

### **Local Infrastructure Planning in England**

### **Prof Janice Morphet**

Highbury Group 11<sup>th</sup> March 2012



#### overview

- Policy Punctuation Introducing infrastructure planning into the local planning system in England
- 2. Progress in practice
- 3. The impact of the Localism Act 2011
- 4. Local Enterprise Partnerships and the new strategic planning
- 5. Challenges
- 6. Discussion



## 1. Infrastructure delivery through local planning a Policy Punctuation?

- When infrastructure delivery planning emerged in UK in 2000, what was its provenance? And what was the impulse?
- Was it a **policy punctuation**? (Baumgartner and Jones, 1993; John and Margetts, 2003)



## Local infrastructure planning – provenance and impulse

- 1987 Single European Act focus on competitiveness
- 1993 Maastricht Treaty focus on networks, bottleneck and missing links
- OECD focus on the role of local infrastructure investment and access to jobs



# Introducing infrastructure planning in local planning in England – milestones to 2010

- Planning Green Paper, 2000
- 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act
- 2005 PINS tests of soundness 'deliverability'
- 2007 UCL Deloitte lack of understanding
- Revised PPS 12 (2008)
- Planning Act 2008
- Steps Approach published 2009
- Rolled out across England 2008-onwards



### What did spatial planning turn mean?

Moving from a plan that is implemented by others to

Plan that the local authority commits to deliver using its own resources and leadership to advocate and coordinate



### **PPS 12:**

- 'orchestrates the necessary, social, physical and green infrastructure to ensure that sustainable communities are delivered' (para 2.4)
- Providing a robust basis of evidence for the need for infrastructure (paras 2.5 and 4.8)



### **PPS 12 requirements**

- infrastructure needs and costs;
- phasing of development;
- funding sources; and
- responsibilities for delivery

(para 4.9)



### And in practice...

- Led to Infrastructure Delivery Plans (IDPs) being prepared to support local development plans
- Some are shown as schedules within Core Strategies
- Some are held outside as evidence or supporting documents
- Can comprise schedules or schedules and analysis
- Can be grouped by locality, type of infrastructure or overarching objectives
- Now generally published before Core Strategy is submitted



### 2. Progress in Practice (to May 2011)

- 2008 no IDPs in any local authority
- over 40% las with Infrastructure Delivery Plan as part of LP process
- 100% las in Black Country LEP
- 80% London Boroughs;
- 60% MBs Gtr Manchester LEP
- 0% MBs Merseyside LEP
- 0% UAs Cheshire and Warrington LEP



### 3. Progress in Practice (to March 2012)

- Currently re-surveying
- Increase in IDPs
- Increase in commitments to prepare IDPs
- Evidence of gaps for CIL
- Some Core Strategies found sound without IDP type evidence...



### **Progress of IDPs in England (May 2011)**

By May 2011 (Las in LEPs)

•36% Core Strategies prepared (since 2004)•40% IDPs prepared (Since 2008)



### Core Strategies delayed since 2010 General Election

- 58 Core Strategies delayed
- 70% in Conservative run las
- 5% in Lib Dem las
- 12% in Labour las
- 12% in NOC

Source: Morphet 2011 survey; nb Doncaster directly elected Mayor



#### 3. Impact of the Localism Act 2011

- Initially promoted assumption that 2004 Act would be replaced by NPPF
- Now confirmed that NPPF will replace some PPS
- Draft NPPF attracted over 16,000 responses
- New final draft NPPF being circulated
- Due at end of March 2012



### Key issues to consider

- Maintenance of infrastructure planning at local level
- Reinforced at national level through National Infrastructure Plan NIP 1 (2010), NIP 2 (2011)
- Promotion of infrastructure investment funding
- Duty to cooperate



#### National Infrastructure Plan

- Government Commitment to Infrastructure
  planning
- Continued approach to national Infrastructure planning Statements (2008) to be approved by Parliament (2012)
- National Infrastructure Planning Association (NIPA) been formed



## Promotion of investment funding at local level

- Localism Act s 1-7 give local authorities financial autonomy – e.g. can open banks
- Local resource review and current Local Finance Bill reform of Business rates and council tax
- Increased role of revolving funds e.g. European Investment bank – evergreen in Manchester
- Use of la bonds e.g. Wandsworth and Northern line extension
- Use of la pension funds e.g. Manchester building homes
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Tax Increment Finance (TIF)



### **Duty to Co-operate**

- Continuation of duty in 2004 Act
- Needs to be demonstrable
- Usually expressed over housing market areas (HMA) (PPS 3) and travel to work areas (TTWA)
- Increasingly seen as basis for Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs)



## Draft NPPF: key infrastructure content to be required

- Delivery
- Integration
- Re-use existing
- Support business
- Across boundaries
- Local standards
- Specific services (approx 16 individual services mentioned)



### 4. Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs)

- Sub National Review 2007 introduced concept
- Introduced by letter of invitation From Coalition Gov to las July 2010
- Locally 'self determining'
- Membership can overlap
- Seen to be engine of local growth
- Seen to be replacements for regional planning (Clark, 2011)
- Can have hybrid legal personalities
- Potentially responsible for housing, transport, planning, skills



### **Progress in LEP formation**

- Now 39 LEPs
- Only 4 las not in a LEP hence 99% coverage
- Over 20 las in more than 1 LEP



### LEPs – powers and policy

- No specific powers
- Policies include:
  - Regional Growth Fund
  - Enterprise Zones
  - Growing Places Fund
  - Transport
  - Skills
  - Planning



### **Competitive funding regimes for LEPs**

- Regional growth Funds primarily targeted where larger volume of public sector job loss
- EZs attempted to focus on large single sites



### **Allocated Funding for LEPs**

- Growing Places fund to get governance arrangements in place
- Transport Fund from 2014 transport boards like Transport for London (TfL)
- City Skills Fund



### **Planning?**

- Use duty to cooperate
- Establish joint committee?
- Use strategic plan to underpin investment
- Consolidate IDPs into a strategic IDP for each LEP – being encouraged through transport funding



## 3. Factors underpinning this change – a discussion

- Infrastructure planning seems to have been taken up more rapidly than LDF process – why might this be the case?
- Some theoretical options to explore:
  - 1. Policy transfer
  - 2. Policy network
  - 3. System stewardship
  - 4. 'culture change'



### 4. challenges?

- Cultural
- Competitive



### **Cultural challenges**

- Many planners don't understand the changes in spatial planning
- Selling the infrastructure role within the la and to private sector
- Could be removed from planners as in Australia



### **Competiton challenges**

- Seen as a regeneration activity
- Funding will not be secured as not tied back into planning process – see Barca 2009 and AGMA LEP work programme 2012
- Between national and local major industry supporting national infrastructure plans – how nodes this relate to the local? No answer in draft NPPF



#### References

- Deloitte Study
- Effective Practice in Spatial Planning Morphet 2010
- UCL WP 2011
- Local Economy 2011
- TCP 2011



#### **Questions and discussion**

j.morphet@ucl.ac.uk