

Local Infrastructure Planning in England

Prof Janice Morphet

Highbury Group 11th March 2012

overview

1. 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% IAs with Infrastructure Delivery Plan as part of LP process
- 100% IAs 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