



RTPI

mediation of space · making of place

Shaping and Delivering Tomorrow's Places: Effective Practice in Spatial Planning

Report, findings and
recommendations

 **UCL**

Deloitte.

April 2007

This Study has been managed by the Royal Town Planning Institute with the generous support of Communities and Local Government, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and the Greater London Authority and forms part of each organisations' programme of research into topical issues of interest to policy makers, practitioners and service users. The facts presented and views expressed in this report, however, are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of their sponsors.

The RTPI and its partners would like to thank the many individuals and organisations who have participated and contributed to this study. We would also like to thank Deloitte for assisting in the design and publication of this report.

ISBN 1-902311-34-5

© The Royal Town Planning Institute
Registered Charity No 262865

Published by the Royal Town Planning Institute
April 2007

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system in any form or by any means electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, photocopying or otherwise, without permission in writing from the Royal Town Planning Institute.



RTPI

mediation of space · making of place

Shaping and Delivering Tomorrow's Places: Effective Practice in Spatial Planning

Report, findings and
recommendations



MAYOR OF LONDON



UCL and Deloitte
April 2007

This study has been prepared for the RTPI, CLG, GLA and Joseph Rowntree Foundation by UCL and Deloitte. The study team was Janice Morphet, Mark Tewdwr-Jones and Nick Gallent for UCL and Bill Hall, Matthew Spry and Rachael Howard for Deloitte.

UCL

Bartlett School of Planning
Wates House
22 Gordon Street
London WC1

Deloitte

Stonecutter Court
1 Stonecutter Street
London EC4A 4TR

Project Steering Group Members:

Richard Summers [Chair]	Royal Town Planning Institute Trustee
Richard Blyth	Communities and Local Government
Patrick Akindude	Communities and Local Government
Debbie McMullen	Greater London Authority
Tony Cumberbirch	Greater London Authority
Julie Cowans	Joseph Rowntree Foundation
John Hack	RTPI Development Planning Network
Vincent Goodstadt	Royal Town Planning Institute Trustee
Jackie Leaske	Planning Advisory Service
Kelvin McDonald	Royal Town Planning Institute
Jennie Crawford	Royal Town Planning Institute
Will French [Project Manager]	Royal Town Planning Institute

Contents

	Pages
Foreword by Baroness Andrews	
Executive Summary	1
1. Effective Spatial Planning – Its Context and Practice	5
2. The Spatial Planning Context	12
3. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning – What we found	27
4. Delivering Spatial Outcomes	36
5. Barriers to Success	42
6. Conclusions	52
7. Recommendations	65
8. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning in Action: Detailed case studies	70
Appendices	95

Foreword by Baroness Andrews

England has had a comprehensive town planning system for 60 years. The principles of this system have served the country extraordinarily well as they have accommodated a great increase in national living standards without losing our unique heritage. However the system has not always enabled a quick response to new challenges. The Government understands the need for a more positive and proactive planning system that responds to the new needs of the 21st century. Planning has to evolve.

In September 2004, the Government introduced the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This Act establishes a process it calls 'Spatial Planning'. Spatial planning is designed to 'bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function'. Spatial planning goes beyond traditional land-use planning. It facilitates and promotes sustainable and inclusive patterns of urban and rural development. Rather than operating through a narrow technical perspective, spatial planning should actively involve all members of society because everyone has a stake in the places in which they live, work and play.

In the two and a half years since the reforms were initiated there has been an unprecedented amount of plan making across the country. Our regional planning bodies and local authorities are to be congratulated for grasping the challenges of the new system. The aims of planning reform are wide ranging and ambitious and we are keen to build on what has been achieved to date.

Therefore my Department is pleased to have joined with the RTPI, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and the Greater London Authority in commissioning this study which uses case studies to examine the effectiveness of spatial planning in practice. This study appears at a particularly important time as it coincides with the Government's Planning White Paper which addresses the overall operation of the planning system. For all these reasons I commend the report to all who are interested in the wide-ranging subject of spatial planning.



Baroness Andrews
Parliamentary Under Secretary of State
Communities and Local Government

Executive Summary

The Effectice Practice in Spatial Planning project was commissioned by the RTPI, CLG, Josph Rowntree Foundation and the GLA and undertaken by UCL and Deloitte. The project has examined how spatial planning is being delivered by those involved in formulating the Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks that were introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The focus of the project has been on the outcomes of planning for places rather than the processes involved in preparing spatial plans. The project involved practising planners and also local authority Chief Executives, Councillors and other public agencies involved in the development and delivery of the new approach.

A first requirement of the project was to clarify what spatial planning is about. PPS 1 explains that '*Spatial Planning goes beyond traditional land use planning to bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function*' but it is apparent that amongst key participants including planners, councillors, senior local authority and other public sector managers that there is little common understanding what this means in practice. There is an urgent need to develop and elaborate develop spatial planning as a concept that like 'best value' for example, can encompass a wide range of activities and outcomes.

The project has found there is an evolving understanding of what spatial planning means in practice. This is summarised in the box below:

Spatial planning is the practice of place shaping and delivery at the local and regional levels that aims to:

- *Enable a vision for the future of regions and places that is based on evidence, local distinctiveness and community derived objectives.*
- *Translate this vision into a set of policies, priorities, programmes and land allocations together with the public sector resources to deliver them.*
- *Create a framework for private investment and regeneration that promotes economic, environmental and social well being for the area.*
- *Coordinate and deliver the public sector components of this vision with other agencies and processes (e.g. LAAs and MAAs).*

This understanding of spatial planning builds upon definitions that have been used by RTPI, CLG and academic experts in the field and it provides a basis for investigating how effectively spatial planning is being applied in practice. This meant considering the role of spatial planning within the wider context of on-going public sector reforms (these are summarised in the box below). The study found that the public sector is becoming more integrated between agencies including health, police, business support and voluntary organisations and revealed the vital and central role of planning in this fast changing environment.

Public Sector Reform context

The reform of the public sector provides a change in the context and role of spatial planning. The main influences are:

- *The Lyons Inquiry and Place Shaping.*
- *Barker Review of Planning and Housing.*
- *Hampton Review of Regulation.*
- *Varney Review of Public Service Delivery.*
- *Stern Review of Climate Change.*
- *Eddington Review of Transport.*
- *Local Government White Paper.*

The study worked with seven case study authorities, (five at local level and two at regional level) and found many instances where spatial planning has been effective thanks to well-developed joint working between public, private and voluntary sector partners. The main report draws on 22 case studies where this was achieved. The use of specialists to facilitate the discussion to help scope and visioning local community priorities and the establishment of joint working across the public sector were particularly important elements of effectiveness.

The study also found examples where evidence was shared at an early stage to support the allocation of land uses for different activities. Other examples illustrate programmes for providing social infrastructure that need to be implemented alongside other developments through various forms of planning agreements. At the regional level, the creation of a Regional Infrastructure Programme, supported by a range of various public agencies, offered another effective approach to social infrastructure provision.

Work with the case study authorities led to the conclusion that, if it is to be effective, spatial planning must focus on:

- Outcomes before processes.
- Users, partners and places.
- Local community needs and preferences from the outset.

The essential elements of effective spatial planning must include:

- A new role for planning within local authorities linked with other activities including Sustainable Community Strategies and Local Area Agreements.
- A common evidence base and information repository shared between partners that is also accessible to the public.
- The key role of development management in delivering tomorrow's places.
- A Local Infrastructure Programme, together with a Local Infrastructure Fund and managed by a Local Infrastructure Group to deliver places through effective resource management and coordination.
- A Regional Infrastructure Programme, together with a Regional Infrastructure Fund and Regional Infrastructure Group to deliver places through effective resource management and coordination.
- Active horizontal and vertical integration between strategies, policies and resources for regions, sub-regions, localities and communities.

- Provision of new skills and training for planners including MBAs and courses on project and programme management.

The study has identified some of the barriers that constrain spatial planning from being more effective. One of the most important of these is the difficulty of ensuring that Chief Executives and Executive members in Local Authorities and leading politicians in Regional Assemblies recognise the key role that spatial planning has in shaping and delivering tomorrow's places.

At the national level an incomplete understanding of the new planning system within Government Departments and Government Offices has also hampered the delivery of spatial planning in the way the 2004 Act intended.

Another major barrier lies in planners' understanding of the role of spatial planning within the wider and rapidly changing public sector landscape. Although the intended role and scope of spatial planning is clear from the 'tests of soundness' set out by the Planning Inspectorate, it is not always well understood by practising planners. Some of the requirements of the 'tests of soundness' are poorly understood, particularly those covering local distinctiveness, evidence based approaches, and resources for delivery. This may have arisen, in part, from existing Government Guidance [PPS11, PPS12] which does not fully reflect current requirements and is resulting in emerging plans that are unduly inward focussed.

The main study report makes over 50 recommendations to a range of organisations to help develop more effective practice, overcome identified barriers and to improve the shaping and delivery of tomorrow's places. Key recommendations include:

- CLG reviews of Planning Policy Statements should include more specific material and advice on the role of spatial planning within the joined up public sector and as part of the local Sustainable Community Strategy as one of the delivery vehicles.
- CLG, the RTPI and SOLACE should prepare a joint communications strategy for local authority Chief Executives on the role and requirements of spatial planning in their local authority wide programmes.
- DOH should prepare a Circular and letter to all Health Chief Executives to advise them of their need to engage in spatial planning processes as part of their infrastructure and capital programmes.
- DfES should prepare a Circular and letter to the whole education sector [schools, children, HE and FE] and their partners in programmes [e.g. Building Schools for the Future] to advise them of the importance of spatial approaches and their need to engage with it in their infrastructure and capital planning.
- CLG should advise all Local Area Agreements of their need to integrate the LDF as part of their delivery machinery at local level.
- CLG should amend or supplement PPS11 and PPS12 to include the implications of resource, delivery and implementation requirements. This should explain the relationship between the LDF, the SCS, the LAA and other funding sources such as Planning Gain Supplement, environmental revenues and other private sector investment.
- Government Offices should manage their relationship with local authorities in an integrated way, and make the same official responsible for the LDF and the LAA.
- The roles of GOs and the Planning Inspectorate in the Local Development Scheme process should be clarified. GOs could concentrate on ensuring that good local public sector integration and consultation has been achieved, leaving PINS to concentrate on the regulatory role.

Executive Summary

- Local Authorities should establish a local authority wide evidence base or repository for all data on social, environmental and economic characteristics and performance and on local opinion about priorities, preferences etc.
- Local Authorities should establish a Local Infrastructure Group [LIG] to translate the SCS, LDF and other planning requirements into a Local Infrastructure Programme [LIP] which is committed and resourced through the Local Infrastructure Fund [LIF].
- LAs should establish a more formal approach to managing planning gain and other funds being derived through the planning process, including identifying requirements identified by the SCS and LIP process.
- LAs should place all items required within Section 106 planning agreements, planning gain, tariff, roof tax or similar devices on a list of public Community Gain Requirements.
- LAs should appoint a Community Delivery Auditor to monitor delivery of all planning gain agreements from the proceeds of the management levy on each agreement.
- RTPi should work with CLG to support the development and delivery of a specialist Planning MBA including modules on finance, HR, business processes, programme management and strategy.

1. Effective Spatial Planning – Its Context and Practice

1.1 Introduction

Understanding and communicating the role of spatial planning has been the key focus of this project. Until recently, it has been difficult to reach a definition of spatial planning which could be understood by all – practitioners, the users of the planning system and the community. If we cannot define it easily, can we understand what spatial planning is by what it does and what it can deliver for tomorrow's places?

This study is about knowing what spatial planning is when we see it. Spatial Planning is a step change from what has gone before. It is a delivery vehicle for the social, economic and environmental infrastructure needed for our communities and it is the mechanism for managing this delivery process. This report shows the needs, requirements and mechanisms for delivery of spatial planning and how this fits into the bigger picture of place shaping. Planners frequently see spatial planning as another version of traditional land use planning. Spatial planning doesn't reflect the immediate past practice of development planning and we hope that this report demonstrates why this is not the case. However, spatial planning does renew the wider purposes of planning activity as initially conceived and practiced. Spatial planning is a team activity, supporting real changes in the way that public services can deliver tomorrow's places through their own and private sector investment.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

Planning is changing in response to the RTP's "Vision for Planning" and the Government's Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Planners must adapt to the new planning framework and utilise the implementation tools available to ensure that they deliver the best possible outcomes to secure sustainable development. The planning profession is therefore going through a period of culture change that is focussed on a renewed emphasis on the principles and practice of what is now called "spatial planning".

A first requirement of the project was to clarify what spatial planning is about. The RTP's New Vision for Planning defines spatial planning as '**Critical thinking about space and place as the basis for action or intervention**' but it is clearly apparent that amongst key participants – including planners, councillors, senior local authority and other public sector managers – there is little common understanding what this means in practice.

The key approach of this project has been to define "spatial planning" by examining how it is being delivered by planners in the practice of formulating the new Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Spatial planning has been defined in principle but its full potential now needs to be defined through a review of emerging best practice. Planning Policy Statement No 1 (ODPM 2005) states:

"Spatial Planning goes beyond traditional land use planning to bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function. That will include policies which can impact on land use, for example by influencing the demands on, or needs for, development, but which are not capable of being delivered solely or mainly through the granting or refusal of planning permission and which may be implemented by other means."

1. Effective Spatial Planning – Its Context and Practice

This study has looked at the operation of the new planning system and a selection of the planners who operate it, to identify how the best possible outcomes can be shaped and delivered. It has focused more on how planners and stakeholders work together. It has also concentrated on how the new system works to achieve its objective of delivering sustainable development rather than serve as a statutory process alone, and how it should be viewed as a means of shaping and delivering tomorrow's places rather than as an end in itself. It has focused particularly on how the sustainable communities' agenda is being addressed within the climate of culture change in planning.

The study also aimed to push the boundaries of current planning practice. It has identified examples of creative and innovative solutions to problems that can be shared with planning practitioners and planning authorities across the country so as to raise the overall level of good practice. This effective practice is demonstrated through work with the private, public and voluntary sectors and directly with communities.

1.3 Study Objectives

The study has also been able to consider spatial planning in the current context of fast changing local government modernisation and also the wider reform of the public sector within which spatial planning is situated and has important roles to play.

The primary objective of this study has been to identify, develop and disseminate best practice in spatial planning in both plan making and development management.

Secondary objectives were to offer advice to:

- help planning practitioners, local and regional authorities, and other stakeholders to understand the full scope and potential of the changes in the new planning system;
- identify potential barriers to good planning created by the new system and suggest how they could be overcome by improving best practice;
- encourage the development of creative and innovative policies and practices which could contribute to the delivery of the sustainable communities agenda;
- encourage Chief Executives and political leaders to realise the opportunities of the new system in developing community strategies and local action programmes;
- encourage key stakeholders in RSS and LDF processes to increase their engagement and align their policies and action programmes accordingly;
- ensure that the first generation of RSSs and LDFs is a clear improvement on the old regional and local plans;
- raise the corporate and public profile of planning;
- raise the awareness of CLG and other stakeholders of areas where policy guidance should be changed to facilitate effective spatial planning practice;
- support culture change in the planning profession and encourage regional and local political leaders to increase certainty throughout the planning process.

It was also intended that the study should draw on the experience of other public, private and voluntary sector organisations and examine the interactions between them and the case study authorities. The case study work was confined to England but lessons will also need to be drawn from any published reviews of spatial planning practice in the devolved administrations.

We began the case study work by examining the various policies in the RSS (or RPG), the LDF (or Local Plan) and the policies in associated plans and strategies of the RPBs, LPAs and other partners and stakeholders in each study area. The case studies were then used to examine emerging good practice in the ways that planners work with their colleagues in other departments of the RPB or Local Authority and with key partners and stakeholders, notably Local Strategic Partnerships [LSPs].

1. Effective Spatial Planning – Its Context and Practice

The study built on this to examine how other local authority departments particularly that of the Chief Executive, and other policy frameworks, such as Sustainable Community Strategies, interrelate with the RSS and the LDF. It explored what creative new ways of thinking are emerging through culture change in planning to deliver the best possible outcomes. The study focused on this planning creativity and has identified the best ways of feeding back lessons learned from the research into the planning system in each case study area. The Case Studies are used to form the findings in this report. The organisations and individuals who contributed to this study are listed in Appendix 2.

1.4 Exploring Effective Spatial Planning in Practice

In order to find what was happening within spatial planning practice, the team undertook a variety of research activities including:

- 5 local authority case studies [Ashford; Middlesbrough; Sheffield; Tonbridge and Malling; Tower Hamlets].
- 2 regional planning body case studies [South East and West Midlands].
- 1 workshop with local authority leaders.
- 1 workshop with local authority chief executives.
- Specific structured meetings with key individuals and organisations including PINS, the Lyons Inquiry.
- Attendance at other workshops, seminars etc.
- A seminar for wider practitioner feedback.
- A feedback session to the RTPI General Assembly.
- Preparation of two background papers on the meaning and role of spatial planning.

In all of these sessions, we were using a series of questions to identify ‘what is effective spatial planning in practice?’ which are set out in Appendix 4.

We were fortunate in finding organisations and local authorities that were willing to give us their time and also to provide us with access to the wider public sector groups with whom they are working. We held two sessions in each case study area which also helped us to confirm and develop many of the issues which we wished to explore.

This project was also intended to have an action research element to it and although we did not bring together all the case studies in a single workshop, we were able share information iteratively between case studies which we could see was encouraging each of the case study teams to think in different ways. This has also encouraged the study team to the view that the case study material will have a wider appeal. Of course, not every case study was at the same point in the development of the spatial planning process. Nevertheless, this process of sharing elements of practice received positive feedback from the participants in the study.

1. Effective Spatial Planning – Its Context and Practice

1.5 Study approach and methodology

One of the key objectives of the study was to define spatial planning. Planners recognise the term as representing a different style of planning from that which went before. The study was designed to determine whether this understanding could be stated in ways which could be communicated not only within the planning profession, but also more widely to those who will be working with planners, and in some cases will be dependent on spatial planning to meet their own service or infrastructure requirements.

Initially two reviews were undertaken, which are available as background papers to this study¹. In the first, the planners' view of spatial planning drawn from planning's traditions, legacy and hinterland was set out. In this the view of spatial planning is almost completely defined by its reference to planning systems and processes from the past.

We thought that this was an important review to undertake as it would help to support ways of defining and describing the new components of spatial planning to planners steeped in this history.

We are also aware that whilst planners have been focussing on the new legislation and the performance of their development management functions, there has been massive reform in the wider public sector which has been changing at least if not more quickly than planning. Thus a second approach was to review the role of spatial planning within its wider public sector context. Spatial Planning has an important role in the wider public sector and this has been strengthened during the course of the study. Integration of the LDF Core Strategy within the Sustainable Community Strategy is proposed in the Local Government White Paper as being best practice and will need to be considered². New guidance on the relationships between LDFs and SCSs entitled *Planning Together* has also been published³. New Guidance on the preparation of SCS is also expected during 2007 to reinforce the converging operational roles⁴.

The 2004 Act and the accompanying tests of soundness⁵ for Development Plan Documents place some very specific outcomes on the LDF which are now increasingly locked into a merging public sector at the local level. This is characterised by Local Strategic Partnerships, Local Area Agreements and Sustainable Community Strategies, with Multi Area Agreements and City Development Companies to follow. The methods of performance management in the local public sector are also changing. This will have further effects on the LDF process such as the proposed changes to the ways in which community involvement is to be assessed. The Local Government White Paper⁶ is proposing that examination of the statement of Community Involvement is moved from the LDF process to sit within the authority wide processes of assessing community participation and involvement as part of Comprehensive Area Assessment⁷.

¹ Refer to the two papers here.

² CLG 2006 Strong and Prosperous Communities para 5.63.

³ Planning Together Jan 2007 CLG.

⁴ ODPM Nov 2005 Local Strategic Partnerships: Shaping their Future a consultation draft.

⁵ PINS A Guide to the Process of Assessing the Soundness of Development Plan Documents.

⁶ CLG 2006 Strong and Prosperous Communities para 5.11.

⁷ CLG 2006 Strong and Prosperous Communities para 6.46.

1.6 What is spatial planning?

Spatial planning has been defined as critical thinking about space and place as a basis for action or intervention⁸. The origin of the term stems from European spatial planning practices, particularly the exercise for the preparation of the European Spatial Development Perspective in 1999, and was used for that exercise to emphasise a process of planning that was something more than the land use regulatory and zoning practices of individual Member States. Cullingworth and Nadin (2006: 91) define spatial planning as “coordination or integration of the spatial dimension of sectoral policies through a territorial based strategy”, by establishing better coordination on territorial impacts “horizontally across different sectors, vertically among different levels of jurisdiction, and geographically across administrative boundaries”.

Within England and Wales, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act provides a new opportunity for the development of spatial planning. The 2004 Act provides for two levels of plan making:

- **Regional Spatial Strategies** – At the regional level Regional Planning Bodies prepare a Regional Spatial Strategy which identifies major regional development priorities.
- **Local Development Frameworks** – At the local level Local Planning Authorities prepare a Local Development Framework – a folder of documents that sets out a vision for the future and a spatially based planning strategy for achieving it.

In introducing the new system, the Government was clear that profound changes to the culture and practices of planning were required for it to succeed.

Scotland is also undergoing planning reform and encompassing the concept of spatial planning. Planning has the purpose of contributing to the delivery of sustainable development. The new planning framework is intended to create a robust system for the future of planning. The renewed emphasis on a purpose for planning through legislative change provides motivation to professionals, developers and planning users. It is important to consider how visionary planning can be developed to meet the needs of a range of stakeholders, to ensure the delivery of sustainable development and sustainable communities, and to shape places that people feel proud of (ODPM, 2004).

In order to capitalize on this new motivation within planning, the term spatial planning is useful in both expressing a shift beyond a traditional idea of land-use planning and describing many aspects of planning practices that provide proactive possibilities for the management of change, including policy-making, policy integration, community participation, agency stakeholding, and development management⁹.

As part of this study, a report was prepared which considers the origins and use of spatial planning to date. It commences with a review of the European origin of spatial planning, and its application and applicability to the UK, and then considers wider governmental and institutional changes – including devolution, decentralisation, and modernisation – that have been underway in parallel to planning reforms and which have been instrumental in the development of the concept of spatial planning¹⁰.

⁸ RTPI Education Commission Report 2002.

⁹ M. Tewdwr-Jones 2004.

¹⁰ M. Tewdwr-Jones 2007.

1. Effective Spatial Planning – Its Context and Practice

1.7 How is Spatial Planning different from what went before?

The term 'Spatial Planning' encompasses land use planning and statutory planning and it is not appropriate to see them as different and distinct elements of spatial planning. Such a distinction does not help in the understanding of the step change that there has been in the planning system since 2004.

The Development Plan system, as set out in the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 was plan-led, and, in purely land use terms, offered a clearer system with more certainty than that which went before. However, the pre 2004 system was still seen to be slow and unresponsive and set apart from other parts of local government¹¹.

The main problems with the preceding system were that:

- the system was too complex difficult to understand;
- provided unclear rules about planning consents;
- delays and uncertainty;
- weak community engagement;
- legalistic process;
- local authorities were advised by the Planning Inspectorate.

Following the 2004 Act, the key principles of spatial planning were set out by the Planning Inspectorate as part of their tests of soundness for spatial planning and are¹²:

- flexibility;
- strengthening community and stakeholder involvement;
- front loading [i.e. seeking consensus on essential issues early in the process];
- the use of sustainability appraisal in the preparation of local development documents;
- efficient programme management;
- soundness in plan content and the process by which the plans are produced.

The new approach offers a different style. The LDF offers a portfolio of documents which provides a single source of information on the local authority's planning policies. The new system requires a far greater integration with the local public sector and maintains its role in the delivery of regional policy and targets. The LDF is now to be joined by the Sustainable Community Strategy in achieving these outcomes¹³. Specific site allocations have to be made on the proposals map and these need to be derived from clear evidence that is provided at the beginning of the process rather than produced as evidence when the local authority is challenged. The documents in the LDF have to be scrutinised for soundness by the Planning Inspectorate [PINS] which has provided full guidance on how to undertake this process¹⁴. The local authority cannot challenge the Planning Inspectorate's decisions.

¹¹ B. Cullingworth and V. Nadin *Town and Country Planning* 14th ed. Routledge 2006

¹² *Development Plan Examination – A Guide to the Process of Assessing the Soundness of Development Plan Documents* PINS December 2005.

¹³ *Strong and Prosperous Communities* CLG 2006.

¹⁴ *Development Plan Examination – A Guide to the Process of Assessing the Soundness of Development Plan Documents* PINS December 2005.

1.8 The Principles of Spatial Planning

Spatial planning is a positive force to guide change. The partners involved in spatial policy-making recognise that better quality and more informed planning can be achieved with public, private and voluntary sectors working together both to develop new planning policy and to co-ordinate action to achieve sustainable development.

In the review of spatial planning undertaken for this study, the principles of spatial planning may be viewed as:

- **Broad-ranging**, concerning the assessment of the spatial dimensions of various activities and sectors, and interactions between them;
- **Visionary**, by opening up planning to a range of participants, and by relating processes of planning policy-making to notions of place;
- **Integrating**, through bringing together spatial issues relating to the development and use of land, and the users of planning;
- **Deliverable**, applying strategy to programmes for action, through proactive processes, involving coordination and choreography between different over-lapping sectors and resources; and
- **Participative**, where planning is a facilitator and dependent on new forms of partnership and engagement with a range of bodies, stakeholders, businesses and communities.

Spatial planning is the core component in the delivery of sustainable development. It is also a core component in shaping and delivering places. Spatial planning is the process concerned with the co-ordination of strategy and policy, with the active involvement of people, business and communities, and with land use and physical development in the public interest. Spatial planning can occur at any governmental level, from European, to national, to regional, strategic and local; it may be a strategic exercise, a local partnership process, or a community-centred activity. **A successful planning framework is one that is layered, integrated, and dynamic. Spatial planning is multi-dimensional, linking development to place, time, and the agents of change. An important principle of spatial planning is that it avoids narrow, exclusive and disjointed practices. It is outcome-focused, but also programme-based.** Spatial planning relates the implications of potential development on particular locations with explanation and prediction.

1.9 Defining spatial planning

We have found that there is an evolving understanding of what spatial planning means in practice. There are already a number of emerging definitions that are not yet conveying the full meaning to a wide cross section of people. Rather than prepare another definition, we have attempted to provide an understanding of what is associated with the concept of spatial planning so that it can be understood by what it does.

We have found that spatial planning can be summarised as follows:

Spatial planning is the practice of place shaping and delivery at all spatial scales and it aims to:

- **Enable** a vision for the future of regions and places that is based on evidence, local distinctiveness and community derived objectives.
- **Translate** this vision into a set of policies, priorities, programmes and land allocations together with the public sector resources to deliver them.
- **Create** a framework for private investment and regeneration that promotes economic, environmental and social well being for the area.
- **Coordinate and deliver** the public sector components of this vision with other agencies and processes [eg LAAs and MAAs].

2. The Spatial Planning Context

In this section of the report we have undertaken a review of the changing context for the operation of spatial planning particularly within a dynamic public sector. Public Service Reform and the increasing pressure for an integrated focus on places and people defines a new role for spatial planning which is discussed in more detail in the rest of the report. In 2.1-2.5 we examine the contextual changes for spatial planning and in 2.6-2.9 we examine their implications on the role of spatial planning in practice.

2.1 The study context

A major part of the study has been about understanding not only what spatial planning is in practice but also what is expected of it in the emerging framework of the public sector going forward for the next 5-10 years. The development of spatial planning has been part of a wider programme of public service reform at all levels, including devolution, changes in local government and the health service. At local level, local authorities are now charged with the leading role of place shaping, which encompasses all aspects of life in their areas¹⁵. These changes are set within an increasing focus on localised or decentralised solutions¹⁶ within frameworks set by each of the four administrations for England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. The way in which they are implemented in each country varies but there is a distinct and common thread in the role of localist solutions.

A second major common thread is the growing trend to join up the public sector from the perspective of the user, whether this is an individual, a community, a business or a place as a major programme of public service reform¹⁷.

This is being manifest in a variety of ways including the duty of public bodies to cooperate in Scotland [soon to be extended to England], the implementation of Local Area Agreements in England and the Review of Public Administration in Northern Ireland. Such approaches are designed to reduce both the public's frustrations in having to deal with a variety of public agencies and also as part of a process of reducing back office costs and working more efficiently. This approach is being supported by a more joined up approach to setting performance indicators and outcome targets so that Government Departments, Agencies and local authorities can demonstrate how they are achieving common outcomes.

The reform of the public sector is a continuing process. The next stages are being developed through the process being adopted for the Public Sector Spending Review SR07 undertaken by the Treasury. Public service investment plans are for three year periods that start 2 years after each Spending Review. Hence, in this case, SR07 will be implemented 2009-2012. Each Spending Review is accompanied by a series of independent reports which are commissioned to inform longer term national spending. In the current Spending Review process, the independent reviews that have been commissioned have a direct or strong relational impact on spatial planning. We have reviewed these below in order to understand the likely future impacts of public service reform on the spatial planning agenda.

¹⁵ The Lyons Inquiry into Local Government National prosperity, local choice and civic engagement
A new partnership between central and local Government for the 21st Century May 2006; Strong and Prosperous
Communities Local Government White Paper CLG October 2006.

¹⁶ 2004 HMT Devolved Decision Making 2 Regions; 2006 HMT Devolved Decision Making 3: Cities.

¹⁷ 2006 Cabinet Office Public Service Reform.

The most direct implications are expected to come from the Barker Review but others included here on regulation, transport, climate change, place shaping and customer services all have a strong impact.

HMT Reviews for SR07 with relevance for spatial planning

Barker	Land Use Planning.
Davidson	Implementation of EU legislation.
Eddington	Transport Study.
Hampton	Regulation and Enforcement.
Leitch	Review of Skills.
Lyons	Inquiry into Local Government.
Stern	Economics of Climate Change.
Varney	Citizen and Business focussed Services.

See: www.hm-treasury.gov.uk

At the same time, other Central Government reforms, including of local government, are also focussing on the future and have a relationship with the outcome of the Spending Review. The Local Government White Paper and the future of City Regions¹⁸ are cases in point. The next section of the Report reviews each of these key contextual changes and analyses the implications for the implementation of spatial planning in the coming period. Effective practice needs to understand and muster these changes to the advantage of places, their people and their economies.

2.2 The changing requirements on planning

In many public service sectors, the Government has identified the expectations it has of them and planning is no exception to this. The acknowledgement that spatial planning has a new and wider role than the development plan and development control approaches that have gone before is also understood and set out clearly in PPS1.

Central Government has also stated that it expects spatial planning to work together within the local authority with the Community Strategy, to be renamed the Sustainable Community Strategy [SCS]¹⁹. Spatial Planning is expected to have a role in the delivery of the Sustainable Community Strategy particularly in the way it can support the delivery of public sector infrastructure through resource management as laid out in more detail in the LDF Tests of Soundness as operated by PINS²⁰.

The Government's main policy objectives for planning²¹ are:

- to support housing growth in the areas identified for such growth;
- to support regeneration/market renewal in other areas;
- to ensure that all development is socially, economically and environmentally sustainable;
- to move from the periphery to the centre of the council's activity; and
- to deliver change more quickly.

¹⁸ CLG 2006 Strong and Prosperous Communities chapter 4; The Role of City Development Companies in English Cities and City-Regions A Consultation CLG December 2006.

¹⁹ See CLG 2006 Strong and Prosperous Communities para 5.11.

²⁰ PINS A Guide to the Process of Assessing the Soundness of Development Plan Documents.

²¹ Taken from The Planning System Matching Expectations and Capacity Audit Commission February 2006.

2. The Spatial Planning Context

Those engaged in planning have frequently commented that the requirements for planning policies and development management decisions to be undertaken more speedily are in conflict with other objectives. The Audit Commission²² examined these concerns and found that there were some potential tensions in the system both in terms of speed of decision making and the emphasis on economic growth. However, the Audit Commission concludes that these tensions are inherent in the system and planning is the framework within which these differing requirements and expectations are decided.

There are also more requirements for the community to be involved in making decisions about its own locality's future, whether through discussion on planning matters or in other areas such as crime prevention or environmental maintenance. A recent study of levels of satisfaction with local government has shown that just over 20% of people are satisfied with the opportunities available for them to participate in local decision making which contrasts with a third who are dissatisfied²³.

2.2.1 The Lyons Inquiry into Local Government

The Lyons Inquiry into Local Government has had a number of key issues to consider as it moves towards recommendations on local authority funding for the future. One of its studies²⁴ has been concentrated on what local authorities are for both now and in a more developed future. The Inquiry has identified the key role for local authorities as being 'place shaping', which is defined as including:

- building and shaping local identity;
- representing the community;
- regulating harmful and disruptive behaviours;
- maintaining the cohesiveness of the community;
- helping to resolve disagreements;
- working to make the local economy more successful;
- understanding local needs and preferences and making sure that the right services are provided to local people; and
- working with other bodies to respond to complex challenges.

The Lyons Inquiry has identified that local authorities need to improve their capability in place shaping and to provide leadership for influencing and affecting things beyond their more narrowly defined legal responsibilities. The Report considers ways in which place shaping can be developed whilst promoting the economic, social and environmental well being, including the way in which local authorities can bring a cohesive approach within the locality to the totality of public services.

The Inquiry recommends that local authorities need to engage in a number of activities for successful place shaping, including:

- Good leadership.
- Building coalitions and consensus about the direction of travel with other agencies and the private sector.
- Effective public and community engagement.
- Effective use of powers.

²² The Planning System Matching Expectations and Capacity Audit Commission February 2006.

²³ CLG 2006 User Satisfaction and Local Government Service Provision: A national survey para 61.

²⁴ National prosperity, local choice and local government for the 21st century HMT May 2006.

2.2.2 The Barker Review of Land Use Planning

The Barker Review has put forward a number of detailed proposals for the future of land use planning which are being considered before being taken forward into a Planning White Paper in 2007. The key focus of the report is that planning should take a positive approach to supporting economic growth which can also support social and environmental objectives. A positive culture for planning decision making is seen to be important. On the other hand it also proposes fiscal measures for dealing with assets held in the private sector and a more rigorous approach to public sector property assets which may be currently underused. The effective utilisation of all public sector assets – central government, local government, agencies and other bodies is also a key focus in the Varney Review [see below] and also is promised to be the subject of further initiatives during 2007, likely to be associated with the Lyons Inquiry on local government finance.

Whilst recommending a more positive planning culture, Barker also recommends that the status of the Chief Planner should be enhanced in the local authority to ensure that they are helping to deliver the outcomes that the Sustainable Community Strategy will have within it. At regional level, Barker supports a much stronger integration between Regional Spatial Strategies and Regional Economic Strategies.

2.2.3 Hampton

The Hampton Review of Regulation²⁵ has been undertaken to assess and where possible reduce the burden of regulation on business and also to make sure that where regulation exists it does so to help to meet social objectives. It proposes a risk based approach and its key principles have been enshrined in The Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006. In this Act the principle of supporting economic progress has to be taken into account by regulators and to further intervene only where there is a clear case for protection.

The Hampton Review recognises that 80% of all regularity inspections are undertaken by local authorities and proposes that a Local Better Regulation Office [LBRO] be set up by the end of 2007. It also proposed that local authorities group their regulatory activities thematically so as to reduce the time spent with businesses and also to ensure that a risk based approach is adopted locally in a manner consistent with other local authorities. The Review is also supporting the reduction of multiple forms and better data exchange between government organisations, moving towards a more central/local approach to thematic regulation.

The implications of Hampton for the planning process are seen to be most easily connected to the development management process. However, a more joined up approach for information collection and sharing could have a significant contribution to play in the generation of more effective spatial planning.


There are seen to be increased benefits in public sector organisations working from the same information base whether this is the Environment Agency, the Housing Corporation or the local authority. Further the ability of public sector organisations to communicate electronically using the same information can also add greatly to the efficiency of managing planning business processes, thus making more resource available for other tasks.

²⁵ HMT/The Cabinet Office Implementing Hampton: from enforcement to compliance November 2006

2. The Spatial Planning Context

2.2.4 Varney on citizen and business focussed services

The Varney Report²⁶ makes recommendations on the transformation of public services through the joining up of delivery to citizens and businesses. The report reviews the way in which access channels can be better focussed on the needs of the citizen and business [the user] rather than being structured by the service provider [the producer]. The report recommends a variety of actions on delivery which will have considerable impact on spatial planning delivery. In order to join up services around individual users, the Varney Report uses the Amazon²⁷ model and translates it for the public sector. This will enable individual users to be able to track their service requests and regulatory processes in real time, and include such things as planning applications.



²⁶ Service Transformation: a better deal for citizens and businesses, a better deal for the tax payer December 2006.

²⁷ See www.amazon.co.uk which has user name recognition, multiple suppliers through a single hub and ability of customers to track their transactions in a secure environment.

In order to achieve these joined up approaches the report suggests a variety of reforms, particularly in the way in which public services are delivered. At the citizen facing end, then re-engineering Directgov²⁸ is proposed for web delivery led by the Department of Work and Pensions [DWP]. For telephone contact, a review of call centres and their accreditation is proposed. Finally for face to face, the report is proposing a major review of the delivery of all public services and, as a consequence, a review of their property holdings in towns and cities across the country [see opposite in the diagram taken from the Varney Review].

In order to assist the rationalisation of property assets and their subsequent release, particularly in urban areas, Central Government is moving to place all asset registers within the ePIMS information schema²⁹. ePIMS is the property information management system for all property assets owned or leased by Government departments and agencies and enables all the information to be held in a dynamic form that can be used to review holdings to enhance business efficiency and effectiveness. It can also help in the reutilisation of assets for regeneration and other purposes. If local authorities used ePIMS for their land and property holdings then it would be possible to review outlets for service delivery and large sites for development where ownership is spread across the public sector. It could provide a significant release of brownfield land for development purposes. The use of the ePIMS schema for all publicly owned property asset registers could be highly beneficial for effective spatial planning.

2.2.5 Eddington

The Eddington Transport Study was commissioned to examine the longer term links between transport and the UK's productivity, growth and stability, within the Government's broader commitment to sustainable development. The reports findings can be summarised as:

- To meet the changing needs of the UK economy, Government should focus policy and sustained investment on improving the performance of existing transport networks, in those places which are important for the UK's economic success;
- Over the next 20 years, the three strategic economic priorities for transport policy should be: congested and growing city catchments; key interurban corridors and the key international gateways that are showing signs of increasing congestion and unreliability;
- Government should adopt a sophisticated policy mix to meet both economic and environmental goals. Policy should get the prices right [especially congestion pricing on the roads and environmental pricing across all modes] and make best use of existing networks;
- The Government, together with the private sector, should deliver sustained and targeted infrastructure investment in those schemes which demonstrate high returns, including smaller schemes tackling pinch points;
- The policy process needs to be rigorous and systematic to consider the full range of modal options and to ensure that spending is focused on the best policies; and
- Government needs to ensure that delivery system is ready to meet future challenges, including through reform of sub-national governance arrangements, new arrangements for the regulation of the bus sector, and reforming the planning process for major transport projects by introducing a new independent Planning Commission to take decisions on projects of strategic importance.

²⁸ See www.direct.gov.uk

²⁹ www.epims.ogc.gov.uk

³⁰ Taken from Promoting economic prosperity: considering the implications of Eddington, Barker and Leitch Questions for stakeholders posed by the Lyons Inquiry into local government December 2006.

2. The Spatial Planning Context

The implications for local government are important and the Lyons Inquiry has asked how local authorities can help asking a series of questions about the combined use of Barker and Eddington including:

- How can local authorities work in partnership to deliver transport outcomes?
- How can local authorities use their 'convening' powers to link transport and economic development at the local level?
- What transport funding sources are best delivered at the local level?
- How can local authorities retain the revenues from local road pricing schemes?

2.2.6 Stern

The Stern review on climate change³¹ has examined the growing evidence of climate change and complex policy challenges which follow. The Review recommends strong and early action to deal with climate change through a variety of means. In considering a policy approach to dealing with climate change, three approaches are proposed:

- Carbon pricing.
- Technology.
- Removal of barriers to behavioural change.

In achieving change, the Review proposes a central role for spatial planning and new guidance on this issue is expected from CLG during 2007.

2.3 Public Infrastructure Programmes and Provision

Infrastructure funds for regions and growth areas were first introduced in 2004. They have since been developing to a point where, for example in the South East, a Regional Implementation Programme supported by the Regional Infrastructure Fund [RIF] is ready to be examined as part of the RSS. In the SW, the region has been attempting to set up a fund to pre-invest in infrastructure. The Community Infrastructure Fund [CIF] has also been established for the four key growth areas identified in the Sustainable Communities Plan and has now been extended to the additional Growth areas.

The establishment of this approach for infrastructure planning demonstrates two key trends which are also emerging at local level. The first is the development of an infrastructure programme for the area under consideration which contains those elements appropriate to its scale. The second is the development of an infrastructure fund generated from local resources rather than being reliant on the additional funds which have been provided for RIF and CIF.

These local contributing funds can be summarised as:

- LA capital Programme including education.
- PCT capital programme.
- Highways Agency funding.
- Regional Infrastructure Fund [RIF].
- RDA funding.
- EU funding [this approach should go towards meeting territorial cohesion requirements].
- S106 agreements.
- PGS [when implemented].
- Environmental taxes [when implemented].

³¹ Economics of climate change 2006 www.hmt.gov.uk

- Gershon efficiency savings [which are all retained by the Ia].
- Prudential borrowing.
- Land and buildings in the ownership of the members of LIG.
- Other public sector land and buildings e.g. MOD, DWP, Universities, Utilities, SHAs.
- Devolved community assets³².
- Income raised from more beneficial asset management³³.
- Tax or charges levied on land remaining underdeveloped³⁴.
- Interest on existing funds.
- Heritage lottery funds.
- Locally raised funding.
- Privately owned land.

2.4 Local Government White Paper

The Local Government White Paper 'Strong and Prosperous Communities' was published in October 2006. The key themes within the White Paper are about joining up local authorities and the wider public sector around people, places and businesses, with the longer term economic growth of the country as the basis for the proposed reforms on governance, efficiency and integration. Planners have not been accustomed to viewing local government as a vehicle for reform of the planning system but this time, the role of spatial planning is one of the key delivery means to achieve these reforms. The changes in the planning system are therefore proposed to ensure that it is fit for purpose in this more central role. The White Paper identifies the main contributions which spatial planning, through the LDF, will be delivering: and the subsequent re-alignments:

- Local authorities will have the leading role in place shaping which extends across communities and places including anti social behaviour, educational attainment and the physical environment.
- The Sustainable Community Strategy will incorporate the Core Strategy of the LDF as one of its components to enable the public sector to tackle issues which are significant in each place.
- The SCS, LDF and other significant local plans, policies and programmes will spring from a common local public sector evidence base.
- Through the SCS, Local Strategic Partnerships of key organisations working in an area will drive Local Area Agreements between central government and a local area that set out the area's funding priorities, and they will contribute to the Multi Area Agreements in City Regions and elsewhere. Public bodies will have a duty to cooperate in this process. In short, the SCS will set out the strategic vision of the place and the LAA will be the delivery plan.
- The LAA will be the contract between local and central government and will form the basis for the new Comprehensive Area Assessment.
- The requirements for the SCS to be subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment will be reinforced.
- The local authority will have a central role in delivering the Regional Economic Strategy and Regional Spatial Strategy through these means.
- The local authority will provide a contribution towards a cross agency place delivery programme. The LDF and development management teams will be one of the main means of ensuring the delivery of this programme. This will be through the role of the LDF in ensuring resources are agreed for delivery as one of the tests of soundness.

³² CLG LG White Paper.

³³ CLG LG White Paper 2006; Varney 2006.

³⁴ As proposed in Barker.

2. The Spatial Planning Context

- The resource envelope is likely to contain capital programmes of local public sector bodies [within and beyond the LAA as a single pot], funding derived from better management of public assets, Gershon year on year efficiency savings, planning gain, environmental taxes and the local funding supplied by national and regional public bodies.
- As part of this resource management and delivery role, housing, homelessness and transport strategies will be aligned with the LDF.
- Local authorities and other public sector bodies will be expected to deliver their services through their role as commissioners; this will include professional and direct delivery services.
- In sub-regions, city regions and other areas where the economic footprint suggests common working, an MAA will be formed to include the LAAs of the local authorities within the area. This is likely to including common working on the core strategies and on planning implementation for policy and programmes for delivery in the authorities covered by the MAA
- Delivery and implementation of the local authority components is to be lead by the Executive who will be promoting the schemes and projects within the council.
- Public consultation as evidenced through a Statement of Community Involvement will be incorporated in the cross co-ordinated local authority engagement strategy and performance assessed as part of the whole programme of public involvement.
- In recognition of the importance of this role, it is strongly advised that each local authority has a planner at management team level.

These changes have considerable implications for the function and role of planning as it will be practised within a whole local authority and public sector context. Planning will need to rejoin the mainstream of public sector reform now occurring at the local level and recognise its role as the key delivery agent of local public sector investment.

2.5 Planning Together

Following the publication of an ODPM consultation paper on the future of Local Strategic Partnerships³⁵, in November 2005, which discussed the future potential relationships between the LDF and Community Strategy in each local authority, the RTPI was commissioned by ODPM to write *Planning Together, LSPs and Spatial Planning a practical guide*³⁶. The short practical guide is primarily intended for Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs), of organisations from the public, private, community and voluntary sector within a local authority area. LSPs have an increasing role in the preparation and use of the Sustainable Community Strategy [SCS]. It focuses on the strategic leadership role of local authorities in shaping good places and delivering better local services.

The Guide provides a common level of understanding, addresses the interrelationships between the two policy areas, identifies practical ways to effectively work together and briefly looks at how planning can contribute to improving outcomes, for example, those associated with climate change, health and wellbeing and social inclusion.

The Guide has been prepared with the aid of a CLG steering group, including representatives from Planning, Cross Cutting Government, LSP and Culture Change teams and a practitioner sounding board. Lead authors and participants in the EPiSP and Planning Together projects have contributed to both projects.

³⁵ Local Strategic Partnerships: Shaping their future Consultation Paper ODPM 2005.

³⁶ Planning Together LSPs and Spatial Planning: a practical guide CLG 2007.

2.6 Implications of these changes for Public Sector Reform and integration

The first part of this section of the report has concentrated on the nature and volume of the public sector reforms. We now go on to examine their more detailed implications for spatial planning in practice.

The volume of reviews and change going on in the public sector is considerable and is likely to continue. Change is now a constant. It has some essential key features which stretch across all the reports reviewed here as well as others which mean that public sector bodies at the local level are being drawn closer together in a variety of ways to provide a joined up service to citizens and businesses. The characteristics of these approaches include:

- Community led from the outset.
- Common and shared evidence base.
- Common understanding of local distinctiveness.
- Common outcomes set out in SCS.
- Common delivery programme.
- Common delivery channels and outlets.
- Common [and reduced] back office processes.
- Common delivery group LSP through the LAA.
- Common performance management processes.
- Aligned budgets moving to pooled budgets.
- Community and stakeholder management through LSPs.
- Devolved responsibilities for central government services.
- Managing more locally to achieve sustainable outcomes.

Spatial planning has an effective role to play in all of these processes as part of the public sector delivery team. It will be able to contribute to and use the evidence. It will be able to prepare the delivery programme and also be able to provide and coordinate much of the funding available to deliver the outcomes. However, spatial planning will need to be strongly aligned to development management to ensure that the delivery is occurring and also be able to be a member of the wider team engaged in the process of co-production in the delivery of tomorrow's places.

2.7 Spatial Planning within a modernised public sector

One of the key roles for spatial planning is to contribute to shaping and delivering places, through the variety of ways in which it intervenes. These may range from the contribution of the specific decision on a planning application through to master planning or the generation of larger scale new communities. Every planning intervention has a positive contribution to make to the quality of place and both the community and planners are keen guardians of this contribution. However, planning is not the only contributor to the sense of place and its quality. Other factors are important to citizens and communities such as crime prevention, the provision of good health and improved public transport and planning has a key role in these services as well [see Box 1].

2. The Spatial Planning Context

Box 1

Aspects important in making somewhere a good place to live*

*All respondents

	%		%
Level of crime	48	Local cost of living	12
Clean streets	34	Road and pavement repairs	12
Health services	34	Level of pollution	11
Affordable decent housing	27	Traffic noise/level of noise	10
Education provision	25	Cultural facilities	10
Activities/facilities for teenagers	21	Sports and leisure facilities	8
Public transport	21	Community activities	7
Parks and open spaces	20	Street lighting	6
Activities/facilities for young children	17	Wage levels	5
Access to nature	17	Childcare provision	5
Job prospects	16	Race relations	3
Shopping facilities	15	Other	1
Level of traffic congestion	13	Not provided	16



Unweighted sample base = 4,462

Source: User Satisfaction and Local Government Service Provision National Survey

CLG 2006

The requirements on planning to work as part of a wider group of public services to improve the quality of place are growing. In this study we are concentrating on spatial planning and how this is implemented through a variety of means. We can see from the review of the changes in the public sector that spatial planning has a strong role to play as part of this public service team supporting this delivery. Spatial planning's role may not yet be fully understood amongst its own practitioners or the wider public sector community yet we have seen effective practice where these relationships are more mature and developed. The understanding of this role is a key underpinning factor in effective practice in spatial planning.

We have represented these relationships in three diagrams that show the new position of spatial planning in its public sector context:



2. The Spatial Planning Context

Diagram 2 Definitions


Spatial Vision is more than the sum of the parts – a stretching but attainable future.

People's view of place includes quality of street environment, Anti-social behaviour, open space provision, road safety etc i.e. what is important to them about place.

Requirements on place includes national policies and standards [in new format post 2008?], RSS, public sector plans and requirements.

Trends to be managed and harnessed include manage positive and negative growth.

The Place includes inherent quality and character, landscape, role and function.



2.8 Current guidance/fitness for purpose

Given all these changes and a clearer definition of spatial planning's central role in the modern public sector, one aspect of our work has been to consider the availability of guidance and toolkits to enable local authorities to understand these emerging roles and requirements.

A review of the relevant Planning Policy Statements [1, 11 and 12] show that the key elements of the new spatial planning system are contained within them as would be expected. This is expressed through the links to achieving better outcomes for localities through Sustainable Community Strategies. The balance of content in PPS1 focuses on achieving *sustainable* development through the spatial planning process. There is little additional material in PPS 1 or 12 of the delivery role of spatial planning. The PPS provide more guidance on the process than the outcome and it is this balance which is guiding practice. However, the purpose of the spatial planning system and the tests of soundness concentrate more on the outcome of the process rather than the process itself. The role of spatial planning in delivering sustainable communities is fundamental and is part of the wider delivery processes clearly set out for Local Area Agreements³⁷. This common requirement should help when Sustainable Community Strategies and Core Strategies in LDFs are brought more closely together in process and outcome³⁸.

³⁷ LGA and Defra Sustainable communities A shared agenda, a share of the action A guide of local authorities 2006.

³⁸ See Planning Together CLG 2007; Strong and Prosperous Communities CLG 2006.

Central Government issues Planning Policy Statements [PPSs] to form the basis of the planning system, and they are used together with legislation to create the planning system. Given this leading role, it is important that PPSs are up to date and accurately reflect what is required of planning at the local level. At present PPSs reflect planning requirements anticipated when they were written but they have not kept pace with the changing requirements on the spatial planning system within the reformed public sector. Various additional statements and letters have been made by CLG and its predecessor to amplify guidance. Additional guidance has been given on specific aspects [such as Sustainability Appraisal and Monitoring], but that has not made the role of spatial planning clearer.

Until PPS reflect the requirements of spatial planning that includes this wider public sector role, as identified above and in this report, then effective practice is going to be potentially undermined at worst and slow to catch on at best. In practice, planners use PPSs to demonstrate what they are required to achieve to their Chief Executives and Councillors. It is currently difficult for them to illustrate their role and contribution to shaping and delivering places from the guidance set out in the current PPS 12. We have concluded that PPSs are a key area for review by CLG.

A further concern is that the tests of soundness as set out by PINS are clear but are not sufficiently related to the PPS. We provide one example of this below in the section about resources for implementation. Test viii of the Planning Inspectorate's Tests of Soundness³⁹ requires that the Core Strategy has to demonstrate that the resources for implementation have been agreed with other public bodies e.g. the Highways Agency or the PCT. However there is little discussion of that in the PPS and local authorities are not commencing preparatory work to meet this test of soundness.

Public bodies and agencies are not sufficiently aware of the requirements of the new system and the obligations placed on them in terms of capital resource and infrastructure planning. The proposed duty on English public bodies to cooperate⁴⁰ will remove some of the current barriers to cooperation but little has been done to develop the awareness of these other agencies to these changes since the implementation of the 2004 Act.

More work should be done with public agencies to alert them to their necessary participation in these processes at the local level and we address how this can be implemented at the local level later in this report. Other guidance and toolkits advocate gaining wider corporate buy into the spatial planning process from the outset⁴¹ but it is difficult to obtain this if there is little preparation of the corporate management team and we are of the view that this needs to be addressed more consistently than hitherto and have made specific recommendations on this point.

2.9 Spatial Plans in Practice [SPiP]

The SPiP project, which is being progressed by CLG in parallel with this study aims to assess how the planning reforms for local development frameworks are being put into practice and how these changes are helping to achieve Government objectives. It is a long term study and will not be completed until December 2007. The SPiP is considering the delivery of the LDF primarily within a 'planning' rather than wider public sector context. It is concentrating on the way in which LDF documents are being delivered rather than the use of the LDF for delivering place shaping outcomes in localities. Its concerns with resources are focussing on the task in hand rather than resources for implementation of the fixed assets of the locality. It is also primarily focussed on planning requirements rather than being set within the wider public sector framework in which local authority activities now sit including LSPs and LAAs.

³⁹ PINS A Guide to the Process of Assessing the Soundness of Development Plan Documents.

⁴⁰ CLG 2006 Strong and Prosperous Communities.

⁴¹ See www.pas.gov.uk

2. The Spatial Planning Context

Although SPiP has not completed its work, it has already reported some key findings⁴²:

- An appropriate relationship between the SCS and LDF has yet to be found, with the SCS offering a low level of significant influence on the LDF.
- A sound comprehensive and credible evidence base is required to underpin the process.
- Within local authorities, it is the housing and regeneration functions which are most engaged.
- External partners are taking longer to engage in the process.
- Relationships with partners such as health are seen to be difficult.
- Local authorities need to develop their relationships internally to encourage better joint working.
- The LSP should be used to support the stakeholder engagement.
- Engagement with other sectors should be on the basis of how the spatial plan can help deliver their aspirations rather than only helping to prepare the local authority's spatial plan.
- More strategic engagement across boundaries needs to be considered.

The work of this project supports these findings as helping to define effective practice. The key difference between the two project findings as yet would be the extent to which SPiP is identifying the level of integrated working required for effective delivery as an issue. This study sees this as one of the major elements of the system since 2004 and one that most planners and others have yet to recognise as part of planning's place shaping and delivery role.

⁴² See PAS Spatial Plans in Practice Reports on www.communities.gov.uk reform of the planning system section.

3. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning – What we found

In this section of the report we have used the context for spatial planning as outlined in the preceding section and findings from the study to develop a fuller understanding of effective spatial planning. We have provided an analysis of what is required of spatial planning and now we turn to the ways in which spatial planning is responding. Where appropriate, we have included references to specific case studies which are to be found at the end of the report.

3.1 Effective spatial planning – some defining characteristics

Spatial Planning is playing a key role in the new approach to local governance, place shaping and public sector reform and it is possible to see these changes already emerging in practice around the UK. We have noticed that effective spatial planning **starts with the community**. Scoping, master planning, visioning, and using parish plan processes all contribute to a strong role for community led planning from the outset. This is as true for local as regional spatial planning processes. The voluntary and community sector can also be more frequently involved if their role is supported through the local voluntary sector compact⁴³ which all local authorities possess. Making early progress on a community led approach need specialist help and assistance in the same way as any other specific tasks such as housing needs or retail assessment. It also needs to be entirely within the local authority's own mechanisms for running these processes and reporting on feedback. Authority wide consultation management, using tools like Acknowledge⁴⁴, which have been developed by local government for this purpose, can support this work considerably and help build public trust and confidence.

For illustration, see Case Studies 1 – 6



We have found that spatial planning is more effective when planners are more **proactive** within the local authority and the wider public sector, as represented by the Local Strategic Partnership. At the same time, a more proactive approach from those leading on the Sustainable Community Strategy is also an important component and we found some authorities where this is working. However, joint working between LDF and Community Strategy teams could best be described as immature at the present time and we did not find any local authority where these processes were merged. In some cases, LDF and SCS teams seemed both to be working with the same set of organisations but in parallel universes.

For illustration, see Case Study 22



At **regional** level, in the preparation and delivery of the RSS, public engagement throughout the process is also important and needs attention from the outset. The engagement of the leading politicians in the Regional Assembly and local authorities across the region, rather than those where there are particular issues, is also important to ensure that a partnership approach develops in shaping and delivering the region's future.

⁴³ See www.thecompact.org.uk

⁴⁴ <http://www.acknow.org/>

3. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning – What we found

For illustration, see Case Studies 2 and 17



The development of a common understanding, priorities and programmes focused on the place is what brings people together. We found that the emerging use of a **common evidence base** between some of the partners in this joint working was proving to be very effective and could be further extended to include both more information and more partners. The evidence base was generally focussed on shared information particularly in relation to economic, social and environmental conditions and has been used for transport projects, environmental assessment and housing need assessments. We found little sharing of performance data or the views of the community, as collected in various ways by public bodies including citizen's juries, specific consultation feedback or from neighbourhoods. It is our view that a local common information repository would make a significant contribution to effective practice. This would be particularly so in the context of the Local Government White Paper that has proposed more joined up working between public bodies and a streamlined approach to community consultation within the local authority. A local information repository could create a single set of sources for the LDF, LAA, SCS, SEA and other cross organisation programmes. It would be more efficient and also help provide a more joined up view of what needs to be done. It can also report back to citizens and communities about what has been achieved.

For illustration, see Case Studies 4, 13 and 22



When we asked the case studies authorities and organisations to define 'spatial planning' many planners identified it as **co-ordination**. However, the approaches to coordination were mainly reliant on existing good working relationships that had been generated over time. There was less evidence of a more systematic approach to co-ordination, which might mean establishing new working relationships with partners. We also found few other public sector agencies or leading members or officers who defined spatial planning in this way. For councillors, the predominant role for spatial planning at present is in meeting housing targets generated by the level above them. The elected members had not considered the need for accompanying infrastructure which would be required with new housing, although they were more aware of the cumulative impact on transport and traffic. This gap in understanding will need to be addressed if spatial planning is to achieve what is expected of it.

For illustration, see Case Studies 7 – 12



Effective spatial planning is also about **leadership**. This can be used in a variety of ways. We have found spatial planning taking a lead in the implementation of sustainable development practice and delivery e.g. through renewable energy policies, heathland management and changing behaviour at regional level and within Action Area Plans. Leadership in spatial planning can also be effective in place making and shaping particularly through local visioning and master planning activities, providing this leadership includes strong community involvement and also engages local councillors in more proactive ways.

For illustration, see Case Studies 19 and 20



We found that some of our case studies had a clear idea about the role of **local distinctiveness** and the importance of this in the spatial planning process. For some it was about the built environment of the place and concerns about the way in which the provision of development, particularly in town and city centres, could undermine this. We also found that some had broadened the concept wider to consider the way in which places interact with their communities, and how they could support social cohesion and the generation of culturally specific solutions to issues. We believe that effective spatial planning is at this end of the spectrum, bringing together an understanding of a place, its people, its environment and its economy to create local distinctiveness.

3. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning – What we found

For illustration, see Case Studies 1 – 6



Effective spatial planning is also aware of its **context** and its neighbours. In some cases this is through sub-regional partnerships whether these have joined up formally through the spatial planning process or whether they are working on a more informal but nevertheless significant basis. At the regional level, a programming and management role for key investment and environmental resource management provides both a context and a mechanism for delivery. Regional spatial planning can also offer effective practice as it leads the region to work within its housing market areas that often transcend administrative boundaries. Reshaping the economic characteristics of the region through cross boundary working between local authorities and other agencies can also be a significant contribution to achieving longer term economic growth. Regions also have differing or specific environmental constraints and these provide a context for decision making. The EU dimension, as it develops its territorial cohesion policies, is also an important underpinning to success and some of the case study authorities were aware of the role of European policy, particularly in urban areas.

For illustration, see Case Studies 2, 7, 12 and 15



Across the UK, the nature of spatial planning is also changing. Elsewhere we have described this as a policy fugue⁴⁵ where the same themes and outcomes appear in slightly different forms and with differing names, but can be seen to be part of the same overall movement. A more joined up approach to the public sector is clear in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, although processes within each country take differing forms. Spatial Planning has been progressing in Wales at national level for some time. Similarly in Northern Ireland there has been a good start to strategic spatial planning. The Review of Public Administration in Northern Ireland is still underway but a devolved approach to planning and its wider integration with economic and social regeneration is emerging with Local Strategic Partnerships in operation. Community Planning in Scotland has been developing since 2003 and has extended its guidance and ways of working further than has been the case in England, although there seem to be fewer apparent overt links between Community Plans and spatial planning in Scotland, a situation which may change soon following legislative reform.

3.2 Positive planning

There seems to be considerable **enthusiasm** for the changes which spatial planning has brought about. Some planners told us that this was the kind of planning that they had always wanted to practice from the earliest days in their careers and that they now felt more fulfilled in their work. Others told us that spatial planning went beyond the promise of integration with corporate planning as set out in the 1970 Development Plans Manual, illustrating the 1968 Structure Plan system, where the promotion of economic, environmental and social well being is first mentioned. Planners considered that spatial planning meant that they could take new and often non traditional approaches, allowing planners to take the opportunity and advantage of being proactive in their duties.

For illustration, see Case Study 21



Some planners we met were having more difficulty in understanding the changes, seeing spatial planning as a continuation of more traditional land use planning systems, and it appeared to us that this lack of understanding was making the process more of a struggle for planners themselves. These planners could not really understand the direction of travel of the new system and did not understand the wider public policy implications for a more joined up system. It is important that this group are encouraged to develop a wider understanding of what spatial planning means and to recognise that it does imply a step change from the past. We have therefore made several recommendations about this.

⁴⁵ Allmendinger P., M. Tewdwr-Jones and J. Morphet [2005] Devolution and the modernisation of local government: Prospects for spatial planning European Planning Studies vol 13 no 3 April [349-370]; Allmendinger P., M. Tewdwr-Jones and J. Morphet [2003] New Order Planning and local government reforms Town and Country Planning.

3. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning – What we found

We were given a number of examples of where positive approaches to planning were leading to **more effective outcomes**. At the regional level, the approach to public sector infrastructure investment was one that regions may wish to consider as effective practice. Not only has the SE RSS provided a regional and sub-regional set of infrastructure requirements for the coming period but it has also used the programme it has drawn up to negotiate its resource requirements with central government and to work with the RES. This approach offers a way of implementing devolved regional investment funds through programmes that can be seen to be closely tied to the future for the region.

For illustration, see Case Studies 7 – 15. 22



Another aspect of positive planning that was mentioned was the wider participation of **voluntary/ community bodies** that are now involved in the process more systematically. Not only are these bodies involved as stakeholders, they are now also involved in policy production and delivery in a new way. Engagement processes are also becoming more mature with a growing understanding of the importance of the role of voluntary and community sector participation facilitated and coordinated through specialist individuals and organisations and this seems to be successful where it has been used as an approach.

For illustration, see Case Studies 16 – 18



We had less evidence of the ways in which authorities were working with the local **business** community and the private sector in their spatial planning production processes. In some cases the private sector has been involved directly in visioning and agenda setting. Elsewhere the private sector was represented by development agencies and other private sector delivery organisations that had been set up locally. Some of the case study authorities have been working with local market agencies for commercial property and actively engaging in site assembly and other forms of intervention to ensure that the economic potential of places can be fulfilled or protected.

For illustration, see Case Studies 1, 3, 4, 6 and 17



We found a number of the case study authorities were reviewing their approaches to **town and city centre development**. This frequently has meant changing land use planning away from employment to residential land uses and the other uses associated with residential communities such as schools, small retail units and health provision. This change in focus in city and town centres was clearly creating some new challenges that need to be thought through in practical and cultural terms. For example, it was clear that many planners we spoke with felt very ambivalent about these changes in policy and did not seem convinced that town centre living at higher density was an appropriate solution to housing provision. The accompanying issues were also throwing up new challenges such as highway capacity management issues related to increases in city centre populations.

Effective practice also engages with **alternative strategies** so that those participating in decision making about the future of the area could see that alternatives were possible. There was also evidence that a wider variety of alternatives are being considered rather than minimal variations on the same theme. These wider alternatives were being generated through the use and consideration of the evidence available in fresh ways. This also included looking at the future through **future proofing**, a further mechanism for examining alternative strategies. Capacity and demographics are also seen to be fundamental to the development of alternative strategies and future proofing.

For illustration, see Case Study 22



3.3 Development Management

Development management is one of the **key delivery agencies** of spatial planning and place shaping. It is essential that this is recognised by all. In our study, the main links between effective spatial planning and development management are appearing through the negotiation of planning gain and section 106 agreements. Perhaps, given the relatively short time period since spatial planning has been introduced, this is not surprising. In some cases, the relationship between the spatial planning and development management teams was very proactive and they saw themselves engaged in a **joint process of delivery** or co-production for the local authority. In some case study areas, these discussions were clearly linked with regeneration and transport development strategies and were seen to be seamless in their roles. In other cases the relationship with development management colleagues seemed to be more disconnected, with the development management team not seen to be actively involved in the spatial planning process. Here, an approach that can **link the delivery of outcomes to the development management process will be more effective** in achieving local delivery.

For illustration, see Case Studies 13 and 15



So far we have discussed the variety of ways in which spatial planning can be developed and implemented more specifically. However, we have also found evidence of where this is being taken further to consider the role of spatial planning in effecting changes in **people's behaviours**, as a contribution to meeting sustainability targets and the management of environmental resources. This new approach can be supported through the approach to community quality, land use allocations and leadership through spatial planning processes. It may also be supported through **demand management** for transport and natural resources and the implementation of a greater number of environmental taxes as recommended recently by the Stern and Eddington Reviews. If behaviour is going to be changed through the use of cultural change and economic instruments, then spatial planning has to be alert to the implications that these changes may bring.

For illustration, see Case Study 19



3.4 Partnerships, integration and coordination

In the study of effective spatial planning in practice we have found a great range of positive partnership working which is seen as being essential for the delivery of policy and services in the future. Although we have reported that some planners are working with the Community Strategy leads and the LSP, we have found far greater involvement with other partners and this could provide strong foundations for the development of these arrangements. In many cases these **partnership working arrangements** were semi-formalised with groups which have been set up for one purpose and then being used to meet the newer requirements of spatial planning. In other cases we have found that groups have been specifically brought together to undertake major **visioning and scoping** exercises for the future, which have been externally and **professionally facilitated**. In some cases this has involved the public sector partners primarily and in others groups of voluntary and community sector organisations brought together under a formal umbrella in order to channel their views into the continuing processes. All these practices are effective.

For illustration, see Case Studies 1 – 6



Once there are groups working together as part of the spatial planning process, we found that having a **joint capacity study** between all the public sector partners is useful for gaining resources and managing the future. Such an approach enabled synergistic discussion of provision and alternative requirements in a positive way and improved the level of understanding between partners. This also improved trust between partners that can be a significant ingredient when infrastructure provision is being provided through planning gain, for example.

3. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning – What we found

These joint discussions across the public and voluntary sector have also led to new ways of **providing and locating services**. We found that the creation of public sector community hubs have emerged as a positive approach which can now be achieved through this integrated approach to infrastructure planning. These **community hubs** can be provided through schools or health facilities and can be associated with other forms of local service provision including parks, youth centres, libraries, retail and day centres. In the future, with a greater joined up approach in the public sector these hubs can be extended to include central government services such as Connexions, Job Centre Plus, Police and Further Education as these are all drawn into the Local Area Agreement [LAA] process.

This public sector service provision is becoming more joined up for the public whilst the **assets** in the public sector could be utilised more productively. We found these approaches working effectively in both older urban areas and those that are being developed as part of growth strategies. **Multi-agency work** on single sites [or assembled sites] is seen to be very positive, even if the utilisation of facilities cannot be taken up immediately by other public services. Making or safeguarding this provision is seen to be an important benefit of working together in this way.

For illustration, see Case Studies 16 – 18



These **common public sector infrastructure** discussions are increasingly being formalised into groups that are examining and reviewing their service provision in a more systematic and programmed way. We found a number of different and useful approaches that could be used for effective spatial planning practice. Where existing facilities were no longer seen to be adequate but were not able to be relocated within the urban fabric, public sector organisations are considering a **network** approach that would allow the complementary use of facilities over the built up area. New provision is being made in a more generic way to complement what was already there allowing a network approach to service provision.

In considering the **partnership relationships** with specific public service partners, we found good examples of effective practice in various areas. Working with health was seen to be very effective where the Primary Care Trust [PCT] was able to consider its longer term capital programme for provision. We also heard from health representatives that they found the process of being asked about the future in the spatial planning delivery group enabled them to bring together their known plans more coherently, and they felt that there was growing evidence of this occurring nationally.

Where **health facilities** are being provided as part of s106 arrangements, the use of the GLA's Health and Urban Development Unit [HUDU]⁴⁶ guidelines and toolkit was seen to be very helpful by those who had used it both in London and elsewhere. The provision of health facilities was seen to be a major requirement in a number of areas with new population growth and success in negotiating these was being reported.

We also found that there was very successful working with public **transport** providers in terms of developing growth led strategies or those where brownfield sites were being used for the provision of the vast majority of the housing requirements. We found that the relationships with Passenger Transport Executives, the Highways Agency, Government Offices and, if appropriate, central government departments were all critical in this process in supporting existing development intensification and new development corridors.

⁴⁶ See www.lda.gov.uk

3. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning – What we found

We found that some authorities were working in a positive way with the **education** departments planning the provision of schools both in terms of current redundancy and future requirements. In some case studies, the private sector housing developers had agreed to develop in neighbourhoods simultaneously to ensure that education and wider social provision was made at the same time as the new housing development. We found that working with education for provision to support place changes was needed at an early stage since education departments might need to close schools to meet changes in population movement. For the DfES, the rules for education provision operate so that funding follows pupils, i.e. in arrears, and it is very difficult to obtain advance funding for school place provision even when it can be shown that this is required. At present there seems to be no way to fund new schools in the Building Schools for the Future [BSF] programme and thus school provision may need some careful planning and consideration at local level as part of development delivery.

At the **regional** level we have already mentioned the benefit of drawing together transport infrastructure requirements and we have found that in one region working with the Fire Service has been very positive in enabling the Fire Service to determine their longer term requirements for provision. This is now increasingly undertaken at the regional level, a practice that might be undertaken with other blue light services.

For illustration, see Case Studies 7 – 12



Spatial planning has to work as effectively as it can with the **voluntary and community sector** not least as they are partners in the delivery of the reformed and modernised public services envisaged for the future. We found that there were few examples of systematic ways of working with the voluntary sector. There could be more scope for bringing this together within the Local Strategic Partnership and through the local voluntary and community sector compact.

For illustration, see Case Studies 1 – 6, 16 – 18



3.5 Integration, participation and practices

In our study of effective practice in spatial planning we saw a number of ways in which the case study participants were working with their stakeholders and communities. One of the greatest **challenges** for those engaged in spatial planning is the need to help the public understand that spatial planning is about more than immediate decisions and has an importance for the longer term.

There is also a need for accurate and regular communication to the public and high levels of input from the community can be obtained if appropriate methods are used. Good facilitators or specialist organisations that can help to undertake consultation can play a very positive role. This has been achieved in a number of ways including holding specific design and visioning days, open fora, surveys, various web techniques and some integration with wider participative initiatives in the community. Some of our case studies showed that it is possible to achieve high levels of public engagement if this is seen as an essential tool in the process and not just a routine procedural stage.

For illustration, see Case Study 1



Co-ordination with other **consultation** processes is important both to ensure that people do not become weary of consultation and to demonstrate that consultation can be undertaken efficiently and effectively and be used in multiple ways if this is appropriate. We heard of some examples where there were a number of local authority consultation processes going on at the same time, sometimes in the same place. This is confusing for the public and also not helpful for the local authority. The integration of the spatial planning consultation into a local authority's wider participation programme should enable the operation of consultation material for all local authority activities and provide the consultation processes in spatial planning with more internal support.

3. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning – What we found

One way to develop incentives for these discussions is the use of the **evidence** that is the basis of the spatial planning process. An analysis of the demographic composition, economy and current public services can provide a comparative starting point for discussions and can be supported by the plethora of new neighbourhood statistics available through Local Area Profiles⁴⁷ from the Audit Commission. These sources of data are publicly available and could be included as web links at community and local authority level. To these other sources of information can be added local data based on the analysis of information and public consultation and preference based work. If the new approach to spatial planning is evidence based, then the evidence also needs to be provided to those who are participating in the process.

For illustration, see Case Studies 4 and 22



Elected members are seen to be important in championing the role of spatial planning and understanding its contribution to the wider local authority agenda. They are also very experienced at seeing decisions from the point of view of their communities. There is a need to develop new ways of working with councillors to communicate the difference in approaches evident since the implementation of the 2004 Act. This training and advice needs to be earlier now that 'front loading' consultation on proposals is required to take place at the beginning of the process. Also, more consultation is required if proposals are changed as a result of internal or external views, including those of the Government Office. It is also important to engage all councillors in the discussions about their local areas and the future.

The development of the spatial vision needs a high level visibility in the local authority to ensure that the **Chief Executive**, Chief Officers and service managers also understand the role that it plays in their service planning for the future. This needs internal briefing for all Departments not only those who may have been involved traditionally. Further, the nature of local service delivery inside the local authority has now changed and it is important for those engaged in spatial planning to understand how service delivery is predicted to develop in the future. Spatial planning may not seem to have much relationship with the provision of revenue and benefits services at face level but the local authorities provision of one stop shops, delivery of front line services through other agencies such as Housing Associations or moving to mobile delivery of service in people's homes may all have a role to play in the public service infrastructure at the local level in the future.

Consultation with **stakeholders** needs to be considered carefully at the outset. We found that effective practice meant early scoping of the potential range of stakeholders and ensuring that they were informed about their potential interest in the process. We were made aware of the difficulties some have found in engaging their stakeholders and we have suggested earlier some ways in which the stakeholder community could be better alerted about the importance of spatial planning process by the sponsoring bodies at national level. At a local level working with stakeholders will need to be tied into other local authority stakeholder work through the LSP. Spatial planning processes needs to engage with stakeholders that may not be part of the LSP and this needs some specific discussion rather than the creation of two separate processes. Stakeholder participation in the development of the spatial visioning and core strategy will be an essential process of the place shaping activity of the area. The new focus on place shaping should considerably aid the ability of those engaged in spatial planning to engage with the LSP.

As the main focus of the LSP will be the **LAA**, it also important for spatial planning processes to be integrated with the development and implementation of the LAA. This will be a new approach for those engaged in spatial planning, since the LAA has not overtly included planning hitherto although it does have a strong focus on place. Each LAA is negotiated and delivered locally. If the LDF is to be a delivery vehicle for LAA, there needs to be more recognition of this at the local level and then integrated processes between both teams need to be introduced to make this work.

⁴⁷ www.areaprofiles.audit-commission.gov.uk

3. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning – What we found

Effective practice in **participation** needs to be undertaken at the regional level. Regional delivery can be enhanced through close working between the RSS and RES and this could be even closer through a merged approach. Regional approaches to housing, transport, natural resources etc can assist local authorities in seeing the ways in which they are linked to other parts of the region through different sub-regional areas for markets and movement. The region can help support measures that can change behaviours to encourage people and businesses to be more sustainable. We have seen that it is possible to engage a wide variety of people, businesses and organisations at regional level. This has been encouraged by choosing the issues which are appropriate to the regional scale of consideration such as infrastructure, biodiversity and natural resources, e.g. water provision and flooding and secondly through the use of appropriate methods and techniques of engagement.

For illustration, see Case Study 17



4. Delivering Spatial Outcomes

In the past, planning has faced criticism for its preoccupation with the formulation of a plan, and with insufficient attention being paid to delivery. In this section we consider how planning can achieve more effective outcomes. Section 4.3 shows how spatial planning outcomes can be delivered.

4.1 Meeting the resource test

Delivery of the Core Strategy through the LDF is seen to be one of the key features that differentiates spatial planning from earlier development planning. One of the defining features of the approach to spatial planning is that places are not only envisioned and shaped for the future and but also delivered. **Delivery is one of the defining features of the new approach.**

This greater emphasis on delivery is confirmed through the Planning Inspectorate's tests of soundness that all core strategies will need to meet particularly through the tests of coherence, consistency and effectiveness. This is also included within the requirements on resources, in test viii. Here the test that resources to implement the plan are likely to be available is set out. The resource provision is also required to be integrated with other strategies and plans which are prepared by the local public sector including the Primary Care Trust, Highways Agency and education providers at all levels. PPS12 states that the identification of resources should be integrated into longer term planning processes based on the future requirements of the community.

The adequacy of infrastructure provision is a material consideration and creates an inevitable link to development management and planning gain regimes. These links between places and their requirements are required to be considered at the front end of the process.

PPS 12 identifies some of the components of this resource consideration – utilities, transport, and waste and air quality for example. It also states that there should be integration with other bodies and strategies with reference primarily to regional bodies and also lists in section 2.5 of the Companion Guide⁴⁸ that this should also include:

- Economic development.
- Regeneration.
- Education.
- Health.
- Crime prevention.
- Waste.
- Recycling.
- Environmental protection.

In our study we have found case study authorities and RPBs that have taken this approach in a systematic and planned way, extending these relationships to public and voluntary bodies which are involved in the LSP and who have a contribution to the well being other area. These bodies include those providing and managing open space and parks, leisure and cultural facilities and faith buildings.

⁴⁸ CLG [2004] Creating Local Development Frameworks A Companion Guide to PPS12.

The approach which seems to be emerging as effective for managing this process is one which is seen to be a common implementation group for the region or the local authority which is linked to the wider public sector programmes such as the LAA [or MAA in future]. The best approaches are systematic. Where these approaches are evolving, they are frequently based on good working relationships around perceived priorities but eventually these will probably need to be more systematic to be both more inclusive and sound in their approaches.

Where local authorities are not picking up the delivery elements of spatial planning this may be due to the weighting of advice given in PPS12 and the Companion Guide as well as advice being given by Government Offices. Local authorities have understood the need to integrate with transport and highway plans, although there are real weaknesses in their ability to deliver on these. However, there is less understanding about the spatial planning process being the mechanism for drawing together public sector capital programmes and longer term service delivery strategies as this is not outlined in any detail in any of the documents. Clearer guidance on this issue is required at an early stage.

At regional level, an implementation plan is necessary, [PPS 11] which should include the organisations and mechanisms responsible for delivering the strategy and will be a test of its realism. We have found that there is a differential understanding of deliverability and in some cases this has not included all partners fully in the implementation process to the detriment of the process.

4.2 Ensuring delivery

This report has found that drawing together local infrastructure requirements into a single programme, supported by a cross stakeholder group is a requirement for delivery. Other features of this will also be important such as the role of the local authorities' own assets which may be a positive addition to the delivery process.

We have also found much concern about the ability to deliver planning gain and s106 agreements with confidence and practices and interpretation vary quite widely. The intention of the Audit Commission to review resources gained through planning processes annually as part of the financial audit might support a more common set of practices. We found that there was concern about the way in which all agreements were monitored and a general feeling that smaller planning gain agreements were frequently lost. A number of additional approaches may be used to support the process of managing this increasingly important and critical delivery resource [as set out in 5.7] and we have made recommendations on these.

4.3 Effective Implementation Practice

Effective implementation can be seen through the use of a variety of approaches which we have summarised here.

At the local level

- Spatial planning needs to be part of the **LAA/MAA** framework so that it can fulfil its role.
- It is fundamental that a **common evidence base** across the public sector for factual, performance and public consultation data is established to support planning delivery and funding bids.
- This evidence base should be in the **public domain** as far as possible to support community and stakeholder engagement.
- A **local public sector delivery group** should be established which brings together all the public sector capital investment in the locality together with other funding generated from fees and charges. planning gain supplement, roof tax, lottery and EU funding.

4. Delivering Spatial Outcomes

- A **common public sector delivery programme** will be a very useful mechanism to support delivery and manage public sector resources together with those generated from the private sector and other funding eg the National Lottery or the EU.
- **Other public agencies** need to be fully briefed by their sponsoring Government Departments on the implications of spatial planning delivery for their own service delivery and need to be alerted of the new duty of cooperation.
- Specific advice and guides such as those provided by the Mayor of London's HUDU are seen to be very successful in supporting the generation of **health** provision within localities.
- New skills such as **programme management** [e.g. Prince 2 and Managing Successful Programmes] are now required; access to financial skills for analysis and evaluation seen to be important.
- Using a wider variety of **financial vehicles** including trusts, JVs and risk and reward models with the private sector are all needed to achieve delivery and need to be explored locally.
- Placing a percentage tariff on all new developments for the benefit of the community and **voluntary sector** would be useful.
- Without positive approaches, the local delivery landscape can be very complex – a **systematic** approach is needed to achieve full place shaping objectives and spatial planning needs to play its full role in this.
- It is Important to develop a **cross boundary** delivery mechanism or vehicle where cross boundary working is the best approach for the community; this will particularly apply in city sub-regions and where there are MAAs and could be rolled out to support all sub-regional delivery.

At the regional level

- The Regional Planning Body is able to encourage local authorities to think differently about their **boundaries** e.g. travel to work areas and market areas for housing and implement more effective **sub-regional** approaches.
- The planning policies at regional level are important in creating a **dynamic framework** that responds to changing social, economic and environmental trends and opportunities.
- A **common regional delivery programme** can be a very useful mechanism for stimulating investment from the private sector and securing investment from central government.
- It is important to understand the **relative weightings** of the different agendas to be delivered through the RSS but also to ensure that the outcomes are joined up e.g. housing needs a comprehensive process.
- Joining up **regional infrastructure requirements** and programmes is an important new role.
- A more focussed approach to some **specific areas** in the region is useful but the **whole region** needs to be considered as well – possibly through sub-regional programmes.
- What are the implications for places which are **lower priority** in the RSS if they also need support – what approach should they take to the implications of their role in the region.
- Good regional **preparation and assessment** can enable environmental resource management to be more robust.
- Regional **participation** is enhanced by focusing on issues which are important at the regional level e.g. infrastructure, natural resources, behaviour change.

4.4 Delivering economic outcomes through spatial planning

In our study, we have found that there is a new focus on delivering **economic outcomes** and that this is being achieved in a variety of ways. Although there was less evidence of the direct involvement of businesses in the process, the need to create stable and growing local economies was apparent. In the **urban** case study areas, the achievement of greater opportunities for a variety of business space and growth were central to the core strategy development. Bringing these economic sites and areas together with the associated requirements for public transport, a wide variety of residential locations and other social facilities all help to shape places and to deliver the well being agenda.

In the more **rural** areas, provision of sites and associated facilities for economic growth were seen to be equally important and a great concern about how best these could be located within market conditions. The use of scoping sessions, master planning and external facilitation were all being used to ensure that the local economy had a voice in the process.

At regional level, the economic drivers were also seen to be important and it was interesting to note that this was encouraging some rethinking of views about the traditional economic base and how the region could re-think its own view about its future role.

4.5 Delivering sustainability through spatial planning

The operational principles of sustainability seem to have been incorporated into policy development and delivery at the local level. Spatial planning is allowing a far greater freedom in considering mixed land uses and the provision of s106 or other planning tariff approaches is also supporting the achievement of more integrated approaches. In some local authorities, spatial planning is seen to be the main driver for achieving sustainability and even where this is not the case, integration with sustainability processes seems to be strong and reasonably mature.

At regional level, we found that the picture was more varied. Sustainability was seen to be a shaping force in one region that was considering innovative approaches to achieving its sustainable objectives including demand management and behavioural change.

4.6 Local and Regional Relationships

One of the key elements for consideration in the study was how far spatial planning was bringing together the local and regional planning requirements as part of an integrated process. We reviewed two regions and five districts in our study, and one of the districts was deliberately selected within one of the chosen regions in order to assist our understanding of effective practice in this area.

At local level we found that there was a developed understanding of regional requirements as they related to the local context and the need to incorporate these requirements in the LDF. The process appeared to be primarily one way with requirements coming down the spatial scales. There was also recognition that the region was concentrating on achieving its strategic objectives and, in some cases, these had a further impact at the local level, in particular in the provision of housing. The two regions we looked at had different approaches to defining their housing market areas, one primarily keeping to existing local authority district boundaries, although crossing county borders as necessary, and the other dividing districts where that was seen to be appropriate. Where the districts had been divided, there was some initial concern but no major problem in implementation.

At regional level, the two regional planning bodies had differing methods of working. In one, the Regional Spatial Strategy was developed in a devolved way, with officers undertaking lead role work within their own local authorities and then this being brought together with a small core team. In the other, a much stronger central team had been established with a clear focus on delivery, the links with the Regional Economic Strategy and achieving a sustainable region. Both approaches had been selected on the basis of the best solution within the region's political context, and both went with the cultural grain for managing affairs in their respective regions.

4. Delivering Spatial Outcomes

In terms of progress made and strategic leadership, the centralised model has achieved a more dynamic approach for the region and has resulted in:

- Firm political leadership.
- Integration between the RES and RSS.
- The development of a costed regional infrastructure framework and programme.
- Integrated and innovative approaches to achieving sustainability.
- Greater stakeholder involvement at all levels.

The spatial planning relationship between regions and individual local authorities was not as fully developed as it might be in either model. This might represent where each was within their respective plan making processes, but there seemed to be gap in the operational dynamic between them. If local authorities are to fully realise the opportunities to be derived from spatial planning then Regional Planning Bodies may need to develop more of a partnership style of working, where both parties are complementary partners in delivery.

4.7 Spatial planning and cultural change

We have found a wide variance in the understanding of spatial planning amongst planning practitioners. For some there is clearly a sense of planning returning to its real role and purpose and they feel that the approach set out in the 2004 Act is what they have always been waiting for. It has given them the opportunity to be proactive, more involved in delivery, engaged with making the places they are concerned with rather than having to set the policy and hope that it will be implemented. It provides a context for more specific regeneration work and allows the whole place to be seen as one.

Planners engaging at the leading edge of these practices have identified the need for new skills which they currently have to learn on the job. There were calls for better support from internal colleagues such from Finance and Legal Departments, who it was also thought, needed a wider range of skills than currently available to them to respond to these new approaches.

For planners, the main requirements are for higher level of management skills and in particular project and programme management skills⁴⁹. These specific skills are needed for two distinct parts of the new approach. Firstly there is a need for project management skills to manage the whole LDF process, to ensure that each stage is completed and that risk assessment is undertaken on a regular basis. In local government, the recommended approach for programme management is Prince 2⁵⁰. The LDF project team will include other local authority colleagues and it is through a joint SCS and Core Strategy team that the whole process of evidence, options, alternatives and consultation and delivery could be managed.

The second skill required was programme management to support the delivery of the LDF in the locality and the approach recommended for local government by the Office of Government Commerce is Managing Successful Programmes [MSP]⁵¹. A delivery programme needs a Senior Responsible Owner at the local level – probably the Chief Executive or member of the management team and the programme needs to manage resources and delivery timescales across a number of specific projects and activities. The sub-projects could be at neighbourhood or community level or could be by type of provision e.g. health, education or highways.

⁴⁹ See also The Egan Review Skills for Sustainable Communities ODPM.

⁵⁰ www.ogc.gov.uk/prince2

⁵¹ www.ogc.gov.uk/guidance_managing_successful_projects

It is difficult to see how effective delivery is going to be achieved without either of these two approaches being used at local level. Project and Programme Management skills are acquired through certificated practitioner training which is recommended as best practice by the Office of Government Commerce. Training can be provided locally and, in some places, a number of local authorities are grouping together to provide these courses.

Wider management and leadership skills are needed within senior planning teams. The management of resources and people to achieve the outcomes set by the local authority and LSP and delivered through the LSP and LDF has to be supported by effective management practices. These need to be informed by greater understanding of the wider public sector environment, development economics and organisational management skills. Many senior planners have lost sight of the role of planning in the wider agenda. This understanding needs to be reawakened and the skills required to ensure that spatial planning does contribute as required need to be acquired or enhanced.

Moving beyond local administrative boundaries to market or natural areas is also seen to be challenging although the logic for doing this is understood. The democratic accountability in these areas needs to be considered and in some cases the authorities have chosen the best alignment between the democratic boundaries and market areas although these groups of authorities may cross county boundaries.

Many planners see their main support coming from immediate local authority peers and, where there is a common sense of purpose, this has been a major driver. In other cases this has come from designation as a growth area which requires some achievement of outcomes within a specific timeframe. It has also raised proactive planning higher on the Council's agenda which has been derived from the bidding process at the outset. Once Councillors and the management team are concerned with gaining resources competitively then it may be easier to obtain their focus and support.

Being able to attract greater resources from joint working on initiatives was also seen to be a positive encouragement to multi-stakeholder working. In this case, stakeholders understood the mutuality of the process and also what might happen if they failed to work together based on previous experience.

Elsewhere, where specific initiatives had not been available, we found that the drive for the planning process had come directly from the Chief Executive who not only allowed spatial planning to play its role but also ensured that the rest of the council participated in the process both directly and through their own stakeholder communities.

On the other hand, we also found some examples where engagement with the council and its stakeholders was more fragmented and not widely understood. The workshops undertaken by PAS in late 2006 concentrated on bringing together the SCS and LDF teams at the local level to share a common agenda and this kind of initiative needs to happen more systematically at the local level.

5. Barriers to Success

Our study has found that many of the principles of Spatial Planning are starting to take root with some extremely encouraging results. However barriers do exist to wider success and we discuss these in this section.

5.1 Understanding the barriers

Part of being effective is about understanding the barriers to success and **managing them proactively**. In achieving effective spatial planning some of these barriers can be overcome by **early preparation** and understanding of what effective spatial planning is. We have also found that some barriers will be more difficult for individual planners and local authorities to overcome unless there are some changes in the understanding of what is required of them from a wider **public sector community**. These barriers are not necessarily difficult to overcome but require some refocusing of guidance and a more systematic communications plan for stakeholders by CLG and other sponsoring **Government Departments** at central and local level. With these changes, those developing and implementing spatial planning should have a firmer base for their work and a greater understanding from others about the potential of what will be achieved through spatial planning.

5.2 Central government

This study has found that a number of the barriers to effective spatial planning stem from a lack of understanding in the wider public sector about its role. In many cases this is replicated within the local authority. If spatial planning is to be effective then its function and role have to be understood throughout the organisation and it needs the support of a more integrated approach from central Government Departments to reinforce this as we have found:

- CLG has not fully briefed other Government Departments and Agencies about the role of spatial planning within the reformed public sector and this is reducing the participation of these Departments and Agencies at the local level where awareness is low.
- Current **guidance** from CLG e.g. PPS and other local government advice for LAAs and LSPs does not systematically reflect the requirements of spatial planning and in the way it relates to SCS and other local authority processes; this will need to be reviewed in the light of the Local Government White Paper in any event but does need to be more consistent across the wider public sector.
- There is a lack of understanding that the use of the term '**local distinctiveness**' is more than just about place. Local distinctiveness includes all social, economic and environmental issues. This needs to be set out more clearly for the wider public sector community and expressed more clearly in the way that it relates to the SCS, the common evidence base, and in place shaping and delivery programmes at local and regional levels.
- Current guidance on the LDFs from CLG seems to emphasise process over outcomes i.e. the delivery of the LDF within agreed timescales rather than the role and relationship of the LDF to place shaping and delivery. This needs to be reviewed as this process orientation is strongly being reinforced by Government Offices rather than place shaping and delivery outcomes for localities and regions.
- The major concern with the provision of health facilities was through the use of the DoH capital charge requirements which bear down on new facilities provided by planning gain even when their first three years of running costs are also provided. There seems to be no easy way to fund these charges under current arrangements.

5.3 Government Offices

Rather than promoting integration of the LDF process with LAAs and the wider local and public sector processes. Government Offices (GOs) now appear to be reinforcing separation between them. This needs to be reviewed urgently in order to ensure that there is integration at both regional and local levels. The unintended consequence of the current approach seems to put the LDF on a divergent path from the main stream of the local authority. The role of the LDF in delivery of place shaping and new local public service agenda needs to be reinforced by GOs. We found that:

- During the process of preparing the LDF, GOs have to change their **roles**. They start as supporters of the local authority and then become evaluators later in the process. This requirement to play both roles in the same process, albeit at different points, is problematic for GOs and local authorities.
- GOs are seen to be **micromanaging** the LDF process as pressure on their performance grows. This seems to be stifling a local response to the issues that face localities and the unintended consequence may be that components of the LDF do not meet their tests of soundness.
- GOs seems to be emphasising the need for **conformity to the RSS** above all other elements of the tests of soundness and this pressure is making it more difficult for local authorities to respond to the local needs of their communities through the LDF despite the opportunity to express difference from the RSS if it can be justified.
- GOs do not seem to be reinforcing the public sector resource management role of the LDF. **Resource issues** tend to be related to the number of planning staff available to undertake the process and we believe that an unintended consequence of this is leading local authorities to overlook the public sector resource management role of the LDF.
- Local authorities are looking to GOs for **advice** as they prepare their LDF and they are also looking to PAS, PINS, POS and in some cases CLG. At present there is a lack of alignment between GOs and PINS advice which means that local authorities need to speak with both about the process and try to meet the stated requirements of both. It would be appropriate for the GOs and PINS roles in the LDF process to be clarified and also for the GOs to have a full working knowledge of the tests of soundness now that they are being applied. Local authorities should not be serving two processes here as this was not intended. GOs could concentrate more on ensuring that the local public sector integration including consultation has been achieved leaving PINS to the regulatory role. Monitoring of progress could be through Comprehensive Area Assessment.
- The presence of the **other central departments** in GOs to support the LAA process is helpful in general but it is not always being utilised to support the LDF process. This can make it difficult to achieve delivery when other programmes delivered by GOs are not seen to be linked to the LDF system.
- The lack of a **National Spatial Framework** and its moderating role for Government Offices is seen as a major drawback at regional level.

5. Barriers to Success

5.4 At the regional level

One of the key barriers to effective spatial planning described to us at regional level is the plethora of regional strategies which are not joined up. It was suggested that if the SCS is the 'plan of plans' at the local level then there needs to be an equivalent **overarching regional strategy** within which all the others fit. Like the SCS this would be based on evidence and be a context for the multiplicity of regional initiatives. It would also provide a common Regional Investment Framework as already occurs in some regions. Without this, regional bodies are not joined up and frequently do not have common objectives. Many of them relate primarily to their central government departmental sponsors. A more joined up approach to local objectives in SR07 may help to remove these separate targets and outcomes but they will not come into force until 2009 so some earlier statement is needed to support a more joined up approach. Without some co-ordination at regional level then there is little prioritisation of investment and this will undermine RSS delivery.

Regions were interested in investment streams to support their delivery programmes and wondered if expected legislation or new taxation changes could be a useful addition to the tools to support delivery. There may need to be a debate on what might be a reasonable split in the distribution of environmental taxation – for example aviation could possibly be seen as regional environmental tax together with some motorways whilst the rest of the proposed road charging income could be distributed locally. As the proposals for local environmental taxation come forward then these issues will need to be considered.


In addition to the region's role in providing an evidence based delivery programme, it was thought that a more proactive approach to regional delivery by the private sector would be helpful. We have found that the private sector has been willing to work together to coordinate delivery voluntarily at the local level and it would be worth considering if this could be replicated at regional level. This could involve establishing a major investor or stakeholder group for the region or sub-regions that could support investment programmes and more strategic development management.

Finally in some regions there is perceived to be no local political support for regional leadership and delivery at this scale. This lack of support can take a number of forms including 'presenteeism' in meetings, that is attending to represent a local authority or organisation but not actually participating or having no active engagement in making delivery work. Other approaches may also undermine regional delivery such as absorbing and internalising regional planning processes as part of a regional political management strategy. In this case, challenging issues, that require political leadership, will not be surfaced. This is a cultural issue about regional working which potentially could be addressed through Multi Area Agreements that will sit within regional spaces and could potentially cover all regions in due course to create effective sub-regions. In order to achieve the economic growth which is sought from the MAA and City Region processes a more competitive and transparent approach will be required at regional level and the current position described here may be overcome in time.

5.5 At the sub-regional level

Understanding how to work together at the sub-regional level is clearly challenging. There is an absence of an overarching Government policy and no easy governance structures that can provide democratic accountability. Yet policy and delivery is seemingly increasingly focussed on the sub-region without any clear policy context. This position may be clarified through Government's response to the LGA's report on Sub-regions, 'Prosperous Communities II vive la devolution!' published in February 2007. In this report, the LGA shows the whole of England in 'preferred' sub-regions as illustrated on the map below, and it discusses the ways in which these might operate.

Map 1 – the preferred sub-regional map, which gives the best fit for the range of indicators used in our research



We found a mixed range of practice at sub-regional levels. There is a plethora of agencies and organisations which has grown up but we found that they were not coordinated well or their roles properly explained. Some questioned whether current sub-regional planning bodies are effective and whether they had a real role to play. Working across administrative boundaries was also challenging existing operational practices although it is a requirement of the LDF processes. Sub-regional delivery mechanisms are needed if sub-regional organisations are going to achieve effective levels of change.

To some extent the proposals for **Multi Area Agreements** at sub-regional level may be a way of taking forward these issues, with their expected role in co-ordinating LAAs and delivery of economic objectives. They will have a clear role in place shaping and delivery of the economic infrastructure which supports this. At present the role of MAAs and City Development Companies do not seem to include any reference to spatial planning or existing sub regional working on spatial issues and this needs to be addressed quickly at all levels – central government, GOs and locally.

5. Barriers to Success

5.6 Inside the local authority

Within the local authority **Chief Executives** do not always understand the new role of spatial planning in place shaping and delivery and can see it more as a process to be completed successfully. This means that little joint working between SCS and Core Strategy teams seems to be in evidence and spatial planning is not seen as a delivery tool inside the local authority. We could find little or no integration between spatial planning and LAAs.

More support is needed from within the local authority for matters such as **financial and legal advice** that are needed if the LDF is to achieve its full local potential. Consultation processes for the LDF are separate from the public consultation programming which is now commonplace within las although these will be brought together through the proposed changes following from the Local Government White Paper 2006.

For **councillors**, the Local Government Act 2000 separated planning regulation from planning policy. Planning policy became the responsibility of the whole council whilst delivery became an executive responsibility. Development management decisions and regulation became the responsibility of non-executive members. CLG now considers that this separation of powers, which was included in the Act in the pursuit of probity, has had the effect of reducing the effective role of spatial planning within a local authority. The Local Government White Paper 2006 proposes that this separation be addressed through the reintegration of executive councillors within the regulatory process⁵².

Within the local authority, planners need to be readier to work with colleagues and the processes required of the council. This will need a specific effort in many places and encouragement from the management team. The concentration on planning process has left some planners isolated and unaware of the scale of reform in the authority and the public sector around them. We have heard many planners express the view that they are the only part of the local authority undergoing this scale of change and also the only service which is directly responsible for delivering the government's agenda. This attitude is damaging the credibility of planners with their colleagues, many of whom have been undergoing considerable structural service reform themselves, for example Children's Services and Adult Services. Also those services involved in LAAs are having to find new ways of working together through pooled and aligned budgets. All departments have to find efficiency savings and many look enviously at the Planning Delivery Grant which is not available to them. Someone said that 'planners need to get out more' and that the potential insularity of planners is now preventing them from delivering effectively. The mutual views of spatial planners and Sustainable Community Strategy leads are also a barrier to local delivery and we found that some planners do not have much respect for the SCS lead role.

One of the key barriers to positive planning was the unavailability of adequate **highways expertise** in district councils. In the past the presence of a county highways agency at district level was able to provide a level of expertise for planning applications that was reasonably adequate. Now that the vast majority of these agency agreements have been terminated, there is little or no expertise at district level and no access to highways expertise at county level at the scale and degree now required. This is giving rise to a number of issues. For major schemes, such as motorway or principal highway improvements associated with development, then the Highways Agency and county expertise is involved. However, in more local situations where new clusters of housing development will require highway delivery as additional works through an s106 agreement, district councils have no funding to prepare these small scale schemes or see them through to implementation once the funding has been amassed. Even preparing adequate s278 agreements is challenging at the local level.

⁵² CLG Strong and Prosperous Communities 2006 vol. 2.

This issue is now preventing good planning of areas and needs to be addressed. Where resources can be provided by the County Highways department then it would be helpful if some of this could be devolved locally to be made available on a much more responsive basis. Another approach would be a shared services approach with a group of district councils appointing a shared highways capacity between them whether in house or through the private sector. A third approach could be the selection of a private sector risk and reward partner, who would undertake the design of the highway scheme and possibly some of the specific negotiation in return for the contract to manage the implementation of the new scheme, including tender and project management. An initial risk and reward partner could be selected on the basis of competition and involvement at this stage would mean that the partner would not be able to supply the works side of the contract. Nevertheless given the frequency and scale of this type of scheme there is reason to believe that such an approach would be attractive to the private sector.

5.7 Planning culture

Much has been written about planning culture and the ways in which it needs to change⁵³. We found that generally planners were very interested in the opportunities provided by the new system but not all could see the change in emphasis. One way of illustrating this is to consider the definition of spatial planning in PPS 1 and to show how it can be viewed in different ways:

PPS 1 defines spatial planning as:

'Spatial planning goes beyond traditional land use planning to bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function.'

⁵³ SPiP Literature Review 2: Culture Change and Planning.

What does this mean ?

'Spatial planning goes **beyond** traditional land use planning to **bring together and integrate** policies for the development and use of land with **other policies and programmes** which **influence the nature of places** and **how they function.**'

What does this mean to **PLANNERS?**

'Spatial planning goes **beyond traditional land use planning** to bring together and integrate **policies for the development and use of land** with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function.'

This difference in view and understanding is potentially reducing effective practice as practitioners are setting out on different journeys and wondering why they are not all reaching their destinations. These points are clear in the reports prepared by PINS following their examination of core strategies, whether sound or not. An inability to adjust to the new system and what it requires does seem to be a barrier to effective delivery.

5.8 Resource management for delivery

We found a major barrier to **implementation** lies in the understanding of what is required in the tests of soundness that Planning Inspectors apply in assessing LDFs. This role of resource delivery in spatial planning needs some enhancement if it is to be fully understood.

When considering the range of **financial mechanisms** open to the local authority to implement the schemes required in the programme, the costs of entry and risk of failure in the use of PFI were seen to be too high for many councils. Other approaches such as site assembly or the use of Compulsory Purchase Orders can also be prohibitive where land values mean that schemes are marginal in the market place and not all local authorities have the funding to be able to pursue such approaches.

As local authorities lead place shaping activities, this could support the establishment of **rolling infrastructure investment budgets** into which land or income realised from property sales could be placed for local implementation of the LAA and SCS programmes. More joint working with other public sector bodies, either through staff or accommodation could produce resources for the local investment pot.

We were told that planning gain does not necessarily create new or additional jobs and there was some frustration about this. A more joined up approach between agencies supporting **economic delivery** might be able to help the achievement of job growth more successfully and some of these approaches were in the Local Government White Paper. Spatial planning as one of the vehicles of delivery will need to be part of these discussions.

There were also concerns about the effects of differing government policies within regions and that these were leading to uncertainty and difficulty in beginning to realise the benefits negotiated. In other cases the **planning gain** had been diverted to fund sub-regional infrastructure development which did not seem to have much local benefit to residents or the economy. As planning gain and s106 agreements are being used as central features of the infrastructure delivery mechanism, they can also be seen as tools of local competitiveness. Some authorities are using planning gain in very traditional ways and not utilising it in the service of the whole community. The Audit Commission's proposals to look at planning gain outcomes across all local authorities as part of their annual financial review might help to even out these practices further and give planners a wider insight to what may be able to be achieved locally.

Some new mechanisms or accepted working practices may be needed if planning gain funding is to be seen as less **piecemeal**. There is some uncertainty about what kind of project could be supported – is a church a landmark or a religious building? Also planners had not really thought through the role of development of pre-mainstream funding contributions for health and educational facilities and this needs a wider set of common practices.

The **private sector** also wants to see the application of their contributions more clearly. There was much concern expressed that the funds provided to the local authority through planning gain and similar agreements were frequently 'lost' within the local authority. It was also clear in discussions, that there should be more careful **monitoring** of the delivery of s106 agreements. It was felt that this was done on major schemes but could frequently be overlooked on smaller schemes and this needs much more careful monitoring. Some local authorities now have officers with this specific monitoring role.

Another barrier was seen to be the **phasing of s106 deliverables** in respect of the whole consent and its implementation and this needs much more careful consideration at the drafting stage. Consideration of the purpose, role, integration, management and benefits of planning gain can help clarify provision and negotiation. Being clear about what is expected in a s106 agreement from the outset is helpful to the applicants as this can be costed into their own development appraisal and is more likely to be straightforward in delivery.

5. Barriers to Success

Planning gain and s106 agreements are seen to be less satisfactory when delivered as part of an **appeal process** but even here clarity from the planning process about what is required can improve this situation.

Finally we have heard concerns that the development of local delivery programmes, including those elements delivered through planning gain, are not being developed as part of the community's involvement in place shaping, visioning and master planning. This is an important element of the process and the derivation of any planning requirement, whether based on evidenced need or community priority should be transparently shown on a requirements register as part of the LDF Delivery Plan.

5.9 Delivery

Local authorities are seen to have no control over phasing of delivery of the private sector components of schemes although public sector programmes can now be more coordinated. This is seen to be frustrating and could possibly be dealt with through s106 agreements, within an Area Action Plan or master planning context. From the perspective of house builders or major site developers, a community based approach to implementing the development together with other infrastructure might be a continuation of the consultation processes which they will have engaged upon as part of the application. A new form of **community delivery agreement** could be developed with the private sector particularly where multiple developers and public agencies are involved.

In the public sector, there were also concerns about delivery not least in health where multiple reorganisations and boundary changes have made it difficult to obtain consistency of approach in some areas. In some cases the requirements of business continuity through the period of change meant that future service planning was being put on one side. We were also told that some public sector partners are unwilling to come to the table as they did not see or understand the relevance of the spatial planning processes to their organisation or were going through internal changes that were of higher priority. [This was the reason that was frequently cited in respect of health bodies.] For this reason, planners had decided to proceed without them. As the test of soundness on resources shows, this is not an option and more effort has to be made directly and through the wider system such as the LSP. The proposed duty on public sector bodies to cooperate will have some influence on this process if only to remove excuses for not engaging. Spatial planning should be able to capitalise on this change with more elusive partners once the law is in place.

5.10 Advice

The final barrier that we encountered was around the issue of the provision of advice. Some told us that there was too much advice coming from different sources including CLG, GOs, PINS, PAS, and the Planning Officers Society [POS] whereas others said that the advice was in too many different places. PAS are doing much of the work of pulling this together. Some of this advice is in written form whereas GOs, for example seem to give much of their advice through meetings that is not always subsequently trackable. In summary there are a number of problems with formal advice:

- total amount of advice about the system within its public sector context is insufficient;
- what does come out is sometimes inconsistent; and
- with so many different points of origin, it is difficult to monitor and keep track of the advice that is issued and understand its relative weighting.

We saw some other barriers in respect of the advice provided including whether it is adequate for the task and fit for purpose. Some advice seems to have been published despite being overtaken by events and perhaps a more disciplined approach on the quality of published advice might be applied. As shown earlier we have concluded that this issue needs to be addressed.

A second concern is the conflicting nature of some of the advice. This conflict is not necessarily in the written form of the advice but more in the tone and emphasis of its delivery. This is causing considerable confusion. We found more weight was being given by planners to this kind of advice than that contained in the Tests of Soundness. This prevents planners being able to talk about the LDF with colleagues who do not share these fears and it can make planners appear to be unduly 'rule bound'.

At a time when the new spatial planning system is being implemented for the first time, the provision of conflicting advice is unhelpful and will slow down the progress of LDF preparation. Also advice which is written as if planning exists in a closed and separate environment will give an inappropriate sense of what is required of planning and planners. This will perpetuate the perception of senior managers that planning has a continuing inability to grasp its role within the wider public sector setting. Planning does not exist or operate within a vacuum. Advice should be associated with the role of the source in the system as a whole, and this needs some careful management. The respective roles of PINS, GOs and RPBs need to be set out more unequivocally and to this should be added defining more clearly the roles of LSPs, SCSs and LAAs.

A further issue concerning advice is that many practicing planners are seeking advice from their peers and practitioner colleagues rather than looking directly at the source documents. As a number of planning practitioners and those advising them have not fully understood the requirements of spatial planning, there is some anxiety about which way to proceed successfully. In some areas, a 'folklore' has built up about what is required, how difficult it all is and this is being regularly reinforced through peer group discussions. The uncertainty generated by the plethora of conflicting advice and a rumour mill is serving to undermine confidence and progress in the system. What is needed here is far greater leadership, clarity and focus on describing the role that spatial planning has to play in place shaping and delivery from leading organisations in local government including CLG, LGA, IDeA and SOLACE.

6. Conclusions

6.1 Defining Spatial Planning

One of the purposes of this study has been to define spatial planning so that it can be widely understood and communicated within all agencies and communities that need to understand its role. There are probably two ways in which definitions of spatial planning need to be considered. The first is in a clear written form and this is important to agree for clarity.

We asked all the participants in this study to give us their definition of spatial planning and this is what they said:

Spatial Planning is:

- Coordination.
- Putting into place pieces of the jigsaw.
- Making a place work properly.
- More than just a map.
- Not what went before.
- More about the delivery of development which is supported through the provision of infrastructure.
- Working across a wider context.
- Developing places rather than spaces.
- Including issues such as fear of crime.
- Understanding what people perceive about their areas.
- Linking to the community strategy.
- Giving people a proper say in their future – SCI doesn't go far enough.
- Promoting quality of life.
- Using all the planning tools to make a difference.
- Delivering outcomes.

There is also a second way in which spatial planning needs to be defined and this is in the understanding of what it does. This becomes an operational definition, where everyone understands what it does and its broader purpose. The meaning becomes more than the mere words. It is in this area where spatial planning's immaturity currently shows the most challenge and it is where some common understanding needs to be fostered. This understanding has to be accompanied by a set of values which can be attributed to the operational definition of spatial planning to provide people with an expectation of the way in which it is conducted.

Spatial Planning needs to encompass several key components:

The components of spatial planning

- Spatial visioning.
- Community and evidence derived outcomes.
- Local distinctiveness.
- Place shaping.
- Part of the wider public sector production team for communities.
- Accountable and transparent processes.
- Delivery through development management.
- Programme development and management.
- Coordination of resources for social, environmental and economic infrastructure delivery.
- Implementing sustainable practice.
- Registration and audit of agreed community deliverables.

This study shows how these two sets of features of spatial planning are being integrated into effective practice at local and regional level.

6.2 Integrating spatial planning

There has been much discussion about integrated spatial planning and in this study it is now possible to see how this integration can be expressed. Spatial planning can have an **integrating** role in the ways it can bring together places and people by visioning their future and helping to manage the public and private sector contributions to place making in a new way.

At the same time, spatial planning is **integrated** into the delivery processes for a reformed public sector that is more unified in its purposes and outcomes than has been seen before. Spatial planning has to become a tool used by the delivery team. It requires a repertoire of interventions that are used appropriately to achieve community generated outcomes. It needs to join those involved in a common purpose for place shaping and to learn their language, cultures and methods. Integrated spatial planning is about delivering tomorrow's places today.

6.3 What is effective practice in spatial planning?

Rather than concentrate on a definition of spatial planning, which is a fluid process and comprises several different attributes, this report illustrates what effective spatial planning looks like in practice. It is important to consider the underlying purposes and outcomes of these effective practices and to set them within a full operational knowledge and understanding of the PINS Tests of Soundness and the emerging revised requirements for Sustainable Community Strategies. Effective spatial planning is not a silo activity either within the local authority or the community.

Effective practice has a number of key components that make up the whole and these are mutually reinforcing. This is not a pick and mix menu and includes the following elements:

6.3.1 Being focussed on outcomes and not processes

Local authorities are now focussed on achieving outcomes for their communities. To achieve these outcomes needs cooperation, evidence, vision and some process. However, process is not the end product. Achieving a set of sound planning documents is the beginning not the end. From this point, planning has a role to play in shaping and delivering places through development management and other delivery processes with its partners from the private and voluntary sectors and from the public sector both within and outside the council. 'Frontloading' means engaging with all of these interests early on the process.

6. Conclusions

This is a new approach for many planners and the most fundamental and difficult change that they are facing at present. What does this mean in practice? Spatial planning plays an important role in a public sector which is increasingly needs to be joined up in its delivery outcomes for citizens, businesses, communities and places⁵⁴. Planners going into the spatial planning process have to be clear that the end product is not merely an approved set of documents. They also have to be clear that delivery will be a combined process between those engaged in setting the policy and those delivering through development management. It cannot work if the two activities are detached.

Spatial planning outcomes produce strategies for the future of the place, led by community's choices, taking into account social, economic and environmental characteristics [i.e. its local distinctiveness based on evidence] that are delivered through a local infrastructure investment programme. This represents a difference in starting points compared with traditional approaches to land use planning. It will not begin with the view of the local authority expressed through the planning system and then consulted upon to see how far the community agrees with its priorities for action. Spatial planning starts in a different place. It begins with community and stakeholder views on the future of the locality and it is supplemented with evidence drawn from a wide range of sources.

Spatial planning supports the wider place shaping endeavour through the full range of Local and Multi Area Agreements to assist in delivering this vision and programme for the future. It will do this primarily this through a programme is for the whole locality of the local authority area, sub-region for MAAs and region for RSSs. The spatial planning process helps to define this delivery programme and brings together the resources for its implementation through a number of agencies and providers.

The preparation and approval of the LDF Core Strategy with the Sustainable Community Strategy⁵⁵ is part of this journey and in practice this joined up way of working will already need to be in place to meet the tests of soundness⁵⁶.

The outcome of joining up these processes will be a delivered programme of protection, enhancement and managed change for the area as a whole, delivered through a combined local resource base generated from a variety of existing and new sources. The cost of failure or under performance is high for the community, who will not have their well being optimised through the place where they live, work or play if this does not occur.

Successful spatial planning will breed confidence, develop a sense of pride and achievement, support an improved quality of life and a positive view of the future. Spatial planning cannot deliver everything – services for children or the elderly for example – but it can make the place in which children and older people can live better and it can help other public services deliver effectively for these groups.

6.3.2 Being focused on users, producers, partners, places

A key feature of effective practice in spatial planning is about knowing who the outcomes are for. As spatial planning is about a **community led approach** this needs to be managed in this way from the outset, through community scoping and agenda setting processes and be part of the frontloading of LDF preparation. It also needs to work with and alongside the community participation processes elsewhere in the local authority as part of a whole, using tools like Acknowledge⁵⁷ to report progress to the community. In order to manage these processes appropriately it may be necessary to bring in **specialists** in community scoping and visioning, in just the same way as specialists may be employed for more technical planning reviews, such as environmental assessment or retail impact. Leaving these processes to the point where options are being considered is likely to be too late to achieve effective spatial planning.

⁵⁴ Varney ref.

⁵⁵ LG White Paper paras 5,60ff.

⁵⁶ PINS.

⁵⁷ www.acknowledge.org

In addition to ensuring that the community and planning users are involved from the outset it is also important to use the **evidence** available to understand the differences between people, business and places. This assessment of differences between places, age, gender, cultural and faith groups needs to be considered in a systematic way that can be demonstrated to them transparently. Similarly businesses are likely to have different patterns of engagement with the local regulatory environment and needs to occur in ways that will make sense to them so that they can participate and contribute as well as benefit from the regulatory processes.

All of this evidence needs to be synthesised so that the key proposals for each neighbourhood or village can be identified both through this evidence and through local consultation. Places also change as do the preferences people have for how and where they live. Ensuring that this information is up to date, using all the evidence which is available from local public sector bodies – the local authority and health, public transport ridership, crime data, air quality, household formation, composition and size are all important elements in developing spatial planning processes and cannot be taken for granted. The LSP will also be collecting this information as will other partners. Establishing a common repository will make a major difference to gaining a common understanding of priorities for action.

6.3.3 Changing expectations within the local authority

Successful spatial planning is going to need a shift in positions throughout the local authority, including that of planners. With the heavy emphasis placed on process in the past, planning has frequently been seen as a fringe activity, poorly understood but also possibly attracting little interest or sympathy. Planning has frequently been viewed as statutory-focused and inward looking process and many senior local authority managers have failed to see how it can add anything to their own work. This needs to be addressed in a positive and proactive way with leadership from the key organisations concerned including CLG, SOLACE, LGA and IDeA.

In performing its role as one of the key delivery agents for change particularly for infrastructure investment, spatial planning has to develop a proactive approach to achieving these ends. It will need to ensure that the Chief Executive and management team are aware of the role it has to play. This will also need a clear and unequivocal understanding of the new role by planning managers inside the local authority. This will require leadership support from organisations including the RTPI, CLG and PAS, but these will not be enough on their own.

Heads of Planning Services will also need to understand the new language of the public sector and be able to communicate the role of spatial planning in terms that make sense within this wider context. Planning's language will need to change so that it no longer remains a barrier to discussion but can speak in an inclusive way. Heads of Service and planning managers will need rapid briefing in the changes that have been going on around them. We have recommended that this work is supported by PAS⁵⁸ and the wider context to be strengthened through the IDeA.

⁵⁸ See www.pas.gov.uk for toolkits and other material to assist in this process including Selling the LDF toolkit and peer review.

6. Conclusions

Some specific tools and approaches required for effective spatial planning at the local level:

- having commitment from the Chief Executive and Management Team;
- ensuring professionally managed community engagement;
- using community engagement material and programmes from across the local authority;
- engaging in common working with SCS process and team;
- having a defined role and relationship with the LAA and MAA;
- establishing a common shared public bodies' repository of evidence on facts, performance and community preference;
- having an up to date and working understanding of your local distinctiveness;
- establishing a common shared asset register of all publicly owned land and buildings using ePIMS as the schema to record the information;
- putting programme and project management processes and practices in place and ensure that they are working;
- preparing and keeping under review a risk assessment with regular RAG [red/amber/green] reporting to the programme team;
- using master planning and visioning tools;
- establishing a Local Investment Programme;
- establishing a Local Investment Fund;
- establishing a Local Investment Group;
- preparing and publishing a public Community Gain Requirements List;
- preparing and publishing a public Community Gain Register;
- generating a monitoring charge on each s106 and planning gain agreement to be paid at the outset and through until the agreement is fulfilled;
- placing all funds from planning agreements into separate account and prepare an annual report on the use of the capital and interest;
- appointing a Community Gain Auditor to monitor the delivery of planning gain agreements;
- delivery engagement from the development management team;
- undertaking early technical and design work e.g. for highways;
- undertaking a 'can it be delivered assessment';
- using Community Delivery Agreements;
- having specific arrangements for working with neighbouring IAs and within the sub-region[s];
- having specific engagement with all the regional strategy family;
- managing the GO relationship;
- managing relationships with central government departments on appropriate issues;
- ensuring that the provision, role and use of existing facilities is examined as well as new ones.

6.3.4 Bringing together the Sustainable Community Strategy and the Core Strategy

One of the key roles of spatial planning is to provide the infrastructure delivery programme for the SCS on behalf of the local authority and LSP through the LAA⁵⁹. This programme will be delivered through harnessing the range of resources available within the local authority. This is shown clearly in PPS12⁶⁰ and in the tests of soundness⁶¹.

To produce a delivery programme, there has to be adequate assessment of the evidence, trend analysis and capacity reviews undertaken with all the key public sector service providers, including health, transport, education, parks, heritage, housing and leisure/community facilities. As places change decisions need to be made, particularly around aligning major investment decisions and financial flows for physical and community infrastructure.

The Core Strategy needs to ensure that the productive use of the existing infrastructure is secured. If assets need to be better used or new facilities are needed for health or open space then a more fundamental place reshaping process may be required. If areas are undergoing master planning, renewal of the market or growth, they should be taking advantage of other investment programmes that may be available. All this needs to be implemented in an orderly fashion that does not blight the lives of the community and businesses for years.

Establishing a **Local Infrastructure Programme [LIP]** supported by a **Local Infrastructure Fund [LIF]** or other mechanisms can generate some confidence in what communities need from this more coordinated approach to investment. The development of these community requirements can be published or made known to potential developers much earlier in discussions on applications. Early identification of local social, economic and environmental infrastructure requirements is likely to be more successful and less contentious if they are based on community preferences and evidence. Early identification of applicant requirements will also enable developers to include the costs within their own development appraisal, which means that the infrastructure is more likely to be delivered. It should enable greater clarity on delivery.

We recommend that local authorities enter into **Community Delivery Agreements** with applicants to ensure commitment to delivery on both sides, with trigger points clearly defined and the ability for the community to see what has been negotiated in their name. Local authorities may increasingly wish to appoint **Community Delivery Auditors**, who will be officers whose role it is to ensure that section 106 agreements are fulfilled.

The spatial plan will determine what is needed where and, based on the market and development cycle, when it is required. A **Local Infrastructure Group [LIG]** will need to be established to manage this process. Membership of this group needs to match local needs and will certainly need to include members of the Local Strategic Partnership. It also has to include all those with a role to play. It has to be a group that has the proactive ambition to include all the key players even if other organisations or departments do not understand its value immediately. Once the LIP is in place, supported by a LIF, then membership of the LIG is likely to grow.

⁵⁹ Planning Together CLG 2007.

⁶⁰ PPS 12.

⁶¹ PINS.

6. Conclusions

Local Infrastructure Group [LIG]: An indicative checklist of members

- PCT.
- Primary and secondary education.
- FE and HE.
- Highways representatives – [County and/or agency].
- Regeneration agencies.
- Lottery fund manager.
- Local authority property managers.
- Parks and open space.
- Sports.
- Housing representatives.
- Other members of the LSP.
- Community and voluntary bodies umbrella organisation.
- SCS team.
- LAA team.
- Local authority finance team.

The work of the LIG to deliver the LIP will need to be managed according to current business best practice standards. The determination of the programme, its strategy and soundness may need to be developed within the Treasury's Green Book processes⁶². Once agreed, it will need to be managed within a recognised programme management discipline such as Managing Successful Programmes [MSP]⁶³ which will need to be accompanied by the use of Prince 2⁶⁴ for individual project management.

⁶² HMT.

⁶³ Office of Government Commerce Managing Successful Programmes.

⁶⁴ Prince 2 [Projects in Controlled Environments] see www.ogc.gov.uk/prince2.

What resources can be harnessed for the LIF? Here are some of the main ones that will increase following the publication of the Lyons Review of local authority funding in 2007:

Resources that can be harnessed in the Local Infrastructure Fund

- LA capital Programme including education.
- PCT capital programme.
- Highways Agency funding.
- Regional Infrastructure Fund [RIF].
- RDA funding.
- Other partnership funding.
- EU funding [this approach should go towards meeting territorial cohesion requirements].
- Section 106 agreements.
- PGS [when implemented].
- Environmental taxes [when implemented including road charging, parking, waste].
- Gershon efficiency savings [which are all retained by the la].
- Prudential borrowing.
- Land and buildings in the ownership of the members of LIG.
- Other public sector land and buildings e.g. MOD, DWP, Universities, Utilities, SHA.
- Devolved community assets⁶⁵.
- Income raised from more beneficial asset management⁶⁶.
- Tax or charges levied on land remaining underdeveloped⁶⁷.
- Interest on existing funds.
- Heritage lottery funds.
- Locally raised funding.
- Privately owned land.

For land in public ownership [and in this case using the wider EU definition of public services to include utilities, universities etc], it is proposed⁶⁸ that all land and buildings are included within asset registers that are based on the same definitional schema, ePIMS⁶⁹. In order to progress successful local asset deployment in the LIP, a common asset register, based on an individual local authority and including all assets owned by local authorities and the public sector will be a positive bonus in reshaping public sector delivery and deploying subsequently released assets to the best effect⁷⁰.

⁶⁵ CLG LG White Paper.

⁶⁶ CLG LG White Paper 2006; Varney 2006.

⁶⁷ As proposed in Barker.

⁶⁸ Varney.

⁶⁹ OGC; www.govtalk.gov.uk

⁷⁰ Varney.

6. Conclusions

6.3.5 Using spatial planning to support change – growth, reshaping, renewal

Spatial planning is an essential tool in managing place shaping which incorporates all change within it. For those local authorities implementing growth areas or market renewal initiatives, the role of spatial planning in achieving these ends is now better understood [from the application of 'roof tax', to infrastructure groups or wider community management of these processes]. However, the techniques of change are the same. Development management is an essential part of the delivery process. This is a joint effort and those leading on spatial planning determine and translate the community's requirements into a programme. Development management's role is then to deliver these programmes through the planning application process. Chief Planning Officers are responsible for ensuring that development management is harnessed to the delivery of these local delivery programmes derived through spatial planning and wider local authority processes. Chief Planning Officers and their senior staff need to have the management skills and capabilities to achieve this. The relationship between spatial planning and development management is critical for delivering tomorrow's places.

6.3.6 Using spatial planning for protection

The role of spatial planning in protecting places is well understood, whether the built, physical or natural environments. The roles of SEA and SA in providing a programme of proactive management, mitigation and enhancement activities needs to be included in the LIP so that areas such as Green Belt⁷¹ can fulfil a recreational as well as a buffer and separation purposes. For heritage environments, conservation areas need policies that can be included within the LIP to provide both design enhancement but also potential funding for improvement. If this work is not undertaken then both will lose out in the LIP process.

6.3.7 Achieving horizontal and vertical integration – regions, sub-regions and natural areas

The integration of RSS within the wider spatial planning process is critical and the relationship with spatial plans at sub-regional, local and parish levels needs to be one of partnership and complementarity rather than hierarchy. The current processes of 'receiving' allocations of uses such as housing or major transport infrastructure down a vertical chain may at times be politically convenient in the face of local opposition. However, the success of places at all levels depends on an evidence base that is then translated into action. This evidence base needs to be open to all and able to be justified.

There is also a need to integrate plans at each scale to reduce the conflicting requirements that each plan will place on localities if they are undertaken in isolation. This applies to national, regional, sub-regional, local and parish levels. Proposals to incorporate the RES with the RSS⁷² are a welcome step forward. We appreciate that the plethora of regional plans and strategies, together with the current separation between planning and the wider public sector within the Government Offices is not making the task easy for those engaged in local spatial planning. However, these interrelationships of scale will always bring issues to be resolved that have always been at the heart of the planning process. The creation of Regional Infrastructure Funds [RIFs] will create new areas of engagement between local and regional interests and the establishment of Regional Infrastructure Groups [RIG] will support the process.

At the sub-regional level, the landscape is becoming increasingly complex. At present sub-regions have no governance structures and have not settled on boundaries that are formally defined. This flexibility can be beneficial as the sub-region can represent a common geography, economy or community of interest. Sub-regions are frequently criticised for a lack of democratic oversight although many sub-regions have incorporated their own managing bodies that are led by democratically elected politicians.

⁷¹ Barker.

⁷² Barker.

The sub-regional approach is about to take a further turn with the implementation of City Regions⁷³ and Multi Area Agreements⁷⁴. City Regions, to be supported by City Development Companies, will cover areas defined by their economic footprints, which could be measured in a number of ways including travel to work areas, using isochrones. City Regions will follow the economic footprint across administrative boundaries for local authorities and regions. They will require governance and delivery arrangements to make them work. In some ways, London already provides a model of a City Region and demonstrates that these approaches can be implemented across a complex set of communities. The recent publication of a report and 'preferred' English sub-regions map by the LGA⁷⁵ demonstrates that this is an evolving policy area which that stabilise in the next year or so.

In the areas covered by MAAs, local authorities may wish to consider developing a joint Core Strategy as part of the process of developing the wider programme for the area. The Core Strategy may include wider issues than those covered by the MAA and in this way it could provide a positive context for MAA delivery.

The implementation of Multi Area Agreements, which will sit above Local Area Agreements, are expected to be used for City Regions but they could also be deployed in other sub-regional areas as a mechanism for joining up strategic direction and delivery programmes. Spatial planning will need to be at the heart of these initiatives as they emerge.

6.3.8 Developing new skills – some specific tools and approaches

Those responsible for managing and delivering the spatial planning process and outcomes are likely to require new skills to manage the task. Again this needs an honest evaluation by planners and their managers. The skills required include:

Skills required for effective spatial planning

- updating on the role and direction of public service reform;
- collection and use of evidence;
- visioning;
- scenario building;
- scoping;
- modelling alternative outcomes;
- evaluative methods;
- decision and resolution techniques;
- benefits realisation from IT systems for business processes, monitoring and performance;
- networking;
- partnership working;
- facilitation;
- modern consultation techniques;
- management of people and resources;
- cultural change;
- organisational sensitivity;

⁷³ CLG The Role of City Development Companies in English Cities and the City-Regions 2006.

⁷⁴ CLG LG White Paper 2006.

⁷⁵ Op cit.

6. Conclusions

- business process reengineering;
- positive public sector strategy development skills;
- programme management;
- project management;
- financial appraisal;
- achieving successful community leadership.

These skills will need to be acquired and can be identified as requirements as part of skills audits [see the Skills Portal⁷⁶ for an example of how this can be undertaken]. The subsequent training needs analysis can be supported through certificated courses for skills such as project and programme management. The consideration of management development and understanding the wider public service reform may need further consideration. There are some new routes that will need to be exploited here including:

- Specialist MBAs for planning.
- Action learning sets with other public sector managers.
- Specific skill development for managing people.
- Managing cultural change.
- Business process reengineering.
- Performance management⁷⁷.

6.3.9 Anticipating barriers to success

In managing any delivery programme there will be barriers and setbacks. Some of these can be anticipated through a risk assessment as part of the programme management approach. However during the life of any programme new problems will arise that can seem frustrating and be set backs. Is there anything that can be done to minimise both the risks and barriers that are apparent at the outset and those that might emerge later? Effective practice suggests that the following points can help:

Overcoming the barriers to effective spatial planning

- Make alliances at the centre of the organisation.
- Read the guidance; don't rely on the interpretation of others.
- Ask questions if you don't understand.
- Use the language of public sector partnership, not the language of planning.
- Assume that you have to get round the problems and that they are not show stoppers.
- Encourage people to take the longer view.
- Know more than one person in an organisation or department in case they move on.
- Try to validate agreements through appropriate systems.
- Don't take short cuts – the quickest way is generally the straightest.
- Keep councillors informed.
- Keep the community informed.

⁷⁶ <http://www.jgp.co.uk/casestudies/doncaster.html>

⁷⁷ See for example SPRINT [ref] or use existing systems e.g. CAPs.

- Feedback your responses to consultation events and processes in a public place.
- Always be prepared with Plan B.
- Know when to lead and when to be a team player.
- Know when to bring in experts or consultants – to provide backup, specialist expertise, technical input, a way of overcoming set positions.
- Understand the benefits of shuttle diplomacy – having everyone together in one meeting will not always help you make progress.

6.3.10 Bringing together the Sustainable Community Strategy and the Core Strategy

The delivery of the locality's future will depend on the way in which you are able to achieve outcomes from the processes which are being used. Bringing together the SCS and CS ensures that there is one programme of outcomes that the whole local public sector is focussed on. Current approaches for the creation of the SCS and CS are different and can be used as an excuse for keeping them separate. However, where there is a will there is a way.

Developing a common approach to SCS and the LDF

- Understand the difference in cultures and use these differences to your advantage.
- Understand that you will have complementary skills which will strengthen outcomes for the local authority area.
- Understand and use effectively the differing networks which you will be operating.
- Understand the difference in time frames and work with these positively.
- Bring the SCS and Core Strategy teams and processes together in a common group and programme.
- Work on a common public sector evidence base.
- Assume that further guidance for SCS will be provided within the next year.
- Encourage the Government Office to see these processes as joined.
- Demonstrate the strength of joined working to the Chief Executive and Management Team.
- Demonstrate the capability of the LIP and LIF to councillors and other LSP participants.
- Ask Chief Executive to be or to appoint the Senior Responsible Owner [SRO] for the programme management of the delivery programme which will derive from the SCS and Core Strategy who will lead and chair the Programme Board.

6.3.11 Engaging the Private Sector

One issue that has emerged through the work on this study is the difficulty in engaging the private sector at an early stage. The private sector will have a variety of interests in the LDF outcomes as both operational users of land and also as owners of land. Local authorities and consultants need to work particularly hard in engaging the private sector from the outset and then ensuring that this engagement is fully representative of the business community. Other structures which are set up including Business Improvement Districts and town centre management groups can assist in this process. However specific activities will need to be organised to tackle both local businesses and on occasion their head offices.

6. Conclusions

Planning consultants who are retained by businesses of all scales also have a role here. Many are retained to provide advice on the development and planning interests of their clients and at present it seems that few planning consultants have really developed a sufficient understanding of spatial planning and its implications. This needs more attention from the RTPI and other providing training in the development sector.

6.4 Supporting the delivery of effective practice in spatial planning

This study has identified many ways in which spatial planning can be made more effective by using the system in the way it is set up rather than attempting to strain it back into a former and more familiar format. Planners need to understand that spatial planning is a break with the past and that it has a central role in place shaping and delivery in the future. This changing role needs to be grasped and embraced as a significant opportunity to contribute to the well being of places and those who use them both now and in the future.

It is also clear that the important wider role of spatial planning has to be recognised by others, within local authorities, the wider public sector, and the private and voluntary sectors. Governance systems are now being aligned to allow a common approach to improving places across a wide variety of agencies and organisations whose contributions can be considerable. Achieving recognition of these opportunities and the responsibilities that they bring requires action on the part of a number of agencies. Recommendations for action are made to these agencies in the next section.

7. Recommendations

In putting together the recommendations from the study, we have drawn on all our work in understanding what is effective practice for shaping and delivering places through spatial planning including the case studies, meetings with Chief executives, councillors, other interested individuals and the project steering group. We also received useful contributions at the seminar we held as part of the project. These recommendations are intended to be practical and achievable for those to whom they are made. Although there is a fast changing context for public sector reform, we believe that there is enough clarity in the direction of travel to enable these recommendations to be progressed immediately, to support place shaping and its delivery both now and in the future.

7.1 To CLG and Central Government

1. That CLG reviews PPSs to include more specific material on the role of spatial planning within the joined up public sector and as part of the Sustainable Community Strategy as one of its delivery vehicles.
2. That CLG, the RTPI and SOLACE should prepare a joint communications strategy for local authority Chief Executives on the role and requirements of spatial planning in their authority wide programmes.
3. That CLG, RTPI and CIPFA should prepare a joint communications strategy for local authority resource managers on the role and requirements of spatial planning in capital planning for the locality including the local authority and wider public sector including that covered by the LAA.
4. That the DOH prepares a Circular and letter to all Health Chief Executives to advise them of their need to engage in spatial planning processes as part of their infrastructure and capital programmes.
5. That the DfES prepare a Circular and letter to the whole education sector [schools, children, HE and FE] and their partners in programmes e.g. BSF to advise them of the importance of spatial approaches and their need to engage with it for their infrastructure and capital planning.
6. That the DfT and other sponsoring Departments advise all Utility companies [including transport, energy, telecomms, water] of their need to engage early in the spatial planning process for infrastructure and capital planning requirements.
7. That the DfT advises all provider sectors of the transport industry that they need to engage early with the infrastructure and spatial planning processes at the local, sub-regional and regional level and to achieve common spatial goals.
8. That all Government Departments advise their direct and agency functions of the need to work within spatial planning infrastructure and capital planning processes including the Home office with the Police and other services including hostels; CLG and Fire; DWP and their local service offices e.g. Job Centre Plus; DTI and the Post Office.

7. Recommendations

9. That CLG works with the DTI, Treasury and other central departments to ensure that the private sector is made aware of the role of spatial planning and to strongly encourage their engagement in it.
10. That CLG advises all parties to LAAs of their need to integrate the LDF as part of their delivery machinery at local level.
11. That the CLG identifies the LDF delivery plan as the LSP's Implementation Programme for capital investment.
12. That PPS12 is amended or supplemented with revised advice on resources and delivery/implementation requirements which set out the relationship between the LDF, the SCS, the LAA and other funding sources such as PGS, environmental revenues, infrastructure funding and other private sector investment.
13. DfES should consider mechanisms for pre-funding school provision within growth areas.
14. DoH should consider reviewing capital charges for health facilities funded by planning gain processes or providing some other mechanism to make these payments.
15. That CLG continues to support research on spatial planning good practice and its outcomes and remains committed to publishing the findings.

7.2 To Government Offices

16. GOs should manage the local authority in an integrated way, making the same official responsible for the LDF, LSP and the LAA.
17. GOs should understand and reinforce the public sector resource management role of the LDF;
18. The roles of GOs and PINS in the LDF process need to be clarified. GOs could concentrate more on ensuring local public sector integration, including consultation has been achieved leaving PINS to the regulatory role.
19. That CLG addresses the lack of a National framework and the effects of its absence in providing a moderating role for Government Offices as this is seen as a major drawback at regional level.

7.3 To regional bodies

20. That all regional plans and strategies should be coordinated through one document – the Sustainable Regional Strategy? – which will have an overarching role.
21. That all regional plans and strategies should clearly address the issues for and roles of their sub-regions.
22. That a common evidence and monitoring base for the region and sub-region be established that is in the public domain.

7.4 To local authorities

23. To establish a local authority wide evidence base or repository for all data on social, environmental and economic characteristics, performance and local opinion on priorities, preferences etc.
24. To ensure that joint or common working on the SCS and LDF Core Strategy is implemented, preferably through a joint team.
25. To include the LDF as part of the programme of local consultation rather than undertake it separately.
26. To establish a local infrastructure group [LIG] which translates the SCS, LDF and other planning requirements into a Local Infrastructure Programme [LIP] which is committed and resourced through the Local Infrastructure Fund [LIF]. Facilities and infrastructure requirements in the longer term will need to be set within capacity studies and the requirements of SEA as the strategy processes roll forward. The LIG should be tied to the LAA and assessed within the Comprehensive Area assessment process.
27. To ensure that all teams preparing the LDF are managed by Prince 2 practitioners and run within the Prince 2 framework.
28. To ensure that all LDF Delivery Teams/LIG groups are supported by MSP practitioners and run within the MSP framework.
29. To use ePIMS as a basis for their asset registers in order to be able to consider all public assets for delivering future places through deployment in the LIP.
30. To establish a more formalised approach to managing planning gain and other funds being derived through the planning process, including identifying requirements as part of the SCS and LIP process.
31. To place all items within section 106 agreements, planning gain, tariff, roof tax or similar devices on a public Community Gain Requirements register.
32. To place all items included within s106, planning gain, tariff, roof tax or similar devices on a public Community Gain list.
33. To include delivery dates and trigger points within the Community Gain Register.
34. To show when delivery has taken place on the Community Gain Register.
35. To put all the financial resources and other assets paid through planning gain in a separate identifiable account within the local authority and prepare an annual report on the use of the capital and the interest.
36. When negotiating any planning gain, to include a percentage for implementation monitoring with the first instalment to be paid to the local authority on signing the agreement and then paid at regular intervals throughout the life of the agreement until fulfilled.
37. To appoint a Community Delivery Auditor to monitor the delivery of all planning gain agreements from the proceeds of the management levy on each agreement.

7. Recommendations

7.5 For development management

38. To be a main agent of delivery for spatial planning and place shaping within the local authority.
39. To engage in the development of evidence and analysis of the requirements for infrastructure that can then be negotiated through section 106 and other agreements.
40. To join the local public sector infrastructure group as one of its key agents of delivery.

8.5 To the Audit Commission

41. That integration between LDF and other local public sector delivery processes be examined as part of CPA, BV and other processes as introduced including Comprehensive Area Assessment.

7.6 To RTPI

42. To disseminate the findings of the EPiSP study to the planning profession and to related development professionals through 'Planning', and the RTPI networks and associations.
43. In partnership with CLG, to support the development and delivery of a specialist Planning MBA which would include modules on finance, HR, business processes, programme management and strategy.
44. To set up a spatial planning and SCS managers network to support and develop their roles and work as found in this study.
45. To establish a web-based spatial planning case study pack to supplement the case studies used in this report.
46. To roll out the findings of EPiSP to the nations, regions and networks.
47. To roll out the findings of EPiSP to planning consultants and sole practitioners.
48. To take the findings and recommendations from EPiSP to CLG, HMT and OGDs.
49. For the study team and RTPI to disseminate the findings through academic journals, trade journals [e.g. AJ, LGC, Estates Gazette, HSJ etc] and conferences.

7.7 To PAS

50. To outline the skills and capabilities required for spatial planning managers and include them in a model Job Description.
51. To promote the take up of 'Funding Urban Regeneration' training modules which have been developed for councillors more widely.
52. To promote the opportunities training for Prince 2, Managing Successful Programmes [MSP] and Treasury Green Book processes [which are required for major public infrastructure projects and schemes].
53. To disseminate the findings of EPiSP through its seminar series.

7.8 To IDeA

54. To establish action learning groups for LSP and spatial planning leads [members and officers].
55. To develop training modules on the spatial planning contribution to the joined upon public service for its Leadership Academy and other similar training programmes.
56. To include briefing on IDeA Knowledge about this project and its implications for local authorities and their partners.
57. To develop briefing for Chief Executives on the interrelationships between LAA,MAA and LDF.

7.9 To Private Sector

58. To enter into local Community Delivery Agreements to support arrangements for s106 and PG agreements.
59. To establish delivery groups with other private sector providers in areas or growth, master planning or market development.
60. To consider providing risk and reward offers to las to help with the development of highway design for new development/section 106 schemes and subsequently managing contract and delivery of the schemes.

8. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning in Action: Detailed case studies

Creating the place of the future

1. Ashford's Future [Ashford].
2. Black Country Initiative [WMRPB].
3. Visioning for change [Middlesbrough].
4. City Centre Planning [Sheffield].
5. Brownfield land led strategies [Tonbridge and Malling].
6. Master Planning for change [Middlesbrough].

Working with other parts of the public sector to deliver

7. Fire Services [WMRPB].
8. Health and PCT provision [Ashford].
9. Health and neighbourhood focus [Tower Hamlets].
10. Education for school provision in growth areas [Ashford].
11. Transport [Sheffield].
12. Delivering Infrastructure [SERPB].

Implementation

13. Managing resources for delivery [Tower Hamlets].
14. Harnessing resources for delivery [Middlesbrough].
15. Creating the conditions for delivery [SERPB].

Working with the voluntary and community sector

16. Working with the voluntary sector [Ashford].
17. Engaging the community at regional level [SERPB].
18. Working with Parish Plans [Tonbridge and Malling].

Delivering Sustainability

19. Managing natural resources proactively [SERPB].
20. Lead on sustainability [Ashford].

Developing new ways of working and new skills

21. Acquiring skills to meet the new requirements [Ashford].
22. Whole authority leadership on joining up [Tower Hamlets].

1. Ashford's Future [Ashford]

At the outset of Ashford's development as a growth area, it established Ashford's Future, a group which has had the principle leadership role through the process of developing a strategy and implementation plan. This group is managing growth which will double the size of the town and will be balanced between housing and economic achievement with a goal to make Ashford competitive in Europe. The role of the LDF has been to set the bar higher to achieve this growth in Ashford but also to preserve the character of the other parts of the local authority area which includes a high number of listed buildings and AONBs. The area is also dealing with pockets of urban and rural deprivation.

Why is the approach effective?

- There is a clear strategy which has political and management support.
- The local authority has been able to tie this to other initiatives such as being a Beacon Council for Asset Management, planning tariff pilot.
- It has made a full assessment of its infrastructure and capacity.
- It has made it easier for the local authority to make decisions more quickly.
- It has helped to create a stable planning context.
- It has helped everyone to understand the scale of potential resources available for delivery from the outset.

Find out more:

www.ashfordsfuture.org.uk

www.ashford.gov.uk/planning/local_dev_framework.asp

2. Black Country initiative

The Black Country authorities have formed the Black Country Consortium, a voluntary partnership of local authority leaders, together with private sector partners and key agencies on the future of the Black Country. There is an ongoing commitment to using a common and shared evidence base. The four constituent local authorities are now working on the preparation of a Joint Core Strategy and the Consortium is developing a Delivery Plan to implement its growth and competitiveness strategy for the Black Country.

The Black Country Consortium has taken a vision-led approach, creating a Vision and objectives for future Black Country in 30 years time. The process adopted has been one of 'hands-on' leadership with the local authority leaders and other key players, including the Chamber of Commerce, the Learning and Skills Council, regional bodies and LSPs, holding regular, facilitated, visioning events.

This has resulted in an integrated strategy for Black Country urban renaissance and transformational change which is economic led, but encompasses action from education to diversity, from homes to business and the environment, including the land use and transport framework to steer that transformation. The Study is effectively the Sustainable Communities strategy for the sub-region.

Some staff have been seconded from the local authorities to develop this work and a budget created to employ additional staff and undertake the studies required to translate the visioning objectives into the RSS. By working in partnership through the participatory regional planning process the local authorities have been able to deal with some major issues such as revisions to sub-regional centre designation which may be more difficult to resolve at local level.


How is this effective?

- It has strong political leadership leading to consensus and ownership.
- It is working across an area which has some existing common understanding and issues.
- It is using visioning processes coupled with evidence gathering which has already been assembled.
- It is using existing structure.

Find out more:

www.blackcountryconsortium.co.uk

Map 6 – Black Country Study: Preferred Transport Networks 2031



3. Visioning for change [Middlesbrough]

The Middlehaven project in Middlesbrough has showcased spatial planning. Middlehaven is the largest single brownfield redevelopment in the north of England covering over 100 hectares and involving some challenging Housing Market Renewal activity. The project is being led by a working group involving One NorthEast, English Partnerships and Middlesbrough Council. Positive planning has been seen in how ONE has funded investment for contemporary designs in building materials and infrastructure, and how planning has been positioned at the forefront of the Vision for the town and sub-region. Joint working has taken place successfully, not least through the ability to shift corporate priorities very quickly to get behind the initiative and to make change happen.



Middlehaven – regeneration of 80ha of former docklands.

How is this effective?

- Working with partners to manage investment.
- Agreeing design as part of delivery.
- Obtaining wider local authority support.
- Delivering for the sub-region.

Find out more:

www.teesvalleyregeneration.co.uk/

www.teesvalleyliving.org.uk/index.html

www.middlesbrough.gov.uk/

4. City Centre Planning [Sheffield]

Sheffield is emerging as a social, economic and environmental growth pole for its surrounding region. Sheffield City Council are working with partners across the city to position Sheffield as an economic driver for an under-performing city-region economy. The regeneration of the city centre is driving this momentum and is a key part of the strategy for Sheffield. The Sheffield Local Strategic Partnership, 'Sheffield First', is responsible for ensuring the ambition in the City Strategy is realised, which involves links with a range of strategies and plans, including the Sheffield Development Framework, which takes up related spatial and land-use issues.

A key component for the regeneration of the city centre is transport, encouraging the use of public transport and alternatives to the private car as well as containing congestion for road users through improved highway infrastructure. There are therefore important links with the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan and the Sheffield Plan for Transport. The Urban Regeneration Company, Sheffield One, prepared the City Centre Master Plan and the City is preparing Area Action Plans which help to deliver the Master Plan. In turn, these will be supported by the economic Master Plan for Sheffield, the City Strategy and the Sheffield Development Framework. The Area Action Plans for the City Centre are supported by a local area forum of business representatives and residents, which assists the consultation on the city centre re-development and the over-arching economic Master Plan for Sheffield and the City Region.



Sheffield Town Hall and the newly redesigned Peace Gardens – a flagship and award-winning project in the regenerated heart of the City.

How is this effective?

- All public partners working together.
- Defining the city centre's role locally and sub-regionally.
- Sense of direction for the future of the city centre.
- Integrated approach for the economy and transport infrastructure.
- Reviewing ways to use incentives to change people's travel behaviour and preferences
- Implementing the Master Plan through Action Area Plans.
- Integrating City Centre with the rest of the City.
- Delivering for the City – region.

8. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning in Action

Find out more:

www.sheffieldfirst.net/sheffield-city-strategy

www.sheffield1.com/plan.asp

www.sheffield.gov.uk/in-your-area/planning-and-city-development/city-development-division

www.sheffield.gov.uk/in-your-area/planning-and-city-development/planning-documents/sdf

www.syltp.org.uk/

www.sheffield.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/plans-policies/transport-policy/plan-for-transport-in-sheffield

5. Leading with Brown field land strategies [Tonbridge and Malling]

Tonbridge and Malling have achieved a total of 98% of development on brown field land which has enabled them to have distinctive approaches to the urban and rural parts of their area. Elected members have understood the role in focussing on brown field land to enable the authority to have more individualised approaches to the settlements in their area and the authority has already exceeded its regional housing targets. A major strength has been to link this with the homelessness and housing strategies.

In the urban area and large villages, it has been possible to locate more housing where Brownfield sites and infrastructure is already available. In Tonbridge Town Centre, an Action Area Plan has been prepared which includes a Tonbridge Central Area Fund as part of the delivery plan which includes town centre management as well as highway and other public service improvement. It also has a proactive stance on the reuse of land through remediation and is increasing densities near to public transport facilities. It is also promoting more housing in the AAP for Tonbridge to use existing infrastructure more effectively and sustainably.

In the rural areas of their district new approaches have included quiet lanes, special signage and other traffic management features. Given that Tonbridge & Malling is predominantly a rural Authority, necessarily this brings with it a number of issues particular to the geography and layout of the place, not least that any movements between settlements and services create a demand and need to travel. Sustainable transport and congestion issues have been particular considerations of the Authority, and more work is needed to look at how the management of traffic can be improved.

How is this effective?

- The local authority has understood local distinctiveness in the development and application of policy.
- It has used brown field land in urban and former major employment areas to provide housing.
- It has proactive rural policies.
- It has proactive town centre policies for the growth in residents.

Find out more:

www.ashford.gov.uk/planning/local_dev_framework.asp

8. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning in Action

6. Master Planning for change [Middlesbrough]

Middlesbrough has experienced large scale physical regeneration, particularly with the clearance of 1500 residential units in close proximity to the town centre. The town has had the opportunity to make a difference at gateway points where there have been new developments and change. Altering the structure of the housing stock through stock reduction and redevelopment to address the housing issues in Middlesbrough and people's perceptions of the town on their approach.



How is this effective?

- Using spatial planning to reshape the place.
- Using a variety of means together to achieve change.
- Working to deliver what the community wanted to see achieved.

Find out more:

<http://www.teesvalleyliving.org.uk/index.htm>

<http://www.teesvalleyregeneration.co.uk/>

<http://www.middlesbrough.gov.uk/>

7. Fire Authorities [WM RPB]

The West Midlands RPB has been working with the Regional Fire Services as part of its discussions on the location of new housing. The Fire Service had been undertaking service planning incrementally, following the development of new housing and then bidding for resources to serve these areas later. In discussion with the RPB it has now been able to review a longer term plan for fire service provision which can take into account population changes in the future. This has allowed the Fire Service to plan its resources for the longer term and ensure that it can provide effective coverage for the future. The Fire Service has also been able to feed in its own advice on locations of housing allocations in relation to its current service provision.

How is this effective?

- It is supporting effective service provision.
- It is supporting longer term effective and efficient provision of fire services in the region.
- It could be extended to other blue light services.
- It could be used at other scales e.g. locally or sub-regionally.

Find out more:

www.wmra.gov.uk

8. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning in Action

8. Health/PCT provision [Ashford]

In Ashford, as part of the delivery of the growth area, the local authority has been working with the PCT to support and develop their longer term health care provision planning and how this should be translated into infrastructure requirements. The PCT had never considered its long term requirements in this way before and has found it helpful both to manage its own resources and to argue for resources for the future.

How is this effective?

- It has been attempted through a new relationship.
- The spatial planning team has been able to support the PCT as it has been through a new process.
- It is resulting in planned provision as part of the growth strategy so that sites can be allocated.
- It is resulting in the potential opportunities to reshape public service provision in Ashford through this early process of assessment.
- It enables the local authority to identify its requirements through s106 and planning gain tariffs.
- There is an essential core relationship between the spatial planning, delivery and the development management teams to achieve these ends.

Find out more:

www.kentandmedway.nhs.uk/structure_and_organisations/primary_care_trusts/ashford_primary_care_trust.asp

9. Health/neighbourhood focus THEMATIC [LBTH]

Tower Hamlets Council and the PCT have been working together over a period of time to develop an effective approach to health care provision in this densely built up area. The Tower Hamlets Information System, THIS, which has been developed jointly has been a means through which assessments of current and future assessment have been undertaken. This approach is in direct contrast to the piecemeal approach taken to working with health in the 1998 UDP process, where health saw planning as an impediment to getting things done. Since then Tower Hamlets has prepared a Health and Well Being Framework for the next 15 years and this has been a key component of the model to consider future requirements for the community.

The PCT has been working with the 6 other PCTS in the area as the scale of growth would have provided the case for a new District general Hospital. However the PCTs have decided to take another route for delivering services through a networked approach to delivering generic consulting facilities, at ground floor level, to allow consultants to see people close to their homes. The existing provision has been taken as the basis for this approach and then subjected to a gap analysis to understand both where new provision is required and the capacity of the existing facilities in their context to provide for this.

A variety of approaches have been used to deliver the new health capacity. Ten capital schemes have been identified and they are being funded through a variety of routes. Two are being delivered through LIFT and others through RSLs and third party developments. One is being delivered with a BSF school which is promoting health care education and qualifications as part of its curriculum. The local authority has used the Mayor's HUDU planning gain toolkit to assess the contributions required form new developments based on the capacity and demographic evidence already collected.

A main concern in the provision of this new health care has been the capital charges which the NHS requires form all their buildings as this has not been calculated in the development costs for new schemes. Revenue funding for operations the first two to three years has been included in s106 agreements if appropriate. Four of schemes have provided a facility rather than cash.

The PCT has said that this approach to spatial planning has changed the way it works. In the past their approach to health care provision was fragmented. The population was changing and rising but there was no plan to help them respond to these changes and the overall system reinforced fragmentation and there was little confidence in their ability to deliver. Under the new approach, they have been able to develop effectively and in some cases have been able to co-locate with other services.

How is this effective?

- There has been a review of existing services and future requirements which has led to the identification of gaps in provision.
- Forward planning has allowed the benefits of co-location to be used.
- Delivery has been driven by need and not by available funds.
- Delivery has been supported by a variety of approaches within planning and through other means.
- It has helped health to deliver services more effectively.

Find out more:

web sites to be added

10. Education for school provision in growth areas [Ashford]

Working in a two tier environment has meant that Ashford has had early engagement with Kent County Council which is their education provider at the local level. This work is undertaken through the Ashford Community Infrastructure Group as part of a common approach across the public sector. KCC has been involved from the earliest stages and has been reviewing the requirements for provision of new primary and secondary school places as Ashford grows. In order to support the process, the County Council has decided to remove provision that is no longer required and move to identify sites where future provision can be more appropriately placed. In undertaking these reviews, the County Council has identified sites on which other public services could be delivered in due course. There is no immediate issue for KCC about the funding for schools following the pupil numbers, which has been mentioned as a barrier in other local authority areas, as their service is of a significant size. However it would be useful if the DfES could provide a mechanism to pre-fund schools in growth areas.

Why is this effective?

- Education services were involved at an early stage.
- The education service has been willing to undertake some strategic planning as part of the process.
- The education authority has considered the funding issues as part of its assessment.
- Ashford has a significant understanding of its education requirements when undertaking negotiations with developers over the implementation of new development.

Find out more:

web sites to be added

11. Transport [Sheffield]

The development of future strategies for Sheffield has been undertaken with South Yorkshire PTE as part of the Local Transport Plan and is using key public transport corridors as the main components to infrastructure investment. The 'Key Routes' network is being used as locations for new housing and other development including public facilities. This is being undertaken to maximise use of the existing infrastructure and to build a sustainable city. Other transport modes including walking and cycling have also been added to the corridors. The Council's Core Strategy will be reinforcing this approach which is a long standing one within the City. The City is developing an approach to car parking in the city centre that enhances its relative role in making the City attractive and competitive by providing for short-stay needs in the centre and for long-stay through park-and-ride.

How is this effective?

- it is using the existing pattern and grain of the City.
- it is maximising the use of existing infrastructure investment.
- it supports the provision of commercial public transport services.
- it is focussing on making the City more sustainable.

Find out more:

www.syltp.org.uk/

www.sheffield.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/plans-policies/transport-policy/plan-for-transport-in-sheffield

www.sheffield.gov.uk/in-your-area/planning-and-city-development/planning-documents/sdf/core-strategy



Sheffield's tram brings wider regeneration opportunities


12. Infrastructure Delivery [SERPB]

The SERPB agreed that PPS 11 and the opportunity to prepare an RSS created a major opportunity for change in its approach to a sustainable and deliverable Regional Strategy. The RPB has taken a strong delivery focused approach from the outset, commissioning work to underpin its assessment not only of the infrastructure required but also of its costs and deliverability. The infrastructure requirements include transport, water, waste and energy. The result is an Implementation Plan which includes not only new requirements for investments but also:

- Behavioural changes.
- Regulatory changes.
- Managing the existing assets.
- The whole approach is contained within a Regional Implementation Plan which is an integral part of the RSS and also identifies sub-regional level investment frameworks.

How is this effective?

- It has connected long-term strategic planning with deliverables.
- It provides information on who should be providing the infrastructure, how much it will cost and an indication of timescale.
- The implementation plan has been developed with many stakeholders including the infrastructure providers and regulators.
- The implementation plan has been used to inform discussions with government on the future of the South East, particularly through the current Spending Review.



SERPB Implementation Plan

Find out more:

http://www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan/key/implementation_plan.html

13. Harnessing resources for delivery [Tower Hamlets]

In Tower Hamlets, the Council's philosophy is to support managed growth by ensuring that the right facilities are available at the right time to support these changes. They have developed a health and Well Being Framework for the area for the next 15 years which has been a way to analyse the social and community requirements for the future. The local authority and its public sector partners have also undertaken a capacity and character assessments of all areas within the borough and from this they have derived a model into which can be plugged various scenarios for the future.. These scenarios include demographic change and the consequent requirements for public services such as health and education. The local authority has also been capacity building with other local public sector agencies and stakeholders.

How is this effective?

- Capacity and character assessment undertaken first as part of evidence analysis.
- Working with other public sector organisations from the outset.
- Looking at potential alternatives for the future.
- Leadership from the centre of the local authority.
- Wanting to ensure that social and cultural facilities are provided to support change at the same time.

Find out more:

web sites to be added

14. Harnessing Resources for delivery [Middlesbrough]

Middlesbrough is one of the top ten most deprived boroughs in the UK. Much of its infrastructure is outdated, and an environment often dominated by a 'Victorian' economy, which has since declined. The town has a poor image and high levels of out-migration and has faced low demand for housing. The existing housing stock is unbalanced, with concentrations of social and terraced housing in particular neighbourhoods, limiting range and choice, particularly in the fringe around the town centre. The quality of the environment is poor, particularly around the River Tees where the degraded landscape covers an extensive area. In Middlesbrough there is a real need to create wealth, jobs, opportunity and a better standard of physical development.



The BOHO Building – the core building of a creative industries quarter in the centre of Middlesbrough

Within Middlesbrough the delivery landscape for spatial planning was influenced by planning being perceived as a service rather than a useful mechanism for change. The range of public sector bodies and their inter-relationships were very complex and have not assisted the delivery. One of the components of Middlesbrough Council's success has been the realignment of its directorates, making sure that there is open dialogue between those leading different departments, not least between housing and planning. The first step in this was to increase the visibility of staff at the highest levels of management and to ensure an open dialogue was forthcoming, enabling barriers to be overcome. In addition, there has been strong political alignment and support and an increasing professionalisation of members, working across-party. Middlesbrough has used a multi-disciplinary approach, identifying areas of skills crossover between different departments and highlighting how they can be used to further the town's development proposals.

How is this effective?

- It has developed an organisation which is fit for purpose.
- It has engaged political leadership.
- It has worked across the local authority to achieve change.
- It has led a proactive approach.

Find out more:

www.middlesbrough.gov.uk/

www.smi-teesvalley.co.uk/

www.visitmima.com

15. Creating the conditions for delivery [SERPB]

From the outset of the process the RPB was focussed on the delivery of the RSS process. In order to develop its regional delivery strategy it focussed on:

- Who had the funding?
- Who could help make things happen?
- Who would need to be encouraged to work in a coordinated way?
- What issues would make a difference – these were based on the issues arising from the Sustainability Appraisal – transport, energy, waste, water and affordable housing.
- They worked directly with central government as well as the regional bodies.
- They decided that working with the Regional Development Agency would be fundamentally important, with an aspiration for a joint implementation plan for both the RSS and the RES.
- They expected to disagree at times and took a mature attitude to the process.
- They engaged political buy-in at an early stage.
- They sought to align budgets and are currently working with partners to a Regional Infrastructure Fund.
- They assessed the costs of implementation.
- They tackled some of the myths about planning stopping things at an early stage with the economic stakeholders.



SE Regional Assembly
Voting

Why is this effective?

- There was an engagement on all levels from central government to parish councils.
- They decided to focus on some key priorities and not tackle everything.
- They recognised that success was dependent on a level of understanding and commitment from all those involved in 'delivery', particularly the local authorities.
- They remained focussed on outcomes rather than process.
- Political leadership was important to achieving progress.
- They understood the process of LAAs and MAAs as these were unfolding for the local authorities.
- They have been able to communicate to developers and investors what funding support there is from the outset and create some certainty for areas with challenges to meet.

Find out more:

www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan/index.html

16. Working with the voluntary sector as part of delivery [Ashford]

In Ashford, as part of the growth area development, a voluntary and community sector umbrella group has been established to work alongside the discussions about Ashford's future. It has been helpful to consider the role of the community's requirements for building and other facilities and link these into decisions about development contributions. The group has been set up early and has been professionally supported and facilitated. This has enabled the voluntary and community sector to be engaged in the discussions on Ashford's future from the outset. It has also allowed the group's requirements to be fed into discussions. This group is separate from the LSP and in future Ashford may need to review how to bridge this divide.

Why is this effective?

- The group was set up from the outset.
- It has a clear role.
- It has been informed.
- It has been professionally supported by an expert in the field.
- The local authority realised the importance of getting this process right with the community and voluntary sector.

Find out more:

www.ashford.gov.uk/about_council/voluntary_compact.asp

17. Engaging the community at regional level [SERPB]

The SE RPB has been through extensive consultation with their communities and stakeholders in the region using a variety of techniques including the web MORI surveys and focus groups to engage people in the process. Key to this was the involvement of a wide range of experts in the Region who contributed to various advisory groups, often through umbrella organisations. Their involvement, though changing, is still crucial and as an example, a new Sounding Board has been established to scope the wide range of requirements for the region and what needs to happen in order to be able to implement the RSS, including behavioural change.

Why is this effective?

- The approach has been proactive.
- There was consideration given to the ways to achieve inclusively from the outset.
- Multiple methods of consultation have been used.

Where to find out more:

www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/publications/surveys/2006/MORI_Perceptions_2006_Final_Report.pdf



18. Working with Parish Plans [Tonbridge and Malling]

Within the Tonbridge and Malling the development of Parish Plans has been an effective means of providing a local perspective and developing a stronger spatial dimension. The local authority is aware of the challenges in delivering this. To ensure implementation and follow through there must be clear linkages to the Core Strategy but the mechanism to achieve this is unclear and opinion varies about the extent to which the Statutory Planning System should consider the Parish-based planning approach, including Village Design Statements. However, the material can provide an additional layer and tier of information to provide greater depth and clarity around particular issues.

How is this effective?

- The use of Parish Plans to create the Core Strategy provides essential information on local distinctiveness.
- Parish Plans represent local views and priorities for the place.
- Village Design Statement can inform and enhance delivery.

Find out more:

www.tmbc.gov.uk/cgi-bin/buildpage.pl?mysql=1179

19. Managing natural resources proactively [SERPB]

The SE RPB is committed to both managing its natural resources and also to reducing its ecological footprint. It has established a monitoring framework from its SEA and is approaching this in line with natural rather than administrative areas in the region. In the SE there are areas of heathland which require special protection under European Regulation which have significant implications for a large number of housing proposals. The RSS has taken a proactive stance to this by working with the local authorities, developers, English Nature and the Environment Agency to find an approach which satisfies both the need for development and protection of environmental assets.

The provision of water supply in the SE is also a major issue and could impede the achievement of the housing required in the region for economic and social purposes. The RPB has worked with the Environment Agency and utility companies on an approach to water quality and supply, which includes tackling changing behaviour to reduce water demands in the region.

Why has this been effective?

- It has identified issues of critical regional importance.
- It has identified an issue which was generating numerous planning problems.
- It has provided a practice approach to managing and preserving the assets through the planning process.
- it is being an enabler not a regulator.
- it has been concerned with managing existing assets through behavioural change.
- It has monitored change in use of these natural resources.
- It has been explicit about the importance of these issues in the RSS.



Find out more:

www.southeast-ra.gov.uk/southeastplan/plan/march_2006/core_document/008_seera_sep_d05.pdf

8. Effective Practice in Spatial Planning in Action

20. Lead on sustainability la wide [Ashford]

As Ashford is proposed to double in size, the process of spatial planning has been combined with the lead on sustainability in the authority. The process of achieving growth has enabled to set a higher standard in the achievement of sustainability than they believe would have been possible with a more modest set of changes. There are some concerns that higher standards could mean delay in delivery or in quality but it has been agreed that this is an important objective.

Why is this effective?

- The local authority has been prepared to take a lead as part of the growth strategy.
- It believes that change can lead to better outcomes for both living and working.

Find out more:

www.ashford.gov.uk/ldf

www.ashfordsfuture.org.uk

www.kentenergycentre.co.uk

21. Acquiring skills to meet new requirements [Ashford]

Delivery of the LDF in Ashford has been seen to be a more fulfilling and rounded experience than has previously been the case. In order to support the delivery of the future for Ashford, a strategic sites and delivery group has been established to focus the skills to be deployed in achieving the delivery of the programmed outcomes. Ashford has attempted to work with new tools where these are available such as design codes and planning tariffs which can play an important part in change. However the planners have also been aware that they need other skills which they have been required to learn on the job as they were not anticipated at the outset. These have included development financial appraisal and also project and programme management, all of which have been essential in the delivery of Ashford's future. They have also been able to learn from others such as Milton Keynes' roof tax which others have mentioned as being a good model which they have also used.

How is this effective?

- Planners have learned from the practices of others with whom they are working.
- They are learning by doing and understand that they make some mistakes in the process and anticipate this.
- They are learning from circumstances.
- They have developed a culture of trying new things.
- They are learning about marketing and communications.
- They are learning how to be linked to corporate processes e.g. CPA.
- They are not waiting for the Government to bring forward advice.
- They understand that the LDF can change more quickly if needed
- They see the Tests of Soundness as important tools to support delivery.
- They use benchmarking across Kent IAs.
- They have partnered with other local authorities if this makes sense in delivery e.g. a housing needs study has been undertaken by 4 local authorities.
- They have shared services e.g. with other Kent local authorities.

Find out more:

www.ashford.gov.uk/ldf

www.ashfordsfuture.org.uk

www.kentenergycentre.co.uk

22. Whole authority leadership on joining up [Tower Hamlets]

Taking a community wide approach is a key feature of the way in which Tower Hamlets works for its community and for its partners. Tower Hamlets is a complex area and has numerous initiatives and organisations managing these operating within its area including the London Thames Gateway development Corporation and the Olympic delivery Authority. The leadership of the local authority Chief executive consistently questioning the way in which things are working together has meant that partners can work with confidence and local authority officers know that this is a requirement of how they work. The culture of the organisations in Tower Hamlets has been changed by this approach in an area which could be seen to have one of the most complex operating environments on any locality.

How is this effective?

- Focussing on outcomes and not organisations.
- Taking an operational approach to delivery using a multiplicity of methods to create outcomes.
- Ensuring partners are equal.
- Starting from the community's requirements for well being.
- Not letting organisational structures get in the way.

Find out more:

web site details to be added

Appendices

1. Abbreviations
2. Case study local authorities and RPBs and individuals who have participated in the research
3. The Study Team
4. The Research Questions

Appendix 1 – Abbreviations

AAP	Action Area Plan
CAA	Comprehensive Area Assessment
CIF	Community Infrastructure Fund
CLG	Dept of Communities and Local Government
CPA	Comprehensive Performance Assessment
DfES	Dept for Education and Skills
GLA	Greater London Authority
GO	Government Office
IDeA	Improvement and Development Agency
LAA	Local Area Agreement
LDF	Local Development Framework
LDF	Local Development Scheme
LGA	Local Government Association
LIF	Local Infrastructure Fund
LIG	Local Infrastructure Group
LIP	Local Infrastructure Programme
LSP	Local Strategic Partnerships
MAA	Multi Area Agreement
PAS	Planning Advisory Service
PCT	Primary Care Trust
PINS	Planning Inspectorate
POS	Planning Officers' Society
PPS	Planning Policy Statement [produced by CLG]
PTE	Passenger Transport Executive
RDA	Regional Development Agency
RES	Regional Economic Strategy

RIF	Regional Infrastructure Fund
RIG	Regional Infrastructure Group
RIP	Regional Infrastructure Programme
RPB	Regional Planning Body
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
SCS	Sustainable Community Strategy

Appendix 2 – Those who participated in the study

Ashford District Council

Black Country Consortium

Bolsover District Council

CPRE [in the SE]

Derby City Council

Derbyshire County Council

Erewash District Council

GOSE

Highways Agency [in the SE]

Local Government East Midlands

The Lyons Inquiry into Local Government

Kent County Council

Middlesbrough Unitary Authority

North Kesteven District Council

North West Leicestershire District Council

Peter Pendleton Associates

Planning Inspectorate

SEEDA

SE RPB

Sheffield City Council

Sheffield First Partnership

Sheffield PCT

Sheffield PTE

Swindon Borough Council

Marilyn Taylor

Tonbridge and Malling District Council

Tower Hamlets Borough Council

Tower Hamlets PCT

Dru Vesty

West Kent LSP

West Midlands Local Government Association

West Midlands RPB

Also over 50 people attended the invited seminar on the project on 6th December 2006 at UCL.

Appendix 3 – The Study Team

The project was led by **Professor Janice Morphet**, who is Visiting Professor in Town Planning at University College London. Janice is a Fellow of the RTPI and has, until recently, been a senior adviser on local government modernisation at ODPM. Janice has also been a local authority Chief Executive and led a Planning School. Janice is a member of the town planning panel of the RAE 2008 and is an independent member of the Olympic Delivery Authority's Development Decisions Committee. Janice has published on a variety of issues including local government, sustainability, planning and diversity. She is now an independent consultant.

Dr Nick Gallent is Reader in Planning and Housing at UCL and has more than 10 years experience in the field of planning and housing. He is co-author of a previous RTPI co-sponsored good practice guide on planning and housing provision and has led several recent projects on planning and housing in the countryside and the future role of spatial planning in the rural-urban fringe. He is also a Chartered town planner.

Professor Mark Tewdwr-Jones is Professor of Spatial Planning and Governance as well as Director of Research at UCL Bartlett School of Planning. He is author of several books on the planning system including *The European Dimension of British Planning* (2001) and *The Planning Polity* (2002). Mark is a chartered town planner.

Bill Hall has over 10 years public sector consultancy experience with considerable and recent experience in e-planning, regulatory services, business processes improvement/review, joint working and national projects and has worked on a number of planning programmes at ODPM including PARSOL One app and NeSDS. Before joining Deloitte, Bill had local authority experience in the planning service, IT and policy.

Matthew Spry is a qualified planner with ten years experience of spatial planning across the UK. He joined Deloitte in 2004, having previously worked for an independent planning consultancy. He specialises in policy evaluation, housing, area-based regeneration, and strategic planning. He has advised RPBs, a number of RDAs, HMR Pathfinders, URCs, HBF, developers, and numerous Local Authorities on spatial planning issues, including the scale and distribution of new housing; the impact of regional economic strategy; the development, delivery, and financing of regeneration proposals/strategy delivery vehicle; and the steering of major development proposals through the planning system.

Rachael Howard is a Chartered Surveyor who specialises in spatial planning, area-based regeneration, and regional development. She has experience on a number of planning projects including preparing evidence on housing numbers as an input to RSS.

Appendix 4 the research questions

The Principles of Spatial Planning

- What is the new space which spatial planning occupies, how is it defined and how can it be communicated?
- Has the case study authority embraced spatial planning either overtly/deliberately or by default in response to other policies/programmes with spatial dimension?
- Has spatial planning practice represented a step change from former practices and in what way?
- Is spatial planning any more than a policy integration tool?
- Does the European link (ESDP) generate any expectations for methodology in spatial planning?
- Are there any lessons for spatial planning from Interreg and trans-national spatial visions?
- What does a spatial vision include?

Achieving Partnership, Integration and Cooperation

- How has the evidence base for the making of spatial planning and programme-specific decisions be integrated into policy-making?
- Is the scope and extent of evidence gathered greater than that required for land use planning?
- How are the broader social, economic, and environmental objectives of communities integrated to policy making?
- Have there been the different perspectives on social, economic, and environmental objectives and how have these been managed within spatial planning?
- What types of investment/programmes should be embraced within a spatial planning process?
- How can physical and social infrastructure investment be incorporated within the spatial planning process?
- What are the barriers to achieving partnership, integration and cooperation and how were/can these be overcome?
- Can and/or should spatial planning replace the multiplicity of different sectoral and spatial strategies?
- Is spatial planning a mechanism to reduce fragmentation?
- Can spatial planning contribute to reducing the partnership plethora or becoming a conduit for managing it and how?

Frameworks, Integration, Participation and Practices

- Can spatial planning be one thing or must it interpreted locally in response to local issues?
- How can political support for spatial planning be harnessed?
- How can spatial planning work within regional and sub-regional constructs including planning products and governance structures such as city-regions?
- What will the spatial plan look like? How will it relate to the LDF and RSS processes and products?
- How are public sector infrastructure requirements identified and interpreted into the spatial strategy?
- How are the different timescales associated with different programmes/infrastructure/investment decisions accommodated within an overall spatial planning approach?
- How are the different geographies associated with different programmes/infrastructure/investment decisions?

- What approaches can be successfully utilised as this integrated approach rolls out?
- As Government Offices are moderating both Local Area Agreements and Local Development Frameworks what positive approaches and potential inhibiting processes could be expected to support spatial planning?

Positive Planning

- Are there tensions between 'new' participants in spatial planning and 'traditional' participants in town and country/land use planning, and how have these been managed?
- How can visionary planning be developed/accommodated within the current system?
- How can/should expectations and aspirations be accommodated and managed within spatial planning?
- What mechanisms for integration, negotiation and compromise can be accommodated within positive spatial planning?
- How can the spatial planning process support the implementation of place shaping requirements?

Spatial Planning as a Stimulant for Cultural Change in Planning

- How can spatial planning stimulate cultural change in planning?
- Who should own the spatial plan/strategy?
- Where should spatial planning be located to best deliver this task?
- Have there been language barriers to spatial planning and how can these be overcome?
- How should spatial planning be represented as part of the Sustainable Community Strategy process, product, programme and outcomes?

Delivering Spatial Planning

- How can land use planning be part of the wider spatial planning process?
- Does the statutory planning framework restrain spatial planning?
- How important is it for the regulatory processes to be associated with the spatial plan?
- Is it necessary to break the genetic codes with town and country planning [and its legal heritage] for spatial planning to be effective?
- Who will be involved in the production of spatial planning?
- How can spatial planning be negotiated and communicated to the participants?
- What are the tools for spatial planning and how do they map on to existing legal and administrative approaches?

Notes

Notes



MAYOR OF LONDON

ISBN 1-902311-34-5

© The Royal Town Planning Institute
Registered Charity No 262865

Published by the Royal Town Planning Institute
April 2007

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system in any form or by any means electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, photocopying or otherwise, without permission in writing from the Royal Town Planning Institute.