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Presentation Overview

With the Ebbsfleet LAA in mind:

- Surface the challenges of collaboration and ‘Partnership Working’
- Particularly in relation to planning and development, the wider political and state context

To prompt feedback and reflection:

- Where have you experienced barriers and/or taken opportunities
- Where do we need further understanding, interpretation and insights from theory/different contexts
Environmental Planning Officer, Dept. of Design and Regeneration
Cheshire County Council

Northwich, NW England – 2005
Back in 2005......
‘It doesn’t work...’

“Need more evidence that this works...”

What’s this got to do with planning?
‘Collaboration’ – ‘Partnership’?

- Refers to formalized joint working arrangements between organizations, which remain legally autonomous, while they engage in coordinated collective action to achieve outcomes that none of them can achieve on their own.

* Not necessarily statutory or contractual

(Vangen and Huxham, 2003)
The Collaborative Advantage…..?

“Collaborative advantage relates to the desired synergistic outcome of collaborative activity suggesting that advantage is gained through collaboration when something is achieved that could not have been achieved by any organization acting alone…..

….Collaborative inertia relates to the often-pertaining actual outcome, in which the collaboration makes only hard fought or negligible progress” (p62)

(Vangen and Huxham, 2003)
Culture:

Culture defined as 'habitual ways of being and acting’ that stem from the partners' distinct professional, organizational and national cultures to which they belong – and disciplinary?

E.g. differences in the operational and decision making procedures of an organization, the values and language of a profession (or discipline) or the etiquettes and norms of a nation

(Vangen & Winchester, 2014):
Culture Paradox (Vangen & Winchester, 2014):

- Similar and compatible cultures yield greater connectivity and shared understanding between partners…but…. may limit the potential for collaborative advantage

- Diversity in partners’ expertise and resources is essential to gaining genuine synergistic gains from the collaborations……yet the cultural diversity can cause potential conflict in values, practices and beliefs – leading to misunderstandings and points of friction

- Studies have shown that in general cultural diversity diminishes collaborative success relative to cultural similarity
The Town Planning Act 1909

Raymond Unwin (1908) - the prospect to govern the future development of a town:

“an event of unique importance in its history. By this plan the future of the town must to a very great extent be determined....It is of the utmost importance that this plan should not be hurriedly prepared, that is should be based on complete knowledge of all the circumstances affecting the town and its development, that, in fact, it should be the very best plan which human art and forethought can create after most careful consideration of all the local conditions of the existing town and of the sites to be developed”

Source:
Early Good Planning Practice (in Potter, 2012)

Town Planning at Oxford by Raymond W. Ffennell (1926) –

“every effort should be made to maintain, as open spaces and playgrounds, flood areas near the city, to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside”

Oxford 1928:

the floods held “no terrors”, “thanks to the wisdom of its earliest town planners and the skill of the Thames Conservancy”. The strategically planned green belt was “marked out by the flood as if it were a moat”

(The Times, 1928, p9)
Quotes from Potter (2012) on Planners:

“Planners need educating in how the water sector plans and funding work, policy to prevent development on the floodplain is a joke” (Consultant Engineer, 2010)

“In my opinion development control is rubbish, getting better, but still rubbish” (EA Engineer, 2010)

“Why don’t spatial plans have contours? Flat earth?” (Local Authority Engineer, 2010)

Source: https://municipaldreams.wordpress.com/2014/04/01/early-municipal-housing-in-swansea/
A (v!) Brief History of Planning:

Charles Hill, Minister of Housing and Local Government - planners must do more to meet the challenge of a “booming population and a bursting economy” and “must not be afraid to experiment” (The Times, 1961)

- 1960s - Pinnacle of modernist (and technocratic) model of government
- 1970s - a variety of experiments with participatory processes
- 1970s/80s - public service provision associated with high levels of inefficiency and a lack of innovation - emergence of neoliberal forms of economic governance, ‘rolling’ back of the state

Michael Heseltine, Secretary of State – “radically recalibrate and refocus the planning system to encourage the freer and more creative play of market forces” (Grove-White, 1991)

- 1980s/90s – planning increasing becoming facilitator of development, developers take on the risk
In a free market, social and environmental values can be maintained through regulation…..however…..

Frustrated by the hoops you have to jump through to get anything done, Cameron’s measures are to start with “getting the planners off our backs. Getting behind the businesses that have the ambition to expand. And meeting the aspirations of families that want to buy or improve a home” (The Telegraph, 2012 in Potter, 2012)
The National Planning Policy Framework (2011)

“"We must house a rising population, which is living longer and wants to make new choices” - Ministerial Foreword

Placed at the heart of the planning system is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking.

Local planning authorities should plan positively for new development, and approve all individual proposals wherever possible.
Climate change adaptation - this is ‘not a task for which planning is constitutionally well equipped’ due to the ongoing influence of ‘the political and economic forces that powerfully shaped the profession’ (Howard, 2009, 30 in Potter et al., 2016, 133)

Vested land owning and property interests, with strong neoliberal ideological links with neighbouring government departments (CLG and the Treasury)……..sets up somewhat different expectations for what can be achieved through a collaborative approach rather than direct public management (Jacklin-Jarvis and Potter, 2017)
Conclusions & Discussion Points:

1. **Collaborative working** (from Vangen et al.):

Working across organizational boundaries is one of the most difficult activities, it is highly resource intensive and requires continued energy, commitment and a great deal of skill.

The ‘paradoxical nature’ – a necessary evil, to emphasise that this will not be free of any compromises or trade-offs and there is a need to consider realistic, rather than idealistic expectations of what can be achieved.
Conclusions & Discussion Points:

2. Rolling Back of Planning Powers

Private sector’s focus on efficiency and short-term financial return on investment sits with use of existing knowledge, practice and technology at odds with The long-term collaborative arrangements and relationships needed to focus on innovation and strategic development to realize blue/green ambitions through new knowledge and technologies

The Challenge:

How can we encourage/incentivise private sector involvement in blue/green infrastructure and resilience - identify governance practices that reconcile the clashing value systems between both?

- prospects for return on investment?
- managing risk perception
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