Received: 1 December 2017 | Revised: 11 May 2018 | Accepted: 9 June 2018

DOI: 10.1111/gec3.12381

ARTICLE

WILEY

Putting community to use in environmental policy making: Emerging trends in Scotland and the UK

Kirsty Holstead[1] | Gerald Taylor Aiken[2] | Will Eadson[4] | Tim Braunholtz-Speight[3]

[1] University of St Andrews and The James Hutton Institute

[2] University of Luxembourg

[3] University of Manchester

[4] Sheffield Hallam University

Correspondence
Gerald Taylor Aiken, University of Luxembourg.
Email: gerald.aiken@uni.lu

Abstract

Community is frequently called upon in policy to meet environmental challenges. It is increasingly recognized that the success of these environmental interventions relies on community awareness and action. But what this emphasis on community does, and what the impacts are, are often neglected, or left uncritiqued. To explore this issue, we surveyed literature from the UK across four distinct environmental domains—energy, urban greenspace, water, and land—to chart what characterizes the use of community in pursuit of environmental goals. We highlight the main conceptual commonalities across the domains by focusing on research that gives insight into the increased interest in communities in environmental policy. In summary, we posit that where community is used environmentally, it brings with it (a) a reframing of justice, (b) processes of "public making," and (c) a rescaling of governance.

KEYWORDS

Community Policy, Environmental Policy, Energy, Greenspace, Land, Water

1 | INTRODUCTION

Community is frequently called upon in environmental policy, both internationally, and also in the UK (Walker, 2011; Warren, 2002). Increasingly, the success of environmental policy relies on community awareness and action. For example, communities develop energy projects to meet targets, and run and manage community gardens. In the UK, a range of policy initiatives and documents aim to support the role of community actors in environmental governance through the provision of funding and institutional support.

The role of community in environmental projects has been the subject of much research (for example see, Agrawal & Gibson, 1999; Middlemiss & Parish, 2010; Bomberg & McEwen, 2012; Creamer, 2015; Fischer, Holstead, Hendrickson, Virkkula, & Prampolini, 2017). In what is a wide and capacious field, one of the few aspects which unifies research on community and the environment is a search for meaning. Walker and Devine-Wright revivified this topic with their 2008 article: 'Community renewable energy: What should it mean?' Much research has since focused on the various meanings attached to community—whether as a place or interest, place, feeling or technique of governance (see Table 1) and has considered how the notion of community is used or employed in different contexts (Catney et al., 2014; Taylor Aiken, 2016; Taylor Aiken, Middlemiss, Sallu, & Hauxwell-Baldwin, 2017). This work is helpful in highlighting the associations attached to community and how the concept can be mobilized to meet different goals. It also usefully encourages one to be vigilant and critical of how policy actors may use community and to what ends.

In this article, we argue that this body of work misses an important point: rather than just what community may mean in a given context, we ask what community actually does, or what are the outcomes of an increasing emphasis on community in environmental policy? To explore this question, we surveyed literature in four distinct environmental domains to chart what characterises the use of community in pursuit of environmental goals. Because we focus on the use of community, and its outcomes, we do not seek to ask what community itself may mean in any given context. Instead, we highlight the main conceptual commonalities across the environmental domains of energy, water, greenspace and land by focusing on research that gives insight into the increased interest in communities (in all their guises) in environmental policy. We posit that where community is used environmentally, it brings with it (1) a reframing of justice, (2) an element of 'public-making', and (3) a rescaling of governance.

We contend that this is important for two reasons. First, although community is called upon frequently in environmental policy, there is less understanding of the impacts of this trend. Policy impacts in relation to communities are typically measured in terms of number of funding applications, jobs created, meals served, or weight of food produced (Dinnie & Holstead, 2017). However, what the emphasis on community does when it is used to meet environmental challenges is often neglected, or left uncritiqued. Second, research on community and the environment is spread thin and wide—disparately spanning domains and disciplines. Therefore, this paper pulls together broad ranging research to explore its commonalities. This article addresses this gap by exploring the outcomes in the literature of an increased reliance on community in environmental policy making.

We have chosen to focus on the UK and particularly Scotland; however, we do not intend this review to be exhaustive. Literature on community governance frequently cites UK an example (Rose, 1999; Wallace, 2016).

TABLE 1 Example of multiples meanings and understandings of community (this list is not exhaustive). Adapted from Taylor Aiken, 2016a

	Definition of community	Sources
Community of place	Community emerging from a shared location such as a town, street, or neighbourhood	e.g., Markantoni and Woolvin, 2015; Taylor Aiken, 2018
Community of interest	Community formed though a shared interest, for example, a desire to reduce waste, or low impact housing. Can also be community though shared epistemic understanding and beliefs.	e.g., Pickerill, 2011; Bulkeley and Newell, 2010; Pickerill, 2016
Community of communion	A feeling of belonging, for example, those who have been though a similar experience, partake in a shared practice or identity.	e.g., Howell, 2012
Community as a gesture	When and organisation (i.e., a business) feels socially compelled to use the term 'community', but little changes in practice.	e.g., Walker and Devine-Wright 2008; Warren and McFadyen, 2010

Moreover, Scotland and the UK has been showcased as best practice and as a place where communities have a strong role in policy relating to environmental governance (Bulkeley, 2015; Walker & Devine-Wright, 2008). In using the UK as a case study, we would like to challenge others to explore if our findings are similar in other contexts.

The paper, first, briefly describes the main themes that have arisen from our literature review. We then summarise how these themes have been discussed in each environmental domain (energy, water, greenspace, and land ownership). We end with some concluding points including future research and areas of emerging interest.

2 | KEY THEMES

Below, we take four separate environmental domains—energy, water, urban greenspace, and land—and chart the emergence, characteristics, and current state of play in these areas where notions of community are used to meet environmental objectives. In particular, we show how an increased interest in community in environmental policy brings with it: has led to: (1) a reframing of justice, (2) a shift in processes of 'public making', and (3) a rescaling of governance. We first briefly describe these themes, before moving on to discuss in more detail how they appear in each environmental domain.

2.1 | Justice

Across the domains covered, we see community's uneasy or ambiguous relationship with inequality and empowerment of people and places with least resources. Often community actors themselves hold community as a progressive (in a broad sense) goal, empowering people to improve local environmental conditions, and wider socio-environmental well-being (e.g., Haf, 2016). Research across the different environmental domains often has evaluative and normative qualities, and has provided impetus to rethink who wins and loses in environmental projects, where injustices occur, as well as how they can be remediated and avoided (Forman, 2017; Haf, Parkhill, McDonald, & Griffiths, 2018; Milbourne, 2012; van Veelen, 2018).

Communities are sometimes said to do the work that states have done in the past (Somerville, 2011). However, when seen as an alternative to the state, rather than a supplement to state action, community involvement to reach environmental outcomes has potentially regressive tendencies. As Rose (1996) argues, using community as a governmental tool can fragment broader collective endeavours. Encouraging people to become active and responsible for their own decision-making—when accompanying state retrenchment—can imply action coming from only those with sufficient capacity and resources, potentially excluding less well-resourced actors (Bradley, 2014). It is not always this clear-cut; nonetheless, it highlights a need to be attuned to how community is embroiled in a morally open and sometimes questionable set of processes and outcomes (Taylor, 2007; Taylor Aiken, 2017, 2018).

2.2 | Public making

When community is called upon in environmental policy, it becomes both an agent and an object of governance. To illustrate this point, in community led energy production for example, community is a process (there is often a set of administrative and institutional processes involved) and an agent (a collective of people come together to develop an energy project). However, community is also an outcome—there is a performative element to what communities do, what they look like, and their role in governance (Walker & Devine-Wright, 2008). The use of community in environmental policy therefore both enrols communities, involving them in the process of governance, but it also produces and shapes them (e.g., see Agrawal, 2005; Eden, 2017). This shaping can take the form of influencing their activities, interests, and subjectivities (Marres, 2012; Marres & Lezaun, 2011). Community groups may for example focus their activities on producing tangible outcomes as a result of public funding (Creamer, 2015; Dinnie & Holstead, 2017; Fischer et al., 2017; Taylor Aiken, 2016).

2.3 | Re-scaling of governance

When community is called upon in environmental policy, governance is often 'rescaled', meaning that actions which may have traditionally been carried out by the state are expected to be carried out by community, and other nonstate actors. Geographical literature on rescaling the state now takes for granted that decision-making does not simply cascade downwards, but instead is 'created, constructed, regulated and contested between, across and among scales' (Bulkeley, 2005, p. 876). The UK has "explicitly devolved environmental responsibilities downwards" through incorporating communities in environmental poliy (Gibbs & Jonas, 2000, p. 303). This, and the shift from 'government to governance' combines an increase in deliberative decision-making, where public participation is seen as positive (Swyngedouw, 2005). Some have suggested this is the result of a decentralization of the state (Batterbury & Fernando, 2006), and others note 'destatisation' (Jessop, 2005) to understand the declining direct role of the state in matters of governance.

At the root of critical geographic literature there is a "rejection of the notion of scale as a bounded, territorially complete concept" (Bulkeley, 2005, p. 884). Yet, as we identify in this paper, community, and the so-called community scale, is still often portrayed as bounded, territorially embedded, and fitting within a hierarchy of scales that sees it as a level above the individual, or family, but below the regional, city, or national scale.

We next move on to discuss how these themes are dealt with in each of our environmental domains (energy, water, greenspace, and land). Table 2 summarises this work.

2.4 | Energy

One of the most common ways to understand the justice implications in energy projects where community groups are involved is the split between process and outcome of community energy (Walker & Devine-Wright, 2008). These community energy schemes—including but not limited to community-owned renewable energy schemes—are presumed to provide positive outcomes ranging from environmental, financial, and social benefits, including reskilling, a greater cohesiveness with neighbours, as well as intangible benefits such as community spirit or place attachment (Bulkeley & Fuller, 2012; Haggett & Atken, 2015; Moloney, Horne, & Fien, 2010; Mulugetta, Jackson, & van der Horst, 2010; van Veelen & Haggett, 2016; Walker, Devine-Wright, Hunter, High, & Evans, 2010). More critically, Eadson (2016) draws attention to the ways that the rise of community energy in the UK accompanies an increasing 'governing-at-a-distance', and individualised or atomised policy. The uneven distribution of 'winners' and 'losers' and positive and negative effects produced by changes in the energy system have given rise to a focus on 'energy justice' frameworks approaches to explore the implications of this way of organising (Fuller & MacCauley, 2016).

Regarding rescaling of governance, community involvement in energy projects also acts to 'territorialise' energy policy. Territorialisation is "a form of behaviour that binds, reifies and controls space for some social end" (Lövbrand & Stripple, 2006, p. 218). The ways territorialisation organises space is shaped by political power (Brenner & Elden, 2009; Bridge, Bouzarovski, Bradshaw, & Eyre, 2013; Elden, 2010; Lefebvre, Brenner, & Elden, 2009). Territorialisation works at various scales and in the UK context community involvement in energy projects accompanies a 'will to devolve'. Nationally, community energy plays a discursive and practical role in the Scottish Government's proclamation that Scotland would become the 'Saudi Arabia of renewables': entrenching the idea of a nationally independent territory. Community energy is territorialised as an expression of wider norms and agendas such as localism, subsidiarity, or market-mediated social relations.

Moreover, in the UK, community can be a site for localism or the assumption that the (local-) community is the right or most appropriate context for energy transition. Separate schemes in both Scotland and England—the Low Carbon Transition Plan (2009) and the Community Energy Strategy (2014)—sought to mobilise territorially defined communities as agents of an energy transition (Creamer et al., 2018; Eadson, 2016; Eadson & Foden, 2014; Markantoni, 2016; Seyfang, Hielscher, Hargreaves, Martiskainen, & Smith, 2014). Delegating responsibility reflects wider trends such as austerity and in Scotland reinforces a Scottish Government agenda that decisions ought to be taken at the most local level

TABLE 2 Environmental domains and themes

	Domain			
Theme	**Energy**	**Water**	**Land**	**Green Space**
Justice	A clear emerging theme of 'energy justice', which focuses on the winners and losers that (changes in) energy systems produce.	Less discourse around justice when compared to other domains. Justice described in terms of self-determination and enabling people to participate in decisions that affect them, as well as fair pricing.	Community land is often framed as related to social justice. This refers both to historical struggles for land rights, and to present day concentration of land ownership. Community Land Trusts implicitly draw on notions of justice in discussions of housing affordability and wider significance of housing market.	Communities mobilised in reaction to perceived injustice over the loss of good quality local green space and/or removal of urban areas from common ownership. A general pattern of those with existing resource being able to act, and a lack of engagement with 'harder to reach' demographic groups.
Public making	Accomplished partly through rooting community within a specific territory (community of place), rather than seeing community and social togetherness being location dependent.	Communities and publics are framed as able to make a difference in environmental policy through increased opportunities for participation. In demand management water users are viewed as collections of individuals, concerned with prices, who are able to shape own water uses. There is little conception of shared social practices, or collectives around water.	Community land ownership raises questions about the constitution of the 'land public',i.e., who has the right to make decisions about land, and on what basis. Policy has supported local residence rather than e.g., agricultural interest, or historical connections. Complex relationship between politics of crofting (long established smallholder agriculture) and new community land movement.	Publics of green space activism closely linked to re-scaling and de-stating. These are produced through practices and discourses of conservation, self-reliance and/or resistance.
Re-scaling of governance	Community energy accompanies a national rhetoric of subsidiarity at the national level in Scotland, and reduces this further in practice, delegating environmental responsibilities to the local level.	There is more interest in participatory and deliberative decision-making tools. Inclusion of community actors aligns with discourses of 'good governance', and the belief that they can improve the legitimacy, quality and longevity of decisions.	Part of policy shift to deliver public policy goals through supporting local initiatives rather that local, regional or national scale interventions. In general some overlap with 'justice' issues, as community ownership seen as moving power away from distant decision-makers (private or public sector) and vesting it in local residents.	Not necessarily rescaling rather than a 'destating' of many previously state-held functions such as maintenance. Site of both grassroots self-empowerment and co-option to government programmes. Necessarily and unavoidably linked to other governance institutions, in particular local government and often sub-local government (e.g., parish councils).

possible, associating community with local (Taylor Aiken, 2015). This containment of community, rhetorically and territorially, within a 'community of place' also produces it as a viable, preferable form of public (cf. Chilvers & Pallett, 2018).

2.5 | Water

The role of communities in water provision and management is most commonly discussed in relation to the Global South, where communities have been central actors in water provision: raising funds, managing and governing water resources (Adams & Zulu, 2015; Agrawal & Gibson, 1999; Bakker, 2008; Cleaver, 2012; Marston, 2014). In Scotland, community led provision and management does exist, although is less common. Instead, driven by international dialogue and agreements such as The Aarhus Convention, and the UN Conference on Environment and Development 1992, community engagement with water in Scotland is seen as part of the 'participation agenda' and frames justice issues around the importance of stakeholders having a say in decisions affecting them (Jager et al., 2016; Reed, 2008). In water management and policy, increased community involvement aligns with wider discourses of 'good governance', and the normative view that the knowledge and input of non-state actors such as citizens and NGOs, improves the legitimacy, quality, and longevity of decisions (Evans, 2012; Holley, Gunningham, & Shearing, 2013; Newig & Fritsch, 2009; Sharp, 2017).

The term community, is often not explicitly discussed in these debates. It is instead enveloped in the range of actors that are referred to as 'the public' or similar. The Water Framework Directive (WFD) prescribes planning and implementation of its procedural requirements to be done with the active involvement of stakeholders, water users and the public (Jager et al., 2016; Waylen, Blackstock, Marshall, & Dunglinson, 2015). Similarly, The Flood Risk Management (Scotland) 2009 Act places more emphasis on consultation, public access of data, information, and flooding plans, with the aim to engage citizens in issues around flooding. These requirements to include (community) actors in water policy are cited as a widespread institutional adaptation, paradigm shift or shift from government to governance, or a rescaling of governance, and have strengthened the need for inclusive and deliberative modes of governance at the river basin level. Nevertheless, how participation in water policy, and how communities can impact in water policy is still openly questioned, especially given concerns around hierarchies of knowledge, power, and a dominance of engineering-based thinking and value systems (Blackstock & Richards, 2007; Irwin, 2006; Newig & Fritsch, 2009; Sharp, 2017; Waylen et al., 2015; Wesselink, Colebatch, & Pearce, 2014; Zwarteveen et al., 2017).

There is a strong element of public making in the area of water provision and demand management in the UK. Here, community involvement in water policy is framed in terms of system innovation to reduce costs, and water usage (Hoolohan & Browne, 2016). As such, water users are positioned as customers responsible for their own water use (Browne, 2015; Hoolohan, 2016; Hoolohan & Browne, 2016; Strengers & Maller, 2012). In England, the commercialisation of mains water provision has led to a re-scripting, and reimagining of community actors as customers (rather than citizens or community collectives) with an individualised notion of water use and a shift from considerations of social to economic equity (Bakker, 2003a; Bakker, 2003b; Sharp, 2006; Sharp, Macrorie, & Turner, 2015; Sharp, 2017). The political economy (Bakker, 2003b) and professional practice of the water industry—including the centrality of values of safety, reliability, value for money, and a dominance of economic rationality shape and constrain interventions in domestic water demand (Hoolohan, 2016) as well as visions of community led management and notions of justice (Strang, 2004).

Here, a specific public is created. Water users are envisioned as individual micro resource managers, exhibiting self-reflection and choice about water services and usage, though appropriate price incentives and information provision. This vision fails to acknowledge how people are entrenched in shared social systems of meaning and how daily water habits are influenced by technology and infrastructure (Browne, Pullinger, Medd, & Anderson, 2014; Maller & Strengers, 2013; Strengers & Maller, 2012). Browne et al. (2014) highlight collective aspects of showering and other bathroom routine showing that home water usage is shaped by norms around good hygiene, and objects such as shower design. As such in the area of water demand, communities in their engagement with water are seen as an

amalgamation of individuals, with little acknowledgement of how they form part of collective and form socially shared practices which shape water demand.

2.6 | Urban greenspace

Greenspace has long been a site of urban governance to shape conduct of communities (Marne, 2001; Perkins, 2010). In this domain, community is frequently equated to people who live locally, despite greenspace being 'host' to multiple forms of community and community organising. Community involvement in UK greenspace is linked to rescaling through political systems. In the UK, community engagement in greenspace provision is rose to prominence during the Labour governments from 1997-2010, and later through Conservative policies and discourses of austerity and localism (Dempsey & Burton, 2012; Mathers, Dempsey, & Frøik Molin, 2015). However, community as a vehicle for governmental interests is less direct than in the case of energy (for example): local authorities (LAs) engage with and put communities to use, while the UK's central government has issued broad statements supporting (local) communities—for instance, in planning guidance—without directly implementing governmental programmes (Mathers et al., 2015).

Recent policy focus sees communities as greenspace owners, managers and maintenance workers. In the context of budget cuts LAs are increasingly keen to use community groups to address funding shortages (Mathers et al., 2015). Communities groups are encouraged to carry out the maintenance and upkeep of urban greenspaces formerly provided by the state (Perkins, 2010). This community engagement is akin to what Catney et al. (2014) term BS (Big Society/bullshit) localism where greenspace publics are produced instrumentally as a governmental tool to prop up ailing local service provision.

In other instances, the formation of publics has emerged from a discourse of resistance and reclamation or protection and conservation. A wide range of examples show communities creating new greenspace by reclaiming vacant land for food production, biodiversity or as leisure spaces (see Garnett, 2000; Kurtz, 2001; Smith & Kurz, 2003; Ghose & Pettygrove, 2014a). In Scotland, this has been adopted as a strategic cause by some public and voluntary sector organisations including funding provided by some LAs to implement temporary greenspace projects on vacant land.

Urban community gardens have become sites of conflict and a space to fight for issues of justice (Domene & Saurí, 2007; Eizenberg, 2012; Ghose & Pettygrove, 2014b; Pudup, 2008; Rosol, 2012). Community gardens often come into being to combat a range of urban maladies including urban food insecurity, environmental degradation, and urban disinvestment (Ghose & Pettygrove, 2014a). Typically, Local Authority representatives can see communities as a stopgap where the state failed to provide attractive public greenspace (Mathers et al., 2015; Milbourne, 2012; Rosol, 2012). However, outsourcing paid work to unpaid volunteers produces new social inequalities. It reduces both the potential for paid employment in the so-called green economy and narrows participation to those who have the capacity and resources (Perkins, 2010). Yet community activists have regularly been found to seek self-determination and decision-making power, holding diverse and vital resources (Firth, Maye, & Pearson, 2011; Milbourne, 2012). Through 18 UK case studies, Milbourne (2012, p. 954) shows the role of community gardens in "re-making the physical, ecological and social spaces of the city" and empowering disadvantaged people and places. In this sense communities are seen as both sites of enrolment and resistance to tendencies of state retrenchment and marketisation in cities (Roy, 2011).

Justice issues also come to the fore in thinking about the politics *within* communities. Engagement with greenspace is often officially apolitical but embroiled in the 'micro-politics' of community action (Creamer, 2015; Fischer et al., 2017) and community groups can find themselves accused of assumed ownership among a largely white, older, 'middle class' demographic (Dinnie, Brown, & Morris, 2013).

2.7 | Land ownership

Community land ownership in Scotland largely emerged in the Highlands and Islands in the 1990s (for accounts of the process see Reid, Birley, Watson, & Flyn, 1996, Brennan, 1999, Campbell, 2001, MacAskill, 1999, MacPhail,

2002, McIntosh, 2004, Dressler, 2007, Hunter, 2012, McMorran, Scott, & Price, 2013). There is a long history of struggles by the region's population for land rights (Hunter, 2000; Wightman, 2010). It is perhaps not surprising, then, that community land ownership has been framed by activists, and sometimes by policymakers, as a matter of justice. This is not only in relation to this history, but also to the present day concentration of land ownership in Scotland (Hunter, Peacock, Wightman, & Foxley, 2013). Community Land Scotland, the umbrella body for community landowners, has actively argued for social justice. This framing has helped land reform become a matter of national (Scotland-level) politics (Dewar, 1998; LRRG, 2014; McCrone, 2001) and the Scottish Government has now adopted a "Land Rights and Responsibilities Statement" that links land reform to "a fairer and more prosperous country" (Scottish Government, 2017).

In England and Wales, community land trusts (CLTs) have emerged more recently, although they have existed in the US for some time (Davis, 2010), and tend to focus on land for housing. Justice as a motivator for their work is implied in their strong emphasis on "affordable" housing, and providing "social benefit" (Heywood, 2016, Ryan-Collins, MacFarlane, & Lloyd, 2017) in a housing market that is "hurting communities" (National CLT Network, 2018).

Community land ownership raises questions about the constitution of "environmental publics" (Eden, 2017): who is included in the community that has the right to make decisions about land, and on what basis. In Scotland, the Highlands and Islands has latterly been widely represented as a tourist destination for "enjoying publics" (Butler, 1985; Devine, 2006; Higgins, Wightman, & MacMillan, 2002; McKee, Warren, Glass, & Wagstaff, 2013). Some see local ownership as a means to assert a different vision of the environment, prioritising the interests of "working publics" (MacKenzie, 2012) or simply of local residents as opposed to "rewilding" visions (Dalglish, n.d.; Community Land Scotland, 2017). Policy actors have tended to favour a place-based interpretation of community, based on local residence. However, at local level, sensitivities remain around conceptions of 'locals' and 'incomers' (Burnett, 1998; Jedrej & Nuttall, 1996; Creamer, Allen, & Haggett, under review) or to what extent crofting[1] defines a community (Braunholtz-Speight, 2015a; Brown, 2007; Brown, 2008; Bryden & Geisler, 2007). South of the border, Community Land Trusts are also created to serve the needs of 'local communities'—and they sometimes experience similar definitional issues (Moore, 2014).

In Scotland, state support for community land emerged in part out of regional policymakers' experience of the difficulty of working with some private landowners for local development (Lloyd & Shucksmith, 1985). However, while many community bodies bought out private landowners, there have also been programmes of disposal of public sector land—notably in forestry (Lawrence, 2009). And more generally, it is notable that the community land ownership movement marks a break from a prior history of Scottish land reform debates that centred on the nationalisation of land (Bryden & Geisler, 2007). State interventions such as the Land Reform Act in 2003, and the allocation of financial assistance (from the Lottery) and technical support (delivered by Highlands and Islands Enterprise) can therefore be seen as part of a wider rescaling and reimagining of how public policy goals are to be achieved.

In England and Wales, policy actors' engagement with CLTs has been more muted. Successive governments have given some support, but CLTs have not become a totemic policy issue. Arguably the peak of policy interest was connecting to rescaling of the state, when the coalition government's 'localism' agenda offered various powers to community organisations (Featherstone, Ince, Mackinnon, Strauss, & Cumbers, 2012; Moore, 2014, Heywood 2015).

Questions of the scale of environmental governance also overlap with questions of justice to some extent. Community ownership is seen as moving power away from distant decision-makers (private or public sector) and vesting it in local residents, and is therefore sometimes analysed in terms of decentralisation of power and democratisation of natural resources (Braunholtz-Speight, 2015a, 2015b; Hoffman, 2013). Others connect such actions to wider scales, as part of a Scotland-wide narrative of struggles over land rights (Wightman, 2010), inequality in the UK housing market (Ryan-Collins et al., 2017), or in the context of global resistance to neoliberal and modernist ideas about property and nature (MacKenzie, 2012; McIntosh, 2004).

3 | DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Community is a ubiquitous term today used in a variety of ways to meet environmental objectives (Taylor Aiken et al., 2017). This article responds to this trend, through analysis of four core domains (energy, water, greenspace, and land ownership), to provide an exploration of the ways that community is utilised in UK (particularly Scottish) environmental policy. In this paper, rather than explore the meaning of community, which has been more typical in this area, we sought to explore the outcomes of the increased interest in community in environmental policy. Through an extensive literature review our academic contribution is the identification of the main thematic threads running across four core domains when community is used environmentally, these are (1) as a reframing of justice (2) as a process of environmental 'public-making', and (3) a rescaling of governance. These trends are not total but reflect much of the commonalities and patters that characterize the use of community in environmental policy.

We see each of these as increasingly relevant and helpful in understanding the ways in which community is used environmentally. Our work may be used by policymakers to neatly grasp the state of the art in theoretical analysis when using community environmentally, for example it encourages to take the implications for community beyond the traditional metrics such as number of funding applications, jobs created, meals served; in doing so, it opens up the possibility for considering these themes. Community activists may use our work to better understand the social, economic and political context within which they operate.

This article focuses on the UK. In bounding our review in this way, we exclude much international literature. Community water management for example has been encouraged in the Global South by development agencies such as the World Bank since the 1990s, and many have focused their research on these sites. Therefore, we challenge others to explore international literature to understand whether the main trends we identify exist, or more interestingly, where divergences can be found. Regardless, we are convinced that each of these three crosscutting themes (justice, public making, and a rescaling of governance) will be a source of revivification of studies of community and environment in the coming years.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Kirsty Holstead's time was funded by the Scottish Government Hydro Nation Scholars Programme. The authors would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and feedback.

ENDNOTES

[1] A long-established form of smallholder tenant agriculture

ORCID

Kirsty Holstead http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5121-3098
Gerald Taylor Aiken http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0798-495X
Will Eadson http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2158-7205
Tim Braunholtz-Speight http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6115-0331

REFERENCES

Adams, E. A., & Zulu, L. C. (2015). Participants or customers in water governance? Community-public partnerships for peri-urban water supply. *Geoforum*, *65*, 112–124.

Agrawal, A. (2005). *Environmentality: Technologies of government and the making of subjects*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Agrawal, A., & Gibson, C. C. (1999). Enchantment and disenchantment: The role of community in natural resource conservation. *World Development*, *27*(4), 629–649.

Bakker, K. (2003a). From public to private to … mutual? Restructuring water supply governance in England and Wales. *Geoforum*, *34*, 359–374.

Bakker, K. (2003b). An uncooperative commodity: Privatizing water in England and Wales, Oxford, Oxford geographical and environment.

Bakker, K. (2008). The ambiguity of community: Debating alternatives to private- sector provision of urban water supply. *Water Alternatives*, *1*, 236–252.

Batterbury, S. P. J., & Fernando, J. L. (2006). Rescaling governance and the impacts of political and environmental decentralization: An introduction. *World Development*, *34*(11), 1851–1863.

Blackstock, K. L., & Richards, C. (2007). Evaluating stakeholder involvement in river basin planning: A Scottish case study. *Water Policy*, *9*, 493–512.

Bomberg, E., & McEwen, N. (2012). Mobilizing community energy. *Energy Policy*, *51*, 435–444.

Bradley, Q. (2014). Bringing democracy back home: Community localism and the domestication of political space. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *32*(4), 642–657.

Braunholtz-Speight, T. (2015a). Power and community in Scottish community land ownership. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of the Highlands and Islands/University of Aberdeen.

Braunholtz-Speight, T. (2015b). Scottish community land initiatives: Going beyond the locality to enable local empowerment. *People, Place and Policy*, *9*(2), 123–138.

Brennan, M. (1999). Melness Crofters Estate, Sutherland—A new 'crofting community landowner'. In G. Boyd, & D. Reid (Eds.), *Social Land Ownership: Volume One*. Inverness: Not-for-Profit Landowners Project Group and Community Learning Scotland.

Brenner, N., & Elden, S. (2009). Henri Lefebvre on state, space, territory. *International Political Sociology*, *3*(4), 353–377.

Bridge, G., Bouzarovski, S., Bradshaw, M., & Eyre, N. (2013). Geographies of energy transition: Space, place and the low-carbon economy. *Energy Policy*, *53*, 331–340.

Brown, A. (2008). Crofter forestry, land reform and the ideology of community. *Social Legal Studies*, *17*, 333–349.

Brown, K. M. (2007). Reconciling moral and legal collective entitlement: Implications for community-based land reform. *Land Use Policy*, *24*, 633–643.

Browne, A. L. (2015). Insights from the everyday: Implications of reframing the governance of water supply and demand from "people" to "practice". *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water*, *2*, 415–424.

Browne, A. L., Pullinger, M., Medd, W., & Anderson, B. (2014). Patterns of practice: A reflection on the development of quantitative/mixed methodologies capturing everyday life related to water consumption in the UK. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *17*, 27–43.

Bryden, J., & Geisler, C. (2007). Community-based land reform: Lessons from Scotland. *Land Use Policy*, *24*, 24–34.

Bulkeley, H. (2005). Reconfiguring environmental governance: Towards a politics of scales and networks. *Political Geography*, *24*(8), 875–902.

Bulkeley, H. (2015). *Accomplishing climate governance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bulkeley, H., & Fuller, S. (2012). Low carbon communities and social justice., 2012. Joseph Rowntree Foundations. View Point: Informing Debate. March, 2012.

Bulkeley, H., & Newell, P. (2010). *Governing Climate Change*. London: Routledge.

Burnett, K. (1998). Local heroics: reflecting on incomers and local development discourses in Scotland. *Sociologica Ruralis*, *38*(2), 204–224.

Butler, R. (1985). Evolution of tourism in the Scottish Highlands. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *12*, 371–391.

Campbell, L. (2001). The growth of community land management and ownership in the Highlands and Islands in the 1990s and beyond, chapter in. In G. Boyd, & D. Reid (Eds.), *Social Land Ownership: Volume Three*. Inverness: Not-for-Profit Landowners Project Group and Community Learning Scotland.

Catney, P., MacGregor, S., Dobson, A., Hall, S. M., Royston, S., Robinson, Z., … Ross, S. (2014). Big society, little justice? Community renewable energy and the politics of localism. *Local Environment*, *19*, 715–730.

Chilvers, J., & Pallett, H. (2018). Energy democracies and publics in the making: A relational agenda for research and practice. *Front. Commun.*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2018.00014

Cleaver, F. (2012). *Development through bricolage: Rethinking institutions for natural resource management*. London: Routledge.

Community Land Scotland (2017). Position paper on rewilding. Downloaded on 9th May 2018 from http://www.communitylandscotland.org.uk/find-out-more/renewal_repopulation/

Creamer, E. (2015). The double-edged sword of grant funding: A study of community-led climate change initiatives in remote rural Scotland. *Local Environment*, *20*(9), 981–999.

Creamer, E., Allen, S., & Haggett, C. (under review). 'Incomers' leading 'community-led' low carbon initiatives: a contradiction in terms?, Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space.

Creamer, E., Eadson, W., van Veelen, B., Pinker, A., Tingey, M., Braunholtz-Speight, T., … Lacey-Barnacle, M. (2018). Community Energy: entanglements of community, state and private sector. *Geography Compass*, 2018; e12378. https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12378

Dalglish, C. (n.d.) Landscape Justice, paper for Community Land Scotland. Downloaded on 9th May 2018 from http://www.communitylandscotland.org.uk/find-out-more/renewal_repopulation/

Davis, J. E. (Ed.) (2010). *The community land trust reader*. Cambridge MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Dempsey, N., & Burton, M. (2012). Defining place-keeping: The long-term management of public spaces. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, *11*(1), 11–20.

Devine, T. (2006). *Clearance and improvement: Land, power and people in Scotland, 1700–1900*. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Dewar, D. (1998). *Land reform for the 21st century, 1998 McEwen lecture*.

Dinnie, E., Brown, K., & Morris, S. (2013). Community, cooperation and conflict: Negotiating the social well-being benefits of urban greenspace experiences. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *112*, 1–9.

Dinnie, E., & Holstead, K. (2017). *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2017.08.003

Domene, E., & Saurí, D. (2007). Urbanization and class-produced natures: Vegetable gardens in the Barcelona Metropolitan Region. *Geoforum*, *38*, 287–298.

Dressler, C. (2007). *Eigg: The story of an island*. Edinburgh: Birlinn.

Eadson, W. (2016). State enrolment and energy-carbon transitions: Syndromic experimentation and atomisation in England. *Environment and Planning. C, Government & Policy*, *34*(8), 1621–1631.

Eadson, W., & Foden, M. (2014). Editorial: Critical perspectives on community energy. *People Place Policy Online*, *8*(3), 145–148.

Eden, S. (2017). *Environmental publics*. London: Routledge.

Eizenberg, E. (2012). Actually existing commons: Three moments of space of community gardens in New York City. *Antipode*, *44*(3), 764–782.

Elden, S. (2010). Land, terrain, territory. *Progress in Human Geography*, *34*(6), 799–817.

Evans, J. (2012). *Environmental governance*. London: Routledge.

Featherstone, D., Ince, A., Mackinnon, D., Strauss, K., & Cumbers, A. (2012). Progressive localism and the construction of political alternatives: Boundary crossings. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *37*(2), 177–182.

Firth, C., Maye, D., & Pearson, D. (2011). Developing "community" in community gardens. *Local Environment*, *16*(6), 555–568.

Fischer, A., Holstead, K., Hendrickson, C. Y., Virkkula, O., and Prampolini, A. (2017). Community-led initiatives' everyday politics for sustainability—Conflicting rationalities and aspirations for change?, environment and planning a, doi: 0308518X17713994.

Forman, A. (2017). Energy justice at the end of the wire: Enacting community energy and equity in Wales. *Energy Policy*, *107*, 649–657.

Fuller, S., & McCauley, D. (2016). Framing energy justice: perspectives from activism and advocacy. *Energy Research & Social Science*, *11*, 1–8.

Garnett, T. (2000). Urban agriculture in London: Rethinking our food economy. In Growing Cities, Growing Food. German Foundation for International Development, Feldafing, Germany.

Ghose, R., & Pettygrove, M. (2014a). Actors and networks in urban community garden development. *Geoforum*, *53*, 93–103.

Ghose, R., & Pettygrove, M. (2014b). Urban community gardens as spaces of citizenship. *Antipode*, *46*(4), 1092–1112.

Gibbs, D., & Jonas, A. E. G. (2000). Governance and regulation in local environmental policy: The utility of a regime approach. *Geoforum*, *31*(3), 299–313.

Haf, S. (2016). The winds of change?: A comparative study of community energy developments in Scotland and Wales Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Bangor. Available: http://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.690699

Haf, S., Parkhill, K., McDonald, M., & Griffiths, G. (2018). Distributing power? Community energy projects' experiences of planning, policy and incumbents in the devolved nations of Scotland and Wales. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2018.1453490

Haggett, C., & Atken, M. (2015). Grassroots energy innovations: The role of community ownership and investment. *Current Sustainable/Renewablw Energy Reports*, *2*(3), 98–104.

Heywood, A. (2016). *Local housing, community living: prospects for scaling up and scaling out community-led housing*. London: The Smith Institute.

Higgins, P., Wightman, A., & MacMillan, D. (2002). *Sporting estates and recreational land use in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, End of Award Report R000223163*. Swindon: Economic and Social Research Council.

Hoffman, M. (2013). Why community ownership? Understanding land reform in Scotland. *Land Use Policy*, *31*, 289–297.

Holley, C., Gunningham, N., & Shearing, C. (2013). *The new environmental governance*. London: Routledge.

Hoolohan, C. (2016). Reframing water efficiency: Towards interventions that reconfigure the shared and collective aspects of everyday water use. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Manchester.

Hoolohan, C., & Browne, A. L. (2016). Reframing water efficiency: Determining collective approaches to change water use in the home. *British Journal of Environment and Climate Change*, *6*, 179–191.

Howell, R. A. (2012). Living with a carbon allowance: The experiences of carbon rationing action groups and implications for policy. *Energy Policy*, *41*, 250–258. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.10.044

Hunter, J. (2000). *The making of the crofting community: Second edition*. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Hunter, J. (2012). From the low tide of the sea to the high mountain tops. In *Stornoway: Islands book trust*.

Hunter, J., Peacock, P., Wightman, A., & Foxley, M. (2013) 432:50). *Towards a comprehensive land reform agenda for Scotland* () *Briefing paper for the House of Commons Scottish Affairs Committee*. London: House of Commons.

Irwin, A. (2006). The politics of talk: Coming to terms with the "new" scientific governance. *Social Studies of Science*, *36*, 299–320.

Jager, N., Challies, E., Kochskämper, E., Newig, J., Benson, D., Blackstock, K., … Von Korff, Y. (2016). Transforming European water governance? Participation and river basin management under the EU water framework Directive in 13 member states. *Watermark*, *8*, 156.

Jedrej, M. C., & Nuttall, M. (1996). *White settlers: The impact of rural repopulation on Scotland*. Luxembourg, Harwood.

Jessop, B. (2005). *The future of the capitalist state, reprinted*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kurtz, H. (2001). Differentiating multiple meanings of garden and community. *Urban Geography*, *22*(7), 656–670.

Lawrence, A. (2009). *Community experiences of the National Forest Land Scheme*. Roslin: Forest Research.

Lefebvre, H., Brenner, N., & Elden, S. (2009). *State, space, world: Selected essays*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lloyd, G., & Shucksmith, M. (1985). Economic development and land policies in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. *Land Use Policy*, April, 115–125.

Lövbrand, E., & Stripple, J. (2006). The climate as political space: on the territorialisation of the global carbon cycle. *Review of International Studies*, *32*(02), 217. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210506006991

LRRG (2014). *The land of Scotland and the common good, final report of the Land Reform Review Group*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

MacAskill, J. (1999). *We have won the land: the story of the purchase of the North Lochinver Estate by the Assynt Crofters' Trust*. Stornoway: Acair.

MacKenzie, A. F. D. (2012). *Places of possibility: Property, nature and community land ownership*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

MacPhail, I. (2002). *Land, crofting and the Assynt Crofters Trust: a post-colonial geography? Unpublished PhD thesis*. Lampeter: University of Wales.

Maller, C., & Strengers, Y. (2013). The global migration of everyday life: Investigating the practice memories of Australian migrants. *Geoforum*, *44*, 243–252.

Markantoni, M. (2016). Low carbon governance: Mobilizing community energy through top-down support?: Low carbon governance. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, *26*(3), 155–169.

Markantoni, M., & Woolvin, M. (2015). The role of rural communities in the transition to a low-carbon Scotland: A review. *Local Environ*, *20*, 202–219.

Marne, P. (2001). Whose public space was it anyway? Class, gender and and ethnicity in the creation of the Sefton and Stanley Parks, Liverpool: 1858–1872. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *2*(4), 421–443.

Marres, N. (2012). *Material participation: Technology, the environment and everyday publics*. Hampshire and New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marres, N., & Lezaun, J. (2011). Materials and devices of the public: An introduction. *Economy and Society*, *40*(4), 489–509.

Marston, A. (2014). The scale of informality: Community-run water systems in peri-urban Cochabamba. *Bolivia. Water Alternatives*, *7*(1), 72–88.

Mathers, A., Dempsey, N., & Frøik Molin, J. (2015). Place-keeping in action: Evaluating the capacity of green space partnerships in England. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *139*, 126–136.

McCrone, D. (2001). *Scotland: The sociology of a nation*. London: Routledge.

McIntosh, A. (2004). *Soil and soul: People versus corporate power*. Aurum, London.

McKee, A., Warren, C., Glass, J., & Wagstaff, P. (2013). The Scottish private estate. In J. Glass, M. Price, C. Warren, & A. Scott (Eds.), (2013)*Lairds, land and sustainability: Scottish perspectives on upland management*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

McMorran, R., Scott, A., & Price, M. (2013). Reconstructing sustainability: Participant experiences of community land tenure in North-West Scotland. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *33*, 20–31.

Middlemiss, L., & Parrish, B. D. (2010). Building capacity for low-carbon communities: The role of grassroots initiatives. *Energy Policy*, *38*, 7559–7566.

Milbourne, P. (2012). Everyday (in) justices and ordinary environmentalisms: Community gardening in disadvantages urban neighbourhoods. *Local Environment*, *17*(9), 943–957.

Moloney, S., Horne, R. E., & Fien, J. (2010). Transitioning to low carbon communities—From behaviour change to systemic change: Lessons from Australia. *Energy Policy*, *38*(12), 7614–7623.

Moore, T. (2014). Affordable homes for local communities: The effects and prospects of community land trusts in England, St Andrews: Centre for Housing research, University of St Andrews.

Mulugetta, Y., Jackson, T., & van der Horst, D. (2010). Carbon reduction at community scale. *Energy Policy*, *38*(12), 7541–7545.

National CLT Network (2018) Why CLTs? http://www.communitylandtrusts.org.uk/what-is-a-clt/why-clts accessed on 2nd May 2018.

Newig, J., & Fritsch, O. (2009). Environmental governance: Participatory, multi-level and effective? *Environmental Policy and Governance*, *19*, 197–214.

Perkins, H. A. (2010). Green spaces of self-interest within Shared Urban Governance. *Geography Compass*, *4*(4), 255–268.

Pickerill, J. (2011). Building liveable cities: urban Low Impact Developments as low carbon solutions? In H. Bulkeley, V. Castán Broto, M. Hodson, & S. Marvin (Eds.), *Cities and Low Carbon Transitions* (pp. 178–197). London: Routledge.

Pickerill, J. (2016). *Eco-homes: People, place and politics*. London: Zed Books.

Pudup, M. B. (2008). It takes a garden: Cultivating citizen-subjects in organized garden projects. *Geoforum*, *39*(3), 1228–1240.

Reed, M. S. (2008). Stakeholder participation for environmental management: A literature review. *Biological Conservation*, *141*, 2417–2431.

Reid, D., Birley, T., Watson, D., & Flyn, D. (1996). *Access to the land: A case study approach to community access to the land resource*. Edinburgh: Centre for Human Ecology.

Rose, N. (1996). The death of the social? Refiguring the territory of government. *Economy and Society*, *25*(3), 327–356.

Rose, N. S. (1999). *Powers of freedom reframing political thought*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, [online] Available from: http://site. ebrary.com/id/2000829 (Accessed 5 August 2013

Rosol, M. (2012). Community volunteering as neoliberal strategy? Green space production in Berlin. *Antipode*, *44*(1), 239–257.

Roy, P. (2011). Non-profit and community-based green space production in Milwaukee: Maintaining a counterweight within neo-liberal urban environmental governance. *Space and Polity*, *15*(2), 87–105.

Ryan-Collins, J., MacFarlane, L., & Lloyd, T. (2017). *Rethinking the economics of land and housing*. London: Zed.

Scottish Government (2017). Land rights and responsibilities statement.

Seyfang, G., Hielscher, S., Hargreaves, T., Martiskainen, M., & Smith, A. (2014). A grassroots sustainable energy niche? Reflections on community energy in the UK. *Innovation and Societal Transitions.*, *13*, 21–44.

Sharp, L. (2006). Water demand management in England and Wales: Constructions of the domestic water user. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, *49*, 869–889.

Sharp, L. (2017). *Reconnecting people and water: Public engagement and sustainable urban water management*. Oxon, UK and New York, USA: Taylor & Francis.

Sharp, L., Macrorie, R., & Turner, A. (2015). Resource efficiency and the imagined public: insights from cultural theory. *Global Environmental Change*, *34*, 196–206.

Smith, C., & Kurz, H. (2003). Community gardens and politics of scale in New York City. *Geographical Review*, *93*(2), 193–212.

Somerville, P. (2011). *Understanding Community*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Strang, V. (2004). The meaning of water, New York. In *USA: Berg*.

Strengers, Y., & Maller, C. (2012). Materialising energy and water resources in everyday practices: Insights for securing supply systems. *Global Environmental Change*, *22*, 754–763.

Swyngedouw, E. (2005). Governance innovation and the citizen: The Janus face of governance-beyond-the-state. *Urban Studies*, *42*(11), 1991–2006.

Taylor Aiken, G. (2015). (Local-) community for global challenges: Carbon conversations, transition towns and governmental elisions. *Local Environment*, *20*(7), 764–781.

Taylor Aiken, G. (2016). Prosaic state governance of community low carbon transitions. *Political Geography*, *55*, 20–29.

Taylor Aiken, G. (2016a). Polysemic, polyvalent and phatic: A rough evolution of community with reference to low carbon transitions. *People Place Policy Online*, *10*, 126–145.

Taylor Aiken, G. (2017). The politics of community: Togetherness, transition and post-politics. *Environ. Plan. A 49*, 2383–2401. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X17724443

Taylor Aiken, G. (2018). One-way street? Spatiality of communities in low carbon transitions in Scotland. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, *36*, 129–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2017.09.028

Taylor Aiken, G., Middlemiss, L., Sallu, S., & Hauxwell-Baldwin, R. (2017). Researching climate change and community in neoliberal contexts: An emerging critical approach. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, *8*(4). https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.463, 2017

Taylor, M. (2007). Community participation in the real world: Opportunities and pitfalls in new governance spaces. *Urban Studies*, *44*(2), 297–317.

van Veelen, B. (2018) Negotiating energy democracy in practice: Governance processes in community energy projects, Environ. Polit., 1it., 1.,:https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2018.1427824

van Veelen, B., & Haggett, C. (2016). Uncommon ground: The role of different place attachments in explaining community renewable energy projects. *Sociological Ruralis*, *57*(S1), 553–554.

Walker, G. (2011). The role for "community" in carbon governance. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, *2*(5), 777–782. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.137

Walker, G., & Devine-Wright, P. (2008). Community renewable energy: What should it mean? *Energy Policy*, *36*(2), 497–500.

Walker, G., Devine-Wright, P., Hunter, S., High, H., & Evans, B. (2010). Trust and community: Exploring the meanings, contexts and dynamics of community renewable energy. *Energy Policy*, *38*(6), 2655–2663.

Wallace, A. (2016) Remaking community?: New labour and the governance of poor neighbourhoods., Routledge, London., 2016.

Warren, C. (2002). *Managing Scotland's environment*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.

Warren, C. R., & McFadyen, M. (2010). Does community ownership affect public attitudes to wind energy? A case study from south-west Scotland. *Land Use Policy*, *27*(2), 204–213.

Waylen, K. A., Blackstock, K. L., Marshall, K. B., & Dunglinson, J. (2015). Participation-prescription tension in natural resource management: The case of diffuse pollution in Scottish water management. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, *25*, 111–124.

Wesselink, A., Colebatch, H., & Pearce, W. (2014). Evidence and policy: Discourses, meanings and practices. *Policy Sciences*, *47*, 339–344.

Wightman, A. (2010). *The poor had no lawyers: Who owns Scotland and how they got it*. Edinburgh: Birlinn.

Zwarteveen, M., Kemerink-Seyoum, J. S., Kooy, M., Evers, J., Guerrero, T. A., Batubara, B., … Wesselink, A. (2017). Engaging with the politics of water governance. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water*, *4*(6). https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1245

Kirsty Holstead University of St Andrews and The James Hutton Institute, Kirsty is currently completing a PhD in community water governance at the University of St Andrews in collaboration with The James Hutton Institute. She previously worked as an environmental social scientist at the James Hutton Institute mainly in the area of water management. She also contributed to the EU FP7 project TESS (Transition to European Societal Sustainability), which aimed to understand the contribution that community-based initiatives make in bringing social change and reducing impacts of climate change. Her PhD research brings together these two research passions: communities and water. Both today in her PhD and in her previous role, she aims to undertake research that can inform and enable equitable and sustainable natural resource management.

Gerald Taylor Aiken University of Luxembourg, Gerald is an 'assistant chercheur', with the Geography department of the 'Identités. Politiques, Sociétés, Espaces (IPSE)' unit of the Université du Luxembourg. He is an Environmental Geographer with a particular obsession for community. His current position looks at Environmental Economic Geography in a European context. He has previously taught Geography at Leeds and Durham universities in England. He co-founded the RIPPLES network: http://www.ripplesnetwork.org.uk

Will Eadson Sheffield Hallam University, Will is a Research Fellow in the Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research (CRESR). His research interests lie broadly in the intersection between the move to a low carbon economy and spatial, social and economic inequalities. Much of Will's academic work to date has focused on government policy on low carbon and energy transitions with an emphasis on community, local and regional responses to this. He is especially interested in the experiences of non-exceptional places, and what they might tell us about sustainability transitions. Will is currently attempting to develop areas of work exploring local/community action on environmental sustainability as a tool for economic and social regeneration, and on the variable nature of work (broadly conceived) in the low carbon economy. He is currently conducting research for Groundwork UK on engaging communities in sustainability initiatives through empowering young people as 'green leaders'.

Tim Braunholtz-Speight University of Manchester, Tim is currently working as a Postdoctoral Research Associate at the Tyndall Centre at the University of Manchester, on a study of finance and business models for community energy projects. He previously researched the social and democratic potential of alternative finance (online crowdfunding, lending and community shares) at the University of Leeds' Bauman Institute. His PhD examined power relations around community land ownership in Scotland, combining in-depth case studies of two Community Land Initiatives with multi-level power analysis drawing on Gaventa's "powercube" framework. Tim has previously worked on local, regional and international development policy research at the Overseas Development Institute, the University of the Highlands and Islands, and both Leeds universities. His research interests centre on questions of power and empowerment, democracy and resources.

How to cite this article: Holstead K, Taylor Aiken G, Eadson W, Braunholtz-Speight T. Putting community to use in environmental policy making: Emerging trends in Scotland and the UK. *Geography Compass*. 2018; e12381. https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12381