PARTICIPOLOGY Case study

Project Profile and Evaluation

IN-DEPTH PROFILE	Description
1. Project Title	PIPA workshop
2. Organisation	RTPI Politicians in Planning
3. Contact name	Prof Alister Scott Paul Gibbs
4. Email address of contact	Alister.scott@bcu.ac.uk
5. Website (*if available*)	**http://www.rtpi.org.uk/knowledge/networks/politicians-in-planning-(pipa)/**
6. What was the aim of the project?	To engage councillors in developing an infrastructure game board based on a morning session of key note lectures and presentations.
7. Start date (and end date if applicable)	November 28th 2015
8. Location and geographical coverage of the project	Various – using infrastructure issues from the councillors own experience lus presentations on the day
9. How and why did the project come about?	Asked to do something using our PARTICIPOLOGY by RTPI for annual conference
10. Participants. Who played the game?	8 politicians and councillors based on a format designed by Gibbs adapting the GBSLEP game of growth .
11. Long-term aspiration for the project / What next?	Develop a n example to highlight on PARTICIPOLOGY case studies particularly for those dealing with infrastructure issues.
12. Funding, cost	Printing costs paid for by RTPI
13. Key documents, Publications and further resources (Please provide weblink where available)	No documents but reports form RTPI on the event. This report and case study is a key output as was being used as part of te testing phase for the PARTICIPOLOGY
14. Photos, videos or podcasts (Please provide web addresses for these)	RTPI have some photos. These will be requested and attached to the report,
IN-DEPTH EVALUATION	
Evaluation of the DESIGN process	
15. Who developed the game? Project lead and partners (organisations) – How well did that process work? (e.g. in terms of time, costs, logistics, skills)	The game was developed using the design information led by Paul Gibbs. Given the goal of the project we adapted questions from the GBSLEP game devised by Carter et al in 2013. Both Scott and Gibbs co developed most of the questions. The board was developed using the old hypothetical version of Rufopoly with questions tailored to the numbered grid. .
16. What PARTICIPOLOGY Resources did you use/not use in the design and play of your game? (board, questions, rules, facilitation etc.)	A PARTICIPOLOGY board was used but questions were generated through the GBSLEP game of growth but crucially there was some 2 questions left for the group to develop based on their own priorities. Given the time tis was seen as pragmatic

17. Did you vary the game (e.g. board, rules, entry/exit question) or always use the same format? Please outline the version(s) of boards, cards, rules etc. chosen and explain the reasons for your adaptations.	The game was specially adapted for this audience and workshop slot . The entrance question was based on the goal of the workshop day itself. Participants were encouraged to identify the priority infrastructure needs for the area of Rufhsire. They were to answer questions and seek a consensus but also recording their original and final answers to see if there was any individual change in positions . The exit question looked at the whole journey to see if their priorities had changed in any way Another key change was that they were given a set of questions to scrutinise building on critiques from NRW and Brussels examples where the requirement to develop questions from scratch was seen as problematic. So each table looked at about 8 questions each (again each table split into pairs). Then the whole table designed a question that emerged from the morning workshop .
18. What would you say were the principal problems with the available PARTICIPOLOGY resources? (in order of significance, starting with the most significant)	1. Understanding why a game format might be useful at the outset. People struggled to see why this was an option based on seeing the video and hearing my brief introduction. PARTICIPOLOGY resources do not really address this. 2. Question design and scrutiny takes time so time constrained sessions raise expectations. 3 issue of facilitation was clearly crucial to people getting it. This raises problems
19. Do you have any comments on the value of the guidance in helping you design, play and evaluate the game?	The guidance was not used explicitly; rather Scott and Gibbs acted as facilitators given the time constrained element of the exercise. .
20. Are there any parts / pages in the PARTICIPOLOGY that would benefit from clarification or expansion? (Please list the specific weblinks and detail your suggestions)	1. the landing page is poor at present and does not address the reasons why this approach adds value. The game is problematic without the wider context and value up front. Otherwise people do not really know why they are doing it. 2. 3
21. What would you say was the percentage ratio of PARTICIPOLOGY resources used to your own tailor-made input?	90/10 – this was heavily derived with only some 2 questions being free to be devised. This strategy was actually very helpful
22. How cost-effective would you say was producing this resource?	Very cost effective in the sense of quickly being able to generate multiple games for different audiences.
Any other evaluation comments on the DESIGN	Overall, a risk that the guidance was too complex and needs to have different levels to be easy simple and clear for some users whilst other users can delve deeper. t.
Evaluation of the PLAY	
23. How did you play the game? (rules, entry/exit questions)	The general rules of RUFopoly were used with the consensus element. Immediate responses captured by each person and then their final positions. A consensus answer captured by facilitator.

24. Overview of the events at which you trialled the game(s). Did the game sessions go as planned? What, if anything, unexpected issues did you encounter?	It worked well and served as a prompt for a wider discussion of issues
25. Did you ask participants to provide feedback? If so, what were the key positive/negative points raised?	There was a feedback session and the key elements captured Not a lot of change from entrance to exit questions. Value lay in the process of discussion and the dice dictating the questions leading to unexpected issues. . Danger of it being used for actual decisions
26. Which key issues emerged from the debrief session(s) with the facilitator(s) / organiser(s)? Summarise any strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, challenges.	Strengths: • Engaging concept • Enables complex concepts to be explore in a more 'hands on' environment • Good to start discussions about the future of a place. Weaknesses: • Instructions somewhat complex for first-time user • Lack of initial understanding meant that facilitation as crucial Opportunities: • Using the hypothetical questions to make a board game of infrastructure perhaps suggests that further games could be created for environment , and community • Seen as a useful staff development and training tool for councillors
27. Retrospectively, would change anything to how you designed or played the game based on your testing experience?	Better initial briefing needed I like the idea of scrutinising questions but audiences like this need to have a meaningful reason to play the game ie a specific aim. By using the aim of the workshop this was good but perhaps did not engage them more to their own work.
Any other evaluation comments on the PLAY	Small group of 4 people worked really well. Everyone was interacting but facilitator needs to be present and not be an active player. Suggest we need a separate section for the facilitator.
Evaluation of the OUTCOMES	
28. On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is not at all and 10 is completely, how successful would you say PARTICIPOLOGY guidance was for your project ?	6

PARTICIPOLOGY Case study

29. In terms of meeting your project aims, what would you say were the main strengths of using the PARTICIPOLOGY / game approach?	1 Enabled complex concepts to be understood 2 Created a more engaging session for the participants they enjoyed it 3 Acted as a springboard for wider discussions
30. In terms of meeting your project aims, what would you say were the main weaknesses of using the PARTICIPOLOGY / game approach?	1 Need for more tailored boards – still focussed around planning/human geography. Physical geographers left out. 2 3
31. What lessons did you learn from developing / using the Resource Kit / playing the game?	More support is required to make it a real success.
32. What, if anything, was the 'added value' of the game? (e.g. in terms of engagement, process or outcomes)	As with the above comments, it enabled the students to get hands on and explore some of the debates from the lecture series.
Any other evaluation comments on the OUTCOMES	

Questions used for the event.

1.   RUFhampton Inner City

Areas just outside the city centre such as Eston, Loxells and Tiny Heath. Parts of these areas experience the typical economic, social and environmental issues associated with inner cities.

In your opinion what are the key infrastructural issues facing these areas and what strategies would you recommend to address them?

2.   RUFhampton City Living

RUFhampton city centre living is characterised by high density developments such as those around the Postbox and the RCC. In the 15-year period up to the economic downturn there was a rapid expansion of housing in the city centre.

In your opinion:

- How might city living be made more family-friendly?

3.   RUFhampton City Centre including Enterprise Zone

RUFhampton city centre is at the heart of the RUFLEP area. RUFhampton is an important international commercial centre and has the 3rd largest economy in the UK, with the city centre being a major contributor to this and the new Enterprise Zone is a major driver of future growth.

In your opinion:

- How can growth and investment in RUFhampton city centre infrastructure benefit the whole of the RUFLEP area?

4.   RUFshire Toll Corridor

The RUFshire Toll is a route which bypasses the more congested parts of RUFshire. Could there be more investment in growth at various locations along this route?

In your opinion, what are the implications of more growth along this route?

5.   Outer Estates of RUFhampton

Some municipal estates on the urban periphery here have a high incidence of deprivation. How can you attract infrastructure into these more disconnected areas

In your opinion, what opportunities do they present and what are the barriers to them being achieved?

6.   Enterprise Belt – RUFhampton

RUFhampton is part of the RUFLEP Enterprise Belt which looks to bring together economic, entrepreneurial and environmental innovation to encourage sustainable growth within strategic rural settlements outside the main city.

In your opinion What are the pros and cons of the Enterprise Belt approach?

7.   Southern Periphery– Urban Extension

The southern areas of RUFhampon are generally affluent suburbs. A significant part of the RUFshire Green Belt is located with close proximity of this area. A recent consultation has proposed that some of this land could be developed for a sustainable urban extension of 5000 dwellings.

In your opinion: Should a large sustainable urban extension be allowed in green belt and if so how can you create an attractive new place to live with its own distinctive identity. If not where would you locate such an extension?

8.   Dormitory Settlement (East)

RUFley is an example of a village located to the south east of RUFhampton surrounded by Green Belt. It has good rail links which forms part of the busiest commuter line outside of London.

In your opinion:

- Do the public transport links make such locations more attractive place for growth?
- Would growth threaten the Green Belt and the inherent attractiveness of such settlements as a place to live?

9. **Multi-Centred Targeted Approach – RUFhampton**

RUFhampton is an expanding town and it has one of the highest levels of commuting to London in the travel-to-work area.

In your opinion:

- Is it desirable that jobs and housing should be better balanced?
- If so, how could that be achieved given the tightly-drawn administrative boundaries?

10. **RUFhampton Suburbs**

These areas of RUFhampton generally have a lower population density and they include some attractive residential areas with good public transport links.

In your opinion:

- Does intensification of residential development threaten the attractiveness of these areas?
- What infrastructural requirements so such developments require.

11. **Rural area around StRUF**

The rural areas around StRuf fall within the RUFshire Green Belt. There are strong commuter flows between these areas and the conurbation.

In your opinion:

- Given the improvements to public transport, especially by rail, is further growth a viable option?
- Is there sufficient infrastructure to accommodate further growth?
- Should the continued protection of the Green Belt in these areas be a more important consideration than accommodating growth needs?

12.   **Dormitory Settlement (StRUF)**

StRUF is an example of a dormitory settlement located to the south of RUFhampton. It represents a community of people who commute to urban centres for their livelihood.

In your opinion are dormitory settlements desirable responses to the RUFLEP's need given the current travel patterns?

13.   **Leisure in St RUF**

What infrastructure provision could be required to develop the edge of St RUF for leisure and recreation uses?

14.   **Rail Corridor – St RUF**

St RUF is a town which lies south of RUFhampton. It has strong transport links which include the railway link which connects to the wider parts of RUFshire.

In your opinion

What opportunities do the improvements to the rail infrastructure (increased frequency and size of rolling stock) offer in accommodating future growth in the RUFLEP?

15.   **Enterprise Belt – East RUFhampton**

East RUFhampton is part of the RUFLEP Enterprise Belt which looks to bring together economic, entrepreneurial and environmental innovation to encourage sustainable growth within strategic settlements.

In your opinion:

- Is there a need to improve transport links with the conurbation?
- Is the re-structure proposed for the local economy meeting the needs and be closely linked with housing growth in the area?

16.   **New Settlement(s)**

The Government has asked local people to come up with the best location for a new settlement somewhere in RUFshire .

What is your response to this request?

If you think this is a good idea, what is the optimum size and what are the key considerations in choosing the right location(s)? If not how else would you accommodate the unmet housing need of the area which is shown to be in the order of 50,000 homes. What are the key considerations in choosing the right location(s)?

17.   **East RUFshire**

East RUFshire is one of the most disadvantaged areas in the country yet paradoxically it is located between RUFhampton City Centre and RUFhampton Airport/RUFEC.

In your opinion how can the benefits of growth be harnessed for benefit of this area and its people?

18.   **South Eastern Periphery Urban Extension (Employment)**

There is a growing labour force in RUFhampton yet a shortage of good quality employment land has been identified.

In your opinion:

- Do you consider that green field in this area might be developed to provide for major new economic development?
- Would a lack of attractive development opportunities adversely affect the scope for economic recovery?

19.   **Eastern Periphery Urban Extension**

The southern edge of RUFhampton is bounded by green belt land which could, potentially provide an urban extension.

In your opinion:

- Does the need for growth override local objections?
- Would development on the urban periphery undermine regeneration elsewhere?

20.   **Dispersed Growth**

Under this option dispersed growth represents increasing the share of development in rural areas. In this example, growth could be located around the eastern part of the RUFLEP area in key rural settlements.

Discussion points:

- How can this type of growth be sustainable?
- What are the key rural infrastructural needs of the area?
- How would development sensitively acknowledge / take account of the Green Belt/ AONB?

21.   **RUFshire Gap**

The RUFshire Gap is an area to the east of St RUF, which has seen very little development, due in part to having much of its area designated as Green Belt. However a major transport corridor is under construction linking the area with London and the rest of Europe

In your opinion:

- Will the proposed new transport infrastructure add to development pressures in a way that might be difficult to resist?
- Is it possible to protect the RUFshire Gap in a way which also facilitates growth and development?

22.   **RUF Hills AONB**

The RUF Hills are an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) located to the east of RUFhampton. This 26 square mile area is attractive for a range of outdoor recreational activities. RUF Hills has high ecological value of national and international significance.

In your opinion

- How do you manage environmental assets such as RUF Hills to encourage growth in the RUFLEP?
- What access to and support for the local population is needed for this local asset?

23.   **Acceptable land uses**

What type of development would be appropriate in this square? What infrastructure is required to make this work?

24.   **Dormitory Settlement (RUFley)**

RUFley is an example of a dormitory settlement located to the south of RUFhampton. It represents a community of people who commute to urban centres for their livelihood. There is strong resistance to any change in their area.

In your opinion are dormitory settlements desirable given RUFLEP's need to address current travel patterns?

Is there scope for growth and new infrastructure to benefit the rural economy.

25. **Rail Corridor –**

RUFley is a town surrounded by green belt, whose residents generally commute, by way of its strong transport links to other urban centres.

In your opinion:

- Given the improvements to public transport, especially by rail is further growth a viable option?
- Would the creation of an 'Oyster' type scheme across the RUFLEP make this a more attractive proposition?
- What infrastructure capacity would accommodate further growth?

26. **RUFshire Green Belt**

The Green Belt is an area of 200 square miles where around 200,000 people live. Located centrally within RUFshire, part of it falls into the RUFLEP.

In your opinion:

What interventions can you make to improve the benefits from the green belt to the citizens of RUFshire whilst still respecting its strategic objectives. ?

27. **Dormitory Settlement (West)**

RUFsty is an example of a village located to the south west of RUFhampton surrounded by Green Belt. It has good rail links which forms part of the busiest commuter line outside of London.

In your opinion:

- Do the public transport links make such locations more attractive place for growth?
- Would growth threaten the Green Belt and the inherent attractiveness of such settlements as a place to live?

28. **Dispersed Growth beyond the Green Belt**

Dispersed growth represents increasing the share of development across rural areas. In this example growth would be located in the south-west of the RUFLEP area beyond the Green Belt.

In your opinion:

- What are the infrastructural requirements of realising the growth potential of such a rural area?
- Would this option be located too far away from the RUFLEP core to offer significant wider benefits?