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1a. Roots / drivers: a changing society

• ‘Detraditionalisation’
• Globalisation – the diffusion of ideas / cultures
• Social pluralism / individualism
• Questions of trust / allegiance

• Lead to questions of governmentality
1b. Roots / drivers: critiquing the ‘system’

- Social problems as ‘wicked problems’
- Social complexity
- Contested ideas of the ‘public good’
- Leads to questions of scale and legitimacy
1c. Roots / drivers: crisis of legitimacy

• Crisis of representative democracy
• Crisis of scale and distance (of government, decision takers, regional planning etc)
• The ‘democratic deficit’
1d. Roots / drivers - communitarianism

- The space between neo-liberalism and public intervention
- Community life as a producer of ‘social goods’
- Production dependent on the store of social capital, and hence community capacity
1. Roots / drivers

Social change combines with critiques of top-down intervention in ‘the system’, and questions of legitimacy, to deliver some acceptance that some problems need local resolution;

Embrace communitarianism as route to resolution?

But it’s an acceptance framed by hierarchical power, as government seeks to address the ‘strategic dilemmas integral to governing’
2. The localism narrative

- Localism not invented by Eric Pickles
- Continuation of a theme and a trend
- Social pluralism + rejection of systems approach + crisis of legitimacy + embracing of communitarianism = localism (in various guises)
- Several episodes of ‘normative’ localism in England (framed extraction of ‘social goods’?)
2. The localism narrative
Affecting public services

• **1990s**: ‘local choice’
• **2000s**: ‘community leadership’ – and complexities of LSPs and community strategies
• **2010s**: ‘control shift’, localism and neighbourhood planning: new powers and responsibilities and...

...‘institutionalising’ community-based planning
3. Neighbourhood / Community Planning
Narrative

3 episodes leading to that ‘institutionalisation’ (Parker, 2014):

1. Communities engaged in ‘evidence gathering’
2. Communities encouraged to draw up ‘informal’ plans;
3. Communities (Neighbourhoods) encouraged to produce ‘formal’ plans.
3. N / CP Narrative: Evidence Gathering

- Parker (2014) says this began in 1995, spurred on by Rural White Paper of that year;
- Rural communities encouraged to conduct ‘village appraisals’ and analyse using dedicated appraisal software;
- Armed with evidence, volunteers encouraged to highlight service / planning challenges and lobby...
3. N / CP Narrative: Evidence Gathering

- In fact, evidence gathering started in 1970s;
- A toolkit was pioneered in Gloucestershire (GLOSCAT);
- Lots of different evidence, from traffic to housing surveys, to service level assessments etc;
- They were community ‘health checks’, which highlighted a systematic gap in the understanding of village / neighbourhood needs
3. N / CP Narrative: Informal plans

• Could the evidence from ‘appraisals’ be ‘tamed’ and made useful for local planning?
• This was the aspiration of the 2000 Rural White Paper;
• Funding established for drawing up ‘Parish Plans’ from 2001; up to £5000 per parish group;
• Mixed bag of plans: some general in scope, some design focused (VDS)
3. N / CP Narrative: Informal plans

- A decade of ‘parish planning’ followed;
- Mixed quality plans;
- Mixed reception from local authorities;
- Rarely adopted as parts of local plans (VDS fared better);
- Too much ‘ultra vires’ content; meaning that formal ‘adoption’ not possible;
- But a potential was demonstrated.
3. N / CP Narrative: Informal plans

- The issue of *how to extract usable local data* from the plans became critical;
- Two schools of thought emerged:
  1. They represent the hopes / aspirations of a community. They have intrinsic value and are a conduit for community energies. Leave them as they are and connect them to Community Strategies;
  2. Formalise them, strip out the ‘white noise’, and connect them to local plans.
3. N / CP Narrative: Formal plans

- Parish plans had been most popular in the Tory heartlands of SE England;
- A real enthusiasm there for the plans to have direct planning impact;
- ‘School of Thought’ 2 won the day;
- Emergence of regularised ‘Neighbourhood Development Plans’ (NDPs) as institutionalised (and framed) Community-based plans
4. Key Features of Localism

- 2010-2015 ‘Localism’ comprises raft of measures, of which NDPs are one;
- Localisation of planning through RSS revocation;
- Return of power to ‘town halls’, largely through RSS revocation;
- Array of ‘Community Rights’ (+NDOs);
- Getting the planners ‘off our backs’, by extending permitted development rights
- NDPs;
4. Key Features of Localism
Dismantle regional machinery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Government Offices RDAs / RAs</td>
<td>Government Offices RDAs / RAs</td>
<td>REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGIES</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>County Councils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local Planning Authorities</td>
<td>Local Planning Authorities</td>
<td>LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS</td>
<td>Local Planning Authorities</td>
<td>Local Planning Authorities</td>
<td>Local Planning Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish / Community</td>
<td>Parish / Community Councils</td>
<td>Parish / Community Councils</td>
<td>VILLAGE DESIGN STATEMENTS / PARISH APPRAISALS / PARISH PLANS</td>
<td>Parish / Community Councils</td>
<td>Parish / Community Councils</td>
<td>NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS &amp; ORDERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Key Features of Localism

Community Rights

• **Right to Build (Order):** Build something for the community, no planning permission needed, just demonstrate that it complies with National Policy, vote on it, and build!

• (Use a **NDO** to set out what you intend to build)

• **Right to Bid:** Define something as a community asset (e.g. a pub or piece of land) and buy it;

• **Right to Challenge:** Think you could run a service better than the current (contracted) provider – go for it!
4. Key Features of Neighbourhood Planning

• The various rights, orders and NDPs are the toolbox for Neighbourhood Planning;
• But what about the NDPs themselves?
• Government says they enable residents to:
  – decide where new homes, shops and offices will go
  – decide what new buildings look like
  – decide what facilities, services and infrastructure is needed
  – grant planning permission for new buildings through a Neighbourhood Development Order.
4. Key features of Neighbourhood Planning

- The plans themselves look / feel like local plans
- Thematic policies, often drawn up by local consultants
- Siting of homes, urban design, services, employment sites etc
- 80 full drafts have been produced (April, 2014)
- 13 passed community referenda;
- LAs have a duty to support production and Parishes / Forums can get £7000 grant...
Example 1: Eden District Council

- Classic rural authority
- Local Plan sets settlement hierarchy of key service centres
- No development elsewhere
- Rural communities want to meet local needs for housing and services...
Example 1: Upper Eden

• ‘Upper Eden’ is a fragment of the district comprising 17 parishes

• ‘Upper Eden NDP’ produced by a local consultant with steering group comprising reps from parishes

• Challenges housing constraint in / around small villages
Example 1: Upper Eden

• Modifies several Eden District planning policies;
• Cites Taylor’s 2008 ‘Sustainability Trap’ and its adverse impacts on small rural communities;
• **UENDP1**: relaxes exceptions policy to allow single plot new builds or conversions, dropping local plan restrictions;
• **UENDP2**: allows conversion of farm buildings to residential use in support of farm incomes;
• **UENDP3**: Specifies that in named parishes, the majority of affordable should be suited to older households
• *Some potential controversy over how ‘local’ is defined*
Example 2:
South Oxfordshire District Council

- District Council wanted to build 775 homes on a single site next to Thame (local plan allocation)
- Thame Town Council drew up a NDP with the help of Tibbalds;
- Went through the allocation process as a LA would;
- Suggested dispersion to 7 site + 3 reserves;
- Aimed to ‘better integrate’ housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Allocated housing numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site C</td>
<td>187 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site D</td>
<td>175 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site F</td>
<td>203 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Meadow Cottage</td>
<td>12 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Morbey Road</td>
<td>18 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at The Elms</td>
<td>45 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Williams’s Lower School Site</td>
<td>135 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>775 homes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site F LWS Reserve</td>
<td>28 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site F Reserve</td>
<td>50 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site C Reserve</td>
<td>57 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reserve</strong></td>
<td><strong>135 homes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thame – main housing sites
Example 2: Thame Town Council

- Plan passed at referendum;
- Held up as an exemplar of Neighbourhood Planning;
- Community had wanted ‘integration’ of new housing, not the single bolt-on proposed in the Local Plan;
- Got integration with 7 smaller sites
Consensus achieved, conflict gone?
A group calling itself ‘Save the Elms’ has sprung it;
895 people have signed a petition to ‘Save the Elms’
Accuses the Council of ‘slipping the site in’;
Various accusations of wrongdoing and could go to court...
But the site was part of the plan in 2013 and got passed the local referendum...
Concluding Remarks

• Localism as ‘framed extraction of social goods’
• Social goods produced anyway...localism tries to capture and frame what’s already present
• Communities have been doing a lot for themselves for years;
• Some have the capacity (the requisite ‘social capital’) to do a lot; some don’t
Concluding Remarks

- Works really well for highly articulate communities, with good links and knowledge;
- Can accentuate disadvantage if certain kinds of communities cannot take advantage of the opportunities; and if usual public actors stand back to ‘give space’ to community groups;
- Also, doesn’t eliminate conflict or automatically deliver consensus
- Referendum mechanism tries to deliver an outcome; still not about pleasing everyone; works with the majority view.
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