

# **DEVELOPING THE IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK: FUNDING PARTICIPATION AND ENHANCING COMMUNITY WELL- BEING**



Briefing Paper 2,  
15 Feb 07

## **Introduction**

The UK Government and devolved administrations have stated that an area for further work is "what could be included in any possible participation and benefits packages ... when and how they would be defined and how we determine whether they are likely to be affordable or offer good value for money"<sup>1</sup>. They add that the details of what this approach might entail need to be considered and developed in an implementation framework, which will be subject to consultation in the second half of 2007.

Government has also stated that it will: "... develop the proposed framework in discussion with local government associations and their relevant sub-groups, for example NuLeAF, and also any individual local authority, or group of local authorities, which believe they have an interest at this stage .."<sup>2</sup>

NuLeAF welcomes the Government's commitment to exploring what might be included in any Participation and Benefits Packages. This briefing paper has been prepared to inform discussion between Government and NuLeAF about such packages. It sets out NuLeAF's current thinking, based on international experience<sup>3</sup>, discussion at a series of regional seminars<sup>4</sup> and feedback from member authorities.

This briefing paper is the third in a series of four. The first two are:

- 'Proposals for Siting Partnerships', Briefing Paper 3, January 2007
- 'Initial Invitations and Local Decision-Making about Participation', Briefing Paper 4, February 2007.

The fourth paper is 'Siting, Planning Requirements and Rights of Withdrawal', Briefing Paper 6, which will be available in late March 2007.

## **The Scope of the Briefing Paper**

NuLeAF's initial view on Participation and Benefits Packages was outlined in a policy statement in June 2006<sup>5</sup>. This stated that:

---

<sup>1</sup> UK Government and Devolved Administrations, 'Response to the Report and Recommendations from the Committee of Radioactive Waste Management', DEFRA, 25 October 2006, p13.

<sup>2</sup> UK Government and Devolved Administrations, as above, p3.

<sup>3</sup> See Enviro, 'The Implementation of a National Radioactive Waste Management Programme in the UK: Implications for Local Communities and Local Authorities', report for NuLeAF, June 06, A Bergmans and A Van Steenberge, 'CARL Country Report: Belgium' and M Elan and G Sundqvist, 'CARL Country Report: Sweden', both November 2005.

<sup>4</sup> NuLeAF, 'Managing the Nuclear Legacy – Issues for Local Government', Regional Seminars Report, December 06.

<sup>5</sup> NuLeAF, 'Implementing Policy on the Long Term Management of Radioactive Wastes', Policy Statement 1, June 06.

In order to empower and incentivise local authorities and communities, support packages should be available.

These packages should include:

- Financial support to meet the costs of effective participation in the siting process. For example, covering the costs of local partnerships, and their scrutiny, research and consultation roles.
- Benefits to compensate for impacts to the area. Packages of benefits would be negotiated within an agreed national framework, with an emphasis on contributing to the sustainable development of the affected area and the well-being of local communities and their descendants. It is envisaged that the benefits would start to become available once facility development was underway.

This briefing develops key aspects of this statement. In particular, it makes proposals about:

- the purposes of, and rationale for, support packages
- the scope of Participation Packages
- the nature of a Benefits Package
- the scale, timing and geographic scope of a Benefits Package
- defining and agreeing Participation and Benefits Packages
- funding arrangements.

In making proposals, the briefing focusses on what NuLeAF would wish to see in the implementation framework, and seeks to distinguish between what should be (a) required by policy and (b) a matter for local discretion.

## **Purposes and Rationale**

It is proposed that the implementation framework should set out a commitment to two types of support packages and specify that the purposes are:

- Participation Package: to empower local authorities and communities by providing resources and meeting the costs of effective participation in the siting process; and
- Benefits Package: to compensate and incentivise local authorities and communities by contributing to sustainable development of the affected area and the well-being of local communities and their descendants.

The Benefits Package should be additional to any community benefits that might be negotiated through the planning obligations regime<sup>6</sup>, or to any infrastructure development that might be secured through the proposed Planning Gain Supplement<sup>7</sup>. It would also be additional to any other support for activities that benefit the social or economic life of communities near its existing sites<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> Audit Commission, 'Securing Community Benefits through the Planning Process', August 2006 and DCLG, 'Changes to Planning Obligations: a Planning Gain Supplement Consultation', December 2006.

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, 'Government Response to the Communities and Local Government Committee's report on Planning-Gain Supplement', December 2006, Cm 7005.

<sup>8</sup> NDA, 'Draft Socio-Economic Policy for Consultation', October 2006

The rationale for committing additional national resources to finance Participation and Benefits Packages is based on the following combination of factors:

- the long-term management of radioactive wastes is a national issue that requires local sites;
- a geological repository will contain hazardous and very long-lived radioactive wastes;
- the actual and perceived impacts of the repository will be mainly in an area containing the site<sup>9</sup>;
- there have been decades of failure to implement a long-term management policy in the UK, with high financial costs and damage to stakeholder relations;
- future failure to site a geological repository will have large financial costs, with associated impacts on decommissioning and clean-up programmes;
- international experience shows that the availability of Participation and Benefits Packages is a key element of many of the programmes where substantial progress has been made in the siting of disposal facilities<sup>10</sup>;
- a Participation Package is a way of enabling potential host communities to understand, address and, as far as practicable, resolve issues associated with repository siting, development, operation and closure;
- a Benefits Package is a way of recognising the role that host communities are playing on behalf of the UK; and
- there is wide support from UK stakeholders for the provision of support packages<sup>11</sup>.

It can be argued, therefore, that the rationale is based on:

- Principle – the provision of Participation and Benefits Packages is the right thing to do; and
- Pragmatism – the provision of packages is one of the key ingredients needed to make implementation work in practice.

As such, Participation and Benefits Packages should be viewed as offering good potential for value for money.

## **The Scope of Participation Packages**

Participation Packages are about empowering local authorities and communities by providing resources and meeting the costs of effective participation in the siting process.

It is proposed that the implementation framework set out a Government commitment to provide resources and meet costs through three main periods:

- Pre-invitation to participate: to provide resources and meet the costs of local authority preparation for receipt of formal invitations to participate in the siting

---

<sup>9</sup> There are likely to be some additional impacts in transport corridors.

<sup>10</sup> Enviro, 'The Implementation of a National Radioactive Waste Management Programme in the UK: Implications for Local Communities and Local Authorities', report for NuLeAF, June 06. Enviro point out that 'voluntarism' alone does not guarantee success, and that its actual or potential failure has often led to the development of various approaches to community benefits. The community benefits developed in different countries are set out in Appendix A of the June 06 Enviro report.

<sup>11</sup> This support is evident from the responses to CoRWM's second and fourth periods of public and stakeholder engagement.

process, including discussion and negotiation with potential partners (see Briefing Paper 4, p6-8, for details).

- Post-invitation/pre-decision to participate: to meet the costs of responding to invitations, including the organisation of local engagement, review of the findings, discussions with Government and assessment of the pros and cons of participation (see Briefing Paper 4, p8-10, for details).
- Post-decision to participate: to meet the costs of establishing and running Siting Partnerships, including associated local authority costs (see Briefing Paper 3, p11-12, for details).

The first two periods would apply to local authorities that have informed Government that they wish to put the issue of potential participation to their local communities. The third would apply to participating local authorities and Siting Partnerships<sup>12</sup>.

### **The Nature of a Benefits Package**

It is proposed that the implementation framework specify that the Benefits Package must contribute to the sustainable development of the affected area and the well-being of local communities and their descendants.

The framework should provide an indication of what this might mean in practice, based on the Government definition of sustainable communities (see Appendix) and CoRWM's definition of well-being.

The Government definition of sustainable communities states that they should be:

- Active, inclusive and safe - fair, tolerant and cohesive with a strong local culture and other shared community activities
- Well run - with effective and inclusive participation, representation and leadership
- Environmentally sensitive - providing places for people to live that are considerate of the environment
- Well designed and built - featuring quality built and natural environment
- Well connected - with good transport services and communication linking people to jobs, schools, health and other services
- Thriving - with a flourishing and diverse local economy
- Well served - with public, private, community and voluntary services that are appropriate to people's needs and accessible to all
- Fair for everyone - including those in other communities, now and in the future

CoRWM defined well-being in the following way:

By 'well-being' we mean those aspects of living that contribute to the community's identity, development and sense of positive self-image. Well-being is a broad concept and not narrowly defined in terms of financial incentives or community facilities. A community's well-being may be realised in a variety of ways through economic development, through greater control over its affairs and through an ability to define and realise its own vision for its future.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> It is anticipated that once a clearer picture emerges of the proposed implementation framework and outline repository development plan, cost estimates could be provided.

<sup>13</sup> CoRWM, 'CoRWM's Recommendations to Government', Doc 700, July 2006, p134.

These definitions are broadly consistent and mutually reinforcing. Taken together they imply that the benefits to the area that hosts a geological repository might include such things as:

- Support for job and business creation, with benefits to local communities
- Increasing training and re-training opportunities
- Improving schools, further and higher education establishments
- Improving public transport
- Improving transport infrastructure
- Increasing the quality of local health, social and family services
- Increasing opportunity for cultural, leisure and sport activities
- Improving the built environment to promote health, reduce crime and make people feel safe
- Support for environmental remediation and improvements
- Seeking to minimise climate change, for example, through increased energy efficiency and carbon neutral development
- Enhancing the natural and historic environment.

The implementation framework should make it clear that the Benefits Package will be ambitious and transformational, so that it will have a significant and lasting effect on the area.

In addition, given the long-term nature of a geological repository, there is a strong case for the establishment of an intergenerational trust fund to enable future generations to fund projects<sup>14</sup>. The purpose of the fund would also be to contribute to the sustainable development of the affected area and the well-being of local communities and their descendants.

Other features of a Benefits Package should include provision for schemes designed to compensate for any adverse impacts that may arise from the siting of a repository, for example, on property values, tourism, agriculture or industry. Further discussion is required about how to identify such impacts and about what would constitute appropriate forms of compensation schemes.

The implementation framework should also indicate the types of initiatives that should be excluded from a Benefits Package. The exclusions should encompass direct short-term financial benefits to individuals, which are difficult to justify in relation to the requirements of sustainable development, enhancing the well-being of host communities, or provision of compensation for adverse impacts. The exclusions should therefore include:

- Cash sums payable to individual residents
- Reduced tax burdens payable by local residents.

Finally, the definitions of sustainable communities and well-being underpin the important principle of 'self-determination'. This applies to potential host communities being able to develop their own vision of the main components of a proposed Benefits Package, within the framework of sustainable development and enhancing

---

<sup>14</sup> For a description of the precedent set by the trust funds established in association with the development of the Sullom Voe oil terminal see Enviro, 'The Implementation of a National Radioactive Waste Management Programme in the UK: Implications for Local Communities and Local Authorities', report for NuLeAF, June 06, Section 2.2.

well-being, and within the budget limit set by Government. The application of this principle is discussed further below.

## **The Scale, Timing and Geographic Scope of a Benefits Package**

The implementation framework should set out the Government position on:

- How the scale of funding for a Benefits Package will be derived;
- the stages within the siting process when funding for parts of the Benefits Package will be made available;
- the scale of the area over which elements of the Benefits Package should be applied.

### ***Scale of Funding***

Government should take into account that the scale of the Benefits Package will need to be substantial enough to enable local judgements to be made that the benefits of repository development are likely to outweigh the actual and perceived detriments.

It is proposed that the implementation framework set out how the budget for the Benefits Package will be derived. Government proposals for ways of identifying the appropriate scale of funding should be presented and discussed during consultation on the draft framework.

One possible approach may be to link the scale of funding to a percentage of the capital costs of repository development. It should be noted that the Audit Commission has found that the value of planning obligations typically does not exceed 10% of development value and is often much less<sup>15</sup>. As stated above, the budget for the Benefits Package should be additional to the funding for community benefits negotiated through this regime.

### ***Timing of Release of Funding***

In recognition of the length of time that it may take to site, construct and start operation of a repository (estimates vary from around 20-40 years), it is proposed that the implementation framework set out a commitment to a staged approach to the release of funding for the Benefits Package.

The following stages are proposed:

- Identification of preferred site (but prior to substantive underground investigation at the site) – ‘good will’ funding of modest elements of the package<sup>16</sup>;
- Decision to proceed with repository construction - a significant but minority proportion of funding of elements of the package;

---

<sup>15</sup> The term ‘planning obligations’ refers to an agreement that may be made with a developer to provide infrastructure and services to make a development acceptable in planning terms. Audit Commission, ‘Securing Community Benefits through the Planning Process’, August 2006, para 23.

<sup>16</sup> It is anticipated that the release of this ‘goodwill’ funding would be linked to local authority endorsement that a specific site is the preferred site for substantive underground investigations and that the right of withdrawal is not being exercised at this stage. Rights of withdrawal are discussed further in Briefing Paper 6.

- Regulatory decision that radioactive wastes can be emplaced in the repository – release of the majority proportion of funding (but not including monies from the intergenerational trust fund).

### ***Geographic Scope***

The implementation framework should outline Government thinking on the geographic scale over which a Benefits Package would be applied. The framework should provide broad guidance, so that local discretion can be exercised.

It is proposed that the primary focus for application of the bulk of the Benefits Package should be the local area containing the site. Further discussion is needed about how to define 'the local area'. One approach may be to use the concept of travel to work area, although its application may not be straightforward for a new site which does not have an established workforce.

Provision should also be made for specific elements of the Benefits Package to be applied over a larger area. For example, it could be appropriate for improvements to public transport and transport infrastructure, and compensation for impacts on tourism and agriculture, to be applied at the sub-regional level<sup>17</sup>.

### **Defining and Agreeing Participation and Benefits Packages**

The implementation framework should set out Government expectations for how and when Participation and Benefits Packages will be defined.

#### ***Participation Packages***

As stated above, it is proposed that Participation Packages meet the costs incurred through three main periods of local activity: pre-invitation, post-invitation/pre-decision, and post-decision to participate.

It is proposed that the budgets for the first two periods be agreed between the implementation funding body (see below) and the relevant local authorities. This would take place prior to the issue of formal invitations, but after local agreement has been reached about: (a) the local process for decision-making about whether to participate; and (b) the local processes for community engagement and assessment which will inform the decision (see Briefing Paper 4, p6-7). As such, the budget for the first period will be agreed retrospectively, but the second in advance of expenditure<sup>18</sup>.

It is proposed that the budget for the establishment and initial running costs of the Siting Partnership be agreed between the implementation funding body and relevant local authorities after the decision to participate has been taken, but prior to formal establishment of the Partnership<sup>19</sup>.

---

<sup>17</sup> Impacts in transport corridors may also need to be taken into account.

<sup>18</sup> As explained in Briefing Paper 4, the costs incurred by local authorities that undertake engagement and assessment in order to reach well-informed decisions about participation should be met nationally, regardless of whether the decision is positive or negative. This is because the costs arise from a national process to site a facility required by national policy decisions.

<sup>19</sup> Forms of formal Partnership agreements will be discussed in forthcoming Briefing Paper D.

### ***Defining the Content of a Benefits Package***

It is proposed that the contents of a Benefits Package be defined by reference to:

- the framework of sustainable development and enhancing well-being;
- the budget limit set by Government;
- the principle of self-determination;
- the need for consistency with local strategic plans; and
- the need for local democratic accountability.

Adherence to the principle of self-determination should ensure that a Benefits Package is defined that meets the needs and aspirations of local communities, and is not imposed 'from above'.

The establishment of a local Siting Partnership, with the involvement of partner organisations and links to other relevant bodies (such as Local Strategic Partnerships), should provide the ideal vehicle for developing proposals for a Benefits Package that meet local aspirations and are consistent with local strategic plans.

The proposals for a Benefits Package developed by a Siting Partnership should be presented to the relevant local authority/ies for endorsement, prior to signing any formal agreement with the implementation funding body. This is to ensure local democratic accountability.

### ***The Timetable for Defining a Benefits Package***

It is proposed that a Siting Partnership start to develop proposals for a Benefits Package once it is properly established<sup>20</sup>. It is envisaged that preliminary discussions and negotiations about the package will proceed in parallel with investigations to identify a short-list of possible sites. It is recommended that proposals for the package only be finalised once a preferred site has been identified. This will enable the package to be tailored to the needs and aspirations of the communities local to the preferred site.

### ***Government Commitment and Formal Agreement***

The implementation framework should set out a Government commitment to honour a Benefits Package defined within the terms set out in the framework (see above). This commitment should be translated into a formal agreement between the implementation funding body and relevant local authority/ies, once proposals for the Benefits Package have been finalised and agreed.

### **Funding Arrangements**

The implementation framework should outline national arrangements for funding Participation and Benefits Packages. These arrangements must provide confidence that adequate funding will be sustained over the lifetime of a Siting Partnership and meet the costs of the agreed Benefits Package.

---

<sup>20</sup> Briefing Paper 3 stresses the importance of allowing enough time for a Siting Partnership to develop a shared vision, working practices and capacity building.



It is proposed that the Government establish funding arrangements that are independent of the implementing body (the NDA). This approach would reflect the requirement for the funding of Participation and Benefits Packages to be in addition to and separate from existing funding arrangements for socio-economic initiatives. Having a funding mechanism that is independent of the implementing body would also contribute to the development of trust and confidence in a Siting Partnership on the part of local communities.

## **Summary and Overview**

This Briefing Paper is intended to inform discussion between Government and NuLeAF about why Participation and Benefits Packages are likely to offer good value for money, what should be included in the packages, how and when they should be defined and arrangements for funding.

The paper has made proposals about:

- the purposes of, and rationale for, support packages (p2-3)
- the scope of Participation Packages (p4)
- the nature of a Benefits Package (p4-6)
- the scale, timing and geographic scope of a Benefits Package (p6-7)
- defining and agreeing Participation and Benefits Packages (p8-9)
- funding arrangements (p9).

The purposes of support packages are:

- Participation Package: to empower local authorities and communities by providing resources and meeting the costs of effective participation in the siting process; and
- Benefits Package: to compensate and incentivise local authorities and communities by contributing to sustainable development of the affected area and the well-being of local communities and their descendants.

The rationale for support packages is based on a combination of:

- Principle – the provision of packages is the right thing to do; and
- Pragmatism – the provision of packages is one of the key ingredients needed to make implementation work in practice.

As such, Participation and Benefits Packages should be viewed as offering good potential for value for money.

On scope, Participation Packages should meet the costs incurred through three main periods of local activity: pre-invitation to participate, post-invitation/pre-decision to participate, and post-decision to participate (establishing and running Siting Partnerships).

On the nature of a Benefits Package, it must contribute to the sustainable development of the affected area and the well-being of local communities and their

descendants. A package should include an intergenerational trust fund to enable future generations to fund projects and provision for schemes designed to compensate for any stigmatisation that may arise from the siting of a repository.

On the scale of a Benefits Package, this should enable local judgements to be made that the benefits of repository development are likely to outweigh the actual and perceived detriments. The implementation framework should set out how the budget for the Benefits Package will be derived. The budget should be additional to any funding available from other sources.

On timing, there should be a staged approach to the release of funding for the Benefits Package, in recognition of the length of time that it may take to site, construct and start operation of a repository.

On geographic scope, the primary focus for the bulk of the Benefits Package should be the local area containing the site. Provision should also be made for specific elements of the Benefits Package to be applied over a larger area, including, for example, improvements to public transport and transport infrastructure, and provision for compensation for any detrimental impacts on tourism and agriculture.

On defining and agreeing the Partnerships Package, the budgets for pre-invitation and post-invitation/pre-decision periods should be agreed between the implementation funding body and the relevant local authorities, after local agreement has been reached about the local processes for decision-making and community engagement. The budget for the establishment and initial running costs of the Siting Partnership should be agreed between the implementation funding body and relevant local authorities after the decision to participate has been taken, but prior to formal establishment of the Partnership.

On defining the contents of a Benefits Package, this should be done at a local level by reference to:

- the framework of sustainable development and enhancing well-being;
- the budget limit set by Government;
- the principle of self-determination;
- the need for consistency with local strategic plans; and
- the need for local democratic accountability.

On the timetable for defining a Benefits Package, this should be started once the Siting Partnership is properly established. Preliminary discussions and negotiations should proceed in parallel with investigations to identify a short-list of possible sites. Proposals for the package should be finalised once a preferred site has been identified.

The implementation framework should set out a Government commitment to honour a Benefits Package that has been agreed by the relevant parties. This commitment should be translated into a formal agreement between the implementation funding body and relevant local authority/ies, once proposals for the Benefits Package have been finalised and agreed.

The Government should establish funding arrangement for Participation and Benefits Packages that are independent of the implementing organisation.

## **APPENDIX: DEFINITION OF SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES**

*As defined on the website of the Department of Communities and Local Government at <http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1139866>.*

Sustainable communities are places where people want to live and work, now and in the future. They meet the diverse needs of existing and future residents, are sensitive to their environment, and contribute to a high quality of life. They are safe and inclusive, well planned, built and run, and offer equality of opportunity and good services for all.

For communities to be sustainable, they must offer:

- decent homes at prices people can afford
- good public transport
- schools
- hospitals
- shops
- a clean, safe environment.

People also need open public space where they can relax and interact and the ability to have a say on the way their neighbourhood is run.

### **The components of a 'sustainable community'**

Sustainable communities embody the principles of sustainable development. They do this by:

- balancing and integrating the social, economic and environmental components of their community
- meeting the needs of existing and future generations
- respecting the needs of other communities in the wider region or internationally to make their own communities sustainable.

Sustainable communities are diverse, reflecting their local circumstances. There is no standard template to fit them all. But they should be:

**Active, inclusive and safe** - Fair, tolerant and cohesive with a strong local culture and other shared community activities

Sustainable communities offer:

- a sense of community identity and belonging
- tolerance, respect and engagement with people from different cultures, background and beliefs
- friendly, co-operative and helpful behaviour in neighbourhoods
- opportunities for cultural, leisure, community, sport and other activities, including for children and young people
- low levels of crime, drugs and antisocial behaviour with visible, effective and community-friendly policing
- social inclusion and good life chances for all.

**Well run** - with effective and inclusive participation, representation and leadership

Sustainable communities enjoy:

- representative, accountable governance systems which both facilitate strategic, visionary leadership and enable inclusive, active and effective participation by individuals and organisations
- effective engagement with the community at neighbourhood level, including capacity building to develop the community's skills, knowledge and confidence
- strong, informed and effective partnerships that lead by example (e.g. government, business, community)

- strong, inclusive, community and voluntary sector
- sense of civic values, responsibility and pride.

**Environmentally sensitive** - providing places for people to live that are considerate of the environment

Sustainable communities:

- actively seek to minimise climate change, including through energy efficiency and the use of renewables
- protect the environment, by minimising pollution on land, in water and in the air
- minimise waste and dispose of it in accordance with current good practice
- make efficient use of natural resources, encouraging sustainable production and consumption
- protect and improve bio-diversity (e.g. wildlife habitats)
- enable a lifestyle that minimises negative environmental impact and enhances positive impacts (e.g. by creating opportunities for walking and cycling, and reducing noise pollution and dependence on cars)
- create cleaner, safer and greener neighbourhoods (e.g. by reducing litter and graffiti, and maintaining pleasant public spaces).

**Well designed and built** - featuring quality built and natural environment

Sustainable communities offer:

- sense of place - a place with a positive 'feeling' for people and local distinctiveness
- user-friendly public and green spaces with facilities for everyone including children and older people
- sufficient range, diversity, affordability and accessibility of housing within a balanced housing market
- appropriate size, scale, density, design and layout, including mixed-use development, that complement the distinctive local character of the community
- high quality, mixed-use, durable, flexible and adaptable buildings, using materials which minimise negative environmental impacts
- buildings and public spaces which promote health and are designed to reduce crime and make people feel safe
- accessibility of jobs, key services and facilities by public transport, walking and cycling.

**Well connected** - with good transport services and communication linking people to jobs, schools, health and other services

Sustainable communities offer:

- transport facilities, including public transport, that help people travel within and between communities and reduce dependence on cars
- facilities to encourage safe local walking and cycling
- an appropriate level of local parking facilities in line with local plans to manage road traffic demand
- widely available and effective telecommunications and Internet access
- good access to regional, national and international communications networks.

**Thriving** - with a flourishing and diverse local economy

Sustainable communities feature:

- a wide range of jobs and training opportunities
- sufficient suitable land and buildings to support economic prosperity and change
- dynamic job and business creation, with benefits for the local community
- a strong business community with links into the wider economy
- economically viable and attractive town centres.

**Well served** - with public, private, community and voluntary services that are appropriate to people's needs and accessible to all

Sustainable communities have:

- Well-performing local schools, further and higher education institutions, and other opportunities for lifelong learning
- high quality local health care and social services, integrated where possible with other services
- high quality services for families and children (including early years child care)
- good range of affordable public, community, voluntary and private services (e.g. retail, fresh food, commercial, utilities, information and advice) which are accessible to the whole community
- service providers who think and act long-term and beyond their own immediate geographical and interest boundaries, and who involve users and local residents in shaping their policy and practice.

**Fair for everyone** - including those in other communities, now and in the future

Sustainable communities:

- recognise individuals' rights and responsibilities
- respect the rights and aspirations of others (both neighbouring communities, and across the wider world) also to be sustainable
- have due regard for the needs of future generations in current decisions and actions.