



RTPI

Royal Town Planning Institute

**RTPI
Research
Paper**

SEPTEMBER 2019

APPENDIX 1: CASE STUDY REPORTS

**Findings from Cambridgeshire and
Peterborough, Staffordshire and Glasgow**



rtpi.org.uk

Registered charity number: 262865
Scottish registered charity number: SC 037841

Contents

Core case study findings	3
1. Introducing the case studies	4
2. Staffordshire County Council	6
Key findings	6
Case study background	7
Spatial planning and the vision for infrastructure.....	9
From planning policy to decision making	11
Engagement with infrastructure providers	12
Resources for infrastructure planning	15
What would help?	17
Good practice	18
3. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority	19
Key findings	19
Case study background	21
Spatial planning and the vision for infrastructure.....	24
From planning policy to decision making	27
Engagement with infrastructure providers	29
Resources for infrastructure planning	31
Good practice examples	34
4. Glasgow City Council	35
Key findings	35
Case study background	36
Spatial planning and the vision for infrastructure.....	38
From planning policy to decision making	40
Engagement with infrastructure providers.....	43
Resources for Infrastructure Planning.....	46
What would help?	49
Good practice examples	50
5. Interview topic guide	52

Core case study findings

1. There is acceptance that the processes for identifying, planning, prioritising and funding infrastructure are imperfect.
2. There is very little sense in the English case studies of infrastructure planning integrating around a strong vision of place, despite some acknowledgement of the benefits of doing so. A stronger vision is more evident in the Glasgow example.
3. Strategic planning activity is taking place in variegated ways across the case studies, and in the English case studies is re-emerging through necessity rather than by design. This reflects the demise of regional planning, not just regional spatial strategies but the previous diminution of structure planning. There is strong commitment to existing and re-emergent strategic planning activity and its potential contribution to infrastructure planning and prioritisation, but as yet little evidence about impact.
4. The concept of working towards 'cross-sectoral infrastructure integration' is not strongly evident. Sector specific challenges and issues are much more readily discussed identified. Only in the Glasgow example did the issue of cross-sector data sharing emerge.
5. The lack of geographical alignment between institutions of governance and infrastructure providers and funders is widely perceived as creating challenges, particularly around knowing who and how to engage.
6. There is lack of spatial awareness in organisations involved in the delivery and funding of infrastructure. This is particularly notable in agencies of government whose priorities seem to focus on the immediacy of service delivery. This represents a disconnect between the planning for, and the delivery of, infrastructure.
7. There is evidence of an uneven playing field in relation to the funding for infrastructure. Deals (of various kinds) have provided significant funds for infrastructure, but they are only temporary rather than representative of previous comprehensive funding agreements for local authorities. This is resulting in more entrepreneurial behaviour by local authorities to address shortfalls.
8. The 'cocktail' or 'pick and mix' approach to the financing of infrastructure is commonplace. Most projects rely on wide variety of funding sources, from both the public and private sectors. S106 and S75 are widely seen as deficient in a variety of ways, and there is undue reliance on funding infrastructure where scheme viability may threaten the likelihood of funding being forthcoming.
9. The disconnect between planning and delivery results in local government being reliant on third parties for delivery. This means that nurturing relationships between organisations is central: clarity on roles and responsibilities for clear communication, and leadership to drive the agenda, are needed.
10. Of the good practice examples highlighted, effective partnership working appears to be a pre-cursor, with key individuals often identified as being particularly important.

1. Introducing the case studies

A consistent message within the literature is that there is a paucity of understanding as to what works in one area and why, and the potential replicability of approaches to infrastructure planning across different geographies and governance frameworks. McClean (2017) reports that:

“Little attention has been given to how the institutional variations between cities, regions and countries can limit or facilitate the potential for various forms of infrastructure integration and evaluation remains in “separate and disconnected institutional entities” (Rogner 2009)” (McClean, 2017, 15)

This section provides the output of three contrasting case studies, conducted to add to our understanding about how approaches to infrastructure planning vary under different governance arrangements.

These case studies were selected to reflect a diversity of governance arrangements in England and Scotland to allow maximum possible scope for identifying enablers and inhibitors of effective practice:

Staffordshire County Council is a strategic level authority providing key public services including education, highways, transport planning, passenger transport, social care, libraries, and waste disposal. It is sandwiched between two combined authorities – the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and the West Midlands Combined Authority. It faces infrastructure deficits in both an urban context – the Stoke on Trent conurbation (where there is a Joint Spatial Plan developed with Newcastle under Lyme but no combined authority) – and in rural areas of the County, such as the Moorlands.

The **Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority** is a new form of public body with some responsibilities for infrastructure planning, funding and delivery. Its constituent partners include both upper and lower tier authorities. It is characterised by strong development pressures with resultant demands for infrastructure investment.

Glasgow City Council is a unitary authority, and a key player within the Glasgow City Region. The £1.13 bn Glasgow City Region City Deal, second in the UK to Manchester’s, was signed in 2014 bringing an integrated package of transport and other infrastructure to promote regional economic growth.

In each of the three case studies we:

1. Reviewed key strategic and non-strategic documents including Strategic and Local Plans, Infrastructure Delivery Plans, Strategic Economic Plans, Devolution and/or City Deals, committee / board papers and minutes
2. Carried out a series of in-depth interviews with key stakeholders informed by a common topic guide across the three case studies (see chapter 5)
3. Collated information about the governance, funders, and providers of infrastructure to inform graphical depictions for each of the three case studies illustrating the complexity of players involved in infrastructure planning at different spatial scales.

Across the three case studies we interviewed a total of 29 people as follows:

Case study	Interviewees
Staffordshire County Council	11 interviewees including county council staff (both corporate and planning), cabinet members, and district council staff.
Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority	8 interviewees including CPCA staff (both corporate and planning), elected members; county council, district and unitary authority staff, and an independent planning consultant.
Glasgow City Council	10 interviewees including, city council staff (both corporate and planning), an adjacent authority, regional organisations including the strategic development plan authority and the sub-regional transport partnership.

We both recorded and took contemporaneous notes of each of these interviews. To protect the anonymity of those interviewed, none of the quotes included in the three reports that follow are attributable to individuals. Detailed analysis of all interviews has been undertaken according to the following themes:

- Roles and responsibilities
- Spatial planning and the vision for infrastructure
- From planning policy to delivery
- Engagement with infrastructure providers
- Resources for infrastructure planning
- Good practice and ‘asks’ for improved practice

The case study reports are structured according to those themes and represent the narrative of infrastructure planning in that case study area as reported to us by those interviewed. Befitting to a case study approach is the contrasting picture across the three areas. For example, some interviewees spoke in general and more strategic terms, others offered detailed sector specific knowledge. This was not consistent across the three areas.

2. Staffordshire County Council

Key findings

- The structures and processes for planning and funding infrastructure in the English regions have become unprecedentedly complex and burdensome; stakeholders perceive themselves to be doing their utmost to make a flawed system functional effectively. The modus operandi is one of constructive collaboration, albeit one beset by tensions.
- In the absence of a long-term financial settlement for local government, councils are obliged to assemble 'cocktails' of funding through short-term competitive bidding. These entail considerable investment of time and staff resource, set against considerable uncertainty of outcome.
- The prevailing national development model is perceived to prioritise investment in a small number of Core Cities. This neglects the problem of uneven development that ensues and underestimates the functional interdependencies that exist between the Core Cities and the Shire Counties.
- There are complex and competing geographies of governance that give rise to multiple networks of economic, social and political relationships. These are compounded by new institutions, the Local Enterprise Partnerships and combined authorities. There is, thus, no single functional geography of place but participants present a strong case for role in strategic spatial planning and leadership of place to be invested in strategic level authorities.
- It is difficult to engage organisations in the statutory sector (especially health and education) in a genuinely strategic dialogue on infrastructure planning. These bodies are characterised by a short-term, service delivery orientation, determined by their sponsor ministries, rather than a long-term preoccupation with place.
- The rail industry is almost unanimously regarded as particularly complex and confusing; the most difficult infrastructure (sub)sector with which to engage.
- There is a limited evidence of exchange at a strategic level with private sector utilities (electricity, gas, water). These actors are more often engaged at the delivery stage, on an incremental site by site basis.
- The participation of voluntary and community providers in the green and blue, and social infrastructure sectors is often assured by their recognition of the potential benefits that may accrue to them through developer contributions.
- A new *Strategic Infrastructure Plan*, produced by SCC and partners due for publication in summer 2019, follows the format of documents produced by Essex, Kent and Oxfordshire County Councils. It is the first of its type the Midlands.
- The policy instruments introduced in the past decade to encourage strategic spatial

planning (Duty to Cooperate - which is unenforceable) and/or to raise finance for infrastructure development (Community Infrastructure Levy - set too low, by necessity) are widely considered ineffective.

- In the context of austerity, there is some evidence of the ‘municipal enterprise’ / ‘commercialisation’ agenda informing infrastructure planning, e.g. through an active local authority role in development to generate (and maximize the retention of) Council Tax / Business Rates, to minimise demand on council services, etc.

Interviewee ‘wants’ for the future

- Recognition of uneven development, bias towards Core Cities
- Recognition of potential economic role of Shire Counties
- Statutory role in strategic spatial planning for strategic level authorities, supported by capacity to raise and spend revenue based on local needs
- Duty to cooperate (applied to infrastructure providers)

Case study background

Geography

“The Core Cities are always making grabs on land and resources ... and the areas between them are vast, forgotten hinterlands”.

The County of Staffordshire is located in the West Midlands region of England. It is a diverse county, comprising a multitude of settlement types – urban, rural and suburban – displaying different social and economic circumstances – disadvantaged, post-industrial cities to affluent, knowledge economy oriented historic small towns. The county is located at the nexus of much of the UK’s strategic air, rail and road infrastructure network, including HS2. It is situated between two major conurbations; Birmingham and Manchester with which some Staffordshire communities have long-established functional relationships.

However, a recurrent concern of local stakeholders was the misunderstood and undervalued role that Staffordshire, and the Shire Counties more generally, play in the UK economy as a whole.

The UK government is perceived to be pursuing a development model that seeks to focus growth on the eight Core Cities and their broader city-regions. In this context, it is argued, the Shires represent both a ‘black hole; and an underutilised asset:

“Planning for the UK at the expense of the counties is a mistake. The economic impact of the Counties cannot be overestimated, neither can what they do to help deliver housing. We play a major role in supporting the UK economy, we’re not just a place people drive through”.

The government, it is argued, underestimated the functional linkages between the Core Cities and their peri-urban hinterland. There is a multitude of functional relationships between the Core Cities and the counties; the latter are:

“...where people want to live; where green infrastructure exists, where clean air exists, where other types of job not found in cities exist, it is a policy gap not to address the system as a whole; the cities and the counties develop hand in hand”.

A common theme of the interviews, therefore, was the (real or claimed) symbiotic relationship between the Core Cities and their county neighbours:

“The Birmingham area needs to build a lot of housing ... but they don’t have enough land ... we would say they need to be sequential and build on their brownfield land first ... without encroaching onto somewhere else ... you need to think about the impacts (environmentally, service need) ... of building housing in these poor areas”.

Governance

“The world is changing. The idea that councils do things only on their own patch is gone. Our [county] job is very much about system leadership”.

The government infrastructure of the County of Staffordshire formally comprises Staffordshire County Council, The City of Stoke on Trent (a unitary authority) plus eight local authorities; East Staffordshire, Newcastle under Lyme, Stafford, and Tamworth Borough Councils, plus Cannock Chase, Lichfield, South Staffordshire and Staffordshire Moorlands Districts Councils. The boundary of the Stoke and Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership is coterminous with that of the County Council. Four Staffordshire local authorities (Cannock Chase, East Staffordshire, Lichfield and Tamworth) are aligned with the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP and two (Cannock Chase and Tamworth) are non-constituent members of the West Midlands Combined Authority.

The central location of Staffordshire, its internal heterogeneity and proximity to powerful urban neighbours has created a complex network of economic, political and social linkages between these councils and neighbouring authorities beyond Staffordshire proper:

“It isn’t just about Staffordshire, but Staffordshire’s relationship with Birmingham, with Shropshire, the Constellation Partnership, Transport for the North, the Northern Powerhouse, Derby and, whatever we do, we need that broader level overview”.

The internal government structures of Staffordshire itself are, thus, supplemented by a range of emerging sub-regional, regional and supra-regional bodies. These include government sponsored partnerships such as the Midlands Engine and Midlands Connect (the regional transport body for the whole of the East and West Midlands regions) the West Midlands Rail Executive (responsible for rail service franchising in the West Midlands region, plus Northamptonshire) and local authority owned initiatives such as the Constellation Partnership (a partnership with Cheshire designed to maximise the investment benefits of HS2). The County Council is represented politically on many of these bodies and emphasises the importance of sub-regional and regional cooperation in achieving its corporate goals:

“We are at the heart of it ... shaping the agenda by getting involved ... If you get embedded in their strategy ... they will deliver”.

The governance boundaries of the County are, thus, porous. The Staffordshire Districts exist within

a multitude of real or imagined functional economic geographies. East Staffordshire has historic links to Derbyshire, the North Staffordshire Districts with Cheshire.

As noted above, four Staffordshire districts have expressed a particularly strong affinity with the Birmingham and Black Country conurbation, as part of that travel to work area, perceiving themselves to be participants in a more logical functional economic geography than with Staffordshire per se. They are, thus, aligned to both Stoke and Staffordshire LEP and Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP, and two are non-constituent members of the West Midlands Combined Authority. These fluid alliances have created some tension at political – if not necessarily officer – level.

Others expressed differing opinions on the merits of participating in both LEPs which, in turn, highlighted the different modes of working of the two organisations.

“GBS LEP channels most money to Birmingham and the Black Country ... but you are at the table ... there is one member, one vote ... our Leader has the same voting rights as the biggest council in Europe ... in Stoke and Staffordshire LEP, local government is represented by two councillors ... how can we articulate what our area wants?”

“...people say “we’re more aligned with Manchester or Birmingham, that’s just politics” ... or ... “Local authorities involved in the GBS LEP do indeed have a seat at the table” ... but the executive board makes all the decisions”.

Others still argued that the multitude of new organisational forms designed to bring coherence to the system simply added to the totality of organisations that required coordination:

“I don’t think, in all honesty, that anyone understands the relationship between the LEP and the Combined Authority in those areas. It’s a decision made on the day ... which money goes to whom...” “Nobody actually though about this beforehand ... there is a need to tidy up geographies as much as possible”.

A number of participants argued that these multiple and overlying relationships make it more difficult to counter the dominance of the Core City narrative in government thinking and, crucially, the distribution of powers and resources that underpins this strategy.

“The membership of districts of the Combined Authority do make the politics more interesting ... we want to get Westminster and Whitehall to realise the West Midlands is not just about Birmingham ... it’s not just the Black Country”.

“This is a fundamental question. We are not prepared to see our business rates and council tax funding improvements in the centre of Birmingham ... we need to pay for an ever increasing number of elderly residents and young people ... where do you want your tax spend ... where you live or where you work? This is a key question that people don’t understand”.

Spatial planning and the vision for infrastructure

The corporate objectives of Staffordshire County Council are formally set out in its *Strategic Plan*. This is a four-year strategy produced to enable the delivery of the manifesto of each new political administration.

The Strategic Plan sets out multiple political aims and objectives. The key priorities that are relevant to infrastructure planning are economic growth and housing. The former is a long established priority, while housing has only become a corporate priority for SCC in the very recent past, with the SCC having long avoided direct involvement in planning for housing. Its (re)newed interest is, at least partly, attributable to: 1) austerity and the related emergence of the commercialisation / municipal enterprise agenda (i.e. to generate income for the Council); 2) demand management (i.e. to reduce reliance on SCC over-stretched core services) and; 3) to counter land banking.

“We got involved ... because of on-going financial pressures ... the government reduced our Rate Support Grant ... we wanted to create places that work, with higher levels of employment, better paid jobs, people healthier and happier ... in less need of our services ... we have an ever increasing number of young and elderly needing care ... we need people with money in their pocket ... if we build 1,000 homes, we bring in £1 million of Council Tax ... there are a lot of sites in some places ... that have been sat on because of the difference between what land owners believe they can sell for and the cost of development” ... “we need to be a disrupter and rattle the market ... we have some and banking going on ... all in the same places ... places that need housing ... we have our own land ... we need to push that agenda ...”.

The SCC Corporate Plan is described as being pitched at *“a very high level ... about the whole place, not its individual parts”*. The process of working with districts on detail (see below) is described as constructive but *“a bit messy, thereafter”*.

The SCC also co-produces the Strategic Economic Development Plan with the Stoke and Staffordshire LEP. This contains no reference to spatial planning beyond a broad objective to create an environment to enable business growth.

Each of the districts is the beneficiary of a bespoke District Deal, sponsored by the SCC and LEP, that sets out its specific growth aims and objectives and the infrastructure investment required to achieve these.

The SCC Integrated Transport Plan was published in 2011. It is described as *“quite historic”*. However, each of the Districts produces a Transport Plan which, collectively, constitute the County Transport Plan.

“What people are really interested in is what we are going to do on the ground ... and that is in the 8 District Transport Plans and themed strategies ... freight, rail ...” “The TP does not shape growth. Rather it poses the question ‘if you want growth here, these are the transport implications’”.

A new *Strategic Infrastructure Plan*, produced by SCC and partners due for publication in summer 2019, follows the format of documents produced by Essex, Kent and Oxfordshire County Councils. It is the first of its type in the Midlands.

The role of strategic spatial planning is described as a “core enabler” to deliver SCC’s corporate goals. However, the strategy is being articulated in the context of a perceived diminishing commitment on the part of central government to strategic spatial planning; to fill a vacuum left by the deconstruction of the Post War two-tier planning system and the regional infrastructure of the

late 20th century. The document is described as a rebuilding of capacity for strategic spatial planning in Staffordshire;

“The government does not like strategic planning any more ... they just want to sweat the assets ... so, you get this ‘bolt on’ type of approach which is unsustainable ... places get slower and slower ... people change their behaviour patterns ... it displaces what people do ... it’s not a linear relationship between ‘building houses and we need a road’”.

“...we are stepping up our game to replace what was lost post regionalism and the County Structure Plan ... we are looking ahead 15, 20, 25 years where we can get in place roads, education, health, utilities ... the importance of that is Local Planning Authorities only do 15 year plans ... with more and more 5 year ‘refreshes’ ... 5 years housing targets ... speculative development ... we do not want to be so incremental ... we want it to fit into a long term framework” “[The new strategy will be] built up from what the LPAs have told us ... but with a wider perspective ... looking at neighbouring areas ... Shropshire, Derbyshire, Greater Birmingham ... the Constellation Partnership with Cheshire...” “We want to be clear down to the development management level what we want to do and why”.

From planning policy to decision making

“Planning policy identifies needs ... development management makes sure it happens ... meets those needs”.

The majority of interviews describe – on balance – a constructive process of co-production in the field of infrastructure planning with a division of labour between the County and Districts that emphasises the strategic and enabling role of the former, and the role in assessing local needs and delivery role of the latter.

The development of the first generation of (NPPF informed) Local Plans was informed by a now defunct county-level Infrastructure Board. The SCC now engages in the preparation of Local Plans via a single point of contact with its Economy, Infrastructure and Services directorate (see below).

SCC sources, especially members, were naturally keen to foreground the strategic leadership role of the County Council.

“The crux of the matter is ‘who does economic development’? We have the financial clout to build a new motorway junction, all that type of stuff ... we’ve got the capital to match fund grant funding... ... Local Planning Authorities have a key role in the design of place ... they are far better at ‘granular’ planning ... we’re better at ‘big picture’ economic development”.

“It is very clear that we need to impress upon people that do not understand the two tier system that we have a strategic role ... that’s often lost on those that are not familiar with the system” ... “Infrastructure has been at the very heart of our discussions with our MP. We made it very clear that their support to get the best out of programmes like HS2 and made it clear that we can deliver infrastructure support and growth ... housing and other things ... we are the people that can do that”.

The strategic leadership role of the County Council, it was argued, included a necessary emphasis on managing of District level expectations in respect of infrastructure investment.

“The major problem of the NPPF model is that infrastructure costs and accountability are associated with the upper tier authority ... the local plan can identify need without any accountability ... that’s a gap in terms of what joint planning for infrastructure should look like ... that needs to be done strategically as it crosses boundaries”.

“If your Infrastructure Delivery Plan is affordable ... by that we mean that we don’t ask the County because we don’t have the cash ... its affordable as in financed by the development itself ... then we will not have to challenge that ... we want to see affordable, manageable IDPs behind each Local Plan ...”.

This is not to suggest a complete absence of tension, however. This is most evident in the process of prioritisation of what constitutes local ‘need’:

“Some infrastructure needs are ‘finite’ ... like water, you need adequate water when you turn the tap on ... for things like roads, if you don’t spend money on roads, then you just clog up your area ... what is ‘critical’? ... what is ‘strategic’? ... it’s a bit of a judgement call ... what do we think will make a place better?”

“You tell us what you want to do ... we’ll run the figures and tell you what’s needed ... they want the Districts to take the lead on identifying growth and sites ... testing ... the County does not have the resources to do it the other way round ... if there’s local congestion ‘that’s tough’”.

There was a broad consensus that the mechanisms introduced to encourage strategic spatial planning – the Duty to Cooperate, Statement of Common Ground – were, in practice, very weak.

“If you don’t have good working relationships, it [the Duty to Cooperate] doesn’t give you strong levers to pull ... if you have good relationships, it simply enhances these”.

“It [the Statement of Common Ground] could be positive ... but it’s not welcomed by all” ... “We need a real statement of common ground ... enforceable but with money attached ... a statement of common ground with teeth”.

The (implied or real) threat of opposition of opposition to proposals was frequently cited as a ‘backstop’ option.

“We can say ‘we’re going to rock up at your Inquiry and object’”.

“We will intervene at Inquiry if they are writing infrastructure cheques that nobody can cash”.

Engagement with infrastructure providers

“It’s a complex 4D chess game” ... “It’s an awful thing to say but it’s not what you know ... it’s who you know ... it’s what you know about who you know”.

Statutory organisations

It is surprising that most respondents expressed a greater degree of frustration in respect of their working relationship with other statutory bodies – involved in, for example, health and transport – than they did with private sector utilities and telecommunication or transport operators.

“In terms of getting to speak to someone [i.e. working with statutory bodies], it’s easier [than private sector] ... except health ... but working with them to get an answer is much more difficult”.

The modus operandi of the health and education sectors – largely determined by sponsor Departments – was considered the source of much inertia. These emphasise short term service delivery priorities rather than long term planning and the impact of investment (and, crucially, disinvestment) on places and populations. The level of cooperation within the health sector, in particular was described as “awful”.

“You speak to people in health and they say ‘we don’t know who is the best person to talk to”.

“If we’re planning on a timescale of 15 to 20 years’ development ... not just housing and employment ... do your plans reflect that? ... they don’t ... what we found was that these organisations are only looking 2 or 3 years down the line ... they are not thinking long term ... the scale of organisations like the NHS is such that to get them to think about social issues ... and for it not to be market led ... is very difficult”.

“Have you [Clinical Commissioning Groups] thought about these developments ... all these people are going to be there ... what their needs are ... what your future provision is ... and the answer is ‘no’ ... and it’s still ‘no”.

“Trying to get an idea from professionals ... what is going to happen when retired GPs surgeries close? ... what sort of provision should we be planning for? ... do you need us to provide sites, for example? ... it is one of the hardest and most important issues ... it’s so difficult to engage ... to get a response”.

In the education sector, the lack of cooperation in Westminster and Whitehall was, similarly, considered to be an effective impediment to integration locally.

“We can look at what the LPA proposes in terms of growth ... how it’s distributed ... existing capacity ... whether new capacity is needed ... we can assess need accordingly ... then it is a question of funding ... there is a disconnect between CLG and DfE ... CLGs approach is underpinned by housing growth ... whereas funding comes from DfE which has a more reactive approach ... they give you an annual settlement ... we need 10 to 15 year settlements ... we chase our own tail to keep our head above water ...”

The impact of academisation was also identified as an obstacle:

“We can’t say ‘you will build that school ... we have to ask and hope someone will say ‘yes’” ... “let’s get the money in and the work out what we’re doing”.

In the transport sector, the rail sector was singled out as uniquely complex and confusing, and Network Rail as a particularly challenging partner. That said, the new regional transport body, Midlands Connect, was widely considered to ‘add value’ to the set of regional governance structures. It was perceived to provide a vehicle to exert influence on certain providers such as Network Rail and, indeed, to influence national decision making. SCC is represented on the board of Midlands Connect and the West Midlands Rail Executive which also allows an input into franchising and, hence, local service provision.

“In terms of the global market ... it is clear we are just too small ... we have to cooperate with Midlands Engine and Midlands Connect ... we have to develop our aims and objectives how we service that partnership to shape the agenda ... to involve them ...”

“If we’d been a voice on our own, we would have been able to do this ... it has created another level of governance but it’s allowed us to influence national government decision making”.

The majority of participants acknowledged the limitation of the LEP model (nationally). Fundamentally, LEPs have no role in strategic planning and have very little money.

“What is it there for? £20 million Local Growth Fund over 20 years is peanuts”.

Moreover, it was noted that the Stoke and Staffordshire LEP had exercised a very high turnover of core membership and staff.

However, equally, it was recognised that the LEP played an important role in prioritisation within infrastructure planning in Staffordshire.

“Our LEP took a conscious decision not to work in spatial planning but if you want help accessing funding, that’s their role” ... “the added value that the LEP adds ... business planning ... very good at weeding out ‘silly’ projects” ... “the LEP is good on outcomes, metrics ... less on glamour and funding things other LEPs do”.

Utilities

It is curious that, unprompted, respondents had little to say on the engagement with private sector utility companies in infrastructure planning. Typically, they were described as “hard work” but amenable to “typical contract management”.

In short, there was little evidence of engagement with utilities at the strategic level. Dialogue was centred on the delivery / development management stage:

“When you’re building new homes ... the private sector has always said ‘well deal with that ... well build that into our plans’ ... to some extent you’re in their hands as to what gets put in”.

“Energy providers say ‘we are quite happy ... what you propose causes us no concern ... we will deal with this on a site by site basis’”.

Land owners

The issue of land banking was identified above as one of the drivers of the County Council’s recent engagement with housing delivery as a strategic priority. The practice drew criticism, in particular, from local members:

“Look at developers’ annual reports ... they state ... ‘we are pleased to report that our land assets have risen £2 million in value ... it’s there for the shareholder’”

Other sectors

There was limited evidence of joint working with providers of green / blue or social infrastructure at strategic level. As above, engagement was displaced to the delivery / development management stage. That said, providers in these sectors were active participants, motivated by a share of potential development capture and planning gain:

“You’re pushing at an open door with organisations like the Wildlife Trust or the Rivers and Canals Trust ... they want to get stuff in in the Plan ... to secure S.106 ... they are quite switched on ... S.106 is the starting point ... ‘tell us what you want and we can help you’”.

Resources for infrastructure planning

“The lack of planning to work out local government finance is really harming things ... it makes it difficult for us as a local authority to make decisions from one year to the next”.

The question of institutional capacity – in the sense of human and knowledge resources – did not emerge as a priority topic in the interviews. Formally, infrastructure planning within SCC is the responsibility of ‘Economy, Infrastructure and Skills’ a Level 2 (i.e. tier below Chief Executive) corporate division. EIS groups together ‘County Commissioners (Level 3) for Business and Enterprise, Connected and Sustainable County, Highways and Built County, and Skills and Education. Respondents were keen to emphasise the merits of brining all related services ‘under one roof’ and added that Staffordshire had been successful in leveraging in funds through supplementary investment in specialist consultancy support, saying *“it’s a very ambitious and healthy picture”.*

“Funding has changed but the Council has been very agile in clawing funding back ... the Integrated Transport Block went to the LEP ... we bid for funding from the Local Sustainable Transport programme and effectively drew some of that money back ...”

It is not surprising that the issue of financial resources was uppermost in the responses of many Staffordshire stakeholders. However, it is of interest to note that it was the absolute lack of resource per se that animated respondents, but the nature by which resources are currently distributed by central government.

“In the past 8 years, the government has told us that infrastructure planning is not long term ... there are small [although actually large sums of money] one off bids ... timescales are very short in terms of building an evidence base ... they are decided by national criteria and do not really align with local issues ... they are one off, quick bidding rounds ... you are competing with other areas ... the whole process is piecemeal ...”

The competitive funding model was criticised as resource intensive (in terms of time, staff and financial inputs). Opportunity costs are, thus, high set against uncertain prospects of success.

“Councils put together ‘cocktails’ of funding to try to prioritise investment ... under the Transport Block, Staffordshire would get £30 million a year ... it wasn’t perfect but it seemed to work ... bidding is a major investment of time and energy ... it does not give you the confidence to invest money in building a business case if you know you won’t definitely get the money in ...”

The uncertain outcome of bidding compounded the sense of Infrastructure Delivery Plans taking the form of a ‘wish list’. Indeed, as one respondent noted *‘I was going to use that terminology myself’*. However, most respondents argued that Inspectors remained very pragmatic and that IDPs typically were not an important factor at Inspection

“The Inspector wants to ensure everything is captured ... and it is not too much of a wish list ... you need to show in the IDP that you can’t fund all infrastructure ... or you can’t get CIL ... you have to show that”.

The current funding regime was contrasted with the promise of greater local government autonomy to raise and spend money in a manner consistent with local objectives that was raised at the beginning of the Coalition government.

“Heseltine promised a ‘single pot’ of money ... but we’re more fragmented than ever” ... “If you remember Heseltine’s ‘No Stone Left Unturned’, the premise was ‘look at all these different departments with different programmes ... we’ll put them into one pot and the LEP and its partners will have priority in spending that money ... in fact, it’s the worst it’s ever been in chasing that money down, the single pot ... even if you dress it up and call it devolution ... just never happened”.

The absolute lack of resources for infrastructure investment and the competitive bidding regime focused participant’s minds on prioritisation. The recurring themes that emerged here were: alignment with corporate objectives (as opposed to ‘pet’ projects); 2) the potential to generate addition income for the local authority; and, 3) projects that represented ‘quick wins’.

“When we did the City Deal, we have a list of projects from all over the place ... “is it in the Local Plan. Will it get planning permission ... how much will it cost ... how many outputs ... ?”

“We are putting in Staffordshire County Councils own money on the basis that we will get in back through the Business Rates”.

“We need to make sure we have projects that are shovel ready”.

There was a general consensus among respondents that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) had provided a disappointment in those districts in which it had been adopted. Two primary shortcomings were identified.

First, the sums yielded by CIL had provided significantly lower than might have been expected from S.106. This seemed to be related to a tendency to under-charge.

“Since we adopted our plan, no developers have really said ‘we can’t afford development because of CIL ... that suggests we set it too low ... you have to set CIL low”

“You end up setting a level for CIL for the worst site possible ... if you have affluent areas with green field sites ... the developers there are making substantial profits ... compared to areas where there is a lot of remediation to do ... the S106 model would have allowed for these comparisons ... whereas with CIL, there is not much in the way of community gain”.

Second, the prohibition of pooling CIL receipts mitigated against flexible – i.e. strategic – use of funds.

“A few years ago, we had a major centres contributions strategy ... that has been undermined by the CIL regulations ... during that time, we were able to develop significant improvements in towns like Lichfield, Stafford and Burton ... the CIL regulations have not exactly helped us”.

Finally, the problem of viability remained pervasive in the minds of participants.

“The idea of viability is a joke ... inspectors are bewildered by all these holes ... its best foot forward ... hope it all works out ...”.

What would help?

- A ‘Plan for England’ (explicit or implicit) that acknowledges the problem of uneven development, uneven distribution of powers and resources to promote economic growth, and the contribution of the Shire Counties to national economic growth; *“you’ve got to create a level field ... its holding us back when we could be contributing”.*
- Formal recognition and facilitation of the key strategic role played by strategic level authorities, including:
 - A statutory strategic spatial (or infrastructure) plan such as that emerging in Oxfordshire; *“we need some sort of vehicle – a strategic plan for the whole of Staffordshire ... and elsewhere ... which delivers with the District Authorities, not in spite of them”.*
 - A comprehensive local government funding settlement; *“we need the power to raise and spend money as we see fit locally ... of a five-year plan from central government ... The lack of resources is really hitting the whole sector”.*
- A statutory Duty to Cooperate, that applies to infrastructure providers, that will overcome the inherent tendency to short termism and sectoral parochialism.

Good practice

Respondents identified two very different examples of good practice in integrated infrastructure planning in Staffordshire, one strategic, the other focused on delivery.

- The emerging Strategic Infrastructure Plan, the first of its type in the Midlands, coproduced with the Districts and LEP and described as *“reimagining regional planning at a scale that works for us”*.
- The I54 Development, a 150-hectare industrial development in south Staffordshire, site of a new Jaguar Land Rover production facility. This represents the pooling of different local authority resources; a new motorway junction funded by the County, additional funding from Districts, Enterprise Zone designation realised by Stoke and Staffordshire and GBS LEPs, collective managed by SCC; *“that is how strategic tier local authorities should operate, leveraging a major inward investment opportunity”*.

3. Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority

Key findings

- The Combined Authority has added a new layer of governance in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area and is the only combined authority in England to have both upper and lower tier constituent councils. There is a strong legacy of collaboration between partners and across local authority boundaries in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, and there is evident willingness of partners to continue to build on that legacy under the new arrangements.
- There is a little confusion – particularly around transport – as to the respective roles and responsibilities of organisations. This is partly viewed as the inevitable result of organisational set up with clarity over roles and responsibilities expected to emerge over time.
- There is a strong appetite for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority (CPCA) to add value by providing a strategic vision for infrastructure linked to its investment decisions. However, there is some uncertainty as to whether the CPCA sees itself (and is in turn seen by others) as predominantly a delivery or policy making body.
- The potential opportunity for the integration of strategic planning and investment provided by the Non-Statutory Spatial Framework has yet to be realised – but there is both appetite for, and optimism about, its potential to do so in the future. Planning policy and a vision for infrastructure are not yet seen - by some stakeholders - as the main drivers for project and investment decisions by the CPCA.
- There is clear consensus about the key infrastructure challenges facing the sub-region, particularly in respect of enabling infrastructure to support growth, energy and water shortages, and addressing congestion and movement in and around Cambridge. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review has been instrumental in creating a strong evidence base.
- Engagement with infrastructure providers is largely happening on an ad hoc basis, with some prior mechanisms for engagement with infrastructure providers having recently receded. The potential for the CPCA to enable a strategic dialogue with infrastructure providers was seen as critical.
- The instruments to raise finance for infrastructure development at the local level (CIL where charged and S.106) are widely considered ineffective and insufficient.
- A key challenge for infrastructure planning is perceived as both the knowledge required,

and the human capacity needed, both within the planning community and by providers, to enable integration to happen more effectively.

Interviewee 'wants' for the future

Governance

- A simplification of governance, with some stakeholders keen on the further exploration of the opportunities offered by unitary governance
- A focus on achieving greater clarity on relationships and responsibilities, such as memorandums of understanding between the CPCA and constituent areas on infrastructure planning, programming and investment.

Central Government

- Greater leadership on planning nationally
- Central Government a player at examinations given their multiple funding roles
- Clearer structures within Central Government on responsibilities for infrastructure
- Government tasking of regulators to plan for growth (see utility regulation)

Planning

- Reduced complexity in planning system and the number of plans
- Early engagement with providers on local plans
- More guidance to planning inspectors on assessing infrastructure requirements and deliverability of plans, and raising the bar on deliverability of plans

Leadership

- Utilising capacity of the Mayor to champion strategic policy and funding issues, and setting up a utilities planning group

Funding

- More flexibility in the use of local authority funds, particularly between capital and revenue

Utility regulation

- A statutory obligation on utility providers to engage early and proactively
- Enhanced planning expertise in regulators and a role for regulators to take local plan inspectors conclusions on soundness and obligate utilities providers to deliver

Case study background

Geography

The CPCA is situated in the East of England, with strong connectivity to London by rail and road. Although predominantly rural in character, the CPCA area contains two of the top five fastest growing cities in the UK in recent years – Cambridge and Peterborough. The population of Cambridgeshire and Peterborough was just under 850,000 in 2016. With planned housing growth the population is expected to rapidly raise to over a million people by 2036¹.

The CPCA consistently performs above the national average across a range of indicators², with the economic performance of the CPCA area – Cambridge in particular – widely acknowledged as significant to national productivity (Centre for Cities, 2017).

There is a strong history of collaborative joint working in the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area to plan for growth across boundaries (see Boddy and Hickman, 2016).

Governance

Combined authorities are a new tier of governance in England, and an important component of the selective devolution of powers and funding to English local authorities under the Coalition and Conservative governments since 2010 (Hickman and While, 2017). Formed from the ‘bottom up’, by authorities wishing to work more closely together to support common strategic aims, they are legal bodies, and each has its own history with different powers, priorities and organizational forms, as set out in their devolution deal with Government. Originally created to promote economic regeneration and transport, their remit is now more open, *‘leaving the functions of a combined authority to be determined by a combination of local choice and the outcome of negotiations with government’* (CLG, 2017). Some, although not all combined authorities, are associated with the devolution of funds from Central Government. The CPCA was formally constituted on the 3rd March 2017 and is one of six combined authorities in England led by a directly elected Mayor³. The CPCA is led by a Conservative, James Palmer. Its key powers and functions are set out in its devolution deal – agreed with Government in March 2017⁴.

The CPCA’s budget for 2019/2020 sets out both the revenue and capital budget for the authority, made up of a variety of sources including Capital Gainshare Devolution Funding, Department for Transport Capital Funding, Growth Fund Income, and the Transforming Cities Fund⁵.

¹ cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Combined-Authority/Item-2.1-Appendix-1-280318.pdf

² ons.gov.uk/economy/economicoutputandproductivity/output/...03.../pdf

³ Combined Authorities are not required to have directly elected mayors, but there has been the expectation from Central Government that devolved funding and powers will be ‘most likely to be given in exchange for increased accountability in the form of a mayor’ (NAO, 2017)

⁴ cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Uploads/Cambridgeshire-and-Peterborough-Devolution-Deal.pdf

⁵ cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/news/combined-authority-reveals-plan-for-the-year-ahead

Key infrastructure planning functions of the Combined Authority

The CPCA does not replace any existing tiers of government and is the only combined authority in England to have both upper and lower tier constituent councils: Cambridgeshire County Council, the unitary authority of Peterborough City Council and the five district councils of Cambridge City, South Cambridgeshire, East Cambridgeshire, Fenland, and Hungtindonshire.

The leaders of each of these councils are members of the Combined Authority Board, which is chaired by the Mayor. The board also comprises representatives from the Police and Crime Commissioner for the CPCA area and the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Clinical Commissioning Group. The board is supported by a number of sub-committees, such as the Transport and Infrastructure Committee which advises on the annual programme of strategic transport projects and the associated capital investment budget, but it is the board only that has decision making powers.

The CPCA's business board is the newly formed Local Enterprise Partnership for Cambridgeshire and Peterborough replacing the previous Greater Cambridge, Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership. The business board receives and considers "*new applications for [growth deal] funding which will be recommended to the Combined Authority for approval, contracting and monitoring*" and in accordance with the Growth Fund Prospectus⁶.

The local and sub-regional government structures of the CPCA area are augmented by a range of other sub-regional, regional and supra-regional bodies and partnerships, such as England's Economic Heartland Sub-Regional Transport Body, the Greater Cambridge Partnership, and other bespoke county council and local authority led partnerships such as the Connecting Cambridgeshire Partnership, and the Cambridgeshire Flood Risk Management Partnership. The CPCA is represented on many – although not all – of these bodies.

In setting out arrangements for '*the transfer of significant resources and powers for infrastructure, housing, economic development, employment and skills*', the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution deal highlights the key roles of the CPCA in respect of infrastructure planning and delivery, including:

- Powers to invest – through devolved funding for housing and infrastructure to '*invest in its economic growth, helping to accelerate housing delivery and job creation*'
- Transport powers – including a devolved transport budget with responsibility for managing local transport including the maintenance and management of the key route network, and bus franchising powers, with the CPCA becoming the local transport authority
- Policy responsibilities, including the preparation of a non-statutory spatial framework (NSSF)

Accelerated housing and economic growth are core messages within the deal, which also details:

- Requirements for a business plan setting out how targets will be achieved
- Proposals for a non-statutory infrastructure delivery plan identifying infrastructure needed to

⁶ cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Uploads/Business-Board-Growth-Prospectus-201819-F.pdf

support the increased funding of new homes, and funding proposals (a requirement of gainshare funding)

- Powers to create Mayoral Development Corporations with land assembly powers
- Commitments to establish a joint assets and investment board with Government, and a land commission
- The need for ‘strong partnership’ to support key large housing sites with brokerage at the local (through Homes and Communities support) and central government level to help resolve barriers, with utility companies, or government agencies, which are holding up the development process.

Observations on roles and responsibilities

The CPCA states publicly that:

‘Councils will continue to deliver services for residents as they do currently. The Combined Authority will work on the strategic issues that cross council borders and span the entire Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area, like housing, travel and infrastructure needs (CPCA, 2019)⁷.

The infrastructure planning responsibilities of each of the constituent district and unitary councils remain the same in relation to local planning policy, decision making, service provision and funding. Cambridgeshire County Council retains many of its core infrastructure responsibilities – for example in relation to education provision, strategic S.106 negotiation, and strategic policy making and statutory responsibilities in a number of thematic areas such as flooding and waste management. Some of its core transport responsibilities – particularly for strategic transport planning and the local transport plan - have transferred to the CPCA.

All interviewees acknowledged that the devolution deal makes “*very clear*” the “*requirement on the CPCA to promote growth and facilitate infrastructure*”, and that “*we have the greatest opportunity to do a better job of joining up infrastructure and housing*”, “*bringing together infrastructure and growth*”.

However, for some interviewees, the establishment of the CPCA had created some initial uncertainty over role and responsibilities in respect of infrastructure planning:

“There are now so many layers and partners. It’s very difficult not to trip up”.

“We’ve effectively got four tier local government here with the Combined Authority. It does add to complexity”.

Interviewees were commonly uncertain about which ‘*bits of the deal*’ the Mayor had already started work on, particularly where elements of the deal involved partnerships with Central Government such as the joint assets and investment board. Some were a little confused about transport planning responsibilities:

“On spatial planning we are clear, because we have historically established relationships on planning. On transport it’s much more work in progress”.

⁷ cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/home/devolution/

“Responsibility for the Local Transport Plan is with the CPCA but key transport functions remain with the County. The CPCA is also passporting certain things back to the County on transport”.

That there are two emerging sub-regional transport bodies encompassing the CPCA geography was highlighted in relation to the perceived complexity of governance arrangements on transport, notwithstanding the fact that their potential was generally viewed positively by participants, and the Mayor’s engagement in these was welcomed.

Nevertheless, there was a strong sense from all interviewees that confusion over roles and responsibilities – or institutional blurring – was simply a natural part of the organisational disruption created by the formation of new bodies. It was also widely hoped that the legacy of strong collaboration would be an advantage in trying to make new structures work.

“We are on a journey ... ongoing process, in a complex organizational landscape, but what has impressed me is the large number of key players who understand the benefits of trying to get to that place.”

“It’s not easy to create an organization from scratch and make it quickly effective”

“We are young and still formalizing the relationships between authorities”.

“What’s the job of each of us in ensuring effective infrastructure is still forming, what’s our job and your job needs refining over the next 12 months.”

Spatial planning and the vision for infrastructure

“The Mayor is clear that the agenda is sustainable growth – he expects and understands to get accelerated growth you have to achieve infrastructure”.

“The demand for housing is what’s driving the need for new infrastructure”.

There was a striking clarity from CPCA interviewees that the work of the new authority is **“bringing together infrastructure and growth”**. Against that backdrop, the Mayor’s vision for infrastructure was reported as *“simply to deliver the objectives of the devolution deal to double GVA ... to create more physical space to deliver houses”*⁸, and *“the devolution deal drives the authority – the expectation is that that is what our work is”*. The sense of a broader overarching vision – beyond the details of the devolution deal or specific projects – was not expressed. Instead the focus of discussion was on the infrastructure challenges to growth (see below) and the focus of the CPCA’s work on delivery. In the context of discussion reported below about the Mayor’s role in relation to strategic planning, there appears to be some tension as to whether the CPCA is seen both by itself – and by others – as a predominantly delivery or policy making body. This is not yet clear.

A number of different **documents** were referred to that encapsulated the Mayor’s priorities (the terminology of ‘priorities’ being more commonly used by interviewees than ‘vision’). All CPCA interviewees referred to the Mayor’s most recent business plan (February 2019) and its 12 key infrastructure projects⁹, but in parallel also mentioned the Mayor’s 2030 Ambition Statement, the Business Board Growth Prospectus (2018-19), and the Mayor’s initial 100 day plan published

⁸ The Mayor’s Devolution Deal with Government included a target to increase economic output by nearly 100% in the next 25 years, from £22bn to £40bn.

⁹ cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Uploads/CPCA-Business-Plan-2019-20-dps.pdf

shortly after his election in May 2017. Those interviewees outside of the CPCA, sensed that, “*the long-term vision isn’t there yet. Theoretically the CPCA should make it easier, but I’m not sure we are there yet*”.

At a more local district and unitary level, the role of local plans, local transport plans and their related infrastructure delivery plans, were seen as pre-eminently important for expressing the vision for infrastructure, and the means by which the infrastructure needs arising out of development are expressed (see section on planning instruments below).

However, across the 8 interviews, a vast range of theme specific plans and strategies were highlighted as providing more detailed visioning including – by way of example - the *Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy*, *Cambridgeshire County Council’s Corporate Energy Strategy*, the *Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Digital Connectivity Strategy*, and the *Cambridgeshire Health and Well-being Strategy*. Many interviewees noted, “*the mix bag of plans - there are too many layers and far too many plans that are not consistent*”. There was no mention made of the Strategic Economic Plan prepared by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough LEP (now absorbed into the CPCA as its business board) and only one interviewee referred briefly to the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Housing Strategy (designed to support the acceleration of building rates in the area) launched by the Mayor at the end of 2018.

The emerging Non-Statutory Spatial Framework (NSSF)

“People are pretty unanimous that the CPCA needs to tell a strategic story.”

Without exception, interviewees viewed the loss of Regional Spatial Planning – and the concomitant focus on local plan making in England – as a wholly “*inadequate process for infrastructure growth, there’s no real strategic conversation ... there hasn’t been a long term and strategic view about what the enabling infrastructure is*”. As one elected member observed, “*Sub-regional planning is so important. Part of the reason we supported devolution was the belief that planning isn’t possible in local plans by themselves*”.

As detailed above, the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough devolution deal commits the CPCA to the preparation of a Non-Statutory Spatial Framework, which must be approved unanimously by all board members. The first stage, published in 2018 “Towards a Sustainable Growth Strategy for 2050”¹⁰ was described by interviewees as a “*blended spatial strategy – a helpful analytical framework*”. However, as “*an amalgamation*” of the key content of the local plans of the constituent local authorities it was not considered by some to “*in its current form ... add much value*”.

That said, the subject of ‘supporting infrastructure’ is identified in the document as a strategic priority, and in identifying the strategic sites allocated in local plans the CPCA states that it “will consider, where necessary, how best it can support the delivery of these and other development sites, including addressing systemic or infrastructure challenges and using investment, influencing opportunities and other practical support as necessary” (CPCA, 2018, 22). Strategic Spatial Objective 7 also states that “*the Combined Authority will develop and maintain a long-term investment programme of infrastructure projects, including projects it seeks national support to deliver ... This includes investment in strategic infrastructure; facilitating grant bids; feasibility studies and business case development; and working with government for timely delivery of committed infrastructure projects*” (ibid, 28).

¹⁰ cambridgeshirepeterborough-ca.gov.uk/assets/Combined-Authority/Item-2.1-Appendix-1-280318.pdf

The second stage, “*just getting going in earnest*” was seen as having the potential “*to have a big impact*”, and an “*exciting opportunity*”, to “*look at the development needs arising out of the Mayor’s ambitious GVA growth targets*”. A number of observations were made about the future relationship between the NSSF and local plans both from those with the CPCA, “*the hard work is to come ... there is an expectation that areas around cities and rural areas will accept higher levels of growth than they have done in the past, which is all well in theory ...*” and those interviewees outside of the CPCA, “*if it determines futures patterns of growth and makes allocations, that will create tensions with local planning authorities.*”

In this respect, many comments were made about the current non-statutory - as opposed to statutory - framing of the spatial framework, and the impact this might have on infrastructure planning delivery in the future. The majority of interviewees were content with the non-statutory approach, not simply because of the potential political tensions in relation to local plans should it be statutory (“*to make it statutory would be a mistake*”) but because there are “*far more freedoms and flexibilities*” with a non-statutory process. Moreover, one interviewee was strongly of the view that the “*potential value of the NSSF is not in deciding where growth goes but in articulating the consequences of lack of delivery to take into Government. Its power is in capturing a spatial ambition through a framework that allows utilities to be held to account by the Mayor*”. However, reflecting the Mayor’s publicly stated desire to move towards a future statutory approach, one interviewee commented: “*We will see what a non-statutory process looks like and how effective it is – this will give us pointers towards appetite and pace for moving towards something statutory*”. But as one interviewee also observed, “*One of the challenges [of a non-statutory framework] is, what is it? The Mayor thinks it will have more weight if it is statutory but talking to the local authority leaders they are not keen*”.

In terms of content, that the CPCA’s recent decision to “*align the content and timetables [of the NSSF and the Local Transport Plan] so that they will now run forward in parallel so that the spatial framework is informed by a degree of certainty on transport*” was widely welcomed. Previous work “*pushing ahead on transport*” in the absence of spatial planning had been seen as “*back to front*”.

Key infrastructure challenges

Several interviews celebrated and highlighted the important role of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Independent Economic Review¹¹ (IER), commissioned by the CPCA and chaired by economist, Kate Barker, in the identification of infrastructure challenges, the development of priorities and in informing the second stage NSSF process: “*The Combined Authority Board was clear from the beginning that a strong evidence base was needed to steer and shape priorities*”. There was strong unanimity amongst interviewees as to the area’s strategic infrastructure challenges. The challenges listed below were those highlighted consistently by interviewees, and largely reflect the findings of the IER:

- The scale of the infrastructure needed to support the sub-region’s economic and housing growth ambitions
- Power shortages and grid capacity - “*it is woeful and pitiful that there is not enough power to support Europe’s biggest life sciences cluster*”, “*The Mayor’s economic growth can’t be delivered if we don’t have power*”, “*The power load of GENOME is astonishing*”, and “*we*

¹¹ cpier.org.uk/final-report

have a renewables industry that can't connect to the grid"

- Water scarcity and flooding issues - *"Can we really focus development in Fenland, if water shortage issues remain", "large areas are covered by flood zone risk, and with sea inundation challenges its more difficult to find development locations"*
- Ensuring that infrastructure investment supports the varying needs of three *"economic geographies"* of the area, and does not simply focus on the needs (important nevertheless) of Cambridge and its hinterland
- Housing affordability and its relationship to labour supply (with the noted suggestion in the IER to increase current housing targets from around 4,700 to somewhere between 6,000 and 8,000 per year)
- Addressing congestion and movement in and around Cambridge (see as a priority in meeting the devolution deal's GVA targets)

The challenge of adequate resourcing for and profile of health, education and community infrastructure was highlighted by some interviewees – particularly those working at the more local level, but for the CPCA, *"We've not got the capacity to do much [on health, education, blue / green infrastructure], we make the right noises but we are not taking the lead"*.

From planning policy to decision making

As described above, if there is a current vision for infrastructure within the CPCA it is about a clear focus on delivery. In that context, a predominant theme from interviewees was about the prioritisation process, and the extent to which CPCA processes were – or even could be (in the context of work still emerging on the NSSF) - informed by wider policy.

Whilst the importance of planning in the identification of infrastructure priorities and investment decisions was clearly accepted at a conceptual level – as evidenced by the commissioning of the IER as an evidence base to support the NSSF (stage 2) and strong views as to the potential future impact of the NSSF - interviewees were clearly more circumspect about the *current* relationship between planning policy and decision making.

For those interviewees within the CPCA, there were three parallel narratives on project prioritisation. The first was about **'quick wins'** with the Mayor's desire to evidence early impact. The second was about **'twin tracking'**, encapsulated in the idea of focusing delivery on the projects contained within the devolution deal, whilst simultaneously developing more long-term plans: *"we have the shopping list embodied in the devolution deal but ... but the CPCA needs to bring a contemporary view to things"* and *"we have a deal with Government with things in that partners put forward as key projects, so we've got to get on with existing projects, but the Mayor's ambitions are to be much more long term"*. The third was about **'acceleration'**, *"the CPCA must focus its investments by looking at additionality"*, and *"what's most critical ... the most important solutions to accelerate delivery"*. Most telling was the observation that: *"the 12 key projects will link up with the NSSF stage 2 process, but several will happen anyway"*.

Furthermore, interviewees within the CPCA were keen to highlight the current Mayor's desire *"to disrupt processes and challenge orthodoxy ... to be more innovative and risk taking"*.

For those interviewees, outside of the CPCA some concerns were expressed about the process of project prioritisation, and how aligned priorities were to a set of strategic objectives: *“There’s an idea of having a vision but that’s not followed through when the latest initiative comes along – the Mayor has lots of ambitions ... it appears project not policy led. Ambition is good but you need to prioritise”*, and *“The Mayor appears to support a whole series of schemes – but we don’t get the justification. We’ve gone from the 100 day plan, to 30 priorities in the Greater Ambition Statement and now 12 projects. The board says it’s been through a prioritisation process, but what’s popped out are political priorities rather than development priorities”*. It was however, acknowledged, that this re-prioritisation process – which CPCA interviewees were open about – was a natural process of merging agreed commitments within emerging strategic priorities and the need to address trade-offs.

Local mechanisms for infrastructure planning

A number of detailed observations were made by interviewees in relation to the mechanisms of planning more locally, from which three core themes emerged:

- The first was the difference between strategic infrastructure to enable major development to come forward – which should be planned at a larger than local level wherever possible – and mitigating the impacts of development. For those working at the more local level, there was a general feeling that *“the local plan process for identifying what’s needed is not an adequate process for infrastructure planning for growth.”* Notwithstanding the concerns about the NSSF process and its relationship to local plans – the concept of planning at a broader strategic level was universally supported.
- The second was about **Local Plan Examination** which was seen widely as ineffective and *“needing a radical overhaul”* in relation to understanding the infrastructure needs of growth and assessing the likelihood of delivery. Examination was described as very variable in style and content, too often reducing consideration of infrastructure to mitigation, and therefore left as something to be resolved at development management - *“The concern of leaving it to development management, is it [infrastructure] will get whittled down to viability ... can end up with sites that are stalled leading to un-planned consequences”*.
- The third related to the role of **Infrastructure Delivery Plans** prepared at the local level about which no-one was complementary - *“they are symptomatic of a dispersed and complicated [planning] system”*. They were described as *“Never about delivery – just part of statutory planning process to get your local plan over the line ... They are rarely enshrined or interrelated with said council’s capital programme or decision-making framework with the exception of education, it just gets done and put on the shelf”*. One interviewee observed that *“everything goes in ... it’s easy to put things in”*, and another that IDPs were *“almost immediately out of date”* and *“how the planning system looks at development needs to move on”*. In recognition of the resource intensive nature of IDP preparation, some work by the previous Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Strategic Planning Unit *“to interrogate and bring coherence to them across a bigger geography”* was highlighted, as having brought *“some success”*. Plans to prepare a Joint Strategic Infrastructure Plan begun by the Unit were thought to have *“fragmented”* (15) under the CPCA, and as one CPCA interviewee highlighted, *“if you get into integrated infrastructure planning that’s a lot of work. It’s not on our horizon. Maybe as we mature on the spatial framework”*. This latter point was

particularly interesting given the proposals in the devolution deal for a non-statutory infrastructure delivery plan (see above).

Engagement with infrastructure providers

“We know we can’t do anything without them, we have to focus on joining up, we have to operate collaboratively and in partnership.”

All interviews highlighted the **strong history of cross-sectoral and cross-boundary collaboration** in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, a history they hoped would support effective infrastructure planning in the future.

However, it was observed with some regret that “*proactive processes*” for engagement with infrastructure providers previously established by the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Joint Strategic Planning Unit (set up to co-ordinate cross-boundary planning activity following the abolition of Regional Spatial Strategies in 2010, but with its functions largely absorbed into the CPCA) had been lost.

“In the past, local authorities came together to try and establish an infrastructure delivery group with utilities – a whole county approach. The momentum and responsibility for that seems to have gone. There’s a lack of resource and owner for that. The district council geography is too small so it’s petered out.”

“A utilities forum was created - we wanted to plug into utilities early - responsive to concerns about utilities in the context of site delivery... It takes effort and drive to do something like this and it’s died a death.”

At a broad level, engagement with infrastructure providers was now variously described as being “**unclear**”, “**ad-hoc**” and “**fragmented**”: “*we have informal meetings but we haven’t set up anything more structured ... we are living off past experience which will degrade over time.*”

Whilst it was acknowledged that the formation of new organisations creates some “*natural disruption*” to existing structures and processes, and “*unsurprising teething issues between partners*”, it was suggested that the CPCA had – perhaps inadvertently - added to the complexity of provider engagement by adding an additional layer of governance. For providers it was observed that the challenge is understanding and identifying which layer of governance provides the most meaningful engagement for them. For those within the differing tiers of governance / government, one interviewee suggested that:

“We are all engaging at different levels and at different times with key partners and stakeholders. There are multiple basis of contact which are not always joined up. There is inadvertent competition to remain at the top. We all have subtle reasons to justify our engagement.”

The potential impact of which widely agreed to be: “*Lack of clarity, wasted resource, at worst disagreement and confusion will be presented back to agencies.*”

Underneath this broad narrative, a number of more detailed observations were made:

- The **multiple players** involved in infrastructure delivery and the many and varying **geographies of providers** makes it very difficult to know where and whom to engage.

- For those within the CPCA, narratives around **positive engagement were cited in relation to particular projects and programmes**. For example, one interviewee commented that *“we have developed good relationships because of having particular projects”*. Relations with Network Rail were, for example, highlighted as having improved as a result of partnership working on station projects – Cambridge South Station being a frequently cited example. Strategic (long term) dialogue however -remained difficult. Specific partnerships – for example the Connecting Cambridgeshire Partnership (being led by the County Council) and work on the Regional Energy Hub (being led by the CPCA), were thought to be **bringing closer engagement** between some players on delivery.
- The nature and quality of engagement with providers was also perceived to **vary both within organisations, dependent on both topic and personnel**. The Environment Agency was, for example, described as *“good to engage with on flood management, less so on water supply issues.”* *“That there is someone really forward looking in Anglian Water”* was highlighted as significant in helping engagement between the water industry and some constituent local authorities.
- Positive engagement was thought to have altered with some **agencies of National Government** *“particularly where they had been put under political pressure to be more responsive”*. Highways England was repeatedly highlighted as a body that was now *“relatively easy to engage with”, “where relationships had significantly improved.”* There was some suggestion that the Treasury had *“become more interested in planning”* and that was helping to encourage more proactive engagement between some national providers and localities. Other agencies of Government – particularly the NHS – were thought to be difficult to engage with on planning: *“its resource and power are fragmented”,* and *“it has byzantine processes to enable investment in health care. We have built surgeries that now have no occupants.”*
- Substantial concerns were expressed about a perceived **‘silo mentality’ within Whitehall** which made the task of engagement with central government providers complex. It was considered that the concept of integrated infrastructure planning should be demonstrated at the level of Government: *“Dft, MHCLG don’t see the bigger picture – there are policy edicts, and last minute declarations which undermine other policies”* and, *“we need to have much greater join between English Nature, Environment Agency. There are too many empires and not enough join on delivery.”* Lots of the national bodies, it was observed, have *“very inflexible ways of making choices”*.
- **Utilities** were widely observed as challenging to engage with - *“finding a way in is hard – they are big opaque organisations that we didn’t really understand”*, not helped by their varying and broader geographies and even *“different philosophy”*, by which was meant their *“shareholder driven investments.”* But the criticism was not placed simply at the door of the utilities: *“There is no coherent place for utilities to come together. Where this is a gap is that even the geography of local government doesn’t reflect the geography of utility providers – and for the utility sector there is no coherent framework or body for bringing that together.”*
- **The regulation of utilities** was also widely considered to be contrary to the objectives of integrated infrastructure planning – particularly at the strategic level: *“the time horizons for*

investment are shareholder driven. Are these bodies required to be far sighted, there is no obligation to engage proactively?"; and "they are regulated so they can't commit funding upfront." However, one interviewee commented that *"utilities are beginning to respond better in growth areas."*

Looking to the future and notwithstanding the current view around the ad-hoc nature of current engagement with providers, there was consensus about, and appetite for, the CPCA and the Mayor to add coherence to *"and campaign for"* for better engagement with infrastructure providers -particularly in relation to strategic enabling infrastructure, with *"signs of a more strategic approach emerging, with the Combined Authority taking a lead on the Energy Hub which is enabling strategic conversations and thinking with national grid about off-grid solutions."*

The strong commitment made within the NSSF 'Strategic Spatial Objective 4' to the Combined Authority 'working with the local authorities and energy, water and digital utilities providers ... to develop a Memorandum of Understanding that will set out new, agreed ways of working to achieve more timely and effective delivery of utilities infrastructure (CPCA 2018, 25), although not yet in evidence, was eagerly awaited, with one interviewee commenting *"We need to be doing planning at a big enough scale that allows you to engage coherently across areas to the full extent of utility provider areas."*

Resources for infrastructure planning

Funding resources

Many detailed points were raised about both the level and nature of funding available to support infrastructure in the CPCA area, grouped into the following themes:

Funding shortfalls: At the most basic level it was – perhaps unsurprisingly - unanimously reported that there is insufficient infrastructure funding to deliver all the projects and priorities identified by both the CPCA and its partner authorities. All partners are, therefore, constantly having to go through a process to prioritise finite resources: *"Work on our infrastructure plans highlighted glaring gaps."* One interviewee highlighted, *"The burden [for enabling infrastructure] falls on the council ... we are currently having to make 8% cuts - a reduction in £50million worth of spend ... but we don't want to take on capital borrowing"*, and another that *"we have to focus on our statutory functions caring for the vulnerable and the elderly, this puts us in a vulnerable position on enabling infrastructure ... push comes to shove if there is a real need for a new school then those projects are more likely to be prioritised ahead of new access"*. One local authority interviewee also observed, *"at a more localised level we try to help members define a balance between aspirations and realities – it's incredibly difficult – we know what we need – but what don't we want?"*

Resource of the CPCA: Although the CPCA was described by one interviewee as *"as a bit of a white knight"*, it was generally agreed that in overall terms, the resources of the CPCA for infrastructure whilst extremely welcome, were still relatively limited - *"The CPCA doesn't really have that much money"*, and the *"Mayor has much more ambition than money"* and *"of course it's a political process ... there are always going to be tensions in terms of what can be afforded, we are not a bottomless pit"*.

There was some considerably scepticism about whether the devolution deal actually resulted in additional money to the area or simply a re-packaging of existing funds and programmes already

destined for the CPCA geography. Some interviewees were positive about the potential for the Mayor – through his profile and leadership - “to attract further resources for the high-ticket items”.

Freedoms and flexibilities: The added value of devolution deal money was seen in terms of the single pot approach, and the ability of the CPCA to spend on both capital and revenue. Outside of the CPCA this was viewed “*enviously*” but also sensible to enable project start up. Interestingly, in the context of strategic plans still emerging, it was observed that “*its [the CPCA’s] benefit – at least initially – is with the funding, especially the revenue spend – they’ve commissioned a whole load of studies ... working effectively to take the lead on projects*”. However, as one interviewee observed, “*The Combined Authority is focussing its work on feasibility, getting projects to the starting block with the future funding being uncertain*” (see Gateway Assessments below).

Gateway Assessments and Long Term Planning: A number of interviewees highlighted concerns about Central Government’s gateway funding review process, meaning that future CPCA funding is uncertain: “*Government should be more part of the process – much of core infrastructure in front of growth is in their hands ... gateway assessments are problematic because it’s difficult to think long term. Funding for the 12 projects [the current CPCA business plan priorities] isn’t in place yet*”. The stricture of gateway assessments were thought to partly explain the observation above about investing in ‘low-hanging fruit’ because of the need to evidence impact and delivery.

Transport funding: There was a general perception that not only was funding for transport projects more transparent than for other enabling infrastructure, it was seen as more readily available and something that authorities within the area had done particularly well from:

“We know what the government pots are, and how we get into those programmes. Big chunky transport funding is on the radar.”

“We have some rare projects like E-W rail that really would enable settlements.”

Funding for other infrastructure, particular green infrastructure, social and community and sporting infrastructure, was seen “*as much more subject to ongoing negotiation*” and therefore uncertain. CIL (for those authorities that charge it) and S.106 were seen as the principal funding sources for ‘softer’ infrastructure, alongside some limited grant opportunities as detailed in local authority infrastructure delivery plans. However, after affordable housing contributions, the ‘residual’ for other infrastructure was limited - “*it’s down to viability. In theory, there is enough value to pick up tab for infrastructure, but the reality is there is not*”. The potential for the Mayor to add value to ongoing conversations on Land Value Capture was welcomed.

In terms of organisational confusion, one interviewee highlighted as a ‘challenge’ that the county council remains the lead on strategic S.106 negotiations, “*we work hand in hand with our district colleagues, but we are negotiating money for strategic transport schemes that don’t necessarily support development*”. This observation was made in the context of discussion about the Mayor having recently reduced his project priorities to twelve and ongoing uncertainty about where development might be prioritised in the future: “*There’s a big disconnect when the Mayor’s priorities aren’t the ones that are needed to make individual schemes acceptable*”.

Supporting Cambridge: The Greater Cambridge City Deal (potentially worth £500m by 2030) – being delivered by the Greater Cambridge Partnership - was noted as potentially bringing significant government grant alongside the CPCA’s single pot for the area as a whole (£770m over

30 years). The City Deal was thought to be “*effective and successful and delivering change in the ground*” and ensuring that “*we can deliver infrastructure for main jobs in greater Cambridge*”.

Central Government initiatives: Central Government was still seen by all interviewees as the principal funding source for infrastructure through its various and multiple sources, and wished to see far greater join-up between Central Government departments and agencies (see engagement with providers). In addition, several interviewees expressed concern about the culture of competitive bidding and deal making as a means of securing funding for infrastructure, resulting in wasted resource, and a perceived lack of focus on long term needs:

“Pots are being constantly reinvented and the proliferation of ideas means that we are constantly chasing things that are over-ready.”

“There is a misplaced view in Government that want a deal rather than a dialogue on leading change.”

“There are multiple Government pots, but there’s always a new initiative and lots of resource has to be put into a competitive bidding process. Much of this ends up being a waste of time and resource.”

Notwithstanding these comments, it was acknowledged that the area covered by the CPCA had benefitted from a number of recent initiatives and programmes, as evidenced by the successful bid to the Housing Infrastructure Fund to contribute to a major reservoir relocation, and the significant investment taking place in: “*super-regional projects, such as East-West rail that have a life of their own and are government sponsored.*”

Staff capacity and knowledge

The human resource needed to support effective integrated infrastructure planning was a frequently cited issue. Observations related both to capacity and to knowledge, both within the planning community but also within funding organisations and providers.

For those within the CPCA, “*there is a challenge over capacity*”, as well as a desire to be “*intentionally lean*”. Interviewees emphasised that “*I don’t think it’s for the CPCA to have all the capacity, we need to work in partnership*”, and “*We need to keep getting the message over – it’s a Combined Authority – better together*”. Whilst some outside of the CPCA remained circumspect about the extent to which the ‘spirit of partnership’ was yet being felt, CPCA interviewees highlighted a newly established CPCA ‘programme board’ comprising senior local authority officers (directors of planning or equivalents and some CEOs) “*to talk about the complex mixture of trade-offs*” and reported it “*as a great success and is to meet sooner than programmed*”.

The **knowledge / expertise** required to support effective infrastructure planning was thought to be challenging. On the positive, one interviewee highlighted “*that we have had a lot of people working on some of these things for a long time means we have a good broad knowledge and understanding*”, and another that there are “*some bright graduates coming up.*” In particular, the question was raised about **infrastructure planning knowledge**, i.e. what knowledge can planners be reasonably expected to have to enable effective infrastructure planning, and what is it reasonable to expect individual local authorities to resource? For example, one local authority interviewee observed:

“I commissioned a piece of work to understand the utility implications and limitations of doubling the size of this town and the number of people that were involved in answering that question was extraordinary – water engineers are different to power engineers and so on, so I don’t think it’s something that in terms of expertise local authorities are capable of resourcing – they can’t pay for that expertise in house.”

And another elected member that:

“We need to have a way of interacting on utilities, water, energy. It’s totally impractical to work on an individual local authority basis – there’s no capacity or resource.”

Few (if any) of the local authorities within the CPCA area have dedicated resource on infrastructure planning, with several of the authorities sharing their limited staff resources on local plan preparation.

Whilst some interviewees were concerned about whether the CPCA as currently staffed has the relevant expertise on infrastructure planning (as evidenced by the passporting of functions “where *they don’t have expertise*” the potential of the CPCA to add value in the future in terms of both engaging strategically with infrastructure providers, but also in building up knowledge was highlighted.

The need for improved knowledge on planning, and **capacity to engage on planning by providers** was highlighted in parallel. The NHS was for example highlighted as not having the “*expertise to sit in the room*”, and the request for ‘enhanced planning expertise’ in regulators to enable better engaged on strategic planning by regulators emerged as a theme (see what would help above).

Good practice examples

Respondents identified some different examples of good practice related to integrated infrastructure planning in the CPCA area;

- Strong collaboration between Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire on their local plans, led by an “*energetic and engaged*” joint director
- Previous work by the Joint Strategic Planning Unit to provide a forum for utilities to engage on planning
- Cautious optimism about the potential of the Non-Statutory Strategic Framework process
- Partnership working to bring forward the delivery of Cambridge South Station
- The “*coherent and integrated planning*” of the substantial development that has recently taken place around the station quarter of Cambridge (see: cb1cambridge.co.uk)

There was a striking sense that key individuals have been important in driving positive outcomes, and that effective collaboration takes years of groundwork to reach fruition.

4. Glasgow City Council

Key findings

- Effective strategic planning is particularly in evidence in the Glasgow City Region, and Clydeplan is particularly important in this respect for *“making connections between people”*.
- The City Deal is the main driver for delivering infrastructure. It is fundamental as the money attached to its projects gives infrastructure providers the confidence that development will actually go ahead.
- Transport planning in Scotland is *“very complicated [and] difficult to explain to an audience of ‘outsiders’”, “there are lots of different strategies [and the] skill is knowing the direction each is going in”*.
- Digital infrastructure provision involves a *“very diverse field”* of players that encompasses providers, tech companies and investment groups.
- Gaining funding for infrastructure through developer agreements (S.75) is a significant challenge in Glasgow due to site remediation costs as a consequence of industrial legacy, and low land values impacting on development viability.
- Glasgow appears effective at making the most out of funding sources through coordinating infrastructure providers to *“bend the spend”* by squeezing the most out of the finance available.
- There was clarity about the role each organization plays in the delivery of infrastructure, and the roles of other ‘external’ delivery bodies, however integration between sectors is still evolving through a data sharing approach being undertaken between councils and infrastructure providers.
- After the City Deal local authorities will compete individually, and also against each other, for scarce resources, as opposed to collectively being able to *“demand”* assistance from providers and other organisations.

Interviewee ‘wants’ for the future

- Key to improving integration across sectors is *“effective dialogue”*, which is facilitated by having a named individual in the infrastructure provider’s organisation (which must be in a key role not just a ‘liaison officer’) so that personal relationships can be built between public and private sector creating a working understanding of each other’s needs and processes.
- To overcome a ‘missing link’ between aspiration in a plan and delivery on the ground, *“if everything’s a priority then nothing’s a priority”*, and greater buy-in to a collective approach to strategic infrastructure which could be provided through the city region’s cabinet model of governance (which is still maturing).
- Where infrastructure needs are set out in high level Government documents there should

be clearly aligned strategic investment provided.

- For transport infrastructure the creation of a single governmental body (either Holyrood or Westminster) rather than having to deal with both.
- That Scottish Government lead on digitally ‘mapping’ out the likely future infrastructure needs of the city and region as an effective way of cooperating virtually between authorities and infrastructure providers, and allowing better understanding of others’ intentions so that works can be coordinated to “*avoid digging the same hole twice*”

Case study background

Glasgow is Scotland’s largest city, with a population of over 615,000 in 2016¹². It is situated on the banks of the river Clyde in western Scotland. Glasgow City Council is Scotland’s largest local authority¹³. The city’s dependence on ship building and related industries had left it particularly vulnerable in the post-industrial era (Jackson, 2019:209 and Evans et al, 2018:74). Transitioning into a modern ‘knowledge city’ can be a “*slow and painful*” process as there is “*often a legacy of persistent poverty, deprivation and physical decay*” (Evans et al, 2018:74).

However, Glasgow’s renaissance since the 1980s is one of the most remarkable and internationally renowned transformations of our age (Myerscough, 2011 in Evans et al, 2018:71). Despite this there remains a significant amount of vacant, contaminated, derelict land within the city (Jackson, 2019:209), which one interviewee considered if not addressed was likely to cause a “*market failure*” in addressing contamination issues with pressure instead being put on “*greenfield sites that don’t pose the same difficulties for developers*” and in turn lead to increased infrastructure costs.

Governance

The City of Glasgow Council was formed in 1996. Glasgow has 85 elected councillors, and had been under Labour control since the 1980s, but following the 2017 local elections the Scottish National Party was able to form a minority administration¹⁴. The city formerly came under the remit of Strathclyde Regional Council¹⁵, which had responsibility for delivering a range of infrastructure, but following its abolition this role is now undertaken centrally by Scottish Government. One interviewee considered this has lessened the City Council’s influence in the wider arena. At regional level, some held the view that there is a long-term commitment to working as a city-region because councils “*see the benefit in a collective approach*” and in “*gaining consensus*”. Having the statutory strategic tier is seen as “*extremely beneficial*” in that it “*helps align agencies’ spending and provides context for prioritization*”.

¹² Data from Key Facts and Figures for Glasgow City: glasgow.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=42024&p=0 [accessed 18/2/19]

¹³ Glasgow City Charter (2018:2) available at: glasgow.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=22384 [accessed 18/2/19]

¹⁴ The political make up of Glasgow in February 2019 is: Scottish National Party 39; Scottish Labour Party 31; Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party 8; Scottish Green Party 7.

¹⁵ Created by the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 and abolished in 1996 by the Local Government etc. (Scotland) Act 1994

Planning framework/structure

Infrastructure provision is a corporate priority in Glasgow City Council. This is linked to the role that planning plays in health, economy, place-making and culture, evidenced implicitly through the thematic sections of the Glasgow City Plan. A range of views were expressed about the role that planning plays in Glasgow City Council, from something of “*fundamental importance*” to an activity that has the potential to “*frustrate*” development through delays in the planning application process. Despite this there is support in the City Council at both officer and at political levels across the authority for example, “*councillors understand how GCC needs to engage with communities and the need for S.75 agreements through planning*”. Infrastructure provision is integral to the Council’s overall delivery programme, for example setting priorities and factoring in practical aspects such as maintenance.

The Development Plan

The Development Plan for Glasgow City, within the Glasgow City Region, has a hierarchical structure sitting alongside other key strategic documents:

- **Scottish National Planning Framework (SNPF)** and **Scottish Planning Policy (SPP)** are non-statutory documents prepared at national level. There is also the **Scottish Infrastructure Investment Plan** (December 2015)¹⁶. Sector specific documents include for example the **National Transport Strategy**¹⁷ (2016) prepared by Transport Scotland.
- **Clydeplan** (adopted in 2017, superseding the *Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Strategic Development Plan* (May 2012)) is a regional plan prepared by the Strategic Development Plan Authority comprised of a Joint Committee of two members from each of the eight local authorities¹⁸. Other documents at a strategic level include: the Glasgow City Region Economic Action Plan (2017); the MGSDP Surface Water Management Masterplan (2016); and the Regional Transport Strategy (2008) and its Delivery Plan 2018/19 - 2020/21, covering 12 councils, prepared by Strathclyde Partnership for Transport (SPT).
- **Glasgow City Plan** (adopted March 2017) is the local development plan (LDP) that sits under Clydeplan, and is consistent with its strategy. The recognition in the plan of Glasgow city centre as being of strategic significance for the wider sub region has been “*fundamental*” to aligning priorities and aspirations for the city’s infrastructure. Contained within the Glasgow City Plan are two levels of spatial guidance: Strategic Development Frameworks and Local Development Frameworks.
- **Strategic Development Frameworks** are set out within the Glasgow City Plan and reflect six priority areas within the city for regeneration¹⁹ with each SDF identifying the resources and actions necessary to progress implementation of the strategy.

¹⁶ gov.scot/policies/government-finance/infrastructure-investment/ [accessed 1/3/19]

¹⁷ National transport Strategy (2016) available at: <https://www.transport.gov.scot/our-approach/strategy/national-transport-strategy> [accessed 1/3/19]

¹⁸ East Dunbartonshire; East Renfrewshire; Glasgow City; Inverclyde; North Lanarkshire; Renfrewshire; South Lanarkshire; West Dunbartonshire

¹⁹ the City Centre, Glasgow North, Greater Easterhouse, Govan/ Partick, Inner East and the River Clyde Development Corridor

- **Local Development Frameworks (LDF)** are at the next level down, “concentrating on action at the local [neighbourhood] level” (GCP, 2017:38). Some of the Frameworks had previously been identified in the City Centre Strategy and Action Plan 2014-2019. “By outlining a shared vision and future development intentions for the wider area, it is anticipated that the Frameworks will provide certainty for investment decisions including the delivery of existing regeneration priority areas.” (GCP, 20127:38).
- **‘Masterplans** inform new development at site-specific level in Glasgow.

The **Scottish National Planning Framework (SNPF3)** was published by the Scottish Government in June 2014 and is seen as “a good thing fundamentally” as it provides some clarity, although the view was expressed that SNPF3 can “both enable and inhibit planning for infrastructure development” as it is non-statutory and whilst it identifies projects “it does not align the funding to deliver them”. There is a caveat that no funding is inferred from inclusion in SNPF3, it provides “no commitments”.

Generally, there is a “clear and close relationship between regional and local documents, this link is less clear with the national transport strategy” however there is currently a “disconnect in terms of timing between national strategy [in SNPF3] and regional infrastructure delivery”. Any disconnect between national and local priorities reflects a “case by case basis... depending upon political expediency”. To be of greater use for infrastructure planning it was considered that the next SPF revision “needs to have a greater spatial element to it at the local/city level due to the great diversity throughout Scotland... I would like to see a more spatial element in SNPF rather than largely sectoral”. Additionally, it was considered that the revisions to SNPF should help to address the timing disconnection between national and local levels and it was hoped that when SNPF4 comes out it may be “moving towards identifying infrastructure priorities”.

Spatial planning and the vision for infrastructure

It was noted by one interviewee that a regional weaknesses with infrastructure provision is that there is “no long term **vision** on where we want to take infrastructure – we don’t have a 20-30 year strategy”. The vision for Glasgow’s infrastructure provision is set out in the City Charter, an informal ‘agreement’ first prepared in May 2018, which notably was after adoption of the City Plan (2017). It identifies a number of infrastructure themes²⁰ against which the City Council will aim to deliver. Glasgow City Council “recognises that infrastructure delivery is fundamental to delivering its objectives”. Despite this one respondent stated that infrastructure requirements are “too short term and reactive”. “Plans should be more visionary in that aspirational aspects should be allowed to be included rather than, for example, Network Rail vetoing aspirations for a new station”.

Regional: Clydeplan

The vision for infrastructure in the Glasgow City region is provided by Clydeplan. It sets out a “delivery and outcomes focus for planning and placemaking” encapsulated in a spatial land use model of a compact city region, highlighted thematically²¹. The plan’s overarching vision (page 8)

²⁰ For example: Invest in education and childcare; improve attainment in all our schools; invest in road and pavement maintenance; promote and improve active travel options across the city; provide more civic space; make the best use of modern digital data and technology.

²¹ Five themes are identified: urban centres; regenerating brownfield land; rebalancing the economy; low carbon infrastructure; and placemaking

identifies the types infrastructure that will be required to deliver its place-making agenda. Specific infrastructure projects are highlighted throughout the plan but the Clydeplan Strategic Development Plan Authority are facilitators rather than deliverers of infrastructure (as they have no budget for such provision). The Strategic Authority therefore incorporated *“lots of consultation with infrastructure delivery providers”* in Clydeplan’s preparation, which is reflected in other reports (for example LGCD, 2015:117)²². Clydeplan sets a *“very strong strategic context for local strategies to come forward”*. But for practical implementation, developers encountering transport issues see Clydeplan as *“too high level”* and look more to the City Plan.

Clydeplan’s management team administer, capture and share data with partners, which is particularly important at start of process to build up trust and confidence. There is a generally held view across those interviewed that strategic level of planning works well in Glasgow City Region with over 70 years’ experience of operating a *“whole city region approach”*. In the words of an officer from an adjacent Council, Glasgow and its neighbouring authorities *“work very well together”*. There is regular cross boundary working at officer level as it is recognised that the economic development that benefits Glasgow will also benefit other local authorities in the region. The *“Regional framework [provided by City Deal and Clydeplan] provides a very helpful way for local authorities to work together”*. But despite this the cabinet model of governance for the city region is still maturing and the view was expressed that there needs to be a *“greater buy-in to a collective approach, for example the Glasgow airport link... which must be frustrating for those that want to invest in the region”*. *“We’re trying to sell the city, connectivity is a very important part of that, and to take 20 years to deliver then something isn’t right”*. There is a missing link between aspiration in a plan and delivery on the ground, *“each part of the plan is doing what it should do but there’s an issue with delivery”*, which was felt to be a result of gaps in a process that has been created centrally.

Performance is reported on quarterly via an ‘Aspire’ document, which is linked to the Action Programme. However, *“there is a huge gap between policy and implementation... but that’s how the system is set up... there is a process failure, we need to deliver things more quickly”*. The 8 councils are currently focused on delivery as the first ‘gateway review’ is looking at spending delivery and there is a push to ensure projects are still viable if they are not as far advanced as initially envisaged.

Local: Glasgow City Plan

The Glasgow City Plan (2017) is a 10 year document based on a *‘place-making principle’* setting out the strategic outcomes for the city and is used to determine planning applications²³ (GCP, 2017:27). Policy CDP1 requires, amongst other things, *“taking the opportunity to deliver an integrated approach to infrastructure delivery”* (GCP, 2017:32). This is supported by a supplementary guidance document (SG1 parts 1 and 2, 2018²⁴) covering matters such as site appraisal and connectivity. Glasgow City Plan was highlighted as being a *“key document”* and *“absolutely central”* for infrastructure planning in the city. That said, views were expressed that site allocations are *“aspirational rather than necessarily deliverable”*. And that plans are *“probably not*

²² Such as: Forestry Commission Scotland, Central Scotland Green Network, Metropolitan Glasgow Strategic Drainage Partnership, Transport Scotland, Strathclyde Partnership for Transport, Scottish Water, SEPA and Scottish Canals.’ (LGCD, 2015:117).

²³ As required under Section 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997

²⁴ Supplementary Guidance available at: glasgow.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=20785 [accessed 18/2/19]

seen externally as being that important to investment decisions as the timing is quite aspirational – in a 10-15 year plan private investors/developers would be thinking ‘is this really likely to ever happen?’”. This is where City Deal has fundamentally changed the picture in terms of increasing the certainty of delivery, and thus engendering much greater interest and ‘enthusiasm’ from utility and infrastructure providers. Early engagement with utility providers at the plan making stage is important for infrastructure if they are going to have influence over a scheme as it is “*where the ideas are put into place*”.

A particular focus emerged from the interviews around the two sectors of Transport and Flood/Drainage:

Transport planning in Scotland is “*very complicated [and] difficult to explain to an audience of ‘outsiders’*”, “*there are lots of different strategies [the] skill is knowing the direction each is going in*”. The **Connectivity Commission** is an independent body of people established and administered by GCC that is tasked to look at transport in the city and carbon emissions and the City Deal programme ‘City Centre Avenues’ is a catalyst to help wider complementary outcomes. It was suggested that for transport issues local authorities need to think more strategically “*outside of their parochial interests*” beyond their administrative boundaries, ask themselves ‘*what is best for the region?*’.

For **flooding/drainage** issues Clydeplan and Glasgow City Plan are “*leading*” development in that their policies pursue an infrastructure first approach, but there is a challenge in translating the objectives into action on the ground and there’s “*a lack of long term vision (for example to 2060)*”. A “*...weakness of all strategies is that they take a view that business as usual will continue into the future, which it won’t for drainage issues*”. The “*...challenge in infrastructure planning is to undertake long term strategic thinking rather than getting bogged down in day-to-day issues and delivery of ongoing projects*”. Infrastructure needs to be looked at long term as its provision “*is a key constraint to development*”. It was considered to be a challenge to agree priorities across the eight councils and funding is too short sighted; power/control from central government resonates strongly; “*strategic area clarity*” is needed over a longer period of time, with longer term commitment over a defined spatial area to secure best outcomes.

From planning policy to decision making

Key infrastructure challenges

During the interviews a variety of issues were raised as being challenges (or barriers) to infrastructure provision in Glasgow. Viability of vacant derelict/contaminated land, flood risk/drainage, and funding were the ones most often mentioned.

- **Viability** - ‘*land values currently are not able to support the cost of infrastructure delivery... across large areas of the city region*’ requiring ‘*public intervention at the national, city region and local levels*’ (LGCD, 2015:114). Interviewees confirmed the very limited range of s.75 planning obligations required by the City Council through City Plan Policy CDP12²⁵. “*Land*

²⁵ Policy CDP12 in the Glasgow City Plan, along with the supplementary guidance in SG12, sets out the approach that the City Council takes in seeking contributions from developers towards infrastructure. The policy’s explanatory text (on GCP page 118) recognises that market conditions will impact on development viability and that accordingly only those specific aspects of infrastructure required to make the scheme function, and which will mitigate the most significant impacts on the City’s infrastructure, will be sought.

remediation is biggest issue as developers won't look at a site without it".

- **Flood risk / drainage** - maintenance of existing infrastructure and upgrade where necessary, for example *"the council wants to do X, Y, Z but they can't until a water pipe has been put into the site for drainage/sewerage, and you're relying on external third parties that are their own commercial entities to help you out and bring forward investment – it still happens but it's getting better"*.
- **Funding** and aligning strategic investment with infrastructure delivery - *"If we're really going to be serious about a joined-up approach, the alignment of budgets within governments and other agencies should really be supporting the documents which are statutorily signed off by ministers... currently there's a disconnect"*. Also, *"is the priority to maintain or build new infrastructure?"*. It was considered important to look after the existing infrastructure before building new 'ribbon cutting' 'headline' schemes. Perceived underfunding of public transport infrastructure for many years was raised as an issue where those running each element *"perceive any change as a challenge and thus detrimental"* and have therefore become very *"protective"* of their particular component. This view was reflected by another interviewee who stated that *"the private sector approach is to modernise and maintain the existing infrastructure rather than build new things, they think about how to keep things going as they are"*.

Other challenging issues raised by interviewees include: difficulties in prioritizing schemes for regional benefit rather than for local interest; the way in which schemes are aligned to political objectives; getting agreement on transport priorities such as routing of rail terminus; road capacity not helped by deregulated bus provision; industrial heritage; utility capacity constraints; provision of utilities (water gas drainage) on site; housing growth requiring schools; air quality; and education provision.

Glasgow City Region City Deal

The Glasgow City Region City Deal was announced in 2014 and was the first City Deal in Scotland. The 20 year £1.13 billion infrastructure investment deal between the UK and Scottish Governments and the eight local authorities in the city region is predicated *"on the basis of partners working together to achieve significant economic growth and development"* (City Deal background paper²⁶). This funding will be used to: enhance transport infrastructure; unlock new sites for housing and employment; and improve public transport over the next 10-20 years²⁷. Glasgow's City Deal comprises 21 infrastructure projects, including: an improved transport network across Glasgow and the Clyde Valley; key development and regeneration sites, unlocking new sites for housing and development; and improved public transport²⁸. Those projects located in Glasgow are embedded in the City Plan. A significant amount of the City Council's funding for infrastructure comes through this programme.

The City Deal Programme is administered and coordinated by an independent Programme Management Office, which: oversees the activities of working groups; liaises with stakeholders;

²⁶ Background to Glasgow City Region city deal is available at:

glasgowcityregion.co.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21669&p=0 [accessed 18/2/19]

²⁷ City Deal FAQs available at: glasgowcityregion.co.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=16878&p=0 [accessed 18/2/19]

²⁸ City Deal FAQs

and analyses and reports to government on the impact of project delivery. The ultimate decision-making body, the Glasgow City Region Cabinet, is made up of the Leaders of the eight member authorities, with meetings held every eight weeks and papers available to the public²⁹. An ‘assurance framework’ is used to meet the requirements set by UK and Scottish Governments (£500m each). A Chief Executives Group supports the Cabinet. Eight thematic subgroups operate to support the Cabinet and Chief Executives Group, one of which comprises the **Assets and Infrastructure portfolio**, which seeks to drive economic strategy goals (Chaired by East Renfrewshire’s Chief Executive). Within this portfolio is a pilot group³⁰ exploring how to align city region project investment with infrastructure utility providers to maximise benefits through coordinated action.

Action Programmes

Action Programmes (AP), prepared by the Local Planning Authority, set out how each of their local development plan’s policies and proposals are to be implemented, by whom and when, and in doing so comprise a “*corporate expression of infrastructure*”. Action Programmes are prepared by the planning policy team at the end of the plan-making process and are seen as a “*mechanism for talking to people*”, “*the interface, outlining the links between parties*”.

The general view was that Action Programmes are useful internally within local authorities for monitoring performance on particular projects. There were though differing opinions as to how useful external agencies (developers/investors) would find them. It was suggested that they can help to raise external parties’ awareness about the authority’s planning priorities, which could be useful for their investment programming and to identify opportunities and constraints with regards infrastructure needs for particular projects “*translating policy into action*”, particularly those in the Regional Transport Strategy³¹. But others however felt that they are “*good for talking, but have no weight*”, they “*cannot make people deliver infrastructure*” so although they are “*the right thing to do, they don’t bring money to the table*”. It was felt that the City Council could be more proactive about raising the profile of Action Programmes through use of GIS mapping (see discussion in later section).

Key players: roles and responsibilities

The issue of ‘Agency fragmentation’ (LGCD, 2015:123) has been highlighted in a previous report:

‘A single infrastructure type may have a physical provider, service provider(s), regulator and funder(s), operating through a dynamic hierarchy of development plans in the context of changing economic and infrastructure strategies, under the aegis of a range of national bodies with statutory responsibility for matters environmental, historic and so on. For a development project of any scale, it is relatively easy to identify many dozens of agents, each with legitimate and defined roles and responsibilities. Community and political interests create

²⁹ City Deal website, available at: glasgowcityregion.co.uk/article/7621/How-will-the-City-Deal-work [accessed 18/2/19]

³⁰ Pilot group includes: 8xLAs; SEPA, telecoms providers, Scottish Water, SGN (gas), SPR (power).

³¹ It was thought that Action Programmes are useful as part of the discussions held with utility providers through RAUC(S) meetings, where roads and utilities companies come together with the council to talk about their investment programme priorities. At a regional level this is also achieved through the Assets and Infrastructure group, which involves mapping areas where projects are happening cross referenced with utility companies’ investment plans to seek closer alignment.

another suite of agents with legitimate and formalised roles in deciding what (and whether) development happens.'

Despite this those interviewed were clear about the role their organization plays in the delivery of infrastructure, and the roles of other 'external' delivery bodies. Indeed, the working relationships between the various bodies were positively described, particularly with regards delivering City Deal projects.

Engagement with infrastructure providers

There are inevitably lots of agencies involved in infrastructure decision-making and delivery. The *"City Council has relatively little power... to actually deliver projects"*, so the formal statutory planning process provides a key mechanism for engaging with infrastructure providers, for example through preparation of the Main Issues Report stage. It was noted though that *"external providers are not great at engaging initially, especially with strategic planning processes"*. One planner that was interviewed noted that it was sometimes *"difficult to understand who all of the parties are as they don't map across geographically"*. Digital infrastructure provision for example involves a *"very diverse field"* of players that encompasses providers, tech companies and investment groups.

The role of the Clydeplan team is one of *"making connections between people"* and *"having a conversation with organisations"*, the view was that *"this coordination role is done well"*. The team have sought to *"take the plan from the bookshelf and try and make it actually happen on the ground"* by proactively engaging with energy and telecommunications providers in particular. This was a two year process to get the right person involved and have the conversation with them. It was highlighted that having a named individual makes for more *"effective dialogue"* and is the *"key to effective delivery... it's a 'win win' situation they have our key contact person name and we have theirs"*.

A number of detailed observations were made by interviewees about the various infrastructure sectors:

Glasgow's urban **transport** system is mostly managed by Strathclyde Partnership for Transport (SPT)³². The Scottish Government formed SPT in 2006 as part of the country's transport framework, which includes Transport Scotland and seven Regional Transport Partnerships. *'SPT's role involves planning and delivering transport solutions for all modes of transport across the region, in conjunction with our member councils and industry partners. SPT is at the centre of the region's transport planning; analysing all travel needs and developing the transport system for now and the future'*.³³ Funding for projects comes from central government's capital investment programme. There is a *"close working relationship"* between roads maintenance/development and SPT at the regional level.

Beyond SPT there are many stakeholders interested in transport infrastructure provision, all have their own priorities and some integrate better than others. At regional level the cross-boundary

³² The political governance of SPT is undertaken by a decision-making Board comprising 20 elected members (there is larger number from Glasgow City) and appointed members (people apply for positions based on their particular expertise). It is supported by a team of technical officers. If a decision needs to be made by the Board and a vote is required, then only the councilors vote. Additionally, there are various thematic committees that report to the board.

³³ SPT website, available at: spt.co.uk/corporate/about/history-background [accessed 28/2/19]

partnership working between organisations varies, with difficulties caused by conflicting ambitions and objectives between organisations. An example raised by one interviewee concerned civil servants seeking to implement locally the objectives that their political masters have decided nationally, the Airport link road, which has been on/off for many years was mentioned in this context. Having a *“common goal”* was considered to be helpful in such circumstances.

Cooperative working is in evidence at regional level where organisations get together to share best practice: City Deal transport group working; Heads of Planning group; and other working groups. SPT have a very close working relationship with Clydeplan to the extent that the two organisations prepared a joint Statement of Commitment that both bodies took to their respective Boards for approval. SPT also work closely with Clyde Gateway Urban Regeneration Company and with district planning authorities to ensure that transport concerns are reflected in local development plans. However, there are difficulties in joining up organisations and their functions across national regional and local levels, for example lack of control over how public transport is provided as a consequence of bus de-regularisation. One interviewee felt that national transport infrastructure providers could be more involved in discussions, possibly through regular attendance at the Infrastructure and Assets ‘pilot’ group. *“Creating relationships”* is the key to effective working, seconded by another interviewee who stated, *“relationships between people and having named people in organisations is critical to getting things done, which is the same in any facet of life”*.

There were differing views as to the effectiveness of the relationship with Network Rail, ranging from *“it’s good that parties are talking to each other”* to believing that engagement has been *“quite tokenistic”* in that representatives attend events/workshops but don’t really contribute effectively with land use planning as they have their own priorities and timescales. Another respondent felt that it is *“challenging”* to deliver through Network Rail to a set timetable and at a reasonable price (the interviewee believed this to be primarily as a result of the link through Westminster not being devolved to Scotland). One possible solution put forward would be creation of a single body, or at least having only one Government (either Holyrood or Westminster, but not both) to deal with.

It was also considered that the governance process for large scale transport infrastructure projects were not being led by a single voice, and it was remarked that there’s no methodology for prioritisation so it is difficult for investment bodies *“if everything’s a priority then nothing’s a priority”*. *“It requires a different mindset from where we are at the moment”*. *“Funding is a huge aspect”* of delivering major transport infrastructure, and this needs to part of a long term vision, rather than just looking at the short term (2-3 years) budgets, which are *“reactive”*, for example *“off the shelf City Deal projects that have been hanging around”* rather than looking 20-30 years into the future – *“that mentality has to change if we’re being serious”*. There is still a *“centralization view resonating strongly around the region”* that central government is dictating what should happen. *“There is no obvious way of prioritising schemes”* it still comes down to an issue of *“trust”* between central and local government and also between agencies and delivery partners as to a *“shared long term vision”*. The cabinet model is still in its relative infancy at the moment but as it matures it could allow championing and leading of the process whereby each player buys into a collective view as to priorities for the way forward. An example given of this difficulty is the Glasgow Rail Link project and the current lack of clarity on moving forwards. *“You can put a scheme in a plan, but that’s aspirational, it doesn’t mean it’s going to be delivered, there’s a huge delivery gap”*. It was stated that land use plans are just one aspect of the process, and that it requires clearer *“marketing”* and *“articulation”* as to what Glasgow will be delivering in terms of infrastructure over the next 20 years to attract investment into the city.

Utility providers

As part of the infrastructure planning process a number of interviewees stated that individual face-to-face meetings are held between council officers and utility providers. *“Infrastructure provision is totally reliant on utility providers, which is frustrating if you’ve got all of your ducks lined up but it’s reliant on delivery of a water pipe and the utility provider say they can’t deliver that for another six months, even though you’ve engaged with the utility provider all the way down the line – it may be that we’ve been speaking with the planning team and it is actually the investment team that make the final decision, so need to make sure we talk to the right person in the utility company”*. Scottish Water for example is really large and complicated structural organization, *“it’s about having a named person and building up a relationship with that person”*.

An interviewee remarked that *“it is not always easy to get government QUANGOs to engage fully in the infrastructure planning processes – they need to talk to people more about what they want to see and the funding they have available to make that happen – it is difficult getting hold of the right person, or knowing even who that person is – a named individual is needed”*.

Some utility providers have been *“very enthusiastic about attending the Assets and Infrastructure pilot group, which has led to a better understanding of who does what and who the key people to engage with are”*. Having named individuals makes a huge difference for the LAs in knowing who to contact in the infrastructure providers’ organisations. Timing is also important and the Assets and Infrastructure group facilitates discussions about specific utility requirements and challenges before development gets too far down the line.

Drainage and flooding

The Metropolitan Glasgow Strategic Drainage Partnership³⁴ (MGSDP) prepare a local flood risk management plan that helps set the context for strategies that are taken forward at a local site level. Added to this a *“wider group of stakeholders”* (such as the Glasgow and Clyde Valley Green Partnership) was brought in as part of a Surface Water Strategy Working Group for 12-18 months. Furthermore, a full time post was created to regularly go around the partners that sit *“on the policy edge of flood risk management to find out what they’re doing and to update them on projects of interest/overlap”*. MGSDP’s success is illustrated by jointly funded projects between Scottish Water and local authorities coming forward. For flood risk management across boundaries there is *“ongoing dialogue”* with district groups including the Clyde and Lock Lomond Senior Officers Group, which meets twice a year, the MGSDP Board meets quarterly, with steering groups meeting eight times a year. There is currently a discussion at national level about bringing together different organisations’ functions into a single body responsible for all drainage.

Energy

During Clydeplan preparation energy and telecommunications providers (examples included SGN, Scottish Power, Virgin Media, OpenReach, Scottish Water) were sought to be engaged but an interviewee noted that it was difficult to find the right person to speak to. However, now a list of key

³⁴ The Flood Risk Management (Scotland) Act 2009 provides powers for the Council to manage surface water flooding in the region through preparation of a local flood risk management plan. MGSDP is a formal partnership project established between Glasgow City Council, Scottish Water, Scottish Enterprise and SEPA; incorporating the Scottish Government, Clydeplan, Scottish Canals, Clyde Gateway Urban Regeneration Company and other Local Authorities to address long-term investment in water and drainage infrastructure across the city region core. It is included in National Planning Framework 3 by the Scottish Government as a National Development.

contacts has been created this has helped to facilitate dialogue – *“it’s been very successful”* and has *“built up credibility”*. In holding such discussions there was an identified need for providers to think strategically rather than locally. Similarly, energy providers and bus companies have been talking to SPT about the opportunities for linking up electric buses to a charging network.

Digital infrastructure

The City Council doesn’t deliver digital infrastructure so is reliant on third parties, the Council’s role is to *“enable maximum proliferation”*. So far there have been *“very positive responses”* from providers, although the engagement is currently undertaken as part of an *“informal learning process”*. The relationship between the eight councils themselves is *“evolving”*, with the next step being to prepare a Digital Connectivity Strategy setting out the region’s approach, which should be published by mid-2019.

Data sharing

Masterplans are used at site level in Glasgow to inform new development, which is helpful *“in getting the interface between utilities and developers”*, but the interviews revealed a mixed picture with regards sharing of data (information) between parties.

The picture is one of slowly evolving processes across the region; the Clydelan team are *“keen”* to share their regional data with other parties, and are beginning to receive reciprocal data in return; in some specific sectors there are formal data sharing agreements in place, for example hydraulic modelling; in others data sharing is currently undertaken voluntarily on a *“trust basis”* as it is in their interests to do so (public and private). The main exception is where commercially sensitive information is involved such as with the telecommunication network providers and bus transport, but *“we are seeking to make this more visible through dialogue”*.

Moving forward it was considered a good idea to share **mapping** (spatially and temporally) of City Deal projects between utility providers and the City Council, so that all parties can see where and when, and to what extent works will be taking place that could allow for joint infrastructure delivery to take place. This view was echoed by another interviewee who noted that whilst the housing team currently phone up utility providers to find out information, a digital based mapping system would be very helpful. There is an aspiration, through preparation work on the Glasgow City Plan, to try to share digital infrastructure data with telecom providers to achieve *“digital masterplanning”* so that utility providers don’t need to dig up public realm shortly after its been laid. There was a view expressed however that there has been *“too much time spent by public sector agencies discussing the legal minutiae of the data sharing agreements”*.

Resources for infrastructure planning

Interviewees painted a picture of using a *“cocktail of funding”* including money from: City Deal; European Structural Funds; Scottish government (including Vacant and Derelict Land Fund³⁵);

³⁵ The Vacant and Derelict Land Fund (VDLF) aims to tackle long-term vacant and derelict land in Scotland. Its objectives are: to stimulate economic growth; create jobs; promote environmental justice and improved quality of life; and to support communities to flourish and tackle inequalities. It is an element of the local government budget settlement, as agreed with Scottish Government. It focuses on projects that promote innovation in both temporary and longer term greening techniques for vacant and derelict land sites.

Active Travel Funding³⁶; Scottish National Heritage; Sustrans; S.75; GCC's capital programme, all of which work *"in partnership with City Deal"* and alongside infrastructure utility providers. It was stated by a couple of respondents that GCC's capital programme is *"absolutely critical"*. There are clearly lots of potential sources of funding but these are not necessarily very easy to access, one interviewee remarked that *"it's a jigsaw pulling them all together"*.

City Deal funding

It was very apparent from the interviews that City Deal funding is the most important funding option currently. It has been *"a game changer"* in terms of having specific dedicated money to spend to deliver economic growth and jobs. City Deal is *"enabling development to come forward"* by making schemes more attractive to developers. City Deal works in tandem with other investments and looks at long term outcomes. City Deal money has also provided *"an opportunity to look again at the city and how transport can be improved"*. Aligning external parties' investment frameworks with the authority's objectives has been *"one of the main benefits of City Deal"* – the Infrastructure and Assets group is working towards *"aligning strategic investment planning is an absolutely key and critical part to achieving infrastructure delivery on the ground"*. The next stage for the working group is to move into council by council infrastructure planning and mapping along with the utility provider companies. This steps up a level from site-specific City Deal projects to the city/district level (for example schools/housing), mapping out where that will be for each local authority level. Utility companies would then add their data to highlight where future issues might occur. East Renfrewshire is being 'piloted' first, with the remaining councils being completed over an 18 months period.

The view was that there is a lack of national funding for investing in the infrastructure projects that are being identified. The individual projects need to be prioritised, but it was noted that this is an inherently political activity, which can lead to tensions, *"but what differentiates a vanity project from one that makes a difference?"*. *"There is no obvious method for prioritisation of infrastructure"* but allied to this is a 'trust' issue between national and local levels, both politically and between officers/civil servants. Interviewees therefore spoke of Glasgow being 'smarter' with the way infrastructure funding is utilised:

"There is only a finite resource available so we need to make the best use of it that we can".

"City Deal projects were agreed before the current governance structure was put in place so they haven't had to make a 'big decision' yet, the real test will come if there's a City Deal Two".

"There are finite budgets in local government, and competing issues, and infrastructure is therefore not always seen as a priority".

"It is important to consider how all of the investment in projects relates to each to maximize your 'bang for buck'".

"The Scottish Government should take the lead on creating a digital mapping system to influence utilities' planning to 'bend the spend' to where it's needed".

³⁶ An interviewee noted that match funding is required for Active Travel Funding, which can be tricky, although S.75 monies have been used in the past, although only larger schemes could realistically contribute.

There is “*uncertainty*” about what happens after City Deal comes to an end. Post City Deal local authorities will be competing with each other for scarce resources and they will also be competing individually, as oppose to collectively “*demanding*” that QUANGOs engage/help in projects. However, it is acknowledged that this funding came about at a point in time due to particular circumstances such as the independence referendum. To address strategic issues there needs to be greater “*political recognition that infrastructure provision requires long term vision/funding*”.

Section 75 Planning Agreements

Glasgow City Plan policy CDP12 ‘delivering development’ makes it clear that, within the limits set by the five ‘tests’ for entering into planning obligations³⁷ with developers, that they will consider “*the impact of current market conditions on development viability*” (GCP, 2017:118). This approach recognizes the difficulty that low land values combined with high remediation costs potentially put on the viability of developments. Furthermore, the aim of Policy CDP 12 is to ensure that only “*reasonable*” amounts of infrastructure and facilities are provided as necessary to mitigate the impact of change on Glasgow’s resources (GCP, 2017:118).

Whilst East Renfrewshire have a dedicated S.75 officer that just works on negotiating planning agreements with developers for infrastructure contributions, it was thought that gaining funding through S.75 obligations in Glasgow is a “*red herring*” as there is very little potential to generate funding for infrastructure. S.75 is not used that often as “*we don’t want to put barriers in the way of development and put developers off*”. “*We don’t want to make development unviable*”. But it was noted that S.75 is very important at linking together with infrastructure delivered through City Deal funding, but it can’t cover everything needed for example S.75 obligations are not sought for drainage. With regards transport schemes, S.75 obligations can operate as a “*natural prioritization tool*” in that where developers are coming forward with money that’s where schemes are getting delivered. However, for addressing transport issues the use of planning conditions are preferable as s.75 monies effectively puts the burden back on the Council to deliver the infrastructure.

One interviewee believed Glasgow to be “*ahead of the game*” in that they’re not reliant on S.75 (planning obligations) for delivering transport schemes or affordable housing as “*the land values won’t support the costs*”. It was considered that it is important to understand developers’ cash flow and profit requirements, and that officers in the transport team in particular understand these issues and negotiate accordingly using flexibility to overcome barriers. In East Renfrewshire, an adjacent authority, they ask for a viability assessment to be provided that is checked by surveyors/District Valuer for accuracy.

The notion of ‘**certainty**’ in bringing forward development schemes was explored with interviewees. In response a number mentioned Brexit uncertainties. Additionally, it was considered that “*certainty could be improved in the process by more clearly articulating the future vision to external investors*” which could be achieved through improved marketing of the vision. Another thought that “*we need to plan long term for infrastructure as external investors need that certainty for them to invest, but there isn’t a systematic long term investment programme for infrastructure in Glasgow*”. The assurance of City Deal money being available was identified as the biggest driver of certainty for infrastructure providers and is “*critical in delivering infrastructure across the city region*”.

³⁷ In Scotland planning obligations can be made under section 75 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended) as guided by Circular 3/2012.

Other funding

Surface water drainage is largely funded by bidding for money through the Council's capital programmes budget. It was stated that Scottish Water's Investment Programme is aligned with local 'capacity' requirements, but not in terms of the approach to meeting it, for example Scottish Water want hard engineering solutions whereas the City Council prefer use of green/blue infrastructure, such as the Llanelli *Rainscape* approach.

EU funding used to be used to lever in additional funding from other sources to undertake transport projects but this is now uncertain due to Brexit. The Government's investment plan is set out in the Strategic Transport Projects Review over twenty years, *"but this is for big stuff"*. There are also a range of opportunities for funding outside of City Deal and Central Government, and there is an ongoing work stream to explore these. The current revision of the Regional Transport Strategy will seek to ensure that there is a strong representation from the Glasgow region into the review document: balancing investing for economic or for social equity reasons. It was also noted that *"infrastructure money came along when the Commonwealth Games was being hosted, but it shouldn't be just dependent on a particular sporting event occurring to get infrastructure funding"*.

Organisational capacity

The organizational capacity to plan appropriately for infrastructure was generally considered to be inadequate in the organisations interviewed, with one regionally operating interviewee believing that the resources available were *"definitely not fit for purpose"*. Whilst Glasgow City Council's size was mentioned by a number of interviewees as being a helpful in terms of having access to staff / skills resource it was noted that previously large numbers of people in the Strathclyde Regional Authority were employed *"doing what two people now have to do"*, *"it's hard to look at large scale projects without the resource available to do so"*. At the Clydeplan level infrastructure planning is *"insufficiently resourced... it would help immensely if it was"*. It was noted that as well as having people with infrastructure planning skills there is also need for procurement, legal, finance etc. to support provision. Where necessary consultancy support is used to fill skills gaps on a project-by-project basis.

Authority/legal powers

The alignment of transport powers was seen as being very important, *"there are sufficient powers with the funding at present, but we need more funding to do things and that in turn could need more powers"*. For passenger transport the view was that *"SPT would benefit from greater powers to deliver strategic infrastructure interventions"*. Transport for London was given as an enviable example in being able to deliver large-scale projects with a big impact. An interviewee considered that if councils had to build things themselves they may need additional powers and possibly the creation of a new body 'Transport for Glasgow' (similar to Manchester) which might help to drive projects forward, but the interviewee noted that this may not be popular with other areas as it would effectively increase Glasgow's influence.

What would help?

One interviewee noted that a weaknesses with infrastructure provision in the region is that *"we don't have a 20-30 year strategy - it's too reactive with too short budget cycle - a very slow progress"*. There was a belief that it would help to have a vision for infrastructure set out nationally, but informed by local conversations. A strategic level document requires political buy-in, but there

is “no track record of delivering projects to time or budget”. In the past there has been a “lack of leadership at all levels” but this is “maybe now becoming stronger”. When looking to broaden and strengthen the strategic role, which it was considered to be a good thing, it was believed that it would be a good idea in future if strategic development plan were to be ‘approved’ locally (by Leaders, CEO, etc.) rather than a central government minister, as they may take it more seriously.

Another interviewee stated they would more closely link together local knowledge (in terms of what needs to be done) with the investment money provided by Scottish Government. It was noted that whilst City Deal does this to an extent, a greater degree of alignment based on an understanding of what is influencing each party was required. This could, for example, see all parties signing up to deliver to the same timescale and complete by a particular date, and then work together to deliver by that date. To facilitate this, it was considered that the players need to “get talking with each other”, telling utilities when works are going ahead to dig up a road and that “this is your chance, you’re not getting another chance for 2 years ...!” ...but such coordination has a way to go”. “We need to be up front about who has to deliver specific projects and by what time, with more proactive central government coordination of parties required to make timescales achievable”. Linked to this, another interviewee considered that the city growth agenda and awareness of the issues would benefit from “online mapping” to make the projects and issues more tangible.

Good practice examples

Three projects/initiatives were identified as exhibiting good practice joined-up partnership working to deliver infrastructure that merit sharing with other local authorities: The Metropolitan Glasgow Strategic Drainage Partnership and Smart Canal project; the Robroyston and Dalmarnock rail stations; and Infrastructure Summits and ‘Barrier Busting’.

There are serious surface water drainage issues in the Glasgow region. The **Metropolitan Glasgow Strategic Drainage Partnership**³⁸ (see mgmdp.org) was identified by a number of interviewees as an example of best practice with regards partnership working between public/private organisations. The MGSDP was founded in 2002 by Glasgow City Council, Scottish Water and SEPA, and it has now increased its membership³⁹. It is a non-statutory, voluntary, partnership between public bodies involved in managing surface water, water quality, flood risk, investment planning and economic development in a regulatory, service provision, asset management and / or infrastructure provision capacity⁴⁰. The MGSDP came together through the *Smart Canal* project using £85m from City Deal plus money from other national and local funders. The partnership has lots of stakeholders involved but is underpinned by very clear governance regime. By addressing drainage issues it “unlocks” land that can be redeveloped for up to 3,000 houses and also links to green/blue infrastructure and health benefits.

³⁸ Glasgow Canal Regeneration Partnership Project won the Overall Award at the Scottish Awards for Quality in Planning 2018, one of the Government's most prestigious awards, using a multi-agency partnership team. See: gov.scot/publications/scottish-awards-for-quality-in-planning-2018

³⁹ The partnership now includes: Glasgow City Council; Scottish Water; SEPA; Clyde Gateway; Scottish Canals; The Scottish Government; Clydeplan; Scottish Enterprise; South Lanarkshire Council; North Lanarkshire Council; East Dunbartonshire Council; Renfrewshire Council. The MGSDP also works with a range of key stakeholder organisations, including; other local authorities; Central Scotland Green Network; Climate Ready Clyde; Forestry Commission Scotland; Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Green Network; Network Rail; Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH); Transport Scotland. Source: mgmdp.org/index.aspx?articleid=21077 [accessed 13/3/19]

⁴⁰ Surface Water Management Masterplan Sept 2016 available at: mgmdp.org/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=38023&p=0

Robroyston Rail Station⁴¹ was identified as a good practice example of “*facilitating and coordinating*” multiple agencies working well together across private and public sectors. It was noted that “*Scotrail were very helpful, Network Rail less so*”. It also exemplifies forward funding infrastructure ahead of other development. And is a “*natural regional level project*”. Another rail related good practice example is Dalmarnock Rail Station, which was linked to the Commonwealth Games Athletes’ Village, whereby various agencies⁴² willingly came together to participate on the scheme “*joint priorities were collectively identified*”. The result was increased public confidence in the area, improved rail services and train stopping with resultant increased patronage such that it is “*used as a selling point for [attracting businesses into] the area*”.

An annual ‘**Infrastructure Summit**’ for engaging with infrastructure providers demonstrates effective practice. High level representatives from the utility providers have been very enthusiastic to be involved and as a consequence joint agreements are being created, and they are currently talking about sharing data through infrastructure mapping to align investment priorities between City Deal and utility providers. To improve infrastructure provision the “*key is aligning infrastructure investment*” for which a digital solution is seen as being the answer. The Assets and Infrastructure portfolio aims to achieve a ‘digital mapping solution’ through facilitating the sharing of information. Whilst the collaboration could be done at city region level, it was suggested that really this should be a Scottish Government initiative. It was noted that a cross boundary group is investigating mapping future road maintenance works using the Scottish Road Works Register⁴³ as the platform to provide information on what works are going to be carried out where and when. Opportunities to expand this to include planning information relating to future housing allocations in plans etc. is currently being explored. Similarly, a “**Barrier Busting**” project is live in Glasgow to support digital infrastructure in the city. This involves partnering up with external providers – mobile network operators, technology providers, investment companies. The rationale is that it costs a lot of money to dig holes to lay cabling/ducting so the Council try to reduce this post development by getting ducting put in through planning conditions.

⁴¹ SPT website news available at: spt.co.uk/corporate/2018/11/new-robroyston-station-construction-underway/ [accessed 28/2/19]

⁴² Clyde Gateway URC, Glasgow City Council, ScotRail/Network Rail, STP

⁴³ Scottish Road Works Register: roadworks.scot/performance/scottish-road-works-register-srwr. The SRWR is a national computerised database system for the electronic transfer, retention and management of road works data utilising internet access and is one of the few completely national systems anywhere in the world.

5. Interview topic guide

Case study	Interviewees
Context (vision / strategy)	<p>What are the core strategic goals of the authority and are these informed by a vision of 'place'?</p> <p>How important is integrated infrastructure provision (IIP) to achieving the strategic goals of the authority (are there clear aims and objectives)?</p> <p>How important is spatial planning to achieving the strategic goals of the authority (does planning inform public / private investment decisions)?</p> <p>What are the main infrastructure challenges and deficits in X (how are these assessed / identified)?</p>
Process	<p>How are the strategic infrastructure goals of the authority set out (which strategies, are they perceived as clear / relevant by external partners)?</p> <p>What is the relationship between strategic IIP objectives and investment frameworks (how are priorities identified, is funding certainty possible, a 'wish list')?</p> <p>What is the role of Infrastructure Delivery Plans (how are they produced, consultation with whom)?</p> <p>What is (or should be) the balance between planning policy and development management (where does policy stop and delivery start)?</p>
The IIP toolkit 1: networking and partnership	<p>How does authority engage with infrastructure providers (all sectors), landowners, and other private interests?</p> <p>Does central government policy framework enable or inhibit IIP (role of Next Steps agencies, NDPBs)?</p> <p>How is the relationship between strategic and local planning managed? (where is – and should be – the centre of gravity, working across boundaries, Duty to Cooperate)?</p>
The IIP toolkit 2: legal powers	<p>How does the status of the authority (e.g. combined authority, county council) and the statutory powers that this confers enable / inhibit effective IIP?</p>
The IIP toolkit 3: finance	<p>What are the key sources of infrastructure funding (and are these unevenly distributed by sector / locality, what are the gaps)?</p> <p>What is the role of spatial planning and development capture in addressing funding gaps? (and how are opportunities identified, S106 and CIL managed)?</p>
The IIP toolkit 4: capacity	<p>How is infrastructure planning organised and resourced in the authority? (does the authority have the required skills / knowledge base for IIP, e.g. funding, deficit assessments)?</p>
Concluding questions	<p>In summary, what are the most important IIP challenges?</p> <p>What additional powers / resources / tools would help? (ideally / practically)?</p>



RTPI

Royal Town Planning Institute

For more information about this research visit:

rtpi.org.uk/integratedinfrastructure

RTPI - Royal Town Planning Institute

research@rtpi.org.uk

Tel: 020 7929 9494

Report contact

James Harris

Royal Town Planning Institute,
41 Botolph Lane, London EC3R 8DL.

Registered Charity in England (262865) & Scotland (SC037841)