneration plans (MHCLG, 2026).  Speed of set-up may undermine community engagement and co-production credentials.

Additionally, some relevant initiatives have been promoted via the third sector, notably the Big Local programme which was led by Local Trust and funded 100 neighbourhoods through lottery monies of £1m per annum over 10 years (from 2012). This approach was designed to put communities in the lead in determining the spend although the planning and facilitation of the spend was not linked to tackling deeper issues. Instead, there was a focus on small project activity - with some positive benefits but less so in changing the conditions of those neighbourhoods (Popay *et al.*, 2023) indicating a role of greater alignment and resolve to address economic development and urban planning.

Limitations of past programmes in respect of community involvement seem recurrent, and the lack of good planning and targetting of some IMD challenges has been

recognised. The New Deal for Communities programme reviews highlighted the importance of *“allowing time for the magnitude of ‘setting up’ tasks involved in regeneration schemes, to ensure better outcomes at the end of a decade of investment. This means setting aside funding and time to ensure that the foundations of the Programme are secure, including employing the right people, selecting effective management systems, and establishing processes for community involvement.”* (PiPP plans guidance, MHCLG, March 2026).

The sentiment toward good preparation is implied in the PiPP explanatory material:

*“Policies are too often done ‘to’ communities, rather than ‘with’ them. This results in a top-down, one-size-fits-all approach that doesn’t meet the different needs of places and the people who live in them. We want to empower people across the country to take back control of the decisions that impact them, with local residents able to actively drive positive change in their communities. That is why **we are committing to giving communities new tools and powers to shape their areas – so that they can play a part in improving the very places that they are so passionate about.**”* (MHCLG, 2025b: para. 134, our emphasis).

In recent exploratory work by 3ni considering Phase 1 PiPP, it was identified there were:

- Significant levels of inconsistency
- Variable governance models and ways of working
- Prioritisation of physical regeneration
- Community engagement: pockets of good practice but at the time the research was carried out, often light touch and weak (3ni, October 2025, unpublished).

Additionally, JRF (2026) found that many highly disadvantaged neighbourhoods remain outside the funded PiPP list. They also raise the issue that some of the places selected appear to have low levels of participation, trust and local organisational capacity, which means that successful delivery may depend not only on investment itself but on whether there is enough civic infrastructure to support community-led governance (JRF, 2026). This is very much in line with our finding from the *Just Neighbourhoods* work (Parker *et al.*, 2026). We argue that particular effort should go into facilitating engagement and plan co-production.

### **Role of neighbourhood scale planning and ‘community-led’ planning**

The role and targeting of the neighbourhood scale has been recurrent - as per Table 1 but the role of planning and community deliberation has not been a strong or consistent feature. Given that the PiPP initiative has been launched with assurances of co-production and extensive engagement there is a need to understand how this is being realised. Indeed, the government have stated recently that *“We will not repeat the mistakes of the past. We are moving away from micro-managed short-term pots of money and pitting communities against one another to*

*bid for them*” (MHCLG PiPP strategy, 2025b). However, if this is the case then the initial approach to plan-making and engagement are critical if the basis upon which PiPP has been sold is to be delivered.

Planning at the neighbourhood scale has long history but in recent times recognition of the need to think about scale and ‘place’ has used the neighbourhood as a proxy and consideration of deprivation below local authority level is important (ICON, 2026; Local Trust, 2024) efforts to set agendas and priorities with communities at lower than local scale has had a patchy history (see Table 1). The advent of Neighbourhood Planning under the 2011 Localism act promised greater control over development and was positioned as being community-led. This is only really true in the sense that community representatives choose to initiate a Plan, but it has been clear from the research that the actual production of a Plan required significant support from public sector and private consultants. Furthermore, the technical and legal requirements combined with other burdens to limit the take-up of NP in areas of deprivation (see Parker *et al.*, 2014; Parker *et al.*, 2023; Parker *et al.*, 2026).

## Review of PiPP

In order to take stock of the state of play we have done an initial appraisal of English PiPP areas based on available information, to highlight where CLP activity (NDPs primarily) is present in the PiPP areas and how the community have been involved so far. Phase 1 PiPP targetted wider areas (LA scale) comprising [75 places](#). On the 28<sup>th</sup> November 2025 the PiPP boards in each area were to have submitted their Pride in Place Regeneration Plan to MHCLG for assessment and approval. From April 2026 phase 1 delivery funding will be released to LAs and the delivery phase will begin. Our review reveals where PiPP areas host neighbourhood plans or emerging Plans or neighbourhood priority statements – as part of the ‘civic infrastructures’ indicated by recent JRF work.

## PiPP and NDPs

Given our past research via the *Just Neighbourhoods* project, we are particularly interested in how prior community planning activity has been recognised and drawn upon. Our review has firstly sifted through all Phase one PiPP areas to identify those with a neighbourhood plan in England (see Table A1 in [Annex 2](#)) this revealed **four** areas, these are:

- Skegness (East Lindsey)
- Blyth (Northumberland) (at regulation 16 stage)
- Hartlepool (at regulation 16 stage)
- Torquay (Torbay)

Also, there is neighbourhood planning activity i.e. where a Plan may not have been completed, or is in progress or the area could be registered as a neighbourhood plan area and/or Neighbourhood Forum, in a further **six** areas:

- Chadderton (Oldham)
- Bexhill-on-Sea (Rother)
- Hastings
- Leigh (Wigan)
- Keighley (Bradford)
- Ramsgate

### **Phase 2 PiPP**

PIPP Phase two has a focus on smaller neighbourhood geographies of around 10,000 people, chosen because they are “doubly disadvantaged” by high deprivation and weak social infrastructure (JRF, 2026). From April 2026 the 169 phase 2 areas are to begin to receive delivery funding and by 17 July 2026 the Neighbourhood / Town Boards are to confirm finalised membership and any proposals to alter the ‘default’ area boundary. The PiPP phase 2a areas we identified with Neighbourhood Planning activity were:

- **Whitehawk** (part of Brighton Marina NDP, Brighton and Hove)
- **Blacon South** (at examination stage) March 2026) (Cheshire West and Chester)
- **Willenhall** (Coventry)
- **Bridlington West** (East Riding of Yorks)
- **Lowestoft Central** (East Suffolk)

These **five** areas are not due submit their vision and pride in place plan until November 2026. However, assessing what community involvement is taking place during 2026 is of clear interest.

Additionally, in Mablethorpe, East Lindsey, there is a NDO and the following **four** areas have NP activity (i.e. a neighbourhood area/forum designated):

- County Durham , Stanley South
- County Durham , Crook North & Tow Law
- Oxford , Greater Leys
- Plymouth, Devonport, Mount Wise & Morice Town

Notably Doncaster has 4 areas in PiPP, see [Pride in Place - Team Doncaster](#). with one of the neighbourhoods, Conisbrough North, being part of the *Just Neighbourhoods?* case studies.

Furthermore, Middlesbrough has 2 areas in PiPP, but not the areas which formed the Just Neighbourhoods cases.

The PiPP Phase two expansion ('2b') was announced in February 2026. The list of 40 areas was only made public on 20<sup>th</sup> March and is available [here](#) and see **Annex 2** - Table A3 where we have checked for presence of NDPs or NPS and found that there were **three** areas with NP activity:

- Harlesden (Brent)
- Boscombe (BCP)
- Handsworth West (Birmingham) - Soho and Handsworth NDP in preparation

Across the three batches of PiPP areas this totals 22 areas with NDPs/NDOs in preparation or completed. A useful next step would be to examine early PiPP activity in all or a selection of these areas (i.e. Phase 1) more closely – see the conclusion here. In particular, the forms and operationalisation of community engagement and use of pre-existing civic infrastructures in those areas.

Part of the planning and engagement work that is being espoused should be mindful of past track records and the impact of poorly executed engagement on trust. Moreover, how good engagement and co-production can foster ownership and ongoing social capital development. Relational capacity is considered to be a crucial aspect of community wellbeing (see Redshaw and Ingham, 2018; Bradley, 2018). It appears that neighbourhood regeneration schemes have often lacked the impact on or legacy effect that sustain community action and strong relationships with institutional actors. In our view, community action, planning and decisions are ongoing process questions - not matters to be picked up and put down whenever funding is offered-up. As an example, during the *Just Neighbourhoods?* research we identified that the Big Local project in North Ormesby was effective at lending residents credibility when making suggestions / decisions, however this standing has not been retained and there are now no structures in place for regular community meetings with local decision makers. In Stainforth, it was identified that community leaders who were instrumental in the success of attracting funding, through community-led planning efforts, no longer felt able to be involved in the decision-making processes about the spend of the money. They felt it was because they asked too many 'awkward' questions. This highlights the issue of power and voice in such situations and raises questions about how PiPP areas will maintain inclusivity and open relations.

## **Conclusion and further research**

The launch of PiPP has left some questions regarding the basis for prioritisation and linkage to community engagement initiated under PiPP and efforts at developing civic infrastructures prior to its launch. Government will need to be attentive to this question

of building from existing resources and that engagement is not tokenistic or shallow. This may be aided-both through the national [neighbourhood network](#) that has been set up, and through effective oversight and liaison in the early stages of PiPP and plan production.

Further research to explore how PiPP engagement has been undertaken and how pre-existing views and inputs has helped shape the PiPP plan locally will be of value. This should include whether these areas have been in receipt of other investment and to what extent PiPP builds upon that and prior community engagement. This will be useful as early feedback to policymakers. Also, exploration of how the areas with pre-existing CLP activity (e.g. neighbourhood plans in England) have connected to PiPP so far, is worthy of immediate investigation – particularly for Phase 1 areas.

## References

3ni (2025). *Plan for neighbourhoods desk research*. October 2025 (unpublished report). London: 3ni.

Bradley, Q. (2018). Neighbourhood planning and the production of spatial knowledge. *Town Planning Review*, 89(1), pp.23-42.

Crisp, R., Leather, D., McMullan, J., Pearson, S. and Wilson, I. (2016). *A return to neighbourhood regeneration? Reassessing the benefits of a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal*. SHU.

Harding, A., Nevin, B. et al., (2015). *Cities and public policy: a review paper*. Located: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7fa25ce5274a2e87db708e/gs-15-29-future-cities-public-policy-review.pdf>

Healey, P. (1998). Building institutional capacity through collaborative approaches to urban planning. *Environment and Planning A*, 30(9), pp.1531-1546.

ICON (2026). *No short cuts: towards a strategy for neighbourhood recovery*. January 2026. London: ICON.

JRF [Joseph Rowntree Foundation] (2026). *Pride in Place: funding gaps and capacity challenges*, March 2026. Located: <https://www.jrf.org.uk/neighbourhoods-and-communities/pride-in-place-funding-gaps-and-capacity-challenges>

Lawless, P., Foden, M., Wilson, I. and Beatty, C. (2010). Understanding area-based Regeneration: the New Deal for Communities Programme in England. *Urban Studies*, 47(2), pp.257-275.

Local Trust (2024). *A new neighbourhoods policy*. Located: <https://localtrust.org.uk/insights/research/a-new-neighbourhoods-policy/>

McInroy, N. (2011). *Evidence to Commons Select committee*, November 2011. Located: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmcomloc/1014/101407.htm>

- MHCLG (2025a). *UKSPF interim evaluation*. Located: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-shared-prosperity-fund-ukspf-interim-evaluation-synthesis-report/uk-shared-prosperity-fund-ukspf-interim-evaluation-synthesis-report#introduction>
- MHCLG (2025b). *PiPP prospectus*. Located: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pride-in-place-programme-prospectus>
- MHCLG (2026). *Pride in Place Programme: PiPP Plans*. Located: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pride-in-place-programme-prospectus/pride-in-place-programme-pride-in-place-plans>
- Parker, G., Lynn, T., Sturzaker, J. and Wargent, M. (2026). *Just neighbourhoods?* Final report. March 2026. Located: <https://research.reading.ac.uk/justclp/just-neighbourhoods/>
- Parker, G., Lynn, T. and Wargent, M. (2014). *User experience of Neighbourhood Planning in England*. Published report. London. MHCLG/Locality. Located: <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/38073/>
- Parker, G., Wargent, M., Salter, K. and Yuille, A. (2023). Neighbourhood planning in England: a decade of institutional learning. *Progress in Planning*, 174, p.100749.
- Popay, J., Halliday, E., Mead, R., Townsend, A., Akhter, N., Bamba, C., Barr, B., de Cuevas, R., Daras, K., Egan, M. and Gravenhorst, K. (2023). Changes to the Big Local programme and positioning in relation to national policy: findings from national fieldwork. In *Investigating health and social outcomes of the Big Local community empowerment initiative in England: a mixed method evaluation*. National Institute for Health and Care Research.
- Redshaw, S. and Ingham, V. (2018). 'Neighbourhood is if they come out and talk to you': neighbourly connections and bonding social capital. *Journal of Sociology*, 54(4), pp.557-573.
- Rhodes, J., Tyler, P. and Brennan, A. (2005). Assessing the effect of area-based initiatives on local area outcomes: some thoughts based on the national evaluation of the single regeneration budget in England. *Urban Studies*, 42(11), pp.1919-1946.
- Shapely, P. (2017). *Deprivation, state interventions and urban communities in Britain, 1968–79*. London: Routledge.
- Tallon, A. (2021). *Urban regeneration in the UK* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn.) London: Routledge.

## **Annex 1: Linked funding to PiPP**

The Pride in Place strategy references existing and new funds, plans and partnerships:

- Pride in Place Impact Fund
- Common Ground Resilience Fund
- £400 million to be invested in new and upgraded grassroots sport facilities
- Schools Linking Programme
- Belong, the Cohesion and Integration Network
- Know Your Neighbourhood Fund
- Near Neighbours
- Neighbourhood Policing Guarantee
- Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) leads and ASB Action Plans
- Creative Foundations Fund
- Heritage Revival Fund
- Heritage at Risk Capital Fund
- create a new Inventory of Living Heritage
- £20 million Museum Renewal Fund
- expanded the Blue Plaque scheme
- Tackling Loneliness Hub
- Community Help Partnerships
- Return on Investment research
- Green Infrastructure Framework.

Notably, the Westminster government announced in March 2025 that financial support for neighbourhood plans would cease, see: <https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/>

## Annex 2: PiPP area assessment

Our desk review has identified up to 22 PiPP areas which could be usefully researched further to assess the extent and form of community engagement and use of existing civic infrastructures to inform wider lesson drawing. Ten areas are in the 75 PiPP Phase 1 cohort.

Note: there are other forms of strategy that may have been created by the local authority, sometimes with partners but not conforming to the label of 'community-led' (see JN final report 2026). The Table (A1-3) below provide an overview of what we know so far about PiPP 1 (and 2a,b) areas.

Table A1 shows the basic set-up of PiPP in Phase one areas, with neighbourhood planning which was completed prior to PiPP.

**Table A1: PiPP Phase 1 areas with NDP / CLPs completed (England)**

Region/ LA / Place	Composition of Town / Neighb, Board (community)	N/hood governance arrangements	Community engagement in PiPP	Content PiPP/ regen plan
<p><b>Skegness</b> (East Lindsey, EM)</p> <p><a href="#">NDP link</a></p>	<p>Board is chaired by an independent local business leader, with representation including: Portfolio Holder, Coastal Economy &amp; Employment, East Lindsey District Council, Boston &amp; Skegness MP, Lincolnshire Police &amp; Crime Commissioner, NHS Lincolnshire ICB, Heritage, education, visitor economy, arts and culture, housing, <b>voluntary sector, and community representatives</b> Lincolnshire County Council (infrastructure, transport) Skegness Town Council</p>	<p>Accountable Body – South and East Lincolnshire Councils Partnership (SELCP), with East Lindsey District Council (ELDC); and programme delivery team.</p>	<p>Principles based on Easy, inclusive, meaningful, empowering, creative, listening and continuous.</p>	<p>Reference to five priorities: 1) safe and well, 2) Skilled and working, 3) Connected, 4) Leisure and culture, and 5) Natural.</p> <p><a href="#">PiPP Link</a></p> <p><b>NDP reference:</b></p> <p>Follows boundary of NDP not ONS built up area 2022 data.</p>
<p><b>Blyth</b> (Northumberland, NE)</p> <p><a href="#">NDP link</a></p>	<p>Chair of Blyth Town Board is the owner of a local transport business. Board representatives include a local priest, the Council's arms-length housing developer, <b>three community representatives, a voluntary sector representative</b>, the Port</p>		<p>Building upon previous community engagement through other regeneration funding programmes, including Town Deal, LUDD, Future High Streets Fund.</p>	<p>No regen plan visible specific to PiPP – part of a wider combination of funding</p> <p>PiPP Link: <a href="#">Energising Blyth</a></p> <p><b>NDP reference:</b></p>

	of Blyth, and Newcastle University.			<i>Regen plan not located</i>
<b>Hartlepool</b> (NE)  <a href="#">NDP link</a>	Board of 27 people from the LA, political representatives, and other institutions, including police, education - <b>there appears to be little or no community representation.</b>	Hartlepool Borough Council is the accountable body. Governance is based on the board, board advisory groups (including young people, business, diversity, VCSE and public sector) and task & finish subgroups (including comm participation, communications and marketing, leveraging additional investment, procurement and investment decision making).	Engaged with 1,437 people including at least 100 people in each of the twelve wards. Refers to continued engagement and consultation, including neighbourhood forums, ABCD and advisory networks.	Emerging priorities: Safety & Security Health & Wellbeing Housing (Foundational) Cohesion Education & Opportunity (Foundational). No mention of NDP, p38-39 mentions other plans/strategies  <a href="#">PiPP Link</a>  <b>NDP reference:</b>  <i>None</i>
<b>Torquay</b> (Torbay, SW)  <a href="#">NDP link</a>	Chair of the Torquay Place Leadership Board is a journalist and Board member of the English Riviera Business Improvement District. The Board has a faith representative and several business representatives, but <b>no resident, community or VCS representatives, apart from one from Torbay Communities.</b>		Summary <a href="#">found here</a> public consultation took place online and in person; included an online survey, a pop-up event in the town centre, presence at other summer events with public attendance, engagement with community centre users, and street-based conversations with residents.	No regen plan visible specific to PiPP – part of a wider combination of funding.  PiPP link: NOT FOUND  <b>NDP reference:</b>  <i>Regen plan not located.</i>

**Table A2: PiPP Phase 1 areas with CLP/NP activity (England)**

Table A2 shows non-completed NP activity in Phase 1 areas.

Place / LA / Region/	Composition of Town / Neighb, Board (community)	N/hood governance arrangements	Community engagement in PiPP	Content PiPP/ regen plan
<p><b>Chadderton</b> (Oldham, NW)</p> <p><a href="#">NDP activity link</a></p>	<p>Chair is a CEO of a 3<sup>rd</sup> sector foundation. Board also includes representatives from the police, council, combined authority, private sector but also includes representatives from a local <b>CIC, Chadderton Together Community Group, and a charity and local infrastructure organisation.</b></p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Board serves as an advisory body to Oldham Council, which is acting as the lead local authority for the Chadderton endowment. The Neighbourhood Board itself feeds into existing Council structures, including the Oldham Place Partnership.</p>	<p>Public consultation in July 2024, which included an urban room pop up, wellbeing centre workshops, focus group sessions and interviews with centre users (via deep hangouts).</p>	<p>The following objectives are set: Safety and Security, Health and Wellbeing, Young People, District Centre, Heritage and Culture, Transport and Connectivity, and Resident Engagement.</p> <p><a href="#">Link</a></p> <p><b>NDP reference:</b></p> <p>No reference or representation from the <a href="#">New Chadderton Partnership</a> who are leading on NDP activity</p>
<p><b>Bexhill-on-Sea</b> (Rother, SE)</p> <p><a href="#">NDP activity link</a></p>	<p>Chair is an accountant, and board members include the town clerk, and representatives from the private sector, council, with the <b>CEO of Rother Voluntary Action being a community sector representative.</b></p>	<p>Bexhill Neighbourhood Board – the primary decision-making body responsible for approving strategic priorities, project proposals, and monitoring delivery. RDC – the Accountable Body, providing legal, financial, and risk oversight, and ensuring compliance with statutory obligations including the Procurement Act 2023, Equality Act 2010, and Subsidy Control Act 2022.</p>	<p>They detail how they will inform, consult, work together (community group representation on the comms working group), and how they will support communities to lead (fund community led initiatives that they have identified to meet local need)</p>	<p>Aims: Enjoy a vibrant and thriving town centre</p> <p>Make the most of our heritage and our emerging cultural scene</p> <p>Feel safe, strong and supported, whatever your background</p> <p>Take up educational, skills and job opportunities – and, ultimately, achieve your life goals right here in Bexhill</p> <p><a href="#">Link</a></p> <p><b>NDP reference:</b></p>

				<i>No reference to NDP activity. Note: "Neighbourhood Plan" used to refer to regeneration plan</i>
<b>Hastings</b> (Hastings, SE)  <a href="#">NDP activity link</a>	Hastings Neighbourhood Board is independently chaired and currently includes representation from: • Local government (Hastings Borough Council and East Sussex County Council) • Education (East Sussex College) • Business (Love Hastings BID, Chamber of Commerce) • Community and voluntary sector ( <b>Hastings Community Network, HVA</b> ) • Culture and heritage (Arts Hastings, 18 Hours) • Health (NHS Sussex, Public health) • Policing and Community Safety (currently represented by Police and Crime Commissioner and Sussex Police local teams)	Hastings Neighbourhood Board operates independently of Hastings Borough Council, although the council acts as the accountable body. The Board's role is strategic and community-led, with a focus on co-design, local commissioning, and participatory decision-making. It is committed to hearing the authentic voices of the community, not just those who shout loudest, and will establish ongoing involvement mechanisms to ensure interventions are shaped by those who live and work in Hastings.	Guided by four principles: Prioritising those who don't always have a voice, Amplifying the voice of children and young people, Doing with' and not 'doing to', and Asset-Based Community Development.	Key programmes of work: pride in our streets (cleaner, safer and greener), pride in our neighbourhoods (revitalised, welcoming and inclusive community spaces), and pride in our town (thriving, creative, outward-looking Hastings with culture, heritage, and enterprise).  <a href="#">Link</a>  <b>NDP reference:</b>  <i>No reference</i>
<b>Leigh</b> (Wigan, NW)  <a href="#">NDP activity link</a>	Chair is owner of a local bar, includes usual representatives from private sector, councillors, council etc. <b>also includes a youth board representative, rep from the local found pantry, and someone who runs the Absolute Leigh Facebook Group.</b>	The Council is the accountable body for the Plan for Neighbourhoods Fund.	During June and July 2024 consultation took place with the community and local businesses to understand the community's priorities for investment. Over 1,200 people shared their views.	Strategic objectives are:  <i>Link for regen plan not identified at first pass, information website <a href="#">here</a></i>  <b>NDP reference:</b>
<b>Keighley</b> (Bradford, YH)	<i>Info not available at first pass</i>	<i>Info not available at first pass</i>	<i>Info not available at first pass</i>	<i>Link for regen plan not identified at first pass, info <a href="#">here</a></i>

<a href="#">NDP activity link</a>				<b>NDP reference:</b>
<p><b>Ramsgate (Thanet, SE)</b></p> <p><a href="#">NDP activity link</a></p>	<p>Usual public and private representation, also <b>includes community sector representation from Neurodivergent Friends in Thanet, a young person representative, a volunteer connector, a representative from a Community Centre Association, and CEO of Social Enterprise Kent.</b></p>	<p>Governance based on these principles: <i>Community-Led</i>, The Ramsgate Neighbourhood Board provides the strategic vision and decision-making on interventions, informed by grassroots community engagement. <i>Accountability</i>, The Local Authority is the statutory accountable body to the government, responsible for finance, legal compliance, and audit. <i>Partnership</i>, The Ramsgate Neighbourhood Board and the Local Authority understand that its success relies on a robust working partnership between all parties. <i>Transparency</i>, All governance processes, decisions, and outcomes are transparent to the local community and key stakeholders.</p>	<p>Phase 1 involved a stakeholder mapping exercise, phase 2 built the vision through story telling workshops with the Board and key focus groups, stakeholders and community members. These were combined with focus groups and drop in sessions focusing on the strongest themes that were identified through the survey, to help define the Ramsgate programmes priorities, and scope for project development. Phase 3 moving from gathering info to co-designing projects and interventions. Phase 4 is yet to be defined, and will aim to foster a sense of ownership, including continuous feedback mechanisms.</p>	<p>Five strategic priorities: <i>Open It Up</i>: Bringing back our town centre and jobs. <i>Clean It Up</i>: Cleaner, greener streets and restoring civic pride. <i>Light It Up</i>: Safer streets, safer lives: policing and access. <i>Raise It Up</i>: Investing in our young people and their future. <i>Join It Up</i>: Health and support for everyone.</p> <p><a href="#">Link</a></p> <p><b>NDP reference:</b> <i>None</i></p>

**Table A3: PiPP Phase 2b expansion areas (x40)**

Note: Given these have only recently been released (20 March 2026) we have only scanned for the presence of NDPs/NDOs in the designated PiPP neighbourhoods.

Local authority area (x28)	Neighbourhoods (x40)	CLP/ Neighbourhood planning activity
Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole (x3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>West Howe</b></li> <li>• <b>Boscombe West</b></li>   <li>• <b>Hamworthy West</b></li> </ul>	<p>No</p> <p><b>Yes.</b> Boscombe has a NDP:  <a href="https://www.bpcouncil.gov.uk/documents/planning-and-building-control/BaPNP-Adopted-5-Nov-2019-003-WEB.pdf">https://www.bpcouncil.gov.uk/documents/planning-and-building-control/BaPNP-Adopted-5-Nov-2019-003-WEB.pdf</a></p> <p>No</p>
Medway (x3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Luton</b></li> <li>• <b>Twydall</b></li> <li>• <b>Rede Common</b></li> </ul>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>(but LPA has x7 NDPs completed or underway)</p>
Barking and Dagenham (x2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mayesbrook Park &amp; Rippleside</b></li> <li>• <b>Central Park &amp; Frizlands Lane</b></li> </ul>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>(No NDPs/NDOs in LPA)</p>
Brent (x2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>St Raphaels</b></li> <li>• <b>Harlesden</b></li> </ul>	<p>No</p> <p><b>Yes</b> <a href="https://www.brent.gov.uk/-/media/files/resident-documents/planning-and-bc-documents/np-final-may-2019.pdf?rev=861ccc4974ec40f39e8c8948bde886d2">https://www.brent.gov.uk/-/media/files/resident-documents/planning-and-bc-documents/np-final-may-2019.pdf?rev=861ccc4974ec40f39e8c8948bde886d2</a></p>
Coventry (x2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Tile Hill</b></li> <li>• <b>Hillfields</b></li> </ul>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>(x3 Neighbourhood plans in LPA)</p>
Enfield (x2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lower Edmonton South</b></li> <li>• <b>Enfield Wash</b></li> </ul>	<p>No. (but there was a Forum for Edmonton 'REACT')</p> <p>No</p>
Ipswich (x2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Stoke Park</b></li> <li>• <b>Whitehouse</b></li> </ul>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p> <p>(no NDPs / NDOs in LPA)</p>
Luton (x2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Central Luton</b></li> <li>• <b>Marsh Farm</b></li> </ul>	<p>No. (a town centre delivery plan exists, 2025)</p> <p>No</p>
Newcastle upon Tyne (x2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fawdon South</b></li> <li>• <b>Throckley &amp; Newburn</b></li> </ul>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>
Slough (x2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Britwell</b></li> <li>• <b>Langley Foxborough</b></li> </ul>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>
Ashfield	<b>Hucknall Westville</b>	No (x2 NDPs in LPA area)

Bexley	<b>Slade Green &amp; Crayford Marshes</b>	No (no NDPs/NDOs in LPA area)
Birmingham	<b>Handsworth West</b>	<b>Yes.</b> Soho and Handsworth in preparation: <a href="https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/download/6682/neighbourhood_area_and_neighbourhood_forum_application_documents_-_soho_and_handsworth">https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/download/6682/neighbourhood_area_and_neighbourhood_forum_application_documents_-_soho_and_handsworth</a> (x3 completed in the LPA)
Cannock Chase	<b>Cannock North</b>	No. (but Cannock Wood has a NDP) 6 NDPS in the LPA area.
Croydon	<b>University Hospital &amp; Queen's Road</b>	Not listed (not listed as a neighbourhood in the '16 places' neighbourhood list)
Derby	<b>New Normanton</b>	No. (only one NDP was initiated - Chellaston)
Exeter	<b>Heavitree East &amp; Whipton South</b>	No
Gloucester	<b>Matson &amp; Robinswood</b>	No
Greenwich	<b>Thamesmead Birchmere Park</b>	No. But Thamesmead Moorings was designated as a NP area in 2019)
Manchester	<b>Moss Side West</b>	No. (only 2 Neighb. Forums in Manchester)
Newham	<b>Little Ilford East</b>	No. (no NDPS or NDOs in Newham)
Rushmoor	<b>Mayfield</b>	No. (no NDPs or NDOs in Rushmoor)
Sandwell	<b>Tividale</b>	No (x2 AAPs)
Stevenage	<b>St Nicholas</b>	No
Stoke-on-Trent	<b>Bradeley &amp; Chell Heath</b>	No (x4 NDPs in Stoke)
Thurrock	<b>Tilbury</b>	No
Walsall	<b>Brownhills</b>	No
Wolverhampton	<b>Waterloo Road</b>	No (x3 NDPs in Wolverhampton)