

Institution: University College London
Unit of Assessment: 16 – Architecture, Built Environment and Planning
Title of case study: <i>The implementation of infrastructure investment into the local and sub-regional planning systems to promote sustainable economic growth in England</i>
1. Summary of the impact <p>Research conducted by Gallent, Morphet et al has revealed a lack of understanding among planners, local authorities and public sector infrastructure providers about the key shift in spatial planning in England since 2004 towards integrated deliverability. This, plus further UCL research work suggesting appropriate means to redress this lack of understanding, led to the development of Infrastructure Delivery Planning (IDP) which has, in turn, had significant impacts on government policy and legislation for local plans. Since 2008, all 346 English local authorities have used IDP, a change that has supported the more effective and sustainable use of land, buildings and facilities, and given greater confidence to communities by demonstrating committed local investment.</p>
2. Underpinning research <p>The development of Infrastructure Delivery Planning (IDP) has its roots in a research project on <i>Effective Practice in Spatial Planning</i> initially undertaken in 2007 by a team at the Bartlett School of Planning (BSP). The research team comprised Professor Nick Gallent (now BSP Head), Professor Janice Morphet (Visiting Professor) and Professor Mark Tewdwr-Jones (at UCL from 2001–12).</p> <p>The project was run in partnership with the global consultancy company, Deloitte, following an open competition organised by the research funders: Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI), Joseph Rowntree Foundation, Greater London Authority (GLA), and Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG). Its objectives were: to identify potential barriers to good planning created by the new integrated deliverability planning system introduced by the UK government in 2004; to suggest means of overcoming those barriers by improving best practice; to support culture change conducive with this improvement in the planning profession; and to encourage regional and local political leaders to increase certainty throughout the planning process.</p> <p>The research was undertaken in six stages, each driven by a named BSP team member:</p> <p>(i) Scoping the principles of spatial planning. During this stage of the research, Gallent led the delivery of a comprehensive literature review of spatial planning, exploring how the definitions (partnership arrangements, evidence for policies/programmes and ‘visioning exercises’), processes (facilitating and negotiating change, multi-level stakeholder involvement, innovation, creativity and shared ideas), and general outcomes (integration with other frameworks, co-operation across administrative and institutional boundaries) worked to focus on delivery particularly that of infrastructure [a, b].</p> <p>(ii) Learning lessons from other studies. Tewdwr-Jones led a literature review and series of interviews to identify valuable lessons from other studies of organizational and culture change in the planning profession [c].</p> <p>(iii) Identifying case study authorities to take part in the research. Led by Deloitte, this phase of the work developed and applied selection criteria addressing the experience, progress in plan-preparation, geography, size and type of local authorities that might be involved and which would make the research credible to local authorities and planning practitioners [b, c].</p> <p>(iv) Action learning with selected planning authorities. During 2006, Deloitte studied the development of six case studies with the planning authorities selected in the previous stage. These used interviews, work-shadowing, group discussions, and assessments of policy and practice to characterise and evaluate the gap between current and effective practice [b].</p> <p>(v) Draft advice notes and areas for further research. Morphet led the preparation of the final report of ways in which plan making processes could and should be changed and this led to the commissioning of the Steps Guidance and to a £500k training programme (see Section 4) [a].</p> <p>(vi) Final Report. A report summarising the research findings, together with recommendations for changes in advice and support for central government, the LGA, the RTPI and local authorities was produced by Gallent, Morphet and Tewdwr-Jones, and submitted in early-2007 – with Morphet then also producing later research outputs explaining these findings [a, d, e].</p>

Impact case study (REF3b)

The key findings of the research were that essential elements of effective spatial planning must include a new and broader role for planning within local authorities, linked with infrastructure provider partners in all sectors. Before 2008, practitioners and local authorities had focused local planning on the preparation of policy and not on its subsequent delivery with partners. The report [a] recommended that there should be a common evidence base on infrastructure commitments and requirements for plan preparation and shared between partners, which is also available to the public in a transparent way. The research also showed that it was important that the regulatory role of planning in local government and development management also has a key role to play in infrastructure delivery. It also indicated that partners should work towards greater horizontal and vertical cooperation – i.e. across boundaries and in aligning investment at different spatial scales.

The UCL research findings and recommendations in the final report were used to build up a powerful case for two new specific tools. The first of these was a Local Infrastructure Programme, incorporating a *Local Infrastructure Fund* managed by a *Local Infrastructure Group*. It was envisaged that this programme would deliver more effective resource management and coordination, based on a new approach to Infrastructure Delivery Planning (IDP) that dealt differently with capital commitments and coordination between partners [a, d] as identified as good practice from the case studies and interviews for the research. The second tool recommended by the research was a Regional Infrastructure Programme, comprising a *Regional Infrastructure Fund* and *Regional Infrastructure Group*, so as to support effective resource management and planning coordination at regional levels.

3. References to the research

[a] Morphet, J., Gallent, N., Tewdwr-Jones, M. et al (2007) *Effective Practice in Spatial Planning*, London: RTPI/DCLG. [<http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/10828/>, PDF]

[b] Gallent, N., Tewdwr-Jones, M. & Morphet, J. (2008) 'Parish Plans and the spatial planning approach in England', *Town Planning Review*, 79 (1): 1–30. [DOI: [10.3828/tpr.79.1.3](https://doi.org/10.3828/tpr.79.1.3)]

[c] Tewdwr-Jones, M., Gallent, N. & Morphet, J. (2010) 'An Anatomy of Spatial Planning: Coming to Terms with the Spatial Element in UK Planning', *European Planning Studies*, 18 (2): 239–257 [DOI: [10.1080/09654310903491572](https://doi.org/10.1080/09654310903491572)]

[d] Morphet, J. (2011) *Effective Practice in Spatial Planning*, London: Routledge. ISBN: 978-0-41549-282-9. [Available on request]

[e] Morphet, J. (2011) 'Delivering infrastructure through spatial planning: The multi-scalar approach in the UK', *Local Economy*, 26 (4): 285–93. [DOI: [10.1177/0269094211404631](https://doi.org/10.1177/0269094211404631)]

4. Details of the impact

Findings and tools developed through the UCL research outlined have since been used for various purposes: to effect changes in local and national planning policy; to improve practitioner understand the benefits of integrated planning approaches; to promote a more integrated and efficient investment approach among public bodies; and ultimately to deliver more sustainable outcomes and enhanced community engagement in local authorities across England.

The adoption by local and national UK policy-makers of these findings was catalysed by their widespread communication through a series of events starting in 2007 led by the Bartlett School of Planning. These particularly included a seminar held in March 2007 and attended by the Chair of the House of Commons Select Committee, Chief Executive of the British Property Association and other leading figures from the public and private sector. A further seminar later that year was arranged specifically for the RTPI and its members. This was followed with the development and delivery of a national programme of over 40 regional seminars from 2007–10 in four programmes of 10 sessions each, the development and publication of the *Steps Guide* in 2008 [1], and the development and delivery of delivery material and direct support packages to over 100 local authorities between 2007 and 2010. These activities have catalysed highly significant changes to English planning policy and practice, including:

(i) **Influencing UK planning policy:** In June 2008 a review was conducted of the UK government's guidance provided to all local authorities, based on our research and its recommendations [4]. Key recommendations from the final report to the LGA – i.e. that local

authorities needed some clear messages about the changing requirements for infrastructure delivery planning – were adopted in 2007 and resulted in the LGA commissioning direct support packages for local authorities to implement the approach identified in the report, and also informed the methodology used in the Mayor of London's first delivery plan for London in 2011 [5]. As a result, IDP methodologies developed from the UCL research are now being used by all 346 local authorities in England (an increase from zero in 2007) as a baseline for local planning, public and private sector investment [6]. Since 2011, these methods have also been used to calculate Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and development contributions [7]. In London, this is supporting the case made and the bids developed by the Mayor for developer contributions to and further infrastructure investment for initiatives including Crossrail 2 [5]. The research findings about the vital importance of integrated approaches to planning also now support neighbourhood plans and strategic infrastructure planning through Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs): local examples include the development of integrated local investment telecommunications in Croydon (2010) and integrated planning within a corporate environment in the London Borough of Redbridge (2012).

From 2009, local authorities were also advised by the Planning Inspectorate National Service (PINS) to adopt both the general practice and Local and Regional Infrastructure Programmes for the examination of all local plans [2; para 25]. This preceded the incorporation of key aspects of that advice into the final iteration of the *National Planning Policy Framework for England*, issued by the UK government in 2012, and now required to be used by all local authorities in England [3].

(ii) Professional training and development of a community of practice: The UCL research has supported a broader culture and practice change in UK planning, such as through policy and training modules for local authorities. The adoption by the LGA of the recommendations in the research report led it to fund a learning module for all local authorities in England, accompanied by a roll-out and learning programme. In 2008-10, researchers in the Bartlett School of Planning led more than 40 national seminars across England, with more than 50% of local authorities attending. The LGA has also funded 75+ training sessions for local politicians, private sector representatives, wider stakeholders, community groups, utilities, fire, and health services. One-day events at UCL in April 2011 and June 2013 each attracted over 120 participants from all sectors [8]. Feedback from participants in this training programme has been highly positive, with input by Morphet commended by various officials [9]. Through these events, a Community of Practice was established in 2008 which now has over 600 members in the UK and abroad to share information, queries and good practice, and also to operate as a support for cultural and professional change.

The research also provided the basis for the development by UCL researchers of Morphet's 2008 practitioner guide, *A steps approach to infrastructure planning and delivery*, published by the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) for local strategic partnerships and local authorities on infrastructure delivery planning to act as a guide in adopting the key research recommendations [1]. It is now widely used and frequently quoted by local authorities to support their methodological approach to infrastructure planning as part of their local plan, together with other widely disseminated and used practitioner guidance. The 'steps' methodology has since been cited as good practice by PINS [2], and is referenced frequently by local authorities. The RICS has likewise commissioned a specific guide about IDPs for their membership. First issued in 2009, the guide has been updated by an accompanying article in the same subject by Morphet in 2012 [10]. The Knowledge Hub section of the LGA's *Knowledge Hub* website also hosts practitioner resources based on Morphet's work, and she has produced an invited blog on the integrated role of infrastructure delivery planning at the local, sub-regional and national levels for the RTPI [11].

(iii) Adoption of a more integrated investment approach by public bodies: Prior to the UCL research, local authorities were not working across boundaries for infrastructure planning and provision, and hence infrastructure providers were working in isolation. This disconnected practice led in some cases led to the multiple provision of facilities in some areas, and elsewhere no provision at all. It is now working practice that infrastructure providers are core to the plan making and delivery process, and this is reinforced through PPS12 [4], the Planning Inspectorate's mandatory independent examination of local plans and which refers to the *Steps Guide* as exemplary practice in achieving this goal. Various local police, health, and fire services have all considered different locations and modes of service delivery as a result of UCL research and the resultant methodological change in practice, and many have started to act upon integrated

investment strategies. The Surrey police force, for instance, closed many police stations from 2009–11 and redeveloped the released land and buildings land for other uses from 2010 onwards. It is now relocating its police services to town halls and libraries, thus providing a ‘one-stop shop’ for the public [12]. Infrastructure delivery planning has also promoted the co-location of facilities and services to improve public access and reduce operating costs. Examples here include: United Utilities in Lancashire and Cumbria engaging proactively in infrastructure planning processes to improve practices in water supply management and new development plans; in Sunderland, primary health services have been delivered jointly with older people’s housing, supporting effective use of resources and complementary services for users; while in the Black Country and Greater Manchester, each statutory authority has produced single integrated infrastructure investment programme for their economic area, and promoting engagement across boundaries.

(iv) Promotion of sustainable outcomes and community engagement: All the local authorities that are now preparing IDPs and neighbourhood plans engage in community decision-making as an integral part of the process, whereas previously this was only done as separate processes and failure to locate infrastructure in the most effective locations for community access and sustainability. In turn, this has led to infrastructure investment being based more on community priorities. For example, in urban areas such as Lewisham, Camden and Wandsworth the method has led to more efficient use of scarce accessible land resources and the reutilisation of brown-field sites for housing. Infrastructure provision has also become more closely integrated with existing communities rather than just focussing on new development as in previous practice.

In Bristol, the IDPs were used to make a case for major investment in a public transit link in 2011 which has resulted in planning applications for three key links and inclusion in the sub-regional programme [13]. This use of the IDP process to engage infrastructure providers including highways, education, health and their committed investment in Gloucestershire (2009 onwards) has led to specific joint working on infrastructure assets, future needs and energy requirements, which again is leading to more efficient and coordinated investment in facilities and the use of land.

5. Sources to corroborate the impact

- [1] Morphet, J., *A steps approach to infrastructure planning and delivery for local strategic partnerships and local authorities*, prepared for the Planning Advisory Service (PAS), 2009 [Available on request]
- [2] PINS advice to local planning authorities [<http://bit.ly/19Uvv32>, PDF - para 25 discusses the *Steps Guide* approach developed through the Bartlett School of Planning research]
- [3] Incorporation of UCL findings and recommendations in the *National Planning Policy Framework for England*, 2012 [<http://bit.ly/1h2Fw4A>, PDF - paras 153, 155–162, 178–182]
- [4] Recommendations from UCL research can be found in Department of Communities and Local Government, *Planning Policy Statement 12*, 2008 [<http://bit.ly/17QSpsA>, PDF - paras 2.4, 2.5, 4.8–4.12, 4.14, 4.17, 4.29, 4.33, 4.45, 4.47, 4.55, 5.1, 9.1]
- [5] Correspondence with GLA officers about infrastructure investment used in London Plan [<http://bit.ly/17bYRXx>], Crossrail 2 [<http://bit.ly/17bYNH6>, PDF], etc. [Available on request]
- [6] Examples of local authorities citing *A steps approach* are Surrey Heath [<http://bit.ly/1aKAKU3>, PDF]. New Forest [<http://bit.ly/1f5CcRN>, PDF]; Portsmouth [<http://bit.ly/1aKATXC>, PDF]; Taunton [<http://bit.ly/1aH2Vko>, PDF] and Kirklees [<http://bit.ly/1afDEM8>, PDF]
- [7] DCLG/PAS, *CIL Statutory Guidance: Setting and Examination Checklist* [<http://bit.ly/1iwWeEG>]
- [8] UCL Bartlett School of Planning, Local Infrastructure Event, 21 June 2013 [Available on request]
- [9] Portfolio of feedback comments about training events run by Bartlett School of Planning and other organisations [Available on request]
- [10] RICS practice report on spatial planning, 2009 [<http://bit.ly/19UAINQ>; Available on request]
- [11] For the inclusion of Morphet’s resources and blog on the Local Government Association *Knowledge Hub* website [<http://bit.ly/HrjsAS>], and for Morphet’s RTPi blog [<http://bit.ly/1agfpRI>]
- [12] For an example of planning consultants using the IDP method, see *Surrey Infrastructure Capacity Project Year 2: Final Report*, January 2012 [<http://bit.ly/1iQO7TH>]
- [13] For an example of the application of the IDP method, see Bristol City Council, *Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy: Infrastructure Delivery Programme*, June 2010 [<http://bit.ly/1dReGb7>]