Comment

Consultee	Mr Michael Henley (1142088)
Email Address	
Address	

Event Name	LPP2 Publicity Period Oct - Nov 2017
Comment by	Mr Michael Henley
Comment ID	6
Response Date	12/11/17 18:11
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Q1 To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate? Please state the paragraph or policy or policies map. 2.82

Q2 Do you consider the Local Plan is Legally Compliant? No

Q3 Do you consider the Local Plan is Sound? No

Q4 Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the Duty to Cooperate? No

Q5 Please provide details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to cooperate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

> I feel that the local plan is unsound as it fails to consider any alternative for the siting of the park and ride at lodge hill or for additional access routes to it.

Q6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the matter you have identified at 5 above. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to cooperate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful

if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Other sites for the park and ride should be considered such as adjacent to the A34 Marcham road interchange.

Other routes to the proposed lodge hill park and ride, eg running along side the A34 from the Wotton road and not cutting swathes through the green belt should be considered.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

Q6 If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?	No - I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
Would you like to hear from us in the future?	. I would like to be kept informed about the progress of the Local Plan

INTRODUCTION

Understanding localism

Mark Evans[a]*, David Marsh[a] and Gerry Stoker[b]

[a]*ANZSOG Institute for Governance, University of Canberra, Bruce, Australia;* [b]*Centre for Citizenship, Globalisation and Governance, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK*

These two special issues of *Policy Studies* investigate various aspects of localism and draw insights from a broad range of different academic disciplines; which illustrates how ubiquitous the issue has become, both in the academy and in political discourse, particularly in the UK and increasingly in Australia. In this introduction, we begin by outlining three different types of localism – managerial, representative and community – which have underpinned both debates in the area and policy developments, before outlining our definition of the term. Subsequently, we introduce the theoretical and empirical contributions that this issue makes to understanding localism in Westminster-style democracies.

The localist turn

Localism has become a much-used word in political discourse. Of course, it is hardly a new idea, given that, historically, many, if not most, social and political institutions were 'local', as opposed to regional, national or global. Indeed, it was only with the advent of the industrial revolution and imperialism in the nineteenth century that there was a distinct refocusing of scale away from the local. Obviously, the local remained a crucial spatial dimension, particularly in some fields and in some countries, but initially the 'national', and subsequently the 'global', dimensions came to dominate economic, social and political organisation.

Of course, localism is a contested term. In particular, it is evident that there are different types or strategies of localism. Here, we adopt and adapt, Hildreth's (2011) classification of the three strategies of localism at work in Westminster-style democracies (see Table 1) – managerial, representative and community. The two crucial points here are: first, different advocates of localism tend to evoke different types/strategies of localism; and, second, in any given situation, it is the mix that matters.

As indicated above, some would argue that the focus on localism is yet another example of old wine in new bottles and its core insights were previously captured in concepts such as subsidiarity or even local governance. However, in our view, there are subtle, but important, differences between the contemporary use of the concept of localism and its antecedants. While all three forms of localism have always existed, representative localism was always first amongst equals, at least in terms of its rhetorical dominance. This is no longer the case; in an era of governance, it is the mix

---

*Corresponding author. Email: Mark.Evans@canberra.edu.au

Table 1.   Three types/strategies of localism.

	Managerial	Representative	Community
Defining mechanism	Conditional devolution of decision-making based on achieving agreed objectives	Provision of powers and responsibility to local government elected on universal suffrage	Rights and support given to citizens in communities to engage in decisions and action
Delivery mechanism	Intergovernmental networks	Hierarchical delivery networks	Community network governance
Metrics for judging success	Targets and evidence	Electoral triumph or failure	Cohesiveness and capacity of network arrangements. Attainment of network goals and fairness of process
Strengths	Makes sense in the context of multi-level governance and complexity	Delivers clear identification of responsibility and accountability and capacity to meet localised needs	Delivers ownership, local knowledge and engagement by citizens in defining problems and supporting solutions
Weaknesses	Can be too 'top-down', lack of downward accountability, associated with a 'government knows best narrative for change', ignores locally derived sources of knowledge. Focus in the end is on externally imposed objectives rather than local choices	Resource issues (both financial and technical) may undermine delivery; accountability in practice may be weak	Potential for network capture by local elite interests persists. Uneven distribution of capacity among communities to respond leads to engagement of some but not all. Accountability structures can be opaque with weak democratic control. Minority voices can be silent

that matters and the balance between the three will differ from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and delivery task to delivery task.

Managerial localism involves the conditional devolution of delegated decision-making or delivery functions from the centre to the locality, based on achieving agreed objectives. Policy is decided at the centre, but policy settings and delivery functions are devolved to the locality, under a strict regulatory framework. A successful policy is one which meets centrally derived performance targets. In representative localism, powers and responsibility for specific governance tasks are devolved directly to elected local government (e.g. rates, roads and rubbish). Here, success is evaluated on the basis of re-election. In the context of collaborative governance initiatives, augmented by either central, regional or state government, the role of local government would focus around its community leadership role and its ability to harness the resources of the community (including private and voluntary

organisations), more than a traditional direct service provider role (Stoker 2006, 2012a, 2012b). In practice, however, a top-down, managerial, tradition has tended to dominate in Westminster-style democracies in which devolution of functions occurs, but without devolution of power or resources.

In contrast, *community localism* involves the devolution of rights and support directly to citizens in communities to allow them to engage in decisions and action. This is underpinned by a participatory view of democracy, which is based on the notion that there is more to democracy than voting every three, four or five years; it requires ongoing engagement with the citizenry and their inclusion within certain realms of decision-making.

The localist turn in practice

The current flirtation with localism in Westminster-style democracies emerged as a policy mantra for the Blair/Brown Labour government in the UK, but it was subsequently embraced by the Conservative-led coalition. Of course, if localism was a common mantra, there were important differences in the justification the two parties used for the 'localist turn'; although we shall suggest that they shared more in common than at first appears to be the case.

New Labour's approach to localism was framed in the context of its core focus on evidence-based policy-making, top-down direction and an over-arching managerialism; as such, it was clearly a managerial localism.[1] In contrast, the Conservatives 'neo-liberal' justification of the localist turn' emphasised the failure of 'big', or interventionist, government and this view was legitimised in the coalition agreement, signed by the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats after the 2010 General Election:

> We share a conviction that the days of big government are over; that centralisation and top-down control have proved a failure. We believe that the time has come to disperse power more widely in Britain today; to recognise that we will only make progress if we help people come together to make life better. In short, it is our ambition to distribute power and opportunity to people rather than hoarding authority within government. (HM Government, 2010a, p. 7, see also comments of Eric Pickles MP, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, House of Commons Debates 2011, col. 558)

Here, interventionist government, which both the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats associated with New Labour,[2] is the problem and localism is an answer. The main point is however that, this was not a localism that stressed the role of local representatives, indeed their role tended to be downplayed; so it was not representative localism. Nor did it focus on the role local communities could play in the development of policies; so it was not a community localism. Rather, it was a localism that emphasised the role that these communities could, and should, play in the delivery of services. In addition, to evoke a common critique of the 'Big Society', it was a localism in which responsibilities, rather than power or resources, were devolved (Stoker 2012a).

In Australia, there are also competing varieties of localism underpinned by different policy values in which the 'top-down' managerial tradition is presently dominant. Indeed, it could be argued that there are a broader set of localisms at work here to satiate different interests – Commonwealth, State, regional, local, privileged

producer interests (e.g. mining, farming interests), etc. These can clearly coexist in, and across, institutions of multi-level governance. Crucially, however, there is increasing evidence to suggest (as in the UK example), that the 'top-down' approach to localism does not work. The reason for this is not new or surprising. In an era of governance, citizens' engagement in policy and delivery has become crucial to the achievement of social progress. Not least because all that public organisations do requires co-production and adaptive behaviours from citizens and often stake-holders. Moreover, the critical challenges confronting policy-makers in a complex, fragmented world require the most adaptive form of power to enable local interests to blend their capacities to achieve common purpose. This is called soft power or *the power to persuade*. Localism is a key policy instrument for achieving soft power.

Academic perspectives on the localist turn

In contrast to the arguments put forward by UK political parties, academic interest in localism has been based on two, largely different, key arguments. First, localism has been seen as having the potential to strengthen democratic engagement at a time when trust in representative government, and politicians in particular, is declining (see Stoker 2006; Hay 2007; Pratchett 2005; Fawcett and Marsh 2013). Here, localism is, in large part, a response to a perceived democratic deficit.[3] The New Local Government Network's (NLGN) *Localist Manifesto* (2012) reflects this position, arguing that we are experiencing increased political and constitutional stress, marked particularly by declining trust in politics and politicians, linked to economic crisis.[4] They further contend that these challenges can, and must, be addressed by an increase in localism, involving devolution of powers to cities and counties, and within them to localities. Here then, the type of localism advocated is clearly a community one.

Secondly, some academic contributions to the localism literature see it as better way of dealing with social and economic problems, particular in periods of austerity (Lowndes and Pratchett 2012). Here, the emphasis is upon localism as a way of producing solutions to wicked problems; so, for example, it is at the local level that we need to manage many of the consequences of the global financial crisis or deal with the effects of climate change. From this perspective, a localist project helps stabilise communities and build their adaptive capacity (NLGN 2012). Crucial to this argument is the necessity of a fusion between representative and community localism.

If the first point here is that we need to be clear about what type of localism we are referring to when discussing the concept, then the second point is even more important; in contemporary polities it is the mix between these strategies of localism that matters. To put it starkly, in a way that has resonance with the current literature on governance, the increased complexity of the issues facing governments' means that hierarchy is increasingly questioned as the dominant mode of governance; yet, managerial localism retains a commitment to such hierarchy. In contrast, community localism advocates subsidiarity and a broader and deeper citizen engagement, what one might term a participatory form of governance. However, in our view, such engagement has to be integrated within existing patterns of representative government and with the need for central coordination and leadership. Hence, with localism, as with governance, and indeed democracy more broadly, it is the mix that matters.

Localism – a definition

Of course, it is important that, before we outline the contents of the two issues on localism, we define the term. For us, localism is: 'an umbrella term which refers to the devolution of power and/or functions and/or resources away from central control and towards front-line managers, local democratic structures, local institutions and local communities, within an agreed framework of minimum standards'. This provides a flexible definition that encompasses the varieties of localism outlined above.

Contributions to the special issue

Our intention in the two issues of Policy Studies on localism is to bring together a variety of contributors on the topic drawn from different disciplinary backgrounds, with different approaches. In addition, we have aimed to strike a balance between conceptual-driven and empirically based pieces, although some contributions span that somewhat artificial divide.

In disciplinary terms, we have authors who would probably self-identify as Political Scientists or Public Policy specialists (Evans, Hickson, Marsh, Porteous, Pratchett and Stoker) or Sociologists (Hogan and Lockie), a Geographer (Clarke) and an Historian (Gentry). At the same time, we have authors whose work is directly interdisciplinary focusing on the Environment (Wilcox, Dare) or Indigenous issues (Sanders). At the same time, some contributors have a particular conceptual approach which underpins their work. For example, Ercan, Hendriks and Felicettia operate from with a deliberative democracy perspective, while Clarke and Wilcox take a contructivist approach. We could go on, but the main point is that the approaches to localism adopted in these two issues are varied and, in our view, that adds greatly to their scope and utility.

More specifically, in this volume we begin with three articles that deal with conceptual issues. First, Hickson traces the emergence and development of localism within all three of the major UK parties – Conservatives, Labour and the Liberal Democrats – and seeks to explain why this transformation has taken place. Subsequently, Ercan and Hendriks consider the democratic challenges and potential of localism by drawing on insights from the theory and practice of deliberative democracy. Then, Hogan and Lockie examine the type of governmental relations which result from the decoupling of society from economy and the ensuing question that this raises about how the economic base can be adequately utilised to ensure continued material sustenance for the community.

These contributions are followed by three articles which, while conceptually driven, have an empirical focus. First, Dare discusses two Tasmanian case studies, the Tasmanian Forest Agreement and the Tasmanian Drought Support Network, in each case identifying the type of localism approach involved and its successes and failures. Here, the aim is to highlight key practical influences on a localism approach and identify how one can address the limitations of localism and enhance its positive aspects. Next, Wilcock examines two cases of indigenous inclusion in environmental decision-making, one in Canada and one in Australia. These case studies are used to demonstrate both the failings of current framings of localism and 'environment' in policy-making and the inadequate responses of governments to the complexities of

'place-making'. Finally, Sanders examines the local government reform introduced in Australia's Northern Territory in 2008. It shows the negative consequences of the move towards representative localism underpinning those reforms.

The contributions to Part Two of this special issue on localism will be outlined in a brief introduction to the issue. Part Two will also include a conclusion reflecting on the theoretical and empirical contribution of the special issue to understanding localism in Westminster-style democracies.[5]

Notes

1. Stoker (2011) has argued that this managerialism limited New Labour from ever in practice really developing a localist agenda that had any political bite.
2. The coalition government argued (HM Government 2010b, 4) that, under the Labour Government: 'Record levels of spending were channelled through the most sophisticated system of state control in Britain's history. Elaborate mechanisms of audit, inspection, targets and guidance enabled the centre to micromanage the public sphere to an unprecedented degree. This may have been done with the best of intentions, but it failed'.
3. This is an assertion which has been heavily criticised, particularly by those who argue that citizens are not apathetic or unengaged, rather they are alienated from mainstream, 'political', organisations, but increasingly engaged in new forms of political participation, some, but not all, of which have a crucial local dimension (Norris 2002; Bang 2009, 2011; Marsh, O'Toole, and Jones 2007).
4. The NLGN's *Localist Manifesto* suggests radical reforms to establish greater localism, including legislation to increase devolution, weakening power (breaking) central government departments, reforming local government to create combined local authorities with greater coordination between them and making voting compulsory.
5. We would like to acknowledge the generous financial support of the Murray Darling Basin Futures Collaborative Research Network which allowed for the completion of this work.

Notes on contributors

Mark Evans is Director and Professor of Governance at the ANZSOG Institute for Governance, University of Canberra.

David Marsh is Professor of Governance at the ANZSOG Institute for Governance, University of Canberra.

Gerry Stoker is Director and Professor of Governance at the Centre for Citizenship, Globalisation and Governance at the University of Southampton.

References

Bang, P. H. 2009. "'Yes We Can': Identity Politics and Project Politics for a Late-Modern World." *Urban Research and Practice* 2 (2): 117–137. doi:10.1080/17535060902979022
Bang, P. H. 2011. "The Politics of Threat: Late-Modern Politics in the Shadow of Neo-Liberalism." *Critical Policy Studies* 5 (4): 434–448. doi:10.1080/19460171.2011.628065
Fawcett, P. and D. Marsh. 2013. "Depoliticisation, Governance and Political Participation." *Policy and Politics*, Forthcoming.
Hay, C. 2007. *Why We Hate Politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Hildreth, P. 2011. "What is Localism, and What Implications do Different Models have for Managing the Local Economy?" *Local Economy* 26 (8): 702–714. doi:10.1177/0269094211422215
HM Government. 2010a. *The Coalition: Our Programme for Government*. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-coalition-documentation.

HM Government. 2010b. *Decentralisation and the Localism Bill: An Essential Guide.* https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/decentralisation-and-the-localism-bill-an-essential-guide--2.

Lowndes, V., and L. Pratchett, 2012. "Local Governance under the Coalition Government: Austerity, Localism and the 'Big Society.'" *Local Government Studies* 38 (1): 1–20. doi:10.1080/03003930.2012.658711

Marsh, D., T. O'Toole, and S. Jones. 2007. *Apathy or Alienation: Young People and Political Participation in the UK*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

New Local Government Network. 2012. *The Localist Manifesto: The Report of the Commission on Next Localism*, London, NLGN. www.nlgn.org.uk.

Norris, P. 2002. *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing Political Activism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pratchett, L. 2005. "Local Autonomy, Local Democracy and the New Localism." *Political Studies* 52 (2): 258–275.

Stoker, G. 2006. *Why Politics Matters: Making Democracy Work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Stoker, G. 2011. "Was Local Governance such a Good Idea? A global Comparative Perspective." *Public Administration* 89 (1): 15–31.

Stoker, G. 2012a. "The Political Environment and Localism: What Future?" In *Housing 2020 Six Views of the Future for Housing Associations*, edited by Simon Graham, 7–22. Coventry: Orbit Group. http://www.orbit.org.uk/mediaFiles/downloads/45077033/Orbit_2020_FINAL_report.pdf

Stoker, G. 2012b. *Building a New Politics?* London: British Academy.