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Democracies across the world are endorsing increased public participation as a means of achieving more effective governance. Following this global trend English governance structures are now a hybridised version of representative and participatory democracy. An emergent question is: what impact can the participating public have when operating within a hybridised multi-level governance system? This is a particularly pertinent question in a hybridised planning system, as it is charged with reconciling local, regional, national and global interests. Subsequently, this dissertation will discuss what impact amenity groups\(^1\) have on the English Planning Process.

A historical analysis demonstrates that in the post war period amenity group's impact on the planning process was often passive, and that the legacy of this was public disengagement from political processes and a loss of confidence in the planning system. This demonstrates the inadequacies of the ‘predict and provide’ mentality, suggesting that people should be enabled to plan for themselves. But how can this be facilitated? Upon analysis of the various modes of participation, I argue that if inclusive deliberative forums are created within a hybridised political system, amenity groups are more likely to have a formative impact on the planning process. A benefit of deliberative participatory methods is mutual capacity building, the impact of which could endure beyond the scope of singular projects. For this mode of participation to be enacted, a complex array of enablement conditions need to exist. A clustered formulation of these conditions is put forward, and a series of case studies measured against them. The cross cutting analysis of these conditions through the case studies highlights the critical importance of hospitable political and social conditions, and the huge variability in local conditions. Hospitable political and social conditions are not strongly present in the wider context of the English Planning Process, reducing the opportunities for deliberative forums and therefore formative amenity group impact. Although amenity group impact is variable because of the particular of contexts and projects, more frequently amenity groups have a relatively low impact on the planning process. Given the limited interventionist will and resources available from government this is likely to continue, with existing inequalities further embedded by the empowerment of amenity groups who may not be representative. However, growing alternative social and environmental movements may be the conduit for amenity group impact on the planning process in the future.

Introduction

Reflecting underlying long-term global trends, both the current and previous governments in Westminster have put forward legislation that requires a devolvement of power to the people – in planning and in a wider legislative framework - to be administered by local governments. For New Labour this was embodied in the ‘Duty to inform’ legislation, for the Coalition government this will be in the form of the localism agenda. Such agendas are having a direct impact on the machinations and requirements of the planning process, and therefore the work of built environment professionals. Many professionals are wondering where such devolvement legislation will lead, and what relationships they should be seeking with communities, amenity groups and other stakeholders. An emerging pertinent question amongst professionals, commentators and academics is, ‘what is the impact of amenity groups in the English planning process?’ Further, what is the purpose of amenity groups, how far should their influence reach and how have they influenced existing policy?

Similar questions are pertinent around the world: the participation agenda is increasingly embraced by both the left and right of the political spectrum as it is seen as providing, choice, voice, and more effective governance. If participation is to improve governance, political actors must be working in tandem with mobilised communities who boast amenity groups that are genuinely representative. Expanding community participation is incredibly difficult. Yet, there are many examples of en masse community mobilisation in the global south. Communities in the global south are often motivated to mobilise as within living memory basic rights and needs may not have been met on a large scale. This deprivation often produces a willingness to enter into co-management strategies with governance structures, and consequently many countries in the global south are demonstrating the possibilities of participatory practice (Mitlin and Hickey 2009, Hickey and Mohan 2004, Cornwall 2008). Some lessons from these contexts are successfully being applied to participatory planning practices in the UK (see section 3.2.5).

The social contract\(^2\) in the UK is vastly different from the majority of those in the global south, causing variability in the

\(^{1}\) The term ‘amenity group’ is used as an alternative to ‘community group’. It suggests a group of assorted individuals who share an identity or interest, and although they may have internal elections the verification procedures for these are not as exhaustive as might be expected of local or national governments.

\(^{2}\) In this dissertation the term ‘social contract’ is used in reference to the understanding - tacit and explicit - between the majority of civil society and those governing them about mutual rights and obligations.
implementation of participatory planning practices in England as shown by the case studies in Section #3. Unlike many countries in the Global South, in Welfare state of post-war Britain, citizenship entitlements have been met by rights-bearers to a degree sufficient to quell community mobilisation. UK citizens have also experienced consumerism and continued growth in a neo-liberal context. These experiences of service provision and delivery has reduced the willingness amongst many communities to deliberate openly with governance institutions and other stakeholders in co-productive spaces. Facilitating grass-roots community mobilisation will require substantial investments of time and resources, considering the inexperience many communities have with regards to open expressions of needs, positions and interests. Unfortunately, participatory democratic procedures are being enshrined in governmental policy without commensurate resource investment in community development. There is a risk this will exaggerate existing inequalities as communities with empowered individuals or amenity groups who already incorporated into political systems are more likely to have formative impacts on planning processes (Cornwall 2008).

The coalescence of participatory and representative democracy models now operating in the UK has been appropriately described a ‘hybridised’ model of governance (King and Stoker 1996, Carpenter and Brownhill 2008, O’Riordan 2004 cited in Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 2009). Although this model has great potential, there are many tensions in its priorities and operations. Professionals and amenity groups working within the governmental system, often view these tensions as obstructive, with government officials retreats to ‘bureaucratic fixation’ (Lichfield 2010:15) and processes becoming adversarial. This is particularly true of planning systems, which has led to a loss of public faith and their political potency (Ellis 2010:6). Collisions of adverse opinions are a healthy aspect of a functioning democracy (Owens 2002). When collisions form the majority of a group or individuals interaction with an institution, and the resultant feedback mechanisms are weak, people are likely to perceive that institution as distant and unresponsive (Burgess et al 1997). There is strong evidence to suggest that this is the case in the UK, with the ‘democratic deficit’ expanding: people want to engage in participation opportunities enabled by ‘hybridised’ political structures but often find them inaccessible or perceive their contributions as having little impact (Newman et al 2004, Cox 2010, Cornwall 2008). Similarly, many individuals and amenity groups feel that they have little impact on the English Planning systems (Informant interviews: Sheffield Council Employee July 2010, Professional Facilitator 19/06/2010, Roger Newton, Professional Facilitator and PEANuT Associate 06/07/2010). This appears to be particularly true for society’s most vulnerable, who are still thought of as ‘hard to reach’ (Arnstein 1969, Carpenter and Brownhill 2008). If feeling of influence, and tangible impacts in the planning process are to increase a wider range of the population needs to be empowered to participate, ensuring more inclusive and representative amenity groups with a stronger voice. There is little evidence that the national government has the interventionist will to build such community mobilisation.

However, Section #3.3 cites cases where relatively representative amenity groups - which include ‘hard to reach’ members - plan their own futures alongside various professionals, and thus have a formative impact on the planning process. In these instances the rationales adopted for participation (see section #2) were manifold, but deliberative forms were pre-eminent. Their open forums facilitated constructive collision as well as creative collaboration, and consequently built trust and capacity amongst the parties involved. Section #3.2 proposes a series of conditions that should exist for deliberative rationales to be practiced, and tests case studies against them. The analysis in Section #3.3 suggests that the presence of conducive political and social conditions are critical to enabling deliberative participation, with the cases in Sheffield and South Tynsede evidencing that when these are present amenity groups can have a high impact on the planning process. In Sheffield the process adopted allowed the planning system to return to its socially progressive roots, and generated community endorsement of challenging architectural projects. The social capital constructed in such processes could encourage continued long-term engagement in the planning process, although this is dependant on continued opportunities for impact and resource support for nascent inclusive amenity groups. In the short and long term, the impacts amenity groups can have remain variable because of the differentiated policies across different localities, their resources and their implementation standards.

Unfortunately – especially given pressing social and environmental issues - instances of representative amenity groups having high impacts on the planning processes will continue to be limited whilst resources are restricted and the legislation accelerates beyond the pace of community development. This puts at risk inter-generational strategic planning (Ellis 2010:6, Sprinks 2010:8). Frustration with the persistence of inequalities which this dubious acceleration may exaggerate, provides self-organised social movements with increasing credibility and recruitment power (Informant: Catrina Pickering, Diversity Officer for Transition Towns, July 2010).
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Methodology

This dissertation was developed between May and September 2010, which coincides with the period where the Liberal Democrat and Conservative parties formed a new Coalition government. However, at the point of writing this dissertation, little legislative adaptation had been formally passed by Parliament. The nascent moves made by the Coalition thus far provide enough information to make an initial tentative analysis of their priorities and how these may effect the planning system\(^1\). It must be acknowledged that the incumbent government - and indeed the leading opposition party - are still in a transitional phase of outlining their detailed policies which entails iterations and oscillations (Morris 18/06/2010:11, Webb 25/06/2010:1). Indeed, there is currently a degree of paralysis within the system (Informant interview: Planning Aid South Representatives 07/07/2010). As well as the limited information available about the political context of the moment, there is 'little detailed evidence on which to base analysis' (Ellis 2010:6) of the immediately proceeding political and planning context as regulations take time to embed before their impacts can be assessed. New Labour predicted in 2002 (Owen and Cowell 2006:418 citing HM Government 2002: para76) that, 'cascading a policy change' through planning 'cannot be achieved in less than about 12 years'.

The lengthiness of cascading new policies through the planning system informed my methods of sourcing information and the nature of the analysis. With the scarcity of current information available much of the hypothesis has been based on long term underlying trends within the English political system, which given our relationships with the globalised economy is also informed by wider political trends. To ensure a rounded view of these long term trends and the current context I have used a mixture of sources including:

- **Primary information from semi-structured interviews with professional practitioners who interact with the planning system and/or with amenity groups (see list of informants in section 5.2.2)**
- **Project information from interviewees that has been unpublished but internally circulated amongst people in their organisations and on occasion to affiliated organisations they are collaborating with**
- **Pamphlets from think-tanks, many of whom have been quick to publish scholarly reactions to the election**
- **Press excerpts: I monitored a broad range of press throughout this dissertation with an awareness that there is a ‘febrile atmosphere of press speculation’ (Morris 14/05/2010:9), and particularly tendentious use of information due to the recent changes in government.**
- **Information from grey literature, books and journal articles in the fields of: political science, social science, international development, planning and architecture.**

Testimony and analysis of relevant literature reviewed will be dispersed throughout the dissertation.

As a consequence of the timing of this dissertation, and because of the complexities of local variation in the planning system it has not been possible to acquire an array of quantitative information of sufficient relevance, quality, depth, and breadth to make a broader statistical assessment of the impact of amenity groups\(^2\) on the planning process. Given the scarcity of relevant quantitative data, the analysis of impacts is qualitative. Impact is taken to be the wider effects of the action, and in this case the action is community involvement in the planning process.

In Section #3.2 I pose a series of conditions that would enable more deliberative participation in the planning process, with section #3.2.5 and #3.3 demonstrating that the more of these conditions are met the higher the impact amenity groups will be enabled to have, and therefore the more likely they are to have a formative impact. The hypothetical conditions were produced in response to relevant literature, and after Cornwall (2008) they embody explorations of context, history and culture. There was no consensus amongst the literature reviewed as to what the conditions for optimal participation may be or how they should be prioritised, so those I pose in section #3 are a proposition which would be contended. Throughout the dissertation, measurements are made on spectrums of qualitative information rather than numeric data.

---

\(^1\) In early May 2010 'The Coalition: programme for government' (HM Government 2010:1), which stipulated that Planning strategies would be 'based on the principles set out in the Conservative Party publication Open Source Planning' (ibid p11), which had been published earlier in the year. On the 27th of May the Secretary of State for Government and Communities Eric Pickles MP sent a letter to planners regarding the localism agenda which was to be viewed 'as a material planning consideration' (Smulian 11/06/2010:8 citing Pickles MP).

\(^2\) 'Amenity group' was chosen as the primary framing device because it is less elastic than the term community group, and neither does it have the 'warmly persuasive' (Cornwall 2010 citing Williams) or 'quasi-mythical' (Bristow 2010:20) connotations.
There is an understanding that impact on the planning process can range from little to formative, and that rationales for participation can range from instrumental to deliberative (after Arnstein 1969, Campbell and Marshall 2000, Carpenter and Brownhill 2008, Cornwall 2008). In section 3.3 factors that indicate whether amenity groups in the case studies were able to have formative impact are outlined in spectrum charts.

Sections (1 and 2) of contextual introduction:
The historical impact of amenity groups in the planning process - and whether it was formative - is an important aspect of the question. Previous impacts also offers insights into people's perception of the planning process and their feelings of influence within it, and within governance in general. Through analysis will emerge an indication of how responsive people will be to concepts of community involvement, as a picture of the social contract between civil society and governance structures is built. A discussion of these issues, with reference to relevant literature forms section 1.

A discussion of the participatory frameworks available, from instrumental to deliberative, and which of these might aid the facilitation of significant amenity group impact, return planning to its socially progressive roots, and build social capacity without exacerbating social inequalities, forms section 2.

Section (3) exploring hypothetical conditions that dictate the impact of amenity groups in particular contexts:
In this section a series of conditions are outlined for optimal deliberation where amenity groups would have a significant and formative impact. Informed by section 1 and 2, assessments are made as to whether these conditions are strongly absent or strongly present in relation to the wider English framework, a series of English cases studies, and an international case study. These cases were chosen as, although the national framework can give some indication of amenity group impact, there are significant variabilities between local governance structures, cultures and social contexts. A foreign example of planning is pertinent in light of Coalition plans to draw on 'relevant models from other countries' (Conservative Party 2010:8). The example from the global south illuminates contrasts in political and social conditions, and the possibilities of impact when amenity groups represent a mobilised mass. English examples were picked where information about them could be triangulated to some degree, with a portion of the information being live research, and where a range of participatory rationales were embraced. Information sufficient for comparison could only be collected across a range of geographical areas. Three of the English case studies are clustered in the South-East of England, and two in North; there is evidence that there are socio-economic differences between these two broader regions (SASI group 2007, Dorling et al 2007, Dorling 2010), so they form the framework for some of the cross-cutting analysis.
Section One

The Long View of Amenity Group impact on the planning process
1.0 The long view of community impact on the planning process

If the town and country planning system had not existed, widespread damage to the environment would have occurred over the last fifty years, probably with serious economic and social consequences’ (Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution 2002:1 Cited in Owens and Cowell, 2006:404)

‘The planning professionals in the last 50 years have got it badly wrong’ (Phillip Beisly 1997:5)

Amenity groups have had a significant impact on the formulation of the planning system as it has evolved since its legislative underpinning in the post war period. However, this impact has often been indirect and in some instances passive as those in control of direct modes of representative governance structures sought to predict and provide for the needs of communities. The service delivery strategies of government have been in response to broad-reaching long-term trends. These trends began with the universalist socially progressive aims to aid the vulnerable in the form of the post-war welfare state, of which the planning system was a crucial tenet. The legacies of post-war planning demonstrated that although it sought to help the vulnerable it had assumed their needs, rather than involving them in a process of planning their own futures. The failures of the planning system led it to be politically discredited, and fuelled the development of alternative social movements, often communitarian in character, endorsed by frustrated community members. Such movements now serve to provide valuable oppositional consciousness in the neo-liberal era of English politics. A current wider trend - endorsed by both the left and right - is for participatory democracy models to be integrated into representative democracy systems. The resultant hybridised political model of political governance has caused tensions and difficulties which are evident in the planning system. There is the potential for planning to return to its progressive roots but with more sustainable results as opportunities could be created for the vulnerable to plan for themselves and thus for amenity groups to have greater direct impact. Tensions between a social contract of relatively passive rights fulfillment that occurs in welfare state and consumerist society, and the demands of participatory practices are a major obstacle to hybridised democracy reaching its potential. The trajectory towards participation is accelerating beyond the pace of community development, as the interventionist agenda of the state recedes; this may cause inequalities to be further embedded in society.

1.1 The Post war planning system: ideas of aiding the vulnerable

After the World War II, there was an effort in the liberal west to enshrine universalist values of social justice in over-arching legislation in the hope of preventing further calamities and overcoming marginalisation; these efforts were embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), which included the right to shelter. Significantly these were constructed along western perception of individual - as opposed to communal - rights (Baehr 2001). This trend was being felt in the UK, where the socially progressive post-war Labour government (1945-1951) was enshrining a ‘Plan for Social Security’, to be known as the Welfare State, into UK legislative frameworks (Cullingworth and Nadin 2006:22 citing Beveridge MP 1942:170).

The UK post-war Planning system was a key tenet of this agenda, and was formalised in legislation via the New Towns Act in 1946 and the Town and Country Planning Act in 1947; prior to this planning procedures had been ‘optional on local authorities’ (Cullingworth and Nadin 2006:22). A keen sense of social justice, and ‘enthusiastic creativity’ (Lichfield 2010:15) was imbued in the ‘visionary’ (Bristow 2010:20) English planning system which hoped to effectively manage the rapid industrialisation of cities and their post-war rehabilitation. The broader social aims of the English planning process made it the envy of many European countries where entirely technocratic processes prevailed (Kunzman 2009). Yet, the policies of the period had an important omission, they dictated the ends but not the means. In the slum clearances of the 1950s this onus on product destroyed communities and ways of life that the policy makers can never have intended (Cullingworth and Nadin 2006). Here, the visible desperation of the poor, rather than the action of amenity groups, had a formative impact on the planning process. This period left a legacy of improved quality of the ‘physical fabric of housing’ (ibid: 27) and environmental protection (Owens and Cowell 2006, CABE 2009b), but the processes often damaged the delicate fabrics of existing communities (Darley 2007, MHLG 1969).

As discussed by Darley (2007:10), 19th century landowners and industrialists, ‘believed it was feasible to replace the subtly interwoven strands and patterns of a traditional settlement with an instant alternative’. This caused severe social disaggregation amongst the working classes, whose chronic poverty and marginalisation was documented by Booth in 1888. His survey of Hackney portrayed the immense vulnerability of many of the poor residing in Hackney as helpless desperation, but talked little
of their resilience. In localities such as Bournville village and Lanark New Town, philanthropically minded industrialists built places around ‘broader notions of well-being and human rights’ (Darley 2007:158). In collaboration with amenity groups formed around various interests - including mutual aid societies and thrift - these industrialists made a conscientious effort to build social capital (Groves 2003, Rendell 2006). The Cadbury Family recognized the importance of the ‘slow growth’ of ‘elaborately overlapping social networks built over 3 or 4 generations’ (Taylor 1973:190), and built upon the foundations of kinship towards such social networks, and consequently is was cited by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in 2003 as an exemplary neighbourhood (Groves 2003).

In the, ‘attack upon five great evils of Want....Disease......Ignorance......Squalor....and....Idlness’ (Cullingworth and Nadin 2006:22 citing Beveridge MP 1942:170), the lessons of Bournville et al were lost and little attention was paid to existing social capitol or amenity group's resilience in the face of poverty. Instead the physical environment - squalid symbols of the desperate poverty of amenity groups - became the object of investment. Natathaniel Lichfield's public call in the 1950s ‘for sociologists to be included in planning teams’, was ignored (Lichfield 2010:15).

### 1.2 The legacy of Product over Process: Improved standards, heightened expectations, community frustration and calls for broadening participation

In the mid 1950s slum clearances reached a peak of 90,000 a year (Cullingworth and Nadin 2006). With this mass demolition social capital was ‘ravaged’ (Putnam 2003:4). They were often replaced by schemes of ‘inadequate’ (Cullingworth and Nadin 2006:27) quality, on a dehumanising scale (Hanley 2007). Existing adequate housing was frequently left to deteriorate (ibid). Citizens were given the right basic to object to compulsory development plans, which was then extended in 1959 to apply to a broader range of development, but still no opportunities for formative input. Consequently, the planning system was still largely viewed as inaccessible to amenity groups, with only educated and wealthy individuals having the knowledge and connections required to exercise their powers of veto and influence the system (Hamdi 1991). Frustration was growing.

After the publication of the provocative ‘The poor and the poorest’ by Abel-Smith&Townsend 1965, and in the hope of stemming community frustration with the failures of post-war reforms before it became civil unrest, a ‘spate of social enquiries’ were launched (Cullingworth and Nadin 2006:27). These enquiries coincided with widespread calls to broaden participation (Burke 1968 cited in Tewdwr Jones 1996, Hamdi 1991, Nelson 1997), including the seminal Skeffington report (1969) commissioned by the RTPI (MHLG 1969, Bristow 2010, Carpenter and Brownhill 2008). Skeffington deemed levels of participation ‘not sufficient’ (MHLG 1969:343) and advocated for broader public involvement in planning as being morally advantageous, and a pragmatic means of making democratic structures more effective at organising local affairs. The recommendations were manifested to some degree in the 1969 Housing Act, which required community consultation on the local plan; a remit later extended in 1974.

The impact of this tentative legislation was minimal, as consultation remained limited in scope and application. The function of consultation processes was to provide legitimacy to already-produced plans, and thus amenity groups continued to have little impact on planning processes (Tewdwr Jones 1996). There were movements - on both sides of the Atlantic - outside of the formal planning process which advocated for more collaborative planning which included diverse, hard to reach and vulnerable groups (Clavel 1985). Arnstein was advocating citizen control (1969), Colin Ward self-organisation (1976), John Turner systematic adaptation (1976), whilst Walter Segal demonstrated that people can build their own homes. All the works of these writers/activists/practitioners had communitarian undertones that contradicted the individualistic political thought dominant at the time; and have been important in the long term trend of strong oppositional social movements advocating communitarian solutions. These will continue to be significant forces in the era of climate change. The Community Architecture movement, Planning for Real, Action Planning (Hamdi 1991), and Collaborative Planning (Healey 2006) emerged from this trend: all suggesting that it is sustainable and pragmatic for people to plan their own lives. There are tools to facilitate such practices and they are still applicable today (Hamdi 1991, 1997 and 2004, CDX 2009, Informant interview: Planning Aid South Representatives 07/07/2010 ). When these techniques have been used, such as by the Resident's Association set up by Rod Hackney for the Black Road Area Improvement Project in Macclesfield in 1974, amenity groups had a reasonably formative
impact on the planning process. However, these instances were rare as co-production was not part of planning policy, so their main impact was as advocacy in favour of the communicative turn in planning. The communicative turn in the 1990s suggested more open communication about spatial strategy-making amongst all actors (Healey 1992 and 1995, Innes 1995, Huxley and Yiftachel 2000), when general planning policy was losing its political potency and endorsement (Ellis 2010:6), and had begun a retreat into ‘bureaucratic fixation’ (Lichfield 2010:15). Despite the communicative turn in planning, much of the UK population remains disconnected from the planning process and thus unaware of how to influence the direction of planning policy (Ellis 2010).

1.3 Global trends that embed contradictions: Neo-liberalism and increased participation

Community architecture movements grew whilst the free-market economics of Neo-liberalism flourished. Neo-liberalism has indeed become the predominant political hegemony in the UK, despite the expansions and contractions of the state, in the last 30 years (Kunzmann 2010, Cox 2010); reflecting its global dominance (Burgess et al 1997, Bakan 2005). Although neo-liberalism has provided many with an increase in monetary wealth and associated living conditions, there has not been a commensurate increase in happiness or well-being (James 2008, Cornwall 2008, Grist 2010). Neo-liberalism’s susceptibility to global market forces has made, ‘it increasingly difficult, if not impossible’ (Baumann et al 2001:1), for ‘hollowed out’ (Sketchler 2000, Newman 2004, Rhodes 1997, Pierre and Peters 2000) governments to design or enact any regulations that may facilitate an equitable redistribution of resources to reduce the economic gap between society’s most vulnerable and most wealthy (Burgess et al 1997). In the UK neo-liberalism sits uncomfortably with a welfare state where people have basic fulfilled entitlements, and the resultant social malaise within this social contract has been characterised as a ‘democratic deficit’ (King and Stoker 1996, Cornwall 2008), a ‘social recession’ (Cox 2010:4), or as ‘Broken Britain’ (Cox 2010:6 citing Cameron MP). Our basic needs have been fulfilled through our social contract, fostering a sense of entitlement and a disconnection from democratic structures and communities, leaving us feeling that we are unable to influence the direction of social policy and protection of public service infrastructure. This disconnection hinders the impact of amenity groups.

This has led to a ‘sustained questioning of the appropriateness’ and effectiveness of ‘traditional paternalistic’, hierarchical forms of direct government (Campbell and Marshall 2000: 322, Newman et al 2004, Grist 2010, Carpenter and Brownhill 2008, Owens 2002, Owens and Cowell 2006). Government rhetoric about reducing the democratic deficit has discussed adapting the social contract embedded by top-down representative government and consumerist culture, whilst characterising civil society as being under a self imposed ‘veil of ignorance’ (Fishkin 1991:1). To reduce the sense of entitlement within the social contract, Prime Minister Tony Blair MP promised the New Labour government would provide a ‘hand - up, not a hand - out’ (Imrie & Raco, 2003:9: citing Blair MP, 1998). This ‘hand-up’ was to be administered by a multi-level governance structure which hoped to be reflexive, and devolve power from the ‘one to the many’ (Campbell and Marshall 2000:321, Newman et al 2004, Kooiman 1999 and 2000, Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 2009). This has been reflected in planning, which is, ‘no longer a single entity’, but is a ‘turbulent, fluid and adaptable series of processes and frameworks’ (Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 2009:71, Sullivan 2004).

By dissecting government into governance layers it is thought it can get closer to the people, and increase participation. This is an endorsement of a global trend where participation has is viewed as a means of increasing the effectiveness, efficiency, and legitimacy of government and its various agencies, whilst building trust, capacity and social capital in civic society (Newman 2004). Participation has trans-ideological appeal as those on the left view it as providing a ‘voice’, and the right as providing a ‘choice’, and for both it can provide an ‘everyday democracy’, rather than project politics (Cornwall 2008). In the UK, a modified participatory democracy has to a degree been incorporated into our existing representative democracy in an awkward synthesis which has been entitled ‘hybridised democracy’ (King and Stoker 1996 Carpenter and Brownhill 2008, O’Riordan, 2004 cited in Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 2009). UK governments since 1997 have explicitly operated within this system, ensuring visible similarities in their agendas, especially those that effect planning. In the efforts to generate political opportunity structures for increased participation, leading New Labour minister David Miliband MP briefly proposed a concept entitled ‘double devolution’ (ODPM 2006:8), which was endorsed by the Young Foundation as a continuance of existing policies towards local empowerment. The agenda outlined in this speech is very similar to the localism agenda currently being promulgated by the Coalition government; double devolution and the localism agenda follow the same trajectory (Informant interview: 2 New Labour represented an ‘ideological continuity with earlier conservative administrations’.in their belief that planning is a burden to economic growth strategy (Owens and Cowell 2006: 407)
Dr Juliet Carpenter, lecturer and researcher, 02/07/2010). There is a contradiction within double devolution and localism: our encounters with the welfare state give us an expectation of quick rights fulfilment that is at odds with the slow process of participatory deliberation and the delayed gratification it offers. When the participatory processes accelerate beyond the pace of community capacity building then instead it may serve to embed existing inequalities. With a neo-liberal government whose resources are depleted and interventionist intentions are unclear, their plans for rapid localisation run this risk. So although the political opportunity structures being created could greatly increased the impact of amenity group, this will be mitigated by the limitations of community representation.

1.4 Dubious acceleration: Participatory agendas without commensurate resource investment

‘Despite the coming together of intellectual thought, political expediency and long-standing experience, there seems to be a lingering sense of scepticism amongst practitioners as to the value of participatory practices (Campbell and Marshall 2000:323, citing Thomas 1996), which is keenly felt within the hybridised system (Carpenter and Brownhill 2008). The criticisms of participation come from various actors: from professionals who feel their skills and roles being devalued, and their time disproportionately directed towards public engagement processes; from frustrated community members who are fatigued by their experience of poor feedback mechanisms (Newman et al 2004); and from respected commentators with practical and theoretical Foucaultian objections (Burgess et al 1997, Cooke and Kothari 2001, Flyvbjerg and Richardson 2002). There is a suggestion that institutional strategies of ‘co-production’ and the ‘responsibilisation’ (Newman et al 2004: 204 citing Balloch and Taylor 2001) they seek to achieve serves only to provide unworthy legitimacy to pre-existing government plans (Nelson 1997) and to defer ‘blame’ (Harrison 2010:7) from local politicians to local people whilst the rights-bearers withdraw from their duties (Mitlin and Hickey 2009). In some circumstances authorities may find themselves to be the most progressive at the table, and thus when their power is reduced longer term benefits may be lost (Campbell and Marshall 2000). Collective consistency is a persistent issue due to the intrinsic problem that communities are not homogeneous, but instead are messy social constructs that have their own complex power dynamics and struggles (Newman et al 2004, Fishkin 1991 and 2003). The arduous efforts needed to engage the poor and vulnerable - and therefore acknowledge their capabilities - often have weak tokenistic manifestations (Lister 2002). The corollary of this is that a restricted, unrepresentative group of educated, middle class individuals - ‘the usual suspects’ - become the most frequent participants in hybridised democracy (Newman et al 2004, Informant: Carpenter 02/07/2010)3. Thus existing inequalities, and discriminatory power structures are further embedded by the process and the impact amenity groups have is negligible because it does not transform the hegemony.

If hybridised democracy is to convincingly rebut these critiques and integrate participation to a degree where amenity groups can have a formative impact, it must deliberate openly and honestly with a broader segment of society. Only when the ‘hard to reach’ (Arnstein 1969) - arguably an undesired legacy of the planning system’s failures - are included can the participatory agenda have representative legitimacy, and be an equalising force that empowers and civic society to build ennobling social capital through maximal use of political opportunity structures. To do this the engagement must be broader and deeper, with more meaningful, creative implementation; especially as the most vulnerable experience the welfare state as retreating ‘like an exhausted mother, too tired to offer her children anything but indifference’ (Davies1997:288). Engagement on this scale requires community development, stakeholder identification, coherent strategy and crucially time, money and skilled personnel.

1.5 New Labour: Tentative efforts to spread the franchise of participation to the ‘hard to reach’ groups

New Labour made structural changes to the planning system which had some success in building communities (Cox 2010), or making society ‘bigger’ as it is now being framed by the Coalition government (HM Government 2010). Through legislation such as the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), The Sustainable Communities Act (2007) and the Duty to Involve (2009), a 3 tier system of national, regional and local frameworks was established, as well as Local Development Frameworks (LDFs)4

3 Willingness or unwillingness to participate are ‘not natural properties of the groups concerned, but are constituted by the way in which the public is conceptualised, addressed and mobilised’ (Newman 2004: 246 citing Barnes et al 2003). Testimony from a Local Authorities Equality Officer describes this process in one locality: ‘In the 1990s they [the council] realised they were not going to develop and regenerate unless they took communities with them. They started to get strategic and to get exclusive – they engaged with odd people, in a very particular way. They engaged with people who became the great and the good, who then became another level of bureaucracy as far as the community went. It was an engagement in which officers were not nurturing the engagement, they were sucking it dry’ (Newman 2004:213).

4 These were encouraged by wider global priorities and initiatives, such as the UN Rio Conference (Chapter 28 of Agenda 21 calling on local authorities to develop sustainable development plans), the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive, and the EU Single Regeneration Budget.
which included Statements of Community Involvement (SCIs). Compulsory Area Assessments (CAAs) would check that the SCIs and LDFs were drafted and implemented to an appropriate standard (Pitchford et al 2009). Towards the middle stage of their governance period New Labour’s policies became more explicitly aimed at market invigoration (Informant interview: Jupp, lecturer and researcher, 05/07/2010). The tiered planning system enabled Housing Market Renewal (Pathfinders) Schemes - and others - to provide strategic investment and community development in deprived regional areas targeted using data from the Multiple Indices of Deprivation (see section 3.1.2). A report for the Community Development Foundation acknowledged that, ‘since 1997 community development have taken on a critical policy importance’ (Glen et al 2003:1). The report argues that resources for the community development profession - operating in shifting messy realities - need significant expansion for greater stability and impact; sentiments echoed by Brent (2009) in his reflections on 28 years of youth and community work.

In the short term amenity groups may have felt the tiered structures created obstructions rather than opportunities for influence, as the systems were difficult to navigate and permitted large scale strategic development apparently irrespective of stated objections5. For some amenity groups this further strained already distrustful - and possibly antagonistic - relations towards local planning authorities, which derived from previously unresponsive experiences of themselves or others. But in the longer-term, political opportunity structures were made for ‘hard to reach’ groups of people in vulnerable demographic areas, and resources were provided that allowed engagement to be contextually responsive, relatively lengthy and creative (see section 3.1.2 and 3.2.4). This perhaps proves that groups may be hard to reach, but more importantly are ‘hard to hear’ and ‘hard to listen too’ (Carpenter and Brownhill 2008, Informant: Carpenter 02/07/2010).

New Labour policies increased the impact of amenity groups inconsistently - due to regionalised redistribution strategies and localised implementation - but there were instances where they enabled amenity groups to have a formative impact on the scale, typology and nature of plans (see Sheffield and South Tyneside case studies in section 3). Importantly, participatory planning practices in deprived areas may continue to increase the impact of amenity groups on the planning process due to their part in the construction and consolidation of social networks. Positive experiences have emboldened some amenity groups, community leaders, local authority representatives, design professionals and other stakeholders to become champions of participation who can advocate to push the agenda forwards (Newman et al 2004, Informants: Sheffield Council Employee July 2010, Newton 06/07/2010).

1.6 Coalition government: Localism agenda risks accelerating beyond the pace of community development

The Coalition could greatly benefit from the ‘insight, passion and commitment’ of these participatory champions as it implements the ‘localism’ agenda (CAAB 2009b:5). This knowledge transfer and horizontal learning, will only be possible if there are opportunities for participation champions to continue to be involved and influential in political opportunity structures that have secure funding. Unfortunately, the current climate suggests these social and political assets may be sacrificed. Cuts to the public sector unveiled in the ‘Austerity Budget’(2010)6 may - perversely - cause a degree of stability as the core staff who are retained within local government may be less likely to move to other opportunities than they would in a more hospitable financial climate; but there is no guarantee that those who are retained will be those with participatory experience or agendas (Informant: Sheffield Council Employee July 2010)7. Indeed much participatory expertise has been fostered within wider strategic projects (see Sheffield case study section #3), that are under serious threat with plans to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies and Regional Development Agencies (HM Government 2010:11, Conservative Party 2010:4; see also, Buratta 2010, Donatantonio 04/06/2010, Smulian and Webb 28/05/2010, Smulian 04/06/2010, all citing Pickles MP DCLG 25th May 2010).

This action may damage the intangible assets and young relationships that have been built by these projects and agencies, and also reduces the credibility the Coalition’s claim to have, ‘the most radical programme of enfranchisement in over a century’ (Owen 2010:7 citing Clegg MP). They are abolishing a mechanism for reaching the most vulnerable, which as previously discussed is crucial to the success of participatory policies. The underlying cynicism towards participation in many circles has

---

5 Evidence suggests that people are often resistant to large scale change and can be instinctively short-termist, and to steer them through these cognitive barriers requires a mastery ‘of our behaviour through instinct, environment and reason’ (Grist 2010:1)

6 Eric Pickles MP announced a £1.6 billion spending cut in the DCLG (June 2010), which included a £146 million drop in housing and planning delivery grants

7 ‘Between 5 and 6 million people - around a 5th of the total UK workforce - now fear for their jobs’ (Posser 11/08/2010:27).
surfaced in the reactions to the ‘localism’ and ‘big society’ agendas in the planning press and broader press, where there is a fear that ‘nimbyism will run riot’ (Smulian 2010:8, see also Fyson 28/05/2010:9, The Week 24/07/2010:1), with longer term intergenerational interests suffering when climate change and population expansion are considered (Ellis 2010:6, Sprinks 2010:9). Evidence of local, familial protectionism was apparent when South Oxfordshire District Council decided to ‘suspend its core strategy’ (Smulian 2010:8) within 24 hours of Eric Pickles’ (MP) confirmation that decision making on housing and planning would be returned to local councils, much to the ‘disappointment’ of neighbouring local councils who had collaborated in the strategy’s development (Buratta 27/05/2010:1). The South East Plan in question was formulated over the space of 8 years and involved extensive public consultation; it’s unceremonious abolition will cause a degree of resentment amongst all those who participated in it’s construction. As well as ceding a large degree of control to local institutions, the Coalition also advocate the empowerment of local institutions such as Parish Councils (Conservative Party 2010:8). The institutions are often unrepresentative and undemocratic, although the commitment and adroit political skill of individuals within them may be commendable (Informants: Planning Aid South Representatives 07/07/2010).

New Labour’s National Policy Statements attracted support from advocacy organisations that had ‘made a great play of the erosion of civil rights’ (Owens and Cowell 2006:414), as they produced a guide of minimum standards that reduced the risk of variability in local processes and implementation exaggerating existing inequalities and fragmentation of political will (Wilks-Heeg 2009). The CAAs also provided a crucial opportunity for scrutiny (Pitchford et al 2009, Informant interview: Professional Facilitator who has advised government on policies with regards to engagement 19/06/2010). The Coalition has stated that a ‘National Planning Framework’ will exist in some form, but with the abolition of Regional Strategies and CAAs (HM Government 2010:11&12), some built environment professionals fear that planning decisions might be challenged via the EU and Human Rights Instruments. These challenges would occur because of the unjustifiable increases in social exclusion and inequality (Sprinks 2010:8). Within the local system there will be a rapid reduction of the rights of appeal and a further streamlining of processes (HM Government 2010:18, Conservative Party 2010:11). Both of these strategies would reduce the potential impact of amenity groups, as ‘relatively civilised collision’ is vital to for the scrutiny and continual amelioration of future planning (Owens 2002:952 citing Mill 1859), and processes to broaden participation take time (Upton 2002, Carpenter and Brownhill 2008). Given the neo-liberal UK context, broad scrutiny and opportunities for collision are vital to ensure that those with the greatest degree of market capital do not wield disproportionate influence in the planning process (Burgess et al 1997).

The Coalition plans to extend community involvement and amenity group impact by their ‘support of……social action, responsibility, volunteering and philanthropy’ (HM Government 2010:29). To help achieve this they will ‘train a new generation of community organisers…..and support the creation of neighbourhood groups’ (ibid). But community development practitioners suggest that what is needed is not just new blood, but resources so they can be more deeply embedded with greater support, and for there to be accessible political opportunity structures that empower communities (Brent 2009, Glen et al 2003). The Austerity Budget (2010) suggests that resources will not be available for the community organisers to have a significantly larger impact than they already do, and without the targeting of deprived areas the political opportunities accessible to the most vulnerable might be lessened.

Although the localism agenda - following a trajectory set by previous governments that reflects long-term trends - may be laudably ‘idealistic’ (Greenwell 2010:3), there is a naivety in the assumption that the big society will build as rapidly as the planning system is deregulated. Hence there is a risk ‘localism’ will reduce the representativeness and long-term impact of amenity groups.
1.7 Conclusions: Can the planning system return to its socially progressive roots with unrealistic acceleration towards localism?

The roots of our planning system are incredibly progressive, with its founding intent being to aid the vulnerable. However the squalor many amenity groups were thought to symbolise, rather than their direct action or engagement, was formative in the planning processes for post-war housing. Consequently, the quality of the products was higher than that of the process, contributing to the development of a social contract which encouraged civic society to become disengaged from wider political processes. This painted the planning system as a failure, forcing it to retreat into bureaucracy and leaving it vulnerable to political ‘electioneering’ (Tilley 2010:6). To aid efficiency, effectiveness, the global trend towards participation has been allied uncomfortably with our neo-liberal representative democracy. Planning systems within hybridised democracy models have the potential to facilitate formative amenity group impact. With this higher impact, amenity groups would have a stronger investment in future development, potentially ensuring it is more socially and environmentally sustainable. Participatory engagement processes involving inclusive amenity groups would also build social capital and reduce the democratic deficit. For hybridised democracy to achieve its potential, a rationale for participation must be adopted and implemented that helps create conditions conducive to maximum amenity group impact by building mutual capacity. Currently the conditions only exist in parts, in certain places, and thus on the whole participation may be serving to exaggerate existing inequalities: this is politically disabling for amenity groups and reduces their long term impact on the planning process. The current Coalition plans reflect long term underlying political trends, and could worsen the situation as participation accelerates beyond the pace of community development.
Section Two

Feelings of Influence and Appropriate rationales for participation
2.0 What benefits can participatory rationales bring?

‘Houses make a town, but citizens make a city’ (Henry Rousseau)

‘If liberty and equality, as is thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost’ (Aristotle)

For amenity groups to have an impact they must continue to exist, and to do so, they must have a feeling of influence. For this to happen they must feel informed and feel that their input can have some impact on decision making (see figure 1 and figure 2). ‘The Citizens Report’ revealed that out of the people in their survey who have been involved in local decision making processes, 35% feel they have had an influence, and 56% of them felt they had not (Newton et al 2010:10). Therefore some institutional structures are being created for community involvement, but they are not or cannot be utilised. This may be an indication that these structures are unresponsive, or that people are unaware of the influence they had because the feedback mechanisms are inadequate (Newman et al 2004). This is a perpetual legacy of our social contract. For feelings of influence and amenity group engagement to flourish, social and political conditions must enable participation opportunities to be utilised, and institutions to be responsive to input.

Forms of participation that foster these social and political conditions need to be adopted. Conditions that enable participation can only be sustained if the amenity groups who access them are inclusive and representative, which is currently not the case. Creating conditions conducive to participation will invariably require significant resources and be a slow process (see Fig 4, Fig 5 and Fig 6). However without this investment, the tensions within our hybridised democracy will continue to make local authorities feel ‘embattled’, and amenity groups disenfranchised (Newman et al 2004). A vital property of the forms of participation adopted is that they help build trust between actors, so that needs, positions and interests can be honestly expressed. If those expressions formed the basis of continued dialogue, it could sow the seeds for sustainable development that reduces vulnerability and increases resilience (see section 3). Other countries – ‘ancient’ and modern – have integrated deliberative forms of participation into their governance structures with significant successes (Dryzec 2002:6). Lessons can be drawn from these precedents despite the differences in social contracts and economic constraints (Fishkin 2003, Hickey and Mohan 2004, Cornwall 2008 and see Fig 8). Frustrations with the inadequacies of current political opportunity structures, and their slow proliferation, is motivating people to become part of social movements that provide an oppositional consciousness, a space for dreaming and a cause for optimism.
2.1 Outline of Participation Rationales

The different forms of participation are listed in Table 1 (adjacent). The title of each of these forms represents the mode or manner individuals, groups or implementing agencies adopt when operating within it. For example, if someone was participating in the form of ‘politics of the consumer’ they would be acting in the mode of a consumer with the expectation of transactional product delivery and freedom of market choice. In a hybridised form of participation, actors may adopt the mode of a representative and/or general participants whose function is to contribute to communal deliberation. The table has been formulated to interrogate the underlying motivations for actor/implementing agency endorsement of different modes, and ‘whether the interests being promoted essentially concern the individual or are focused on the well-being of the community as a whole’ (Campbell and Marshall 2000: 324). As the table describes the form, motivation and risks of participation it essentially outlines each typology’s rationale. With a debt to Arnstein’s ‘ladder of participation’ (1969), in 1996 White outlined a table assessing the rationales for nominal, instrumental, representative and ‘transformative’ participation (Cornwall 2008:28). A year later a comparable analysis by Stoker (1997) included communitarian and deliberative participation, as well as ‘the politics of presence’ (Campbell and Marshall 2000:324). Campbell and Marshall (2000) later added ‘the politics of the consumer’. My addition of ‘hybridised’ participation respects current political context. ‘Politics of patience’ is a mode adopted with significant successes by members of the Slum Dwellers International CBO (see section #3), and thus becomes an enlightening addition.

Hybridised democracy will only reach it’s potential if, ‘policy makers and practitioners acknowledge the existence of the range of (participation) approaches and thus design strategies and mechanisms that take account of this’ (Carpenter and Brownhill 2008:228); hence the pertinence of Table 1. Without the awareness and utilisation of these approaches a significant proportion of the population will continue to experience hybridised democracy as a fragmented, congested, unaccountable democratic model (Burgess et al 2001, Cowell 2004, Sullivan 2004).
## Participation Rationales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Participation</th>
<th>What’s in it for the implementing agency?</th>
<th>What’s in it for the participants?</th>
<th>What is participation for?</th>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>- Legitimisation</td>
<td>- Feeling of inclusion</td>
<td>- Display</td>
<td>- Exacerbates any existing mistrust between parties and may heighten frustration and disengagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>- Efficiency</td>
<td>- Feeling of inclusion</td>
<td>- Cost effective means of improving service delivery and generating feelings of influence and interest</td>
<td>- Political disablement of the most articulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>- Sustainability</td>
<td>- Leverage</td>
<td>- Gives people a voice in a paternallyistically manageable structure</td>
<td>- Incorporation into existing structures may make it difficult to change them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative</td>
<td>- Empowerment</td>
<td>- Empowerment</td>
<td>- A choice and a voice</td>
<td>- If processes are conducted in a formulaic unresponsive manner may create 'consultation fatigue', and community hostility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Better governance, better citizens, building social capital</td>
<td>- Act as justification for withdrawal of rights-bearer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Creating mediating institutional spaces for honest expression, civilised collision and trust creation</td>
<td>- Reaching less progressive conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reducing democratic and social deficit</td>
<td>- No conclusions reached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybridised or 'Collaborative' (Healey 2006)</td>
<td>- Legitimisation</td>
<td>- Leverage</td>
<td>- As deliberative</td>
<td>- As deliberative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Empowerment</td>
<td>- As representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>- As representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Exaggeration of existing inequalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communitarian</td>
<td>- Empowerment</td>
<td>- Empowerment</td>
<td>- Participation framed as a right</td>
<td>- Framing as an <em>Obligation</em> creates professional participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Broad educational benefits</td>
<td>- Participation is continuous and onerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Opportunity for self-organisation</td>
<td>- Centre-led participation not acceptable so expert knowledge may recede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics of Consumer</td>
<td>- Withdrawal</td>
<td>- Market Choice and expression</td>
<td>- Maintaining livelihoods and wider economy</td>
<td>- Power of agencies are unrecognised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Efficient service delivery</td>
<td>- Access to global resources</td>
<td>- Those without material wealth have increased vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Personally passive transactions</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increase social and democratic deficit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Selective participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics of Presence</td>
<td>- Sustainability</td>
<td>- Leverage</td>
<td>- Provides political opportunity structures for marginalised groups to have recognition and a voice</td>
<td>- Political disablement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appearance of diversity and representation</td>
<td>- Status</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Weakening of social movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics of Patience</td>
<td>- Non-confrontational relations with marginalised, vulnerable groups</td>
<td>- Recognition</td>
<td>- Presence</td>
<td>- Reduces power of opposition to advocate for radical structural change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sustainable Leverage</td>
<td>- Mass mobilisation</td>
<td>- Vulnerable groups remain subsumed by globalised trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reduction of confrontational encounters with authorities</td>
<td>- Self organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Access to governmental structures and resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1*
Motivation of participants vs Franchise. Figure 3: If hybridised democracy is to increase the franchise of participation and motivation of participants - both of which would facilitate an increase in the potential impact of amenity groups - the participatory forums it creates needs to move towards more deliberative, communal models. Although the level of motivation required for communitarian participation may be unachievable whilst the politics of the consumer has a presence.

Soft skills requirement vs Franchise. Where soft skills are defined as: the ability to create space for others to express their opinion, to listen, to delay judgement of ideas exchanged, and to discuss ideas in a non-confrontational manner (Informants: Professional Facilitator 19/06/2010 and Newton 06/07/2010). Figure 4: The level of soft skills required in hybridised democracy is arguably greater than those required for many other rationales because these skills have to be sufficient - on the part of the implementers and other stakeholders - to manage the tensions between the systems they envelop, not just the planning issue or project in hand. Soft skills may be minimal in some areas, as demonstrated by the South Tyneside case study (see Section #3). In the Woodbine estate soft skills had to be established at the outset of the Participatory Appraisal. Although if this initial investment is made, the skills will remain in place for future deliberations.
Broad educational benefits vs Resource investments. Figure 5: If hybridised democracy incorporates deliberative methods which are implemented by highly skilled facilitators/facilitating institutional spaces that exist between civic and political space, then broad educational benefits can ensue. This includes building soft skills to make conditions more conducive for high numbers of participants (as per fig 4). If there are more participants to deliberate with, the process is less reliant on the constant presence of particular amenity groups and individuals, and thus making the level of time commitment required more manageable. This would produce a more ‘everyday democracy’, that simultaneously complements and challenges the hegemony of ‘the politics of the consumer’. Hybridised democracy should continue to envelop ‘the politics of presence’, as broad representation of a diverse range of communities is not yet in place, and ‘the politics of presence’ can facilitate involvement from these marginalised groups.

Capacity to reach the ‘hard to hear’ vs Resource investment level required to reach the ‘hard to hear’ considering current social contract. Figure 6: As previously discussed in Section #1, significant resources must be invested if hybridised democracy is to reach the ‘hard to hear’ groups. The self-organisation implied in ‘the politics of patience’ and communitarian participation means that these rationales can proliferate amongst alternative social and environmental movements (see section 3.1.3.2), which provide a vital force in a healthy democracy. Alternative oppositional spaces are an important facet of optimal enablement conditions, as they provide a functioning example, a space to dream and a motivation for governmental institutions to do participation better.
Country comparisons. Figure 8: In Brazil and India, and Brazil in particular, participatory democracy is a powerful force. However, the social contract in Brazil, and many other countries in the global south, is formed around rights-bearers not fulfilling many rights including those that are economic, social and cultural. Citizens may therefore be accustomed to working without the expectation of state assistance in the fulfilment of their basic needs, and consequently there may be more social will in response to political opportunity structures.

In countries like Brazil, where participation has come to be viewed as a basic human right, you can no more deprive citizens of this than of the right to a free trial which is also an expensive process. There are many practitioners and academics who advocate for participation to achieve the same status in the UK (Lister 2002). In Norway and Sweden participation is more integrated into social and political structures than in the UK; thus proving deliberative approaches are applicable in northern hemisphere democracies.
2.3 Challenges identified and what participatory rationales would best serve to address them

Lessons can be learnt from the participatory approaches in the newer democracies of the global south, despite their differing social contracts. Their collaborative spirit is an endorsement of the idea that the vulnerable know their needs the best, it is their reality that counts, and they should be enabled to help themselves (Chambers 1997, Lister 2002, Fishkin 2003). ‘Don’t plan for the poor, plan with them’ (French and O’Neil 2010:22 citing Brazilian President De Silva), is a lesson we should have learnt from our post-war social policies, particularly that of planning. In the spirit of mutual exchange and with a recognition of the potency of horizontal learning, in 2007, ‘45 “participation champions” from 15 countries met in the UK....to share experiences’ (Cornwall 2008:16). The core challenges they identified in enabling and maintaining optimal deliberation for maximal impact - broadly echoed by CABE (2009a) - were as follows:

- ‘Addressing negative attitudes and mutual distrust between local communities and government
- Being more inclusive, and making sure the most disadvantaged have a voice
- Building mutual accountability in partnership arrangements
- Creating greater mutual understanding of the pressures on bureaucrats and citizens to deliver and engage
- Securing longer-term sustainability of participatory initiatives and institutions’ (Cornwall 2008:16).

I would argue that for these challenges to be addressed in the UK, the hybridised rationale is the most suitable - although that does not mean to say it’s potential is currently being maximised. The hybridised rationale has the potential to provide deliberative forums that facilitate an honest expression of needs, identities, and interests; including from institutional actors who are in a position to outline the scope of the forum. In these expressive spaces amenity groups are more likely to feel informed and consequently maintain their involvement. The collaborative civic-political relationships built in these neutral spaces would instil more responsive feedback mechanisms, and more opportunities for amenity groups to influence decisions and formulate plans. Given that planning occurs ‘in the context of a global political-economy’ and must seek ‘just outcomes beyond the confines of the locality’, conflicts within the process are inevitable (Campbell 2006:104). When mutual trust and capacity is built through a deliberative process, these conflicts can be exposed, and interrogated through ‘civilised collision’ (Owens 2002:952, Dryzec 2002, Seeds for Change 2010). A meaningful degree of collective consensus can established through these processes, potentially increasing the sustainability of plans in the implementation phase (Seeds for Change 2010). For hybridised democracy to achieve these deliberative forums and formative amenity group impact, a broader range of the population - including the ‘hard to hear - must be included in participatory processes. The development of co-productive deliberative institutional spaces should be symbiotic with community development practices to prevent the forums exacerbating existing inequalities. This will require resources, interventionist will and the willingness to cede control and take risks.

Being subject to underlying political trends and a broad range of agendas, planning must operate in realpolitik (Campbell 2006). The hybridised rationale of participation is suitable in these conditions as it’s representative aspects can envelop various other participation rationales and harness their underlying positive aspects. Miller (RSA 2008) argues that decisions actors make in consumerist or instrumental modes are often manifestations of familial affection; these actors are protecting and/or providing for their social networks. A flexible hybridised participation process could harness this implicit altruism. It could also work with the ‘politics of patience’ and ‘politics of presence’ to build a more diverse and inclusive franchise. To envelop a range of participation rationales at appropriate moments, hybridised democracy must develop the confidence and flexibility to be contextually responsive. This might be difficult to achieve if there is a heavy reliance on engagement through ‘new media’; although this allows you to ‘take part in your lunch-break’ (Morris 28/05/2010:11 citing Topham), it is no substitute for the trust and capacity built through face-to-face contact (Informant interview: Professional Facilitator 19/06/2010). With face-to-face deliberative interaction between representative amenity groups and built environment professionals socially progressive development can occur, with all involved becoming more personally invested in the process. This could ‘reconnect markets and values’, further enabling amenity group impact (CABE 2009a:91 Hill citing Sandel).
Section Three

Optimum enabling Conditions for amenity group impact and demonstrative case study assessment
3.0 Enablement Conditions

‘When everywhere is everywhere, only the familiar is familiar. If you can’t find the postcard, you haven’t arrived’
(Iain Sinclair)

If more deliberative approaches are to be successfully adopted and implemented, then we should ask what conditions need to exist for optimum deliberative participation (Cornwall 2008, Pal 2006). In this section I formulate what the aforementioned conditions may be (after Cornwall 2008:70&71). The more of these enablement conditions that exist, the more likely it is that an amenity group could have a a formative impact in planning processes in any given area. Therefore, the compliance with these conditions gives an indication of what impact amenity groups could have achieved in the particular case studies cited; leading to an assessment of what impact amenity groups have had on the English Planning Process as a whole. The case studies cited represent a range of participation rationales, project types, and socio-political contexts, serving to give a broad overview of amenity group interaction with the planning process. The case study included from the global south demonstrates the empowering potential of deliberative participation in hospitable socio-political environments.

3.1 Case Studies: Narrative information

In this section the narratives of who, what, when, where and why in a variety of case studies are impartially presented for a variety of case studies are given. This offers a context for the analysis and arguments contained in section 3.2.

3.1.1 South East England

3.1.1.1 Streatham

In Early 2008, developers selected Assael Architects to work on a proposal for Palace Road site, in a location which the local Lambeth Council has defined as a Conservation Area. Assael architects hired a leading ‘Communications Firm’, to assist in the generation of a communications strategy particular to the local political and social context. The ‘Communications Firm’ had vast experience in the London area and had previously worked with the architects in challenging projects which had been given planning permission (Informant interviews: John Assael R.I.B.A, Managing Director Assael Architects, Summer 2010). Their initial reports highlighted the political tensions in the local borough council, and suggested that these would be exacerbated by manoeuvring in preparation for the elections that would be taking place in 2010. As part of this electioneering, local politicians were more likely to vociferously object to any planning applications (Communications Firm June 2009: provided by Assael Architects June 2010). The design team arranged preliminary private meetings with potentially hostile local politicians in the hope of addressing their concerns before the project became the object of political manoeuvring. There were significant changes to the designs in response to these meetings, and the Architect’s team were under the strong impression the councillors involved would support the development (Informant: Assael 2010). By July 2009 wider stakeholder engagement conducted by the design team included: regular discussions with local planning officers, private briefings with local neighbours, a two day public exhibition and the...
distribution of two newsletters (Internal design team email 2009).

To the dismay of the design team, on the 3rd of July 2009 two of the aforementioned local councillors appeared in a local newspaper article deriding the Palace Road scheme (See Figure 9: Casey 2009:18). Their objections were carried by the Local Planning Committee, which unanimously rejected the application on the 2nd of February 2010. The application had been recommended to the committee by the Local Planning Officer. There was a suggestion from the Senior Architect involved in this case that the Planning Inspectorate would be investigating the circumstances of the application’s rejection. The planning application proposed to demolish a Victorian house - with the approval of English Heritage - and in the remaining land build 33, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses, including 2 (6% of total) affordable units with private gardens. These units were presented in the application as being high quality, sustainable, residential accommodation (see figure 10 & 11). The design team received a number of ‘letters of support’ for the scheme which they highlighted as being rare for such schemes (Informant: Assael, Summer 2010).

3.1.1.2 Wandsworth (Units 1-20 Enterprise Way, Osiers Road, London, SW18 1 NL)

The developer Barratt Homes, has owned this site since 2007. A planning application was approved by the local borough in May 2008. For various reasons, including some suggested revisions by the GLA and continued hostility towards the project from the local amenity groups, the development approved in 2008 was never implemented. In 2009 Assael Architects were appointed to produce a revised planning application for the site. Assael worked with Bell Pottinger Public Affairs (BPPA), and other stakeholders to produce the SCI and complementary implementation strategy. Public consultation began formally in Spring 2009, although there had been meetings with Lambeth Planning Authority and the GLA prior to that. Between June 2009 and January 2010 stakeholder engagement had included: distributing a newsletter to 1,700 local residents (sent 23/04/2009); the supply of a dedicated phone number, email and postal address for ‘further information…on request; independent meetings with councillors (held 25/03/2009 and 20/07/2009) and large residential groups (held early September 2009); and a 2 day long public exhibition (Local Planning Officer Report (LPOR) 07/01/2010: 25). The Osiers Road Exhibition Report (ORER) (2009:13) asserts that of the 60 people who attended the exhibition, ‘the majority of the local residents…made positive comments’. Although there were some positive responses, strong objections were expressed by key political stakeholders (LPOR 2010: 37, 38, and 39) and from 3 highly organised local Resident’s Associations (ibid 42 and 43). The Resident’s Associations objections were articulated in a strategically adversarial manner which suggested extensive prior familiarity with the machinations of the planning system; they were incorporated into it’s language.

Despite these objections, on balance the Local Planning Officer concluded that the scheme was ‘rational and efficient’, and recommended it to the Planning Committee with only minor amendments to be considered in the detailed design phase (LPOR 2010: 62). The final planning application presented by Assael Architects contained a number of significant revisions from the original application (May 2008), and some of those listed (LPOR 2010:21) do relate directly to specific programmatic suggestions made by the public (ORER 2009:9). The
resulting application was for the erection of 8 buildings, ranging in height from 2 to 21 storeys, comprising of 275 flats of which 89 would be affordable (32% of total), with commercial floor-space, and ecological and landscaping ‘enhancements’ (LPOR 2010:17) (see figure 12 and 13). This planning application was approved by a vote of 6/2 on the 7th of January 2010.

3.1.1.3 Chelsea Barracks (Chelsea Bridge Road, SW3 4SR, London)

In 2009, the developer Christian Candy - with financial backing from Qatar - commissioned the Richard Rogers Partnership to design a residential development at the prestigious Chelsea Barrack site. Prince Charles was not in favour of the ‘brutalist’ modern development which emerged, and privately lobbied the Prime Minister and Emir of Qatar (Prince Charles correspondence 01/03/2009 made public June 2010: see figure 14). Soon after this lobbying, the backers in Qatar withdrew their support from the £3 billion, 13 acre development, and the development plans were suspended indefinitely.

Christian Candy took his former partners to court for a breach of contract, and in June 2010 a High Court judge ruled in his favour. During the hearing, the judge publicly rebuked Prince Charles, stating his intervention was ‘unwelcome and unwarranted’ (Morris 11/06/2010:32, Morris 02/07/2010:32 and The Week 03/07/2010:20). In the media Prince Charles was lauded for defending a public treasure, and simultaneously derided for obfuscating the democratic channels of the planning process. CABE, Richard Rogers, and the planning process itself were also subjected to public criticism (ibid).

3.1.1.4 Bicester Eco-Town (on North West Edge on Bicester)

In January 2009 a proposal to build 15,00 new homes in Western Otmoor - between Kidlington and Bicester - was rejected by the local council as it was deemed ‘harmful’ to Bicester (Cherwell District Council website 2010). This justification was supported by New Labour’s preliminary Eco-Town appraisals, which gave the Western Otmoor proposal the lowest possible ranking. In March 2009, the Housing Minister at the time visited Bicester’s key political stakeholders. In these meetings the housing minister stressed the importance of Eco-towns to the central government agenda; Eco-Town developments would sustain ‘the greater South East as an engine of economic prosperity’ and enable the housing needs of the current
and projected future population to be satisfied (Ellis 2010:6, Sprinks 2010, Tilley 2010). After this meeting, Bicester’s key political stakeholders appear to have been more receptive to Eco-Town proposals.

In the spring of 2009 a developer was formed - entitled ‘P3 Eco’ - specifically to fund and build Eco-Town projects. The P3 Eco Consortium included experts from a land-holding company, a communications consultancy and A2 Dominion Housing Association (a Socially Registered Landlord (SRL)); ensuring that the team had significant experience in managing large scale housing projects, lobbying for social and political support, and an extremely good understanding of multi-level governance structures. On the 16th of July 2009, Bicester was one of four sites selected by central government for an Eco-Town development (BBC online and ‘This is Oxfordshire’ online 16/07/2009). Cherwell District Council supported the scheme and allocated 345 hectares of land for the project on the north western periphery of Bicester (see figure 17). The district council also affiliated with the P3 Eco Consortium, which was charged with managing the project.

In October 2009, Cherwell District Council applied for central government funding to aid infrastructure improvements relating to the Eco-Town development; they were awarded £9.6 million in February 2010. Despite a ‘50% cut in government funding’ under the new regime, the infrastructure money already received, and a letter of support from current Housing Minister Grant Shapps MP have provided strong incentives for the Cherwell District Council to pursue with the Eco-Town development (Oxford Mail online 15/07/2010). The P3 Eco Consortium are expecting the first planning application of the phased development to be submitted in the Autumn of 2010, with all phases to be completed in 15 to 20 years, resulting in the construction of approximately 5000 homes (Ibid, Informant interview: Steve Hornblow, Development Manager for A2 Dominion Housing Association 06/07/2010).

A representative of P3 Eco asserted that consultation with key stakeholders began as soon as they were involved in the project (Informant: Hornblow 06/07/2010). The P3 Eco Consortium has developed a detailed Engagement Strategy (P3 Eco Consortium April 2010) which contains dates for its own revision. By August 2010 P3 Eco had facilitated: the ‘Bicester Summit’, attended by key stakeholders and a Member of Parliament; various stakeholder meetings; and an ‘Open Planning Week’ (05/06/2010 to 10/06/2010) held in four different location and including a ‘Community Feedback Session’ which locals could register for (ibid). As a consequence of their engagement process, P3 Eco believe they have the support of the majority of parish councils, the local council and the county council, and are expecting minimal opposition to the first planning application (Informant: Hornblow 06/07/2010). However, there are still some vociferous opponents to the scheme, including Local Councillors Charles Shouler and Catherine Fulljames, and the action group ‘Bicester and Villages Against Sham Eco-Town’ (BASE) led by a former town planner. These actors object to the concept of the Eco-Town development as well as the speed, scope and authenticity of the engagement process which they view as rushed, inadequate and disingenuous (McGregor 24/06/2010 and 13/08/2009).

3.1.2 Northern England
3.1.2.1 North Sheffield Housing Market Renewal

In the late 1990s a group of local people formed the North East Sheffield Trust (NEST). They conducted various community building activities in the north-east area of Sheffield, and their efforts contributed to the City Council’s successful bid for £20 million from Round 5 of the EU Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) in 1999. North Sheffield was eligible for SRB funding because it was consistently, ‘in the top 1% of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation’ (Waite 18/06/2008 citing Plowden). Following the receipt of this substantial funding, a proposal for radical large scale demolition was submitted for planning approval (Waite 2008, Chiles 2006, CABE site 2010). This plan was adjudged ‘top down’ and was strongly opposed by the local community, and was subsequently rejected by the Sheffield Regeneration Board.

In 2000, the Sheffield City Council brought new staff to the project. Miranda Plowden led this revitalised team, and remains involved in the project in her current role as Programme Director for the Strategic Housing Service. Under the new leadership, existing communities of place, culture and interest were identified (Hamdi 2004:111). In recognition of these community identities, there was a division of the larger strategic area into 6 more localised areas. In each of these areas the community-led partnerships with the Council were established, and ‘grass roots-led’ masterplanning was undertaken (Waite 2008: citing Plowden, Chiles 2006, CABE site 2010). This strategy was elaborated in a Cultural Action Plan, written in collaboration with a local Cultural Planning Agency (Eventus) in 2000. In 2005, after 5 years of collaboration between partners, wider stakeholders and designers, and with the assistance of a Design Panel, a Local Plan was approved by the Sheffield’s Regeneration Board and City Council.

The plan proposed drastic changes to Southey Owlerton and Brightside Shiregreen; currently home to approximately 70,000 people (Waite 2008). These areas were also identified as Housing Market Renewal Zones (Pathfinders) in the South Yorkshire Housing Market Renewal Scheme of 2003; by 2008 Miranda Plowden was managing a total project budget of £200 million. Pathfinder schemes were funded by central government, and reflected their prioritisation of economic revival (Informant interview: Dr Ellie Jupp, Lecturer and Researcher, 05/07/2010). An increase in the ‘residential offer’ of housing was to be the economic stimulus for the desired economic revitalisation (Waite 2008). Nationally, many Pathfinder schemes facilitated mass housing demolition with varying degrees of acceptance from local communities (ibid, Informant: Jupp 05/07/2010). In North Sheffield the community-led project saw 1,200 of the 15,000 council-owned properties demolished. The North Sheffield Team is currently delivering a number of projects, with an ‘impressive’ range of design practices and developers (Waite 2008, CABE site 2010). All the planned products are not yet in place, and there is a degree of uncertainty over the future of the project in the new political and economic climate (Informant: Sheffield Council Employee 2010).

3.1.2.2 South Tyneside Participatory Appraisal

19 of South Tyneside’s 71 residential neighbourhoods are amongst 10% of the most deprived in the country according to the Multiple Indices of Deprivation. Under New Labour this made the region eligible for various pieces of central government funding. In response to these financial opportunities - and government reports encouraging citizen engagement in public projects - the South Tyneside Council initiated a collaboration with the PEANuT (Participatory Evaluation and Appraisal in Newcastle upon Time) team at Northumbria University. Council staff and PEANuT associated planned a Participatory Neighbourhood Appraisal and Action Planning process for 3 of the 19 most deprived local neighbourhoods. The project would adhere to the current political understanding of planning as being about ‘shaping the places where people live and work’ (Conservative party 2010:1, ODPM:2004). South Tyneside Council acknowledge a methodological debt to the global south, although earlier participatory projects in the North East - often to address anti-social behaviour - may have given some local actors experience of deliberative forums (Participatory Appraisal Document 2010).
Implementation of the participatory methods varied, as processes responded iteratively to the particularities of each locality and lessons drawn from other neighbourhoods. Staffing, resource provision, and prior investment in community development were further variables. Teams of PEANuT associates and council staff - and where in post community development workers - liaised local communities to generate local interest. In each estate there were a team of community volunteers who committed to being on the localised research team that would facilitate the appraisal. These teams were given training in: participatory tools, consensus building, and consolidation tools. Where deemed necessary and appropriate, training may have included soft skills building amongst the volunteers. The initial Appraisal and Action Planning took between 1 year and 18 months, approximately (Informant: Newton, Professional Facilitator and PEANuT Associate, 06/07/2010).

Due to complications in the implementation phase, project delivery information is not yet available for all the neighbourhoods involved. An initial evaluative report produced by South Tyneside Council suggested that all the actions for the first project (Horsely Hill) had been successfully implemented through the continuance of central government funding (Culture and Neighbourhood Service Report (CNSR) 2010:16, see figure 19). The average costing was £77,412 per neighbourhood project, at a cost per neighbourhood resident of £34.42 (ibid:11). In Horsely Hill - the largest of the 3 projects - the Participatory Appraisal Team carried out over 600 resident interviews with 1,400 responses being received and analysed (South Tyneside Council 2010).

3.1.3. Wider UK Movements

3.1.3.1 Planning Aid (with reference to Planning Aid South)

Planning Aid was established in 1973 by the TCPA to help community groups access the planning process. It is now part of the RTPI, a registered charity. Funding sources differ slightly between the 9 regional offices of Planning Aid, although DCLG funding since 2003 has provided stability. My informants at Planning Aid South (interviewed 07/07/2010) estimated that in their case 90% of the funding comes from the local authority, with 10% coming from other sources. Planning Aid London operates independently of this system and has a profit making arm; a model which other regional offices are beginning to consider given the current austerity budget. Planning Aid have recently mapped their practice against the ‘Big Society’ agenda to demonstrate the continuity of it’s value in the current climate (ibid).

Planning Aid now aims to ‘involve disadvantaged groups in the planning process’ (Carpenter and Brownhill 2008:227), by offering ‘free and independent professional planning advice to community groups and individuals who cannot afford to pay for professional fees’, through their team of over 1,200 volunteers and over 50 paid staff (Planning Aid 2010: see figure 20, Planning Aid website). This is administered by a proactive and reactive service. The reactive service is in the form of an advice line, with extra help being provided in eligible cases (see figure 20). In their proactive work Planning Aid conducts engagement and educational work in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, identified through the Multiple Deprivation Indices and their local knowledge. Their achievements in this work are ‘considerable’ given their ‘limited budget’ (Carpenter and Brownhill 2008:238). In cases such as Plymouth, and the Thames Gateway many community members, including young people, were involved in making plans for their own communities which were then actioned (ibid:240, Informants: Planning Aid South representatives 07/07/2010). Numerous analogous examples are cited in the ‘Good Practice Guide to Public Engagement in Development Schemes’ (Planning Aid 2010: see figure 21&44). Figures published by Planning Aid England suggest that in 2009 they ‘helped more than 31,000 people and nearly 1,100 community groups and residents’ forums play a part in the planning system’ (Lee 2010 and Planning Aid website 2010).
3.1.3.2 Selected social and environmental movements (alternative oppositional spaces)

There are many movements/organisations in the UK who believe the key to climate change mitigation lies in alternative ways of organising society based on empowerment through self-organisation, consensus decision making, and community resilience.

Transition Towns is an international movement in which members organise action to mitigate the risks of Peak Oil to protect the environment for future generations. UK Transition Town organisations are planning their own futures; Transition Totnes developed a 20 year Energy Descent Plan, and Transition Winchester are elucidating a 3 year plan in collaboration with the local authority (Totnes and Winchester Transition Town websites 2010). The Transition movement acknowledges that it’s potential scope and visibility are currently limited by the relatively narrow demographic range of its members (Transition Towns website 2010: survey reports). Transition Towns UK now have a dedicated Diversity Officer to address this issue. This Officer is looking to the example of BTCV ’who have gone from an organisation that appeals to middle class conservationists to having literally 1,000’s from BME/ low income groups involved in their work. Key to their success was an inner change in themselves (ie, looking at how they were hard to reach’). (Informant: Pickering 08/07/2010)

‘Seeds for Change’ is a not for profit co-op whose experience derives from grass-roots social and environmental activism. They offer free ‘training and resources to grassroots campaigners and to NGOs, Co-ops and other organisations in the social sector’ (Seeds for Change website 2010) Their free online resources include training on facilitation, consensus decision making, press campaigning, and meeting organisation (see figure 23), and are accessed from all over the world. ‘Doing it Without Leaders’ articulates the co-ops rationale for self-organisation: ‘Every kind of human activity should begin from what is local and immediate, should link in a network with no centre and no directing agency’ (Seeds for Change 2010:5 citing Colin Ward 1988). Seeds for Change has a wide array of networks with other social movements, including housing co-ops, ‘Planning Democracy’ and ‘Planning Sanity’. The educational material promulgated by Seeds for Change gives this organisation a broad reach, which is likely to be influential on social and environmental movements in the long-term.

3.1.4. International Comparison

3.1.4.1 Mumbai Railway Settlers (Resettlement Process)

In 1999 in Mumbai there were 15,000 households living along the Railway tracks and 4,000 people living in the Railway stations, totalling some 60,000 people which had to be moved to build ‘vital infrastructure’ (Pal, 2006:161). To prevent severe social disaggregation, a 60,000 people needed to be involved in the organisation of their own resettlement (ibid). The community was mobilised by their affiliation with ‘The Alliance’, which comprised of Mahila Milan (Women Together), SPARC and NSDF (Patel and Mitlin 2004). At the point when the relocation was proposed 70% of the settlers were in affiliated with The Alliance through Daily Savings schemes (Mitlin and D’Cruz 2009:9). This provided a legitimising critical mass that empowered the community in all future negotiations with political institutions. NSDF’s federation with SDI
enhanced their legitimacy further by connecting them with fellow Slum Dwellers around the world (Arputham 2008). SDI and its federated CBOs operate the ‘politics of patience’ (see section 2), giving them the flexibility to negotiate with any incumbent government in a non-confrontational manner whilst gradually building capacity and harnessing resilience (Patel et al 2001).

The scale of the Railway Settlers mobilisation, and tax opportunities motivated the Mumbai municipality to provide alternative secure land tenure. Indeed the arrangement became viewed as sustainable and mutually beneficial (Pal 2006). ‘The Alliance’ played a ‘pivotal role as an intermediary’ (Patel et al 2002: 171). However, all the negotiations, assessments, housing cooperative’s formation, welfare provision for the most vulnerable, design and construction of homes, and procedural management were led by the community themselves, with women playing a prominent role (ibid, Mitlin and D’Cruz 2009). This self-management was enabled by extensive and regular capacity building activities amongst the grassroots, which became habitual in the preceding years. Planning the move so there was minimal disruption to livelihoods was a ‘difficult and time – consuming process’ (Patel et al 2001: 166), but it ensured that the move itself was rapid. ‘The spirit of collaboration’ between stakeholders (Pal 2006:521) overcame the obstacles of resource scarcity, and the Railway Settlers ‘withdrawal from various spheres of citizenship entitlements’ (Tunstall 2004: 182).

3.2 What Enablment Conditions are met in these cases?

In this section the case studies presented in 3.1 are analysed, with the arguments based on evidence drawn from section 3.1 with further elaboration or corroboration where required in the prose that follows each Table (2-6). The case studies are analysed in relation to a series of enablement conditions, which are clustered as: political/bureaucratic/economic, social, actors, and engagement process/nature of project (following Cornwall 2008: 70&71). This allows for more detailed analysis of the factors present or absent, and an investigation of how these larger clusters inter-relate in these cases. In turn this facilitates over-arching assessment of the conditions that may restrict or expand the opportunities for amenity groups to have a formative impact in the planning process (see section 3.2.5). The cases included in the Tables 2-6 were those where the broadest range of information for comparative analysis was available, with the Mumbai case providing a comparison in a vastly differing context. The national English context is included for an indication of broader conditions, and utilises information from section 1 and 2. It should be noted that in none of the cases cited are all the conditions - including their subsets - strongly absent or strongly present. Each case is incredibly complex, as they are all situated in fluid multi-level governance structures subject to global geo-political processes, with factors within the projects themselves also being variable.

If, as Chandhoke suggests (2003: 40), our deliberations are only as ‘civil as the civic society that produces them’, then some of the case studies cited do give cause for optimism, as they demonstrate that the conditions for enablement can be fostered and utilised. Perhaps the challenges identified in section 2.3 can be addressed in some manifestations of the English Planning Process.
### Optimum Enablement Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>English context</th>
<th>Streatham</th>
<th>Wandsworth</th>
<th>Bicester</th>
<th>North Sheffield</th>
<th>South Tyneside</th>
<th>Mumbai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Sufficient Political Stability
- at multiple levels
- Regime with confidence willing to take risks and be flexible
- Coordination and good relationships between departments
- Horizontal learning between departments

#### Clear Political Accountability and Responsiveness
- Representation
- Accessible regular feedback mechanisms
- Strong political opposition and scrutiny
- Accessible transparent operating procedures
- Accessible systems of redress
- Mutual accountability in partnerships
- Willingness to engage honestly and openly, expressing needs, interests and identity
- Recognition of citizenship pressures

#### Strong Political Endorsement of Participatory Processes
- Legislative frameworks that frame participation as a human right
- Emphasis on government policy on social justice
- Political champions with agency willing to take risks and able to secure continued funding

#### Appropriate financial resources
- Commensurate with scale and participatory scope of the project
- Invested throughout the engagement process
- Interventionist will of agencies

#### Socially progressive planning system
- Willing to address the needs of the most vulnerable in society
- Understanding of inter-generational tangible and intangible assets

---

**Key:**
- ✓ Evidence suggests factors are strongly present
- ○ Evidence suggests factors are strongly absent
- ✗ Evidence suggests that, on balance, factors are neither strongly present or strongly absent
Within the wider English political framework, the establishment of the Coalition government ‘could never’ have been predicted prior to the May 2010 election (HM Government 2010:8; citing Clegg and Cameron). Subsequently the stability and longevity of the Coalition is particularly uncertain. The leadership, direction and strength of the political opposition is also uncertain, bringing their ability to offer thorough public scrutiny of the incumbent government into question. The demographic range of Westminster MPs does not reflect the diversity of our population and is therefore unrepresentative. To improve ‘Government Transparency’ (ibid:20), ‘a lot more government data is being made public’ (The Economist 14/08/2010:9). Following wider trends this public information will primarily be accessible via new media (HM Government 2010:14). This method has serious limitations; I would assert it rarely increases personal engagement with institutions, and consequently will not greatly improve feedback mechanisms, feelings of influence or in-depth scrutiny. This view was shared by the Professional Facilitators interviewed for this study (19/06/2010, 06/07/2010). The ‘localism’ agenda endorses participation but is not accompanied by the interventionist will or capacity to broaden affective participation. Evidence of long-term trends of state withdrawal and austerity (see section 1) suggests the immense enabling potential of hybridised democracy (see section 2) is unlikely to be utilised at a large scale.

In the cases cited where the planning system could act in a progressive manner (Pal 2006:501) there had been a convergence of support from multiple levels of government to identify those who were most vulnerable. The differentiation in public resources available for the engagement amongst the case studies cited is indicative of the socio-economic divide across northern and southern England (see figure 24 and 25, SASI Group 2007, Durling 2010 and 2007). The Multiple Indices of Deprivation highlighted chronic poverty in North Sheffield and South Tyneside making them eligible for a variety of funding from European, national, regional and local government. Secure funding was crucial to the successes of these projects. Continued financial support built institutional confidence and capacity, which enabled accountability, responsiveness, inter-governance cooperation, risk taking and the ceding of control (Cornwall 2008, CSNR 2010, section 2.3). The stable left-wing local governance structure in Sheffield has confidently endorsed a variety of participatory practices across a range of projects and services; providing opportunities for horizontal learning and knowledgeable support of the community-led processes adopted in the Pathfinder case study (Informant: Sheffield Council employee 14/07/2010, Government Ideas Website 2010, Waite 2008, CABE 2010&2009b). This hospitable political context - echoed in South Tyneside - was pivotal as it gave agency ‘Participation Champions’ embedded in local governance structures to implement deliberative participatory projects (see figure xx). The empowerment these key ‘champions’ experienced encouraged them to remain involved in their projects in the long-term. Continuity of personnel signalled stability and strong personal investment to the local communities, aiding the building of personal relationships and trust which ameliorated collaborations, and thus made more space for amenity group impact.

The predicted duration of the full Bicester Eco-Town implementation provides an opportunity for personal relationships and trust to be built over a 20 years period. Bicester’s local governance structures have sufficient stability to display flexibility, risk-taking and internal cooperation, as indicated by their willingness to change
the actors and methodologies after they rejected the initial Eco-Town proposal. The accountability, responsiveness, and participatory intentions of Bicester’s political institutions are extremely questionable. I agree with the complainants cited in McGregor (24/06/2010 and 13/08/2009) in that the engagement processes for the Eco-Town proposal are rushed in relation to the scale of the project. The anticipated timing of the first planning application - the seed for a 345 hectare development - leaves little time for meaningful feedback or broad community deliberation. There is a high risk this will embed mistrust which will obstruct collaboration for the 20 year project duration. As part of the P3 consortium Cherwell district council are endorsing these severe limitations, which will reduce amenity group impact. The process thus far has paid particular attention to key local political stakeholders, in potentially undemocratic institutions such as Parish Councils, indicating a lack of progressive interventionist will. Cherwell District Council’s £9.6 million of central government funding is earmarked for wider infrastructure improvements, indicating that local political/bureaucratic investment priorities are for product rather than process, the dangers of which are elucidated in Section 1.

In the South East England cases, the prioritisation of product over process is partly due to the urgent demands for new housing in this region (Sprinks 2010:8, Tilley 2010:6, Ellis 2010:6). The scale of new developments market demand necessitates often causes tensions with existing residents. In Streatham local politicians were vociferous in their opposition to the scheme and presented their position as being protectors of a cultural community resource and a defender against developers (Casey 2009:18). With a tightly contestable election approaching when representatives of one political party were publicly opposed to the project, their counterparts adopted the same position, resulting in a unanimous vote against the development. Considering the on-balance recommendation of the local planning officer, I would argue that in this instance the positioning of the politicians was not a representation of public opinion arrived at through a deliberative process, but rather a presentation of a presumed preference for their political benefit. The prominence of these volatile political conditions prevented a strong political endorsement of participatory processes. The Wandsworth and Streatham planning applications were submitted within a calendar month of each other, and therefore were both subject to the pressure of an imminent election. Yet the stable governance structure in Wandsworth prevented short-term ‘electioneering’ dominating the planning process. The 5 Conservative Party councillors have a stable majority in local governance structures, giving them the confidence to endorse the controversial scheme, in concurrence with the Local Planning Officer’s recommendation, despite the strong objections from articulate amenity groups. One local conservative councillor presented strong objections to the project (LPOR 2010:37), they then voted in to approve it. This is an indication of low political accountability. The lack of intermediary civic/political institutions to harness the capacities of existing amenity groups indicates a weak endorsement of participatory processes.
Figure 28: Sketches representing design development of Streatham scheme

Figure 29: Images of the scheme later in the design development
### Optimum Enablement Conditions

#### Community Motivation and Willingness
- Willingness to engage honestly and openly, expressing needs, interests and identity
- Presence of community champions who do not monopolise process
- Established good relationships with governmental and non-governmental institutions
- Prior positive experiences with the planning process
- Strong long term emotional investment in the area and inter-generational assets, tangible and intangible
- Commitment to social justice
- Time to engage
- Cultural habit of participation; aided by high motivation to fight for basic needs

#### Strong Community Organisation
- Prior community development
- Embedded community development workers and youth workers who are well-resourced
- Broad community representation
- Trust and cooperation across different community groups
- Political and socio-economic awareness amongst individuals and the collective
- An understanding of the pressures on politicians and bureaucrats

#### Alternative Oppositional Spaces
- A space beyond the gaze of officials
- Strong and visible oppositional groups demonstrating alternative ways of living and organising communities
- Independent free press
- Strong voluntary sector organisations relatively autonomous from government
- Organisations willing to lobby government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases English context</th>
<th>Streatham</th>
<th>Wandsworth</th>
<th>Bicester</th>
<th>North Sheffield</th>
<th>South Tyneside</th>
<th>Mumbai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Motivation and Willingness</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Community Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Oppositional Spaces</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wider national social context was discussed in Sections 1 and 2, and provides the argument as to why there is a lingering reticence towards engaging in a deliberate manner with the planning process. Broad community development has been suffering from neglect in the post war period. Prior community organisation is therefore variable, and given underlying political trends, this patchwork is unlikely to improve. Nationally, there are alternative oppositional spaces which are gaining momentum and visibility (see section 3.1.3.2). Oppositional spaces were present in most of the cited cases, notably with Sheffield and South Tyneside having strong voluntary sector organisations that were relatively autonomous from government (Informants: Sheffield Council Employee 14/07/2010, Newton 06/07/2010).

The north-south socio-economic divide (see section 3.2.1), causes demographic differences that contribute to the absence or presence enabling conditions in the cases cited. In Sheffield and South Tyneside the projects were addressing deprived communities with minimal economic mobility who often share identities of place, culture and interest (after Hamdi 2004:111). This interest is in the protection and improvement of areas to which they have invested much of their lives and have strong emotional attachments too, thus making them willing to be future orientated in their interaction with the planning process. In Sheffield, ‘the community forum was too young as an organisation to effectively engage’ (Waite 2008:citing Plowden), it evidences community willingness and organisation, with amenity groups being built and consolidated through the grassroots process. In South Tyneside, community organisation varied between the 3 neighbourhoods. In neighbourhoods where Community Development Workers were deeply embedded they were crucial in enabling community motivation and willingness.
to participate. In South Tyneside and Sheffield, the ‘cycle of unemployment and under-investment’ (Waite citing Plowden 2008) meant that the majority of the local population would generally be characterised as ‘hard to reach’. The prominence of these ‘unusual suspects’ made the benefits of engaging them immediately apparent, enabling creative processes that facilitated their inclusion. In such circumstances the employed middle classes can turn from being the ‘usual suspects’ to being ‘hard to reach’. In Sheffield and South Tynside institutional actors were aware of the risks of this subversion and created responsive mechanisms to keep the inclusion broad.

In Wandsworth, Streatham and Bicester, institutional actors and project development professionals were in social contexts where prior community organisation was more prevalent amongst the ‘usual suspects’ who were representative of a larger proportion of the local population. The amenity groups formed mostly by the ‘usual suspects’ often have amplified visibility and agency, which in these cases obscured the identification and subsequent inclusion of other stakeholders. In Wandsworth, the vociferous, well-organised amenity groups comprising mostly of the ‘usual suspects’ were well-versed in political and bureaucratic systems and encultured into adroit adversarial interactions. This reduced their willingness to participate in more open, time-consuming consultation processes, partly evidenced by the relatively low attendance levels at the Project’s Public Exhibition. Reticence towards more deliberative participation processes are exacerbated by the London’s particularly transient population, which reduces the frequency of longer-term personal investment in local areas, so communities of place are weaker than deprived areas with economic immobility. Wider stakeholder identification, motivation, and organisation are extremely challenging for developments where there are relatively few current residents. This is the challenge with the Bicester Eco-Town development, and in the absence of a clear community of place the factors to enable them are yet to be tested thoroughly for their absence or presence. To encourage receptive community interest, they are presenting the development as ‘a catalyst for the regeneration of Bicester as a sustainable community’ (P3 Eco 2010), and are aware that without sustained wider involvement a volatile ‘them and us’ scenario may arise between the new and existing communities (Informant: Hornblow 06/07/2010).

The presence of community ‘Participation Champions’, who do not monopolise the process, can aid community willingness, organisation and cooperation across different groups. Due to stability of the core population in South Tyneside and Sheffield, the emergent community champions were key in spreading the franchise of the engagement as they had built social networks over several generations and were passionate about the social and economic welfare of the area. The role of women in maintaining non-confrontational deliberative spaces that increase amenity group impact is recognised in international development (Satterthwaite 2006, HM Government 2010:22, Mitlin and Hickey 2009). Following examples such as Mumbai Railway Settlers, female community champions were prominent in Sheffield and South Tyneside.

![Figure 30: Community Champion Janet Bagshaw of SOAR](image)
### Optimum Enablement Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actors Context</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>English context</th>
<th>Streatham</th>
<th>Wandsworth</th>
<th>Bicester</th>
<th>North Sheffield</th>
<th>South Tyneside</th>
<th>Mumbai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Sufficient Agency to Enact Participatory Planning** | - Feelings of influence 
- Possibility for all actors to have an influence 
- No individuals with disproportionate influence 
- Champions of participatory agenda in institutional spaces, intermediary spaces and civil society who are willing to be innovative, flexible and take risks | | o | o | o | o | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| **Strong Motivation and Willingness** | - Willingness to engage openly and honestly, expressing needs, interests and identity 
- Commitment to social justice 
- Strong long-term investment in the area | | o | o | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| **Trusting Relationships Between Individuals, Institutions and Civil Society, Open to Scrutiny** | - Facilitates open expression so that people can be flexible and responsive 
- Mutual accountability 
- Recognition, clarity and openness about what the internal power structures and dynamics of groups are 
- Previous positive experiences within planning system | | x | x | x | o | ✓ | ✓ | o |
| **Communication Skills that Facilitate Deliberative Processes** | - Actors willing to mediate, challenge, other willing to innovate and take risks, and a degree of communal flexibility 
- Soft skills 
- Cultural sensitivity 
- Neutral, mediating, facilitating actors who inspire confidence | | o | x | o | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

Table 4
I would suggest that the results of Table 4 are evidence of the pre-eminence of enabling political, economic and social conditions. The Sheffield and South Tyneside cases are deemed more enabling in Table 4 largely because of the political opportunity structures that economically empowered political actors created and championed, which were then endorsed by Community Champions and utilised by a representative franchise of the local community, who felt they could influence the process due to their experience of regular feedback mechanisms. The clarity of roles within the political and civil interactions generated trust, as did the mediating presence of neutral facilitators. In Streatham there were relatively antagonistic relationships between key political and bureaucratic stakeholders without institutional mechanisms to facilitate direct community empowerment. In Wandsworth the manner of engagement between amenity groups and institutional process demonstrated that the range of communication skills stakeholders were willing to adopt was not conducive with deliberative processes.

In the South East examples cited, the range, and number of actors who have long-term emotive personal investment in the area was generally proportionately smaller than those in northern England; allowing motivated external or peripheral actors with sufficient economic resources to gain prominence. The P3 Eco Consortium have experience which makes particularly adept at operating within this realpolitik. Their quick identification and extensive liaison with ‘key’ stakeholders demonstrates the perceived importance of lobbying for their favour, especially in such sizeable developments. However, the process will not be equitable if actors wield disproportionate formative influence on the process. The ruling in favour of Charles Candy, and the reprimanding of Prince Charles for his lobbying efforts demonstrates that disproportionate influence is not conducive to a democratic planning process. Similarly, ‘communication firms’ who specialise in using political intelligence to seek out individuals or parties whose opinion may endanger a positive planning decision and directly lobby them may be obfuscating democratic planning processes. But these firms are not unusual or malevolent, and given the appropriate contexts, their expertise could be use to bring reluctant parties into engaging deliberative forums, thus broadening the scope of participation and opportunities for impact.
3.2.4 Engagement Processes and Nature of Project

As discussed in sections 1 and 2 there is currently a ‘democratic deficit’ in the UK. This is due in large part to political, economic and social conditions that are in hospitable to broad participation in governance. It is also because, ‘conventional consultation methods can be so deathly boring’ (Cornwall 2008:15). However, some of the cases cited suggest that the skills exist to design enjoyable and empowering engagement processes which encourage deliberative participation, and in doing so, reduce the democratic deficit.

In Sheffield and South Tyneside – where the majority of enablement conditions in Table 5 were met - the engagement processes generated the projects. Persistent socio-economic deprivation generated a shared desire in the civic space to improve their environments and potentially break the cycle of deprivation. In Sheffield threats of mass demolitions in an earlier planning application brought deeply personal connections to local place and culture to the surface, and thus furthering the willingness of people to plan their own futures. In both cases, co-management structures allowed communities to lead their own needs assessment and action planning. ‘Bone’, a participant in the South Tyneside project described his experience of the project: ‘joint team effort. Team effort. Definately......we’re working it out for ourselves......we’re pulling together different information......it empowered us’ (South Tyneside Council 2010:35 Internal Report)(see figure 31,32, 42 and 43). This ‘front loading’ (Arnstein 1969) recognised participants them as ‘future orientated actors with creativity and agency’, even if they may normally be ‘hard to reach’ (Shanmugaratnam 2003:31). Their prominent inclusion in the partnerships, alongside a diverse range of other stakeholders and institutional actors built trust and personal relationships. These processes broke down encultured barriers and created

---

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimum Enablement Conditions</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Streatham</th>
<th>Wandsworth</th>
<th>Bicester</th>
<th>North Sheffield</th>
<th>South Tyneside</th>
<th>Mumbai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient Resource Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Available throughout the process</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time and money both made available</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continuance of staffing levels and personnel where appropriate</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continued training and horizontal learning</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest, Flexible, Responsive, Deliberative Engagement Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Soft skills training</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Creative process that is fun and builds social capitol</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear scope and depth of project from the outset</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appropriate method to engage maximum number of participants</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Facilitator who are culturally sensitive</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and Reaches All Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reaches the hard to reach groups</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assessable feedback information available through a variety of methods</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of Project Sufficient to Provoke Communal Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A long term process beyond a single project</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 32: Bone (centre) and his fellow Horsely Hill team
deliberation across difference through the expression of needs, positions and interests. These were expensive, lengthy engagement processes. Yet when the social, cultural and economic legacies of post-war failures are considered, it is a worthy long term investment. I agree with Miranda Plowden: ‘You only get one shot at this and if you mess up you’ve lost the opportunity’ (Waite 2008), There is risk of community disengagement if the process is too slow; the optimal pace of deliberation is context specific. The Sheffield project and the case in Mumbai demonstrates that although ‘meaningful community engagement becomes difficult with areas over 15,000 people,’ it is possible (CNSR 2010:17).

In Streatham and Wandsworth, the resources available for the engagement process itself were scarce in relation to those available in the publicly funded northern England cases. In Streatham and Wandsworth the architects produced an indicative design/approach for the developers prior to being given the job - a regular procedure in this market - and thus were arriving at the community involvement sessions having already generated relatively detailed designs. In these cases the needs assessment and design brief responded to market forces, with private developers having little financial incentive to ‘front-load’ the processes. The engagement processes in Wandsworth and Streatham and were to the satisfaction of local planning authorities, and demonstrated a degree of responsiveness. For example, in the Wandsworth development a Play Facility was included in the development following a suggestion from residents at the Public Exhibition (LPOR 2010:21, ORER 2010:9). Although this exhibition was centred around informal discussions, presentations of highly crafted professional images (see figure 33) can make attendees feel there is little opportunity to influence the design, and thus disable participation (Informant: Professional Facilitator 19/06/2010) (see figure 33). Such formulaic engagement processes, with minimal time and resources available for feedback mechanisms are insufficient enable broad amenity group participation. But then, the remit of the design team is not to build capacity - challenging in such inhospitable social/political conditions - it is to acquire planning permission.

In Bicester P3 Eco are presenting their engagement approach as ‘Masterplanning in Partnership’ (P3 Eco 08/06/2010:1), which will be supported by a ‘complex array of events, networks, and stream of activities to maximise engagement and educational opportunities’ (Pal Mall Consult 2010:1). In a politically adroit manoeuvre they are adopting the same ‘Enquiry by design’ method (ibid:2) advocated by the OSP (2010:13), and plan to adapt this method iteratively in response to the Bicester social context and the experiences they build there. Unlike at the Public Exhibition in Wandsworth, barely any professionally produced design material was presented at the Open Planning week (05/06/2010 to 12/06/2010). Instead the meeting room had a variety of stalls and a large space dedicated to ‘post it note tables’ where any suggestion could be expressed (see figure 34). This openness is possible because the masterplanners (Farrells) are a member of the P3 Eco Consortium, and as such were not obliged to produce design material prior to the project commencing. When interacting with stakeholders the Eco-Town is presented as ‘truly pioneering’ (P3 Eco 08/06/2010:1: Citing P3 Eco Chairman), and an ‘organic extension to Bicester’ (P3 Eco 08/06/2010:2). This presentation
is possible because to meet the Eco-Town guidelines, the Consortium must provide 30% affordable housing, 40% green infrastructure, and 20% public open space.

The scale of the Bicester project, the Eco-Town standards it must adhere too and the variety of engagement methods adopted have generated a healthy degree of interest, with an average of 81 people attending the Open Planning Week, as opposed to the average of 30 people per day in the Wandsworth case. Yet there remains little evidence that they are seeking to identify or engage the 'hard to reach' wider stakeholders in the process or feedback mechanisms; one of the few areas neglected in the ‘Note for the Strategic Delivery Board on NW Bicester Consultation Activities’ (Pall Mall Consult 2010). The Press Release (P3 Eco 08/06/2010:1 emphasis added) suggests the drop in sessions are ‘to ensure that those interested in the proposed eco-development are involved’, with the ‘interested parties’ being those that they ‘can draw on for further input’ (Pall Mall Consult 2010:3). To be on the mailing list, you must sign up to be a ‘Friend of the NW Bicester Eco-development’ (ibid: emphasis added). These moves may engender more positive amenity group collaborations, but it is also may discourage diverse and challenging actors/amenity groups, reducing the scope and authenticity of the participatory practice which then appears to be for legitimisation rather than democratic deliberation.

Evidence from Sheffield, South Tynside, Planning Aid and A2 Dominon demonstrates that enjoyable, creative engagement processes are possible, they reach more stakeholders, aid deliberation, and can build enduring capacity (see also Hamdi 2005, Cornwall 2008, and Carpenter and Brownhill 2008). Clare McManus, the Managing Director of Eventus stated that: ‘The main outcome of using the arts from housing staff viewpoint is that artists reach more people and more different sorts of people in changes affecting their neighbourhood than they ever could’ (Informant: 02/07/2010) (see fig 36 to 41). I would suggest it also had the benefit of making the community more receptive to modern design and thus creating space for architecture that is socially and environmentally sustainable. A2 Dominon are aware of this, and as an SRL, have used creative engagement methods in their social housing projects, including ‘Tenant’s Got Talent’ contests, and collaborations between sculptors and children in local schools to generate place names and signs (Informant: Hornblow 06/07/2010). By working with young people and in schools, the North Sheffield Housing Market Renewal Scheme, Planning Aid, and A2 Dominon are working with potential future tenants, building their social capital and perhaps increasing their inclination to engage in collaborative planning processes as they mature.

Whether A2 Dominon will transfer their experiences of creative outreach to the Bicester engagement process is yet to be seen, although their spontaneous adoption of a Town Cryer during the Open Planning Week bodes well. P3 Eco’s planned erection of a Demonstration House has the potential to generate wider interest; this technique is regularly used by ‘The Alliance’ (section 3.1.4.1) for its educational benefit. The CNSR (2010:16 emphasis added) suggests that creative participatory engagement might be more economical in Bicester then it was in South Tyneside as, ‘unit costs per head of population appear to rise significantly for neighbourhood populations below 5,000’. In South Tyneside, after some initial reticence the appraisal groups became absorbed in the creative process and were generating their own PRA tools. However, there was a tendency for council staff to ‘retreat to formulaic’ methods of engagement (Informant: Newton 06/07/2010). There is some
evidence that similar tendencies are being exhibited in the Bicester case (see figure 35).

Figure 36: mapping popular places in Parsons Cross (North Sheffield)

Figure 37: walkabout exercise in Parsons Cross (North Sheffield)

Figure 38: topiary sculptures rethinking green space (North Sheffield)

Figure 39: Participatory video with young people in Southey Green (North Sheffield)

Figure 40: building narrative for future Public Springs Area (North Sheffield)

Figure 41: Community-led partnership planning event (North Sheffield)
3.2.1 Over-arching Conclusions

**Optimum Enablement Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Over-arching view</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>English context</th>
<th>Streatham</th>
<th>Wandsworth</th>
<th>Bicester</th>
<th>North Sheffield</th>
<th>South Tyneside</th>
<th>Mumbai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optimum Political /Bureaucratic/Economic Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sufficient Political Stability</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear Political Accountability and Responsiveness</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strong political Endorsement of Participatory Processes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appropriate Financial Resources</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Socially Progressive Planning System</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optimum Social Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community Motivation and Willingness</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strong Community Organisation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alternative Oppositional Spaces</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optimum Actors Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sufficient Agency to Enact Participatory Planning</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strong Motivation and Willingness</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trusting Relationships Between Individuals Institutions and Civil Society Open to Scrutiny</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communication Skills that Facilitate Deliberative Processes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optimum Engagement Processes and Nature of Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sufficient Resource Investment</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Honest, Flexible, Responsive, Deliberative Engagement Method</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identifies and Reaches all Stakeholders</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scale of Project Sufficient to Provoke Communal Interest</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the cases cited where the over-arching conditions are met, the hospitable political and social conditions were critical, addressing the challenges highlighted in section 2.3. In Sheffield and South Tyneside the wider remit of the projects - instigated by political institutions perceived to be responsive - was crucial in engendering community interest and facilitating willingness to engage openly. These local political institutions acknowledge that the adoption of participatory project approaches were, ‘enabled by the availability of dedicated funding to support it from central government’ (CNSR 2010:16). As previously discussed (see section 1), in the national political context, the availability of financial capital and suitable interventionist will are declining, reflecting wider underlying long-term trends. As the national government has the electoral mandate to prioritise resources (Conservative Party 2010:3), it is unlikely that dedicated funding will be available for participatory projects of the scale or scope seen in Sheffield and South Tyneside.

With the relatively extensive resources available, the presence of empowered Participation Champions in the political and civic spheres in both Sheffield and South Tyneside, community-led partnerships could be established. These partnerships acted as intermediary institutions between civil and political space. Deliberative participatory approaches flourished in these co-managed spaces. The relative neutrality of the intermediary institutions facilitated positive collision and mediated deliberation across difference. Most - although not all - opportunities for mutual capacity building were utilised in these projects. In varying degrees these methodologies built social capital - and arguably an increase in psychological well-being - by providing a degree of, ‘choice about when, where, and how’ local development would be structured (Hansen and Oliver-Smith 1982:268). In Sheffield and South Tyneside such open engagement was aided by a ‘greater role for non-partisan and locally based civil society organisations’ (Pal 2006:501), thus providing them the capacity to be, ‘instruments of deep democracy rooted in a local context’ (Appandurai 2001:23). Without the strong presence of enabling political and social conditions, organisations leading public engagement are likely to resort to more instrumental participation in the hope of successfully navigating through the realpolitik of the local planning system. Only by doing so will they have the opportunity to make manifest the plans they have generated. This was the case in Wandsworth, Streatham, and arguably Bicester. In these cases time, money and expertise were invested...
in the engagement process and there is evidence that feedback effected, or will effect, the design proposals. However, the instrumental participatory practices necessitated by the political and social conditions made it appear that the engagement was undertaken to seek legitimacy. This could embed inaction amongst communities, reduce the franchise of amenity groups and exacerbate embedded social inequalities. In Streatham and Wandsworth the actors implementing engagement did not the remit or resources to build social capital. With commensurate resource investment, P3 Eco’s educational aims (Pall Mall Consult 2010:1) may foster social and political conditions more conducive to deliberative participation.

In the cases where social capital was built, it can continue to benefit the community when the projects have been completed and the implementing agency has withdrawn. Perhaps, there is also an increased possibility in these cases that the local civil society organisations may collaborate with alternative social movements (section 3.2.3.2). Such alliances may generate robust enough social conditions for deliberative participation to exist without state intervention. Perhaps. However, the pre-eminence of the ‘politics of the consumer’ is one of many obstacles to the mass mobilisation achieved in Mumbai being echoed in the UK. Without this the impact of amenity groups is limited to what implementers facilitate. In South Tyneside and Sheffield, the amenity groups and social capital consolidated by the projects discussed is still young, fragile, and subject to larger economic, social and political forces (Waite 2008: citing Plowden, CNSR 2010:16). Whilst this is the case it is difficult to see the nascent civil society organisations/amenity groups in the cases states ‘engendering state interest’ (Mitlin and Patel 2009:11) to a transformative degree in neo-liberal political conditions, or acting independently to achieve ‘widespread change’ (Mitlin and D’Cruz circa 2009:4 citing Castralls 1983). Although with cooperation between these groups and growing awareness of pressing environmental concerns, given time such groups may invoke widespread change; something that would be greatly accelerated by an interventionist state.
3.3 What impact did the amenity groups actually have?

The greater the compatibility with optimum in enablement conditions (section 3.2), the more likely that amenity groups were able to have a formative impact on the planning process. This section attempts to answer the question of what impact the amenity groups actually had in these cases. The results of this assessment will offer a partial insight into what impact amenity groups may have on the English Planning Process as a whole. The Spectrum Charts which follow were devised to help answer the question of impact. These list a series of factors derived from in part from section 3.2, which act as indicators of whether the conditions allowed amenity groups to have an impact on the planning process, and if so whether this was high or low, formative or none. The assessments of whether trust, social capital and capacity were built during the process act as an indication as to whether the amenity groups will continue to exist as cohesive groups that are able to engender further changes in their community and therefore have a continued longer term impact on the planning process. These indications are given within ranges, rather than as absolutes, because of the fluidity and variability within every aspect of each case. Following the spectrum assessment of each case is a summary what impact the amenity groups had in these cases.

3.3.1 Spectrum Assessments
## Sketch Project Assessments: Streatham

### Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political context</th>
<th>Inhospitable</th>
<th>Conductive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social-economic context</td>
<td>Inhospitable</td>
<td>Conductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of project</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of influence</td>
<td>Individual Project</td>
<td>Range of Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong oppositional groups</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior community development/organisation</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources invested</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process Product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder identification</td>
<td>Cursory</td>
<td>Probing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rationale</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Deliberative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Exclusive</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise</td>
<td>Mass mobilisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement processes</td>
<td>Formulaic</td>
<td>Responsive/Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of engagement speed (as experienced)</td>
<td>Rushed</td>
<td>Exhaustive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Feedback mechanisms</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>Inclusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpreted sketch results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust between actors</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before project After project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project effect on Social Capital</td>
<td>Greatly Reduced</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project effect on Capacity</td>
<td>Greatly Reduced</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall impact of amenity groups in this planning process

| Low | High |
| Short-term | Long-term |

### Nature of impact

| None | Formative |
### Sketch Project Assessments: Wandsworth

#### Context
- **Political context**
  - Inhospitable
  - Conducive
- **Social-economic context**
  - Inhospitable
  - Conducive
- **Resource Availability**
  - Low
  - High
- **Scale of project**
  - Small
  - Large
- **Range of influence**
  - Individual project
  - Range of projects
- **Strong oppositional groups**
  - Absent
  - Empowered
- **Prior community development/organisation**
  - Minimal
  - Extensive

#### Process
- **Resources invested**
  - Low
  - High
- **Stakeholder identification**
  - Cursory
  - Probing
- **Participation rationale**
  - Instrumental
  - Deliberative
- **Community involvement**
  - Exclusive
  - Representative
- **Franchise**
  - Small
  - Mass mobilisation
- **Engagement processes**
  - Formulaic
  - Responsive/Creative
  - Fatigue
  - Positive engagement
- **Appropriateness of engagement speed (as experienced)**
  - Rushed
  - Exhaustive
- **Institutional Feedback mechanisms**
  - Rare
  - Frequent
  - Selective
  - Inclusive

#### Interpreted sketch results
- **Trust between actors**
  - Low
  - High
  - Before project
  - After project
  - Low
  - High
- **Project effect on Social Capital**
  - Greatly Reduced
  - Stable
  - Greatly Increased
- **Project effect on Capacity**
  - Greatly Reduced
  - Stable
  - Greatly Increased
- **Overall impact of amenity groups in this planning process**
  - Low
  - High
  - Short term
  - Long-term
- **Nature of impact**
  - None
  - Formative
# Sketch Project Assessments: Bicester Eco-Town

## Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Inhospitable</th>
<th>Conducive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-economic context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong oppositional groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior community development/organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources invested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rationale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of engagement speed (as experienced)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Feedback mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Interpreted sketch results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust between actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project effect on Social Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project effect on Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impact of amenity groups in this planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of impact</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sketch Project Assessments: Sheffield

### Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political context</th>
<th>Inhospitable</th>
<th>Conductive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social-economic context</td>
<td>Inhospitable</td>
<td>Conductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of project</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of influence</td>
<td>Individual Project</td>
<td>Wider policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong oppositional groups</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior community development/organisation</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources invested</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder identification</td>
<td>Cursory</td>
<td>Probing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rationale</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Deliberative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Exclusive</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Mass mobilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement processes</td>
<td>Formulaic</td>
<td>Responsive/Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of engagement speed (as experienced)</td>
<td>Rushed</td>
<td>Exhaustive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Feedback mechanisms</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpreted sketch results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust between actors</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project effect on Social Capital</td>
<td>Greatly Reduced</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project effect on Capacity</td>
<td>Greatly Reduced</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall impact of amenity groups in this planning process

| Short term | High |
| Long-term | |

### Nature of impact

| None | Formative |
Sketch Project Assessments: South Tyneside

Context

- Political context:
  - In hospitable
  - Conducive

- Social-economic context:
  - In hospitable
  - Conducive

- Resource Availability:
  - Low
  - High

- Scale of project:
  - Small
  - Large

- Range of influence:
  - Individual
  - Project
  - Range of Projects
  - Wider policy

- Strong oppositional groups:
  - Absent
  - Empowered

- Prior community development/organisation:
  - Minimal
  - Extensive

Process

- Resources invested:
  - Low
  - Process
  - Product
  - High

- Stakeholder identification:
  - Cursory
  - Probing

- Participation rationale:
  - Instrumental
  - Deliberative

- Community involvement:
  - Exclusive
  - Representative

- Franchise:
  - Small
  - Mass mobilisation

- Engagement processes:
  - Formulaic
  - Responsive/Creative
  - Fatigue
  - Positive engagement

- Appropriateness of engagement speed (as experienced):
  - Rushed
  - Exhaustive

- Institutional Feedback mechanisms:
  - Rare
  - Selective
  - Frequent
  - Inclusive

Interpreted sketch results

- Trust between actors:
  - Before project
  - After project
  - Low
  - High

- Project effect on Social Capital:
  - Greatly Reduced
  - Stable
  - Greatly Increased

- Project effect on Capacity:
  - Greatly Reduced
  - Stable
  - Greatly Increased

- Overall impact of amenity groups in this planning process:
  - Low
  - High
  - Short-term
  - Long-term

- Nature of impact:
  - None
  - Formative
## Sketch Project Assessments: Mumbai Railway Settlers

### Context

| Political context | Inhospitable | Conducive |
| Social-economic context | Inhospitable | Conducive |
| Resource Availability | Low | High |
| Scale of project | Small | Large |
| Range of influence | Individual Project | Range of Projects | Wider policy |
| Strong oppositional groups | Absent | Empowered |
| Prior community development/organisation | Minimal | Extensive |

### Process

| Resources invested | Low | High |
| Stakeholder identification | Sparse | Probing |
| Participation rationale | Instrumental | Deliberative |
| Community involvement | Exclusive | Representative |
| Franchise | Small | Mass mobilisation |
| Engagement processes | Formulaic | Responsive/Creative |
| Fatigue | Positive engagement |
| Appropriateness of engagement speed (as experienced) | Rushed | Exhaustive |
| Institutional Feedback mechanisms | Rare | Frequent |
| Selective | Inclusive |

### Interpreted sketch results

| Trust between actors | Low | High |
| Project effect on Social Capital | Greatly Reduced | Stable | Greatly Increased |
| Project effect on Capacity | Greatly Reduced | Stable | Greatly Increased |
| Overall impact of amenity groups in this planning process | Low | High |
| Short-term | Long-term |
| Nature of impact | None | Formulaic |

### Sketch Project Assessments

- **Context**
  - Political context
  - Social-economic context
  - Resource Availability
  - Scale of project
  - Range of influence
  - Strong oppositional groups
  - Prior community development/organisation

- **Process**
  - Resources invested
  - Stakeholder identification
  - Participation rationale
  - Community involvement
  - Franchise
  - Engagement processes
  - Appropriateness of engagement speed
  - Institutional Feedback mechanisms

- **Interpreted sketch results**
  - Trust between actors
  - Project effect on Social Capital
  - Project effect on Capacity
  - Overall impact of amenity groups in this planning process
  - Nature of impact
3.3.2 Summative Assessments

The Streatham and Wandsworth cases are indicative of how the stability or volatility of local governance structures can have a formative impact on the planning process; reducing the impacts amenity groups are able to make where they do not mobilise a large segment of the population. In both of these cases amenity groups were not involved in a needs assessment that led to an instigation of the projects, as they were instead led by market demand beyond the community immediately local to the project sites. In Streatham the impact the amenity groups had was low, as although the representations were made by the councillors on their behalf, there is little evidence that these representations were made because of direct deliberations conducted with the amenity groups in their area. Amenity group's positions were instead largely assumed, on the basis of what the reactions to development would generally be with consultative engagement. This is not to say the positions taken by the councillors was entirely unrepresentative, but the representations were not made based on extensive engagement that made amenity group impact formative in the final rejection decision. The trust between different institutional actors was diminished by the apparent political manoeuvring. The project did not stimulate a discernible increase in social capital. The interaction of these make it unlikely that amenity groups will have a formative impact on local planning process in the foreseeable future. Instead, the planning process will probably continue to be a tool for politicians to seek personal support.

Planning Aid South representatives suggested that even though in many cases amenity groups cannot influence whether a development will be constructed, they can often influence the design (interview 07/07/2010). In the case of Streatham the consultation process did offer some limited opportunities for this to happen, but the Senior Architect involved in the scheme suggested that the most significant design iterations made were in response to changes proposed by individual local councillors, rather than amenity groups (Assael 2010). In Wandsworth some community members - including amenity group members - made programmatic suggestions to the development which were acted upon in the final design. This participation gave amenity groups a small incidental impact, as those present at the Exhibition were acting as individuals rather than as part of a collective. This impact is probably insufficient to stimulate civic endorsement of deliberative engagement given the lack of strong enabling conditions, and thus in the long term it is unlikely that amenity group impact will be formative. The political stability allows planning applications to be viewed on balance, in relation to the planning officer's advice. Consequently if amenity groups could articulated sufficiently persuasive for or against particular development to convince a Local Planning Officer of their validity they could have a considerable impact on the planning process. However, the complexity of other forces at play make this unlikely. If the amenity groups in Wandsworth became more willing to participate in collaborative spaces they could occupy a greater range of influence on the planning process, but currently their impact is relatively low and isolated to individual projects.

In Bicester the potential range of influence for amenity groups is relatively broad due to the size of the project and the intention of phased implementation. The stated educational aims of the engagement strategy, and the facilitators willingness 'hand over the pen', make for a relatively communitarian process. Subsequently it could build the capacity of amenity groups, enabling them to have a more formative impact in the planning processes. There is also a risk their empowerment could be diffused by the predicted 20-year length of the project. Many decisions regarding the future of the Eco-Town will be made at a political level, with economic forces playing a significant role, because of the project’s large scale. With this considered, despite the feeling of influence among some local amenity groups, the impact they are actually is probably low. The political endorsements received mean the project will likely proceed irrespective of their input. It is difficult to see how P3 Eco's desire for 'collaborative masterplanning' will converge with the fulfilment of complicated minimum standards required for 'Eco-Town' status. If this potential conflict can be reconciled then the project may well be adopted as a model for wider English planning processes, prolonging the Bicester amenity groups in the planning process.

In Sheffield and South Tyneside time and monetary resources were available for engagement processes that were commensurate with the scale of the projects, enabling amenity groups to have a high impact, that was largely formative. In Sheffield, amenity group's emotional renunciation of the initial planning proposal had a large impact on it's rejection. The grass-roots community-led planning that was enacted thereafter gradually built the capacity of amenity groups, and gave them the opportunity to deliberate over the remit of the schemes, as well as their design. The South Tyneside participatory process also built and
consolidated amenity groups. These newly constructed amenity groups were empowered to assess their own needs and plan their futures, thus having a formative impact on the planning process. The social capital and capacity these approaches built should endure beyond the course of the project and facilitate higher impacts on the planning process for the amenity groups involved in the long term. However these project approaches ‘cannot be seen as a universal panacea’ (CSNR 2010:16). Deprivation persists in these areas, with amenity groups and the wider community still vulnerable to political, social, economic and cultural pressures. The scale of the Sheffield project in particular has strengthened community resilience to an extent that amenity groups will can continue to exist in the face of various pressures, and continue to have a high impact on the planning process.

Planning Aid, Transition Towns and Seeds for Change facilitate amenity groups forming their own plans for their own futures. Planning Aid operate within conventional planning systems, and provide advice and engagement that increases the impact of a range of amenity groups on planning processes across the country. Their outreach work facilitates deprived communities to have a formative impact, although their restricted resources in limits the broad impact of this work. There are signs that Planning Aid will survive the current economic climate, and will therefore continue to contribute to the growth in capacity of amenity groups in the long term. Although Transition Town’s amenity groups operate mostly outside conventional planning systems, they are beginning to influence these systems. Some Transition chapters are working with local authorities. More broadly, Transition Towns are providing a prominent oppositional space which they are using to demonstrate the possibilities of deliberative; informal learning from this amongst a variety of actors may impact the procedures of planning process and the social contract in the long term. The educational remit of Seeds for Change has a similar potential impact. The Prince Charles case demonstrated that within English legal institutions, the planning process is thought of a fundamentally democratic process that should be subject to mutual deliberation upon which individuals should not have a disproportionate impact.

Figure 42: Participatory planning event in South Tyneside
Figure 44: Planning Aid England engagement processes
Section Four

Conclusions
4.0 Conclusions

‘There is no discipline, no structure of knowledge, no institution or epistemology that can or has ever stood free of the various socio-cultural, historical, and political formations that give epochs their peculiar individuality’ (Saïd 1989: 21)

In keeping with the global trend for increasing public participation, UK planning legislation and accompanying political opportunity structures have evolved in the hope of facilitating greater public involvement. Due to the multiple levels of the hybridised governance structure, the institutional mechanisms for facilitating participation vary hugely between different localities. The same can be said of the feedback mechanisms within these institutions (see section 3.2). The feedback mechanisms are an indicator of the responsiveness of local structures, and therefore of the impact amenity groups can have in that locality. The impact of amenity groups within these localised mechanisms is variable, and consequently amenity group impact on the English Planning Process as a whole is variable. This can be seen in the spectrum assessment that follows.

The impact amenity groups have range from passive to active, none to formative, low to high, short term to long term. As indicated by the analysis in section 3.3.1 various amenity groups will be occupying a wide range of the spectrums of these impacts at any moment. The legislative requirements for community involvement mean that if amenity groups are able to access the planning system they will have some degree of impact upon it. For example, even if an amenity group does not have an impact upon the nature of the decision, the investment of time and resources into recording their position, or ignoring their position, affects the planning process as it diverts those resources from elsewhere. There are instances where amenity groups cannot or choose not to access the planning process; in these instances the amenity groups may not impact planning decisions but their absence from the process can potentially have a negative impact on the credibility of the planning process.

If people are to plan their own futures and therefore have a formative impact on the planning process, opportunities for deliberative participation must exist which address the difficulties outlined in section 2.3. The conditions required to enable deliberative participation, and therefore the potential for amenity groups to have a formative impact are outlined in section 3.2. The strong presence of these conditions is difficult to achieve within our social contract (see section 1), and therefore the presence of such deliberative forums are rare. This means formative amenity group impact is also a rarity. The strong presence of interventionist political will and economic resources is critical to generating and maintaining intermediary spaces between the civil and political sphere that enable co-production. The publicly funded cases cited in section 3 were located in enabling political, economic and social conditions. Subsequently community-led partnerships were given political endorsement which was accompanied by secure funding. In these projects the communities assessed their own needs and planned their own futures; their impact on the planning process was active, formative, high and potentially long-term. Deliberative forums can aid long term impact because they build mutual capacity, and thus can mitigate some of the obstacles caused by our social contract. The true long term impacts on the planning process of these projects could yet prove to be the children who were engaged creatively in the process who may yet become members of amenity groups engaged in the planning process. Evidence of how political context can reduce the impact of amenity groups if there is instability or a lack of transparency is shown through the Streatham case study and section 3.2.1.

Following wider political trends there is currently a lack of interventionist will and resources within the neo-liberal government. This makes it unlikely that publicly funded projects such as those cited in section 3 will be initiated again in the near future. Instead, more planning applications will come through the private sector. This will reduce the likelihood of formative impact from inclusive representative amenity groups. In the publicly funded projects the implementers had the remit to build the social assets of the community, as well as tangible products. The social capital and mutual capacity built in these cases could have a long term impact on the planning process as amenity groups may remain willing to engage in an open manner, and will be more empowered individually and en-masse to be resilient in the face of external pressures. In the private sector there is less motivation, time and money to build this social capital. Subsequently implementors will find the social contract severely limits what they can achieve through the engagement process, as the democratic deficit remains in place. In this scenario the impact of amenity groups on the planning process will be relatively low on the whole, as their main opportunities for impact will be in obstructing/lengthening the process or influencing some elements of the design. The persistence of the democratic deficit infers that the majority of the population feel unable to influence governance structures. This is reflected in planning and indicates that the majority of amenity groups are only experiencing a minor impact on the planning process. There is a risk this will embed fatigue and possibly inaction, having the impact of reducing the credibility of the planning service which now
requires public involvement to perform its allotted functions.

The movements towards greater participation within our hybridised democracy model is currently accelerating beyond the pace of community building. This will exaggerate existing inequalities and further embed cynicism towards participation. Organisations like Planning Aid will continue to build broader community engagement in the planning process, but their impact is limited by their resource restrictions (Carpenter and Brownhill 2008). With this being the case it is more likely that amenity groups who have a formative impact on the planning process in the future will be the 'usual suspects' rather than the 'hard to reach'. The impact of this will be to further distance the planning process from its progressive post war roots; as a crucial tenet of the Welfare State which sought to help the vulnerable. The impact of amenity groups in this post war planning process was as passive actors whose needs were assumed. The legacy of this is the social contract which still obstructs public participation in the planning process. Frustrations with the limitations of our social contract is growing. This is feeding the membership of alternative social and environmental movements who advocate deliberative participatory approaches that enable amenity groups to plan their own futures.
4.1 Long Term Spectrum Assessments
### Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Conductive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-economic context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of project</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of influence</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Range of Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong oppositional groups</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior community development/organisation</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community visibility (is their presence symbolic?)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources invested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Identification</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rationale</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Deliberative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Exclusive</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Mass mobilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement processes</td>
<td>Formulaic</td>
<td>Responsive/Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of engagement speed (as experienced)</td>
<td>Rushed</td>
<td>Exhaustive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Feedback mechanisms</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpreted sketch results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust between actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project effect on Social Capital</td>
<td>Greatly Reduced</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project effect on Capacity</td>
<td>Greatly Reduced</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impact of amenity groups in this planning process</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of impact</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political context</th>
<th>Inhospitable</th>
<th>Conducive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social-economic context</td>
<td>Inhospitable</td>
<td>Conducive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Availability</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of project</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of influence</td>
<td>Individual Project</td>
<td>Wider Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong oppositional groups</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Empowered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior community development/organisation</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community visibility (is their presence symbolic?)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources invested</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Identification</td>
<td>Cursory</td>
<td>Probing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rationale</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Deliberative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>Exclusive</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchise</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Mass mobilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement processes</td>
<td>Formulaic</td>
<td>Responsive/Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate speed (as experienced)</td>
<td>Rushed</td>
<td>Exhaustive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Feedback mechanisms</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpreted sketch results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust between actors</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>After project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project effect on Social Capital</td>
<td>Greatly Reduced</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project effect on Capacity</td>
<td>Greatly Reduced</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall impact of amenity groups in this planning process</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of impact</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Five

Limitations, Areas for Further Research and Sources of Information
Limitations to Broad Analysis in Section#1 and #2:
The presence of a new government being elected within 4 months of the submission of this dissertation - and therefore still in transition - was a strength and a limitation. It made a longer-term analysis of broader trends that affect the impact amenity groups can have on the planning process a pertinent exercise, but it also limited the amount of verifiable current information and actions to evaluate. The breadth of assessments attempted in section #1 and #2, limited the depth of analysis possible given the constraints of the study.

Limitations to studies in Section#3:
The Enablement Conditions compiled in section #3 were derived from a reviews of the relevant literature, but their formulation is a contestable interpretative proposition. Some people would argue for the inclusions of exclusion of different factors or for different systems of clustering and prioritising them, which are perhaps more immediately related to particular local contexts and social contracts. Assessing a broad range of cases against the same criteria is difficult, but it does provide some insights within the terms of use in this dissertation.

The range of case studies was a limitation, and could be improved. This could be achieved by a broader range of case studies to offer more testing and validity to the general conclusions drawn. There could also be more detailed assessments between more immediately comparable projects, such as comparisons between projects led by commercial developments, projects led by municipal authorities, projects with similar overall budgets or built scales, or planning applications submitted to councils in the same region within a narrow time frame.

Within the scope of most of the case studies cited, I acquired qualitative information from a relatively small number of sources selected for their relevance to the research. This small sampling is an obvious limitation; more primary information should be acquired from more actors - involved in the projects in a variety of roles - would be needed to make the research more representative. There were various actors who I could not access for this dissertation, notably community members who were or were not part of amenity groups and engagement processes, who should be included in future research. Testimony from the developers in the Wandsworth or Streatham cases, with regards to what their requirements were as the clients of the architects, and other issues, would also have benefitted the dissertation.

The method of acquiring information from actors was through email correspondence, semi-structured interviews, and/or informal discussions. If more actors were interviewed with comparable roles within projects, then more structured interviews could be conducted to acquire comparable information relating to specific questions.

Limitations to studies in Section#3:
The breadth of my research, its relationship to a variety of disciplines, and its siting in the current socio-political has meant that it has raised more questions than it has offered answers too. Consequently it suggests many areas for further research, some of which are as follows:

Research areas that relate to current governance structures:

- More live research about how community involvement, with particular reference to hard to reach groups, is effected by the new regime, with particular reference to the Austerity Budget and the Big Society
- Assess Prince’s Trust Enquiry by Design methodology which has been endorsed by the Coalition in relation to what impact this allows amenity groups to have
- The ethics, benefits and difficulties of adapting planning regulations to allow community groups to develop their own schools, housing trusts and hospitals
- Whether social and economic disaggregation is exacerbated by the ‘localism’ agenda
- Does the ‘localism’ agenda encourage personal responsibility and the formulation of stronger local identities
- What impacts can and do amenity groups have on the planning process in relation to large scale infrastructure projects?
- What are the optimal engagement methods with regards to large scale infrastructure?
- A study of how the planning system could protect the vulnerable in the current UK political zeitgeist.
- An international comparison between countries thought to have a socially progressive planning systems, with lessons learnt.
Research areas that relate to recent governance initiatives:

- More assessments of the impacts of Housing Market Renewal Schemes (Pathfinder) on their local neighbourhoods as the schemes are fully completed?
- The effectiveness of the Regional Development Agencies in stimulating a long-term change in the culture towards participation and active citizenship?
- The long-term effectiveness of cultural engagement as a means of changing participatory culture, with particular reference to the involvement of school children, and what happens in their later years?

Wider research possibilities:

- Would the quality of product and/or process increase if planners and architects occupied political positions where policy could be formulated?
- How can alternative social and environmental organisations impact or bypass the planning process?
- Can conflicts between architectural modernists and architectural traditionalists be mitigated by deliberative planning processes?
- Does an increased involvement from women ensure a more deliberative planning process?
- Where ‘communications’ or ‘public affairs’ firms that are accustomed to using political intelligence to find potential disagreement which they then mitigate through private lobbying, research could ask whether this facilitates or hinders engagement?
- How far can do wider human rights frameworks effect planning legislation in the UK, and whether wider human rights are being adhered too by the planning process?
- How far does the human rights framework facilitate deliberative democracy?

5.2 Sources of Information
5.2.1 Bibliography


• Smulian, M (04/06/2010). ‘Call to fill regional vacuum’, Planning, 4th June, Issue 1871, p1.


5.2.2 List of informants

- Assael, J (Various interviews Summer 2010). Managing Director and Founder of Assael Architects and a Senior Architect on the Streatham (1 Palace Road) and Wandsworth (1-20 Enterprise Way, Osiers Road). Has significant experience in the housing development sector in the South East region.

- Carpenter, J (Interview 02/07/2010). Oxford Brookes University lecturer and researcher.

- Hornblow, S (06/07/2010). Development Manager for A2 Dominion Housing Association (socially registered landlord), who are part of the P3 Eco consortium. Has worked for them on various social housing projects in the South East region, and is now involved in the Bicester Eco-Town development, and expects to be for the next 15 to 20 years.

- Jupp, E (Interview 05/07/2010). Oxford Brookes University lecturer and researcher.

- McManus, C (Email correspondence 02/07/2010). Managing Director and Founder of Eventus, a Cultural Planning Agency agency based in Sheffield. Eventus were partners in the Housing Market Renewal Process, and heavily involved in the formulation of the Cultural Action Plan (2000).

- Newton, R (Interview 06/07/2010). Professional Facilitator. PENuT (in association with Northumbria University) Associate and Director of 3Ps social enterprise. Involved in the Participatory Appraisal Project in South Tyneside, and particularly Woodbine Project.

- Sheffield Council Employee (Email correspondence July 2010). Has been working in different roles in the voluntary sector and the City Council in Sheffield for over 15 years, and has therefore built a range of contacts and project experience in this context, so has good local knowledge.

- Senior South Tyneside employee (Email correspondence Summer 2010). Was involved in the instigation, planning, and evaluation of the Participatory Appraisal project in South Tyneside.

- Pickering, C (Email correspondence July 2010). Diversity Officer for Transition Towns movement in the UK.

- Planning Aid South Representatives (07/07/2010). Professional Facilitator (who has advised government on policies with regards to engagement) (Interview 19/06/2010)

- Seeds for Change Co-Op member (Email correspondence July 2010). Founding Director of Planning Democracy.

5.2.3 Case Study Information

5.2.3.1 Case study information: Streatham (see section 3.1.1.1)

- Assael Architects (2009). Design reports (provided by Assael Architects June 2010)


- Internal email from Communications firm to project team (provided by Assael Architects June 2010)

- Initial reports by the communications firm (Communications Firm June 2009: provided by Assael Architects June 2010)

- http://streathamlocal.blogspot.com/2010/02/1-palace-road-saved-for-now.html

5.2.3.2 Case study information: Wandsworth (see section 3.1.1.2)
5.2.3.3 Case study information: Chelsea Barracks (see section 3.1.1.3)

- The Week (03/07/2010:20). 'Prince Charles in High Court Case'.

5.2.3.4 Case study information: Bicester (see section 3.1.1.4)

- P3 Eco. (April 2010) Engagement Strategy (Provided by Steve Hornblow of A2 Dominion July 2010)
5.2.3.5 Case study information: Sheffield (see section 3.1.2.1)


Other relevant websites:
- http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/matshef/chiles/MSchiles.htm
- Sheffield Cultural Planning Agency involved in the project: http://www.eventus.org.uk/

5.2.3.6 Case study information: South Tyneside (see section 3.1.2.2)

- Culture and Neighbourhood Service of South Tyneside Council (March 2010). ‘An Evaluation of South Tyneside’s Neighbourhood Programme’ (provided by Senior South Tyneside Council employee June 2010).
- South Tyneside Council (provided 2010). Internal Evaluation Reports (provided by Senior South Tyneside Council employee Summer 2010)

Other relevant websites:
- PEANuT were part of the team designing the Participatory Appraisal. For more information access: http://www.northumbria.ac.uk/sd/academic/sas/enterprise/pa/who/
- Roger Newton (interviewed 06/07/2010) who worked on the Woodbine estate in the Participatory Appraisal is associated with PEANuT, and is a director of 3PS. For more information access: http://www.3ps.org.uk/examplesofwork.html

5.2.3.7 Case study information: Planning Aid (with references to Planning Aid South) (see section 3.1.3.1)


Other relevant websites:
- http://www.rvadirectory.org.uk/org/planningaidsouth

5.2.3.8 Case study information: Selected social and environmental movements (alternative oppositional spaces) (section 3.1.3.2)
• Transition Town Totnes website (2010): (http://totnesedap.org.uk/) and (http://totnes.transitionnetwork.org/)
• BCTV. (2010) General website and diversity information. (http://www2.btcv.org.uk/) and (http://handbooks.btcv.org.uk/handbooks/content/chapter/831)
Other relevant websites:
• http://climatecamp.org.uk/
• http://www.tlio.org.uk/pubs/agm2.html
• http://www.pnuk.org.uk/

5.2.3.9 Case study information: Mumbai Railway Settlers (resettlement process) (section 3.1.4.1)


5.2.4 Images

• Figure 1: (Newton et al 2010:3). Key factors associated with feelings of influence among local residents
• Figure 2: (Newton et al 2010:7). Factors associated with feelings of influence.
• Figure 3: Motivation of participants vs Franchise.
• Figure 4: Soft skills requirement vs Franchise.
• Figure 5: Broad educational benefits vs resource investments
• Figure 6: Capacity to reach the ‘hard to reach’ vs resource investment level that would be required
• Figure 7: Political Endorsement vs Ease of Application in conditions.
• Figure 8: Country comparisons
• Figure 9: South London Press 03/07/2009:38
• Figure 10: Summary of proposed Stretham scheme produced by Assael Architects (2009)
• Figure 11: As Figure 10
• Figure 14: Prince Charles letter to Emir of Qatar 01/03/2009. Made public in June 2010. Accessed through: http://www.
telegraph.co.uk/culture/culturenews/7850091/Prince-of-Wales-emotional-Chelsea-Barracks-letter-revealed.html

- Figure 15: Connections to Bicester diagram from P3 Eco website
- Figure 16: 'Holistic visions for Bicester' (This is Oxfordshire 16/07/2009)
- Figure 17: Land to be used for Eco-town development from P3 Eco website.
- Figure 18: View of Southey Owleton Area (from SOAR website)
- Figure 19: (Culture and Neighbourhood Service Report (CSNR) March 2010; provided by Council Worker June 2010
- Figure 20: Planning Aid. (2010) ‘What we do’ document (available on website and also provided by Planning Aid informants)
- Figure 21: Planning Aid England. (2010) ‘Good practice guide to public engagement in development schemes’. Available on Planning Aid website and also provided by Planning Aid South informants
- Figure 22: Representations of Transition Towns ideas, from Transition town website UK, http://www.heatingoil.com/blog/leaders-at-closed-door-uk-meeting-on-%E2%80%9Cinevitable%E2%80%9D-peak-oil-crisis-weigh-possible-solutions-to-energy-scarcity325/ (Macintosh 25/03/2010: Leaders at Closed-Door UK Meeting on “Inevitable” Peak Oil Crisis Weigh Possible Solutions to Energy Scarcity):
- Figure 23: A sample of the resources available through Seeds for Change Website
- Figure 24: North South economic divide. Social And Spatial Inequalities Group (2007). 'The North South Divide - Where is the line?'. The University of Sheffield. Can be accessed via: http://www.sasis.group.shef.ac.uk/maps/nsdivide/index.html
- Figure 25: North South economic dividing line. Reference as per Figure 24.
- Figure 26: Miranda Plowden, Programme Director for the Strategic Housing Service in Sheffield, an empowered 'Participation Champion' (Waite 2008)
- Figure 27: Image of intermediate Streatham design presented to local councillor (from Design Report Part 2 2009:1 provided by Assael Architects Summer 2010)
- Figure 28: Sketches representing design development of Streatham scheme (from Design Report Part 1 2009:3 provided by Assael Architects Summer 2010)
- Figure 29: Images of the scheme later in the design development (from Design Report Part 2 2009:13 provided by Assael Architects Summer 2010)
- Figure 30: Community Champion Janet Bagshaw of SOAR (Copyright Michele Turriana). Featured on CABE website, communities website, in preamble to CABE 2009a.
- Figure 31: The Participatory Appraisal Team at Horsely Hill in South Tyneside (Image reproduced with permission of South Tyneside Council)
- Figure 32: Bone (centre) and his fellow Horsely Hill team members working it out for themselves (Image reproduced with permission of South Tyneside Council)
- Figure 33: Information about Wandsworth housing development presented during the engagement process (Assael Architects (2009: 41-45), Design and Access Statement
- Figure 34: Bicester Public Planning Week room layout plan (provided by Hornblow 06/07/2010)
- Figure 35: A print out of a presentation given to the public by P3 Eco which is information and text heavy (provided by Hornblow 06/07/2010)
- Figure 36: mapping popular places in Parsons Cross (Chiles 2006, can be accessed online via: http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/matshef/chiles/MSchiles.htm)
- Figure 37: walkabout exercise in Parsons Cross (Chiles 2006, accessed as Figure 36)
- Figure 38: topiary sculptures rethinking green space (Chiles 2006, accessed as Figure 36)
- Figure 39: Participatory video with young people in Southey Green (Government Ideas Creative Futures website, accessed via: http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/aio/900739)
- Figure 40: building narrative for future Public Springs Area (Chiles 2006, accessed as Figure 36)
- Figure 41: Community -led partnership planning event in North Sheffield (source as Figure 39)
- Figure 42: Participatory planning process in South Tyneside (Image reproduced with permission of South Tyneside Council)
- Figure 43: As Figure 42
- Figure 44: As Figure 21. (2010:3)

5.2.5 Tables
• **Table 1**: Participation Rationales
• **Table 2**: Optimum Enablement Conditions (*Political/Bureaucratic/Economic Context*)
• **Table 3**: Optimum Enablement Conditions (*Social Context*)
• **Table 4**: Optimum Enablement Conditions (*Actors Context*)
• **Table 5**: Optimum Enablement Conditions (*Engagement Processes and Nature of Project*)
• **Table 6**: Optimum Enablement Conditions (*Over-arching view*)

### 5.2.6 Websites of Interest

- [http://www.britac.ac.uk/policy/Deliberative-Democracy.cfm](http://www.britac.ac.uk/policy/Deliberative-Democracy.cfm)
- [http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,1352913,00.html#article_continue](http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,1352913,00.html#article_continue)
- [http://www.equalities.gov.uk/national.equality_panel.aspx](http://www.equalities.gov.uk/national.equality_panel.aspx)
- [http://www.peopleandparticipation.net/display/Methods/Planning+for+Real](http://www.peopleandparticipation.net/display/Methods/Planning+for+Real)