

**Issue 20**



**2004**

# **Planning Newsletter**



## **Contents...**

- **Editorial**
- **The SQW Scholarship**
- **Staff News**
- **Student News**
- **RUPS field trips– Sarajevo (2002/03) & Palermo (2003/04)**
- **PhD News**
- **London article**
- **Did we miss your news?**

Hello everyone,

Here is the Newsletter for 2004.

It is June Exam time here at the LSE and of course as ever at exam time the weather is hot (28 degrees Centigrade). The current MSc students have another week to go before celebrating with the usual champagne picnic in Lincoln Inn Fields.

Sharp readers will note that this Newsletter is coming out at a different time of year – we have decided to publish in the Summer in the future so this edition covers the last eighteen months and spans two cohorts of MSc students. So in the following section there will be the usual news from past students and staff, PhD student news together with reports on two study trips Sarajevo (2003) and Palermo (2004).

One new item to report is the SQW scholarship. The SQW consultancy has, very kindly, decided to award five scholarships a year of £2,000 for the next three years. One of these is allocated each year to a student from the MSc Regional and Urban Planning Studies. Later in the Newsletter we report on this very welcome initiative in more detail.

London continues to provide a very fertile location for the study of planning. The new mayoral system is now four years old and a few days ago the incumbent Mayor Livingstone was re-elected for another term of office. The new London Plan and the instigation of a congestion charge for driving into the central zone are two of his most interesting achievements. Professional teams from cities all over the world are coming to study the way this new charge operates. For those interested in the London Plan there is a short paper later in the Newsletter. Meanwhile the 'cultural quarter' along the South bank of the Thames continues to develop, full of tourists, art galleries and Starbucks, and is the location of one of the programme's London Walks.

Closer to home, the environment around St Clements continues to change with new piazzas outside the bookshop and library. At this time of year with the intense library use and warm weather the Library piazza is very vibrant and the café there is in much demand. The new British legislation requiring all building to be accessible for the disabled has meant much construction on new access ramps and conversion of toilets.

One of the next developments will be the move of the student's Brunch Bowl restaurant to a site on the ground floor in a building at the junction of Houghton Street and the Aldwych currently occupied by the Columbia Bar.

So, please keep sending in your news items.  
Best wishes,  
Andy

\*\*\*\*\*

## The SQW Scholarship

The SQW planning consultancy awarded its first round of scholarships in 2003. At the LSE the first winner of an award was Marion Macindoe – see the picture of the lucky recipient below! The company is keen to establish a relationship with the scholar and the LSE and Marion reports on a meeting that was held in march 2004.....

‘In March 2004, I met with the SQW team. All of the so-called Sqwolars were invited to the London office for lunch, a presentation, and to give feedback on the scholarship process. We were asked to present our thoughts and opinions on the programs at our different schools. I focused mostly on the interdisciplinary approach and (everyone's favorite!) the London walks. I also chatted a bit about my Long Essay and how my year at LSE has changed my perspective on planners' roles in redevelopment in urban areas. It was a fascinating experience, not only because I was able to get a glimpse at careers planners pursue once they graduate, but to see what angles other universities take, and what trajectories other students are following. All in all, the scholarship made a huge difference financially and I hope to pursue a further relationship with SQW in the future.’

Marion Macindoe



We would like to thank the company for providing this valuable award. For those that would like to know more about SQW you can read their statement which now follows:

**SQW** was established in 1983 and now operates from five offices in the UK. Our head office is in Cambridge and we have growing offices in Edinburgh, London Manchester and Leeds, all providing a wide range of services. We also undertake a significant number of international assignments and have an office with a partner organisation in Hong Kong. We employ around 50 consultants, who have a wide range of backgrounds including academia, government, industry, development agencies and local authorities. Our clients include international bodies, such as the World Bank and the European Commission, government departments in the UK and overseas, several directorates of the European Commission, major charitable foundations, private firms, all the UK regional development agencies and a variety of local authorities and partnerships. SQW is committed to equal opportunities. We aim to ensure that both as an employer and as a provider of services, we treat fairly all those with whom we

come in to contact. SQW has a detailed quality assurance policy that covers all of our activities and services to clients and we are recognised as an 'Investor in People'.

### **Services**

*Regeneration* – We work in urban and rural regeneration throughout the UK, building partnerships, developing projects and evaluating programmes, including work at national, regional and neighbourhood level.

*Performance Management* – SQW has a long track record in developing and implementing performance management frameworks and systems, including wide experience of appraisal, monitoring and evaluation.

*Research & Higher Education* – We work in the fields of research policy and higher education including feasibility studies, strategy development and evaluation. We regularly work for Government, funding councils, universities and others.

*Business Competitiveness* – We have considerable experience of developing and evaluating policies and programmes that assist businesses to improve their competitiveness. Our work includes projects for the DTI, regional development agencies and others.

*Skills & Learning* – We have a specialist team providing research and consultancy support on social inclusion, learning and skills, lifelong learning and workforce development.

*Regional Development* – SQW is at the forefront of work promoting regional development and has worked with all of the UK's regional development agencies as well as, internationally, on regional development strategies and capacity building.

## **Field Trip – Palermo 2003/04**

### **LSE Regional & Urban Planning Students' visit to Palermo**

Every year, the MSc. Regional & Urban Planning Studies students of the London School of Economics & Political Science (LSE) embark on a study trip to a European city. The city is chosen by the students' democratic vote, and in recent years groups have visited Sarajevo, Berlin and Moscow. This year the fate befell Palermo – but it wasn't just the good food and the cheap flight that made Palermo the first choice of this year's students! We were keen to visit a major city in one of the EU's poorest regions, whose history is manifest in the structure and architecture of the town. Furthermore we were interested in the ongoing regeneration of the historic centre with all its structural, economic and social constraints.

We were exceedingly fortunate that the Director of the MSc. RUPS program, Dr Andy Thornley, had met Professor Francesco Lo Piccolo at a conference in Florence last year. Prof. Lo Piccolo was most gracious in organising the study program for our visit from the 18<sup>th</sup> to the 22<sup>nd</sup> of April. We wish to thank him for his hospitality as well as for the time and effort he spent in helping us to understand the urban issues faced by the city of Palermo.

We started exploring the city by visiting Monreale on Sunday afternoon, not only to have a look at the cathedral, but to get a first impression of Palermo and its hinterland by looking at it from above (Tina, do you still have Michael's quote he sent us with the 360 view? This would be great here)

Like the LSE generally, the visiting MSc. RUPS students represented a diverse range of countries: England, Jordan, Peru, Turkey, Greece, Italy, Australia, USA, Switzerland, Germany, Mexico, Canada, Japan and the Philippines. Our previous knowledge of Palermo and the city's history was similarly varied, but was greatly increased by the fascinating introduction given by Prof. Lo Piccolo on the Monday of our visit. He elaborated further on the 1989 *Piano Particolareggiato Esecutivo* (PPE), which was of particular interest to us due to its specification of allowable uses in the historic buildings of Palermo. The selective application of this principle would be worth consideration in London, where schools, churches and

industrial buildings are inevitably converted to offices and housing at great loss to the city's economic, cultural and historic diversity.

Prof. Lo Piccolo's lecture was followed by an illuminating lecture by Prof. Ignazio (surname?) on the PIT program of the European Union. The challenges of coordinating PIT projects with cities' and regions' masterplans provoked much discussion among the group. After sampling the culinary delights of the architecture department's cafeteria, we followed the Professors to the PIT project north of the university, then through the historic (which?) quarter to the Spassimo centre. Here Sa. (name?) of the City Council outlined a number of programs underway in the ..... Urban... program. We finished the busy day with a tour through the magnificently refurbished St (name?), which accommodates the City Council's Urban Department (correct title?), and revelled in the views of the city and the sea from its roof terrace.

The next morning Prof. Lo Piccolo guided our group to the Regional Art Museum, where we were particularly impressed by the medieval palazzo and the Scarpa interventions. This was followed by a welcome to the University by Vice-Chancellor (name?) and a tour of the (name?) palazzo with Prof. (name? engineer), who pointed out the university's forthcoming regeneration project from the roof terrace. The Vice Chancellor kindly invited us to morning tea at the end of our tour. Most of the RUPS students and Dr. Thornley spent the rest of the day delighting in the historic ruins at Agrigento, despite the pouring rain - having spent the winter in London we were all used to this but did not expect it in Sicily!

On Wednesday Dr. Thornley gave a lecture at the Planning Department of the University of Palermo on the Greater London Authority's recently finalised strategic development plan ([www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/sds/index.jsp](http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/sds/index.jsp)). This was attended by professors and PhD students. The affordable housing requirements of the plan prompted much discussion by the PhD students, who identified a discrepancy between the city government's goals of affordable housing and the current inadequacy of UK central government funding. After enjoying the hospitality of coffee and sweets in the Planning Department, the RUPS students spent the afternoon at the markets, visiting historic buildings, or at Mondello beach. For our last evening we were fortunate to have the company of (name? Professor ...) and Prof. Lo Piccolo over dinner at Piazza (which one?) and were all sorry to bid the city of Palermo farewell the following morning.

The LSE and the Regional & Urban Planning Studies students wish to thank the University of Palermo Faculty of Architecture & Planning (? department of planning?) for its hospitality during our visit. In particular we are greatly appreciative of the insights into urban planning in Palermo provided by Prof. Lo Piccolo, who so kindly gave of his time and energy.

Martina Johnson and Robert Salkeld (2003/4)



The female mafia!



Relaxing on the beach after field trip!



Derelict building in the old town.



Walking seminars in the old parts of Palermo

## Staff News

### **Derek Diamond** (former Course Director)

"As I write this it is almost exactly nine years since I attended the RUPS reunion party during the LSE Centenary which also served as my farewell on retirement. It does not seem such a length of time in part due to the continuing contacts with past students. Thanks for all your news and views, especially to those of you I met between Washington DC and Atlanta in October 2003. Is another re-union in 2005 a good idea? If so let me or Andy Thornley know".

Derek Diamond

### **Michael Hebbert** (On staff 1979-1994 and former Course Director)

Michael has spent the past thirty years shifting between geography and planning, and is now busy bringing the strands together at Manchester where geography, planning, architecture and development studies (IDPM) are being re-launched in September 2004 in a exciting new School of Environment and Development. Remember, he also edits 'Progress in Planning' and will be interested to hear from you with proposals for manuscripts in the word range 25-35,000 at <mailto:progress@man.ac.uk>

### **Hazel Johnstone** (former Course Administrator)

Hazel will soon be celebrating the official tenth birthday of the Gender Institute (although informally it's nearer 12). Soon the Gender Institute will have another geography connection, as Diane Perrons takes over as director in October for 3 years. Work/life remains good.

**Mark Kleinman** (On Course team until 2001) is now working at the GLA in charge of Housing Policy.

### **Diane Perrons**

Diane's research has focused on theorising social and spatial divisions, with particular reference to globalization and the new economy and this year published 'Globalization and social change: people and places in a divided world', (Routledge 2004) which draws on ideas about the new economy, risk society, welfare regimes and political economy to explain the growing social and spatial divisions in the increasingly divided world. She completed her research on Brighton and Hove with articles in: *Gender, work and organisation*, (2003) concerned with the implications of new ICTs, and new forms of work for work life balance and gender equality, and *Economic geography*, (2004) which relates to the cluster debate, finding that while Brighton and Hove could be construed as a new media cluster in the Marshallian and social network sense, the digital divide remained. This finding formed the basis for her argument that a holistic framework that moves beyond the focus on the firm is necessary in order to evaluate the implications of economic restructuring on local and regional



development. Together with colleagues from UCL and Manchester University Diane has been running an ESRC seminar series on Work, life and time in the new economy and this has been extended for two further years to become Gender, Work and Life in the new global economy. If you are interested you can follow this series virtually through the website <http://www.lse.ac.uk/worklife>. In September 2004 she will be moving to the Gender Institute to become Director on a half time basis, but the rest of the time she'll be in the Geography and Environment Department so will still be teaching GY453 on the RUPS programme.

**Andy Thornley**

The main news to report is the final completion of the book on Planning World Cities which I have been preparing for many years with my colleague Peter Newman. This is now with the publishers Palgrave/Macmillan and will be published in the autumn of 2004. Its full title is *Planning World Cities: globalization and urban politics*. My thanks go to the cohorts of students who, perhaps unwittingly, have contributed to the development of our ideas over the years. I have also edited a book with two Dutch colleagues that looks at the interaction of strategic city planning and urban governance in European cities. It covers 19 cities and is proving very popular – its full details are *Metropolitan Governance and Spatial Planning* edited by Salet, Thornley and Kreukels, Spon Press, 2003. Meanwhile research on planning in London has found its way into a number of book chapters and articles, including translations for a number of European journals.

## Student News

### **Esmeralda Francisco 2002/03**

Is currently working at the famous Barcelona Forum 2004 coordinating a series of projects, two exhibitions and a project called "Sky of Aspirations" that involves 9 cities around the world. If you would like information on Barcelona Forum 2004, please visit the following website: [www.barcelona2004.org](http://www.barcelona2004.org)

### **Alex Lim 2002/03**

Alex has been working for Civic Regeneration Ltd, a regeneration consultancy based in London.

### **Ingrid Pachauer 2002/03**

Works for the City of Surrey's planning department in Canada.

### **Mercy Ringelmann 2002/03**

Mercy works for an economic development organisation as well as working for her family business. She has written a four page article which was published in the December 2003 issue of the Architect's Journal out of London. The co-editor of an architecture magazine based in San Francisco read her article in the AJ, and, as a consequence, she is consulting on their next issue as it is dedicated to Sixth Street and its design, physical & social challenges.

### **Nami Sogabe 2002/03**

Nami works for NYK (Japan's largest shipping logistic company in London). She is responsible for ensuring that shipping operations run smoothly. There are financial and communication aspects to her role. She is now married.

### **Rosita Aiesha 2001/02**

Rosita works as a research fellow on the VivaCity 2020 project – at the Cities Institute, based at London Metropolitan University. The project is undertaking a large national study of 'Sustainable Urban Environments' (SUE) under a new Engineering and Physical Science Research Council (EPSRC) programme. A consortium of four universities (including LMU) has been awarded a 5 year grant to undertake the study, entitled 'Urban Sustainability for the Twenty-four Hour City'. Rosita leads the 'Generation of Diversity' part of the project which investigates 'mixed use, vitality and seedbed economies in 3 cities. She has also decided to pursue a part-time Mphil in Town Planning at UCL.

### **Jeremy Dennis 2001/02**

Works in San Francisco for a public affairs firm that deals with land use issues, lobbying the city to make certain projects come to fruition.

### **Sara Dilmamode 2001/02**

Sara works in the Planning, Development and Regeneration department at GVA Grimley. She is working in a team that deals primarily with FE Colleges and Universities in the South East.

### **Daniel Hawkins 2001/02**

Daniel has been working for Ben Franklin Technology Partners (an economic development agency). It is one of four regional agencies in Pennsylvania that provide seed capital for technology-based companies. He conducts research and data analysis to support various technology and entrepreneurial initiatives. He has also been involved in city marketing activities in Philadelphia through work and a civic affairs group.

### **Thera Medcof 2001/02**

Works for the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and housing for the province of Ontario. She writes: "affordable housing is a hot topic on the provincial agenda so it should be an interesting place to be".

### **Joyce Zhu 2001/02**

Joyce is working in local government in Yorkshire and is buying a house with her husband in Castleford.

### **Maria Kalantzopoulou 2000/01**

Maria received a lectureship at the School of Architecture of Democritus University in Thrace (Northern Greece, city of Xanthi). She splits her time between working on her PhD and teaching, and is responsible for teaching two courses in Regional Planning.

### **Sean Pierce 2000/01**

Sean is still working for the US Department of Transportation. He married in August 2003 and he and Meaghan are living in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

### **Sini Rinne-Kerridge 2000/01**

Sini works for Cambridge Policy Consultants in Cambridge. She deals with a number of projects for government departments and other public sector bodies. She married last year and loves living in Cambridge.



**Michelle Anderson 1999/00**

Michelle is in her final year of law school at Berkeley and has been busy with all sorts of projects that intersect housing, urban planning, civil rights, and American constitutional law.

**Nancy Easter García 1999/00**

Works at the Town and Country Planning Association as an Events & Projects Officer. She organises all national conferences and seminars on a variety of planning related topics. She is currently involved in a number of projects including a consultation on PPS1 and the creation of a Toolkit for Sustainable Suburbs for the GLA. She recently got engaged to Andrew Parry, a colleague from the BA Geography degree at LSE, and will be married in September 2004. They have just bought a property in Berkshire and have joined the ranks of commuters braving the UK transport system everyday.

**Tommaso Giovacchini 1999/00**

Tommaso has been a social protection manager for 'Save the Children' in Luanda for the past two years. He witnessed the end of war in Angola and provided technical assistance for a resettlement process which aimed to "send back" almost 4 million displaced persons affected by the conflict. He also designed a project in the Philippines with the aim of providing shelter to displaced persons in Mindanao who were affected by a conflict between the army of Manila and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front. At present, he is in Cambodia working with indigenous communities in the lower basins of two Mekong tributaries (Sretan and Srepok). He writes that the main problem for these communities is lack of development, poor planning and flooded dams which are destroying fisheries and polluting the water.

**Taku Honiden 1999/00**

Taku is on loan to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan from the Ministry of Land Infrastructure and Transport. He will be located in New York until 2006. He is in the economic section of the Japanese Embassy.

**Anita Konrad 1999/00**

Anita recently joined Groundwork UK as their Senior Development Officer and Interreg Co-ordinator.

**Sukey Montford 1999/00**

Sukey has a new job as a Senior Investigator for the NHS Ombudsman.

**Toru Sekine 1999/00**

In 2001, Toru did an internship as an assistant urban planner at the United Nations/Economic Commission for Europe in Geneva. More recently, Toru has been working at the Nomura Research Institute (a Tokyo based think-tank) as a business consultant.

**Aron Gooblar 1998/99**

Aron works for the department of city planning in New York. His work is concentrated in Queens and focuses on the entire city with what the mayor calls "a 5-borough economic development strategy".

**Jennefer Holmes 1998/99**

Has moved on from City Fringe Partnership to work at LDA as a Strategy Development Advisor: European and International Policy.

**Bert Hancock 1996/97**

Bert lives in Omaha, Nebraska with his wife and two sons. He works for the family business developing new multifamily housing in his area. He also tries to keep his planning interests active and is a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals for the City of Omaha, and a member of the Millard Town Center Foundation, which aims to revitalize an older neighbourhood. In addition, he has started a company (Alchemy Development) which is dedicated to urban redevelopment.

**Crispian Fuller 1996/97**

Crispian completed his PhD on after-care and corporate investment in 2001, followed by two years doing post-doc work at Cambridge University with Bob Bennett, culminating in a book on local and regional economic development. Now a research fellow at Warwick University working on the national evaluations of New Deal for Communities and Local Strategic Partnerships, and trying to publish all the empirical data he has managed to accumulate in the last few years!

**Ray Magdaluyo 1996/97**

Ray's RED CRAB empire continues to expand. They now have 5 stores spread over the metropolis, and are still on a semi-expansion mode. They sell approximately 10,000 kilos of crabs each month! In addition, he completed another masters program in entrepreneurship last July, and was awarded a distinction. He married Patricia Ramos last February.

**Joao Seixas 1996/97**

Joao is hoping to finish his PhD at Barcelona Autonomous University this year. Meanwhile he has been working on interesting projects in the Lisbon City Hall and teaching urban geography at Lisbon University.

**Monica Lacerda 1995/96**

Monica had a baby boy (Pedro) in April 2003 and is living in Portugal. She has left the world of banking and now works for NetJets.



**Frédéric Duvinage 1993/94**

Frédéric has successfully presented his PhD on "knowledge economy and territorial governance of knowledge" at the university of Neuchatel in Switzerland . He currently works as "general coordinator" of the Trinationale Agglomeration Basel. To RUPS 93/94 cohort who would like to contact Frédéric, please email: [frederic.duvinage@tab-atb.org](mailto:frederic.duvinage@tab-atb.org)

**Neil Curtis 1979/80**

After becoming Senior Planner for the City of Auckland in 1986, Neil later internationalised his career. For the last 13 years he has been working around the Asia -Pacific region as a consultant on a variety of planning, development, transport and tourism projects. For some years he was based in Hong Kong or Kuala Lumpur and has worked on projects in Mauritius, Hong Kong, China, Malaysia, Philippines, Papua New Guinea, and Vietnam. Some projects were for the World Bank or the World Tourism Organisation. One more notable project was the Hong Kong Disneyland (now under construction) which Neil recommended be relocated from the site favoured by Disney Corporation to the site now occupied. Currently he is working on tourism development in Nepal. Neil conveys his very best regards to the members of the class of 1979/80.

## SARAJEVO 2003

The students of the 2002/3 cohort developed a fascination with the idea of going to Sarajevo for their study trip right from the start of the year. This rather ambitious plan was given a sense of possibility with the late arrival on the course of Esmeralda from Barcelona who had previously worked for the UN High Commission for Refugees in Sarajevo. So, much research was done by the students who found people who had recently visited the city to talk to and, with Esmeralda taking a leading role using her networks, the idea became a reality. Attempts to set up meetings with people beforehand did not produce a very clear response, however once we were there everyone was keen to talk to us and in the end we had more opportunities than we had time to take up. The timetable was incredibly full, speakers very informative and passionate, and as wandering the city was such a powerful experience in itself, the week was one of those events that remain in the memory for life.

We had talks on the political background, planning issues and policy dilemmas from professors at the University of Sarajevo's Urban Planning Department, a Minister in the Federal Government, and the Institute for Urban Planning of Sarajevo. We had a talk on the work of the UN High Commission for Refugees. Researchers at the European Stability Initiative spoke about their research into Bosnia and Herzegovina's relationship with the EU. The director of the NGO Development Foundation gave us a very illuminating talk about the difficulties in re-establishing a stable civil society in the post war conditions and the inadequacies of the approach taken by outside agencies, such as the UN and EU, that are more interested in their own agendas than developing organisations that build up from the grass roots.

We were all highly stimulated by these talks that raised innumerable issues and demonstrated the huge problems that the city faces. For example, how do they move forward economically when they are not only dealing with the economic collapse that is familiar to other former communist countries but also the war devastation. The foundations, both economic and physical, of the former economy has been destroyed – how do they start again and what direction do they take? An intriguing aspect of this was that the levels of unemployment were astronomically high, and a third of the population is said to be on the poverty line, but there seemed to be quite a flourishing street and café life in the old, very attractive, Turkish quarter, that was not dissimilar from other European cities (there is certainly considerable potential here for a tourist industry if stability can be maintained and the necessary infrastructure created). The legal and institutional framework from the communist period is often still in place holding back the transition to the new conditions and the city planning department complained that they did not have the planning skills to adapt to the current needs. Planning itself was caught up in the ongoing social tensions between the different ethnic groups as planning processes were often used as the vehicle for maintaining privileges or maintaining segregation. One of the strong messages we received was that although the violence has stopped the groups are still fighting using other means. The outside bodies and agreements focus on the issues of stopping the warfare and dealing with repatriation rather than the broader issue of rebuilding harmony and social development between groups.



Parliament offices – still vacant.



'The front line'

However perhaps the most dramatic impact on our perceptions came for the physical state of the city itself. We saw at first hand what it meant to have a civil war fought out in the streets of a city. We were taken to the 'front line' – this was not the usual image arising from the second world war of trenches and barbed wire on bleak farmland. The front line often consisted of residential streets with the housing blocks on each side in enemy territory and shooting taking place across the street. Most of these buildings remain unrepaired and often unoccupied, with all the physical damage of the shooting still evident. Often these blocks are now partially occupied with material that people have salvaged from other buildings while other parts remain empty burnt out shells. So after all the years since the war it was a surprise to us that there was still so much devastation – even the government building remains an empty shell. Clearly in a city with no economic base and outside aid often oriented to other agendas the job of reconstructing the city is monumental. Small beginnings can be seen – for example developers are allowed to add a story on top of a housing block and get the economic returns from this additional space – in return for renovating the rest of the block below. Such small-scale formulas proved one way of overcoming the financial problem.

## **PhD News**

The following continue to work on their theses:

**Vasileios Tselios** 2003

"The impact of integration and economic development on income".

**Marcia Thorpe** 2003

TBC

**Achilleas Tsamis** 2003

TBC

**Pushpa Arabindoo** 2002

"A post-colonial condition assessment of development in Chennai, India".

**Laurence Crot** 2002

"The construction of Buenos Aires' urban planning agenda".

**Steve Hammer** 2002

"Renewable energy use in cities".

**Ramola Naik-Singru** 2002

"The relationship of Globalisation and History in the Spatial transformation of Mumbai (Bombay), India".

**Debora Cavalcanti** 2001

(provisional title) "Territorialisation of Urban Poverty: migration, mobility and housing in the Northeast of Brazil".

**Christopher Lyons** 2001

"Planning, the state, and microeconomic policy: An investigation into the impact of progressive politics on the state as enabler through the planning process".

**Keh-Her Shih** 2001

"The emergence of world city domination and the consequent implication in regional governance: Globalisation crises and institutional changes in East Asia".

**Ljiljana Grubovic** 1999

"Planning and illegal building construction in Belgrade".

**Laurentios Vasiliadis** 1999

"The creation of a favoured environment for the attraction of foreign direct investments in Greece. A critical comparison between Ireland, Portugal and Greece".

**Miguel Jimenez** 1998

"The globalisation effect in the economic structure of Mexico City". Miguel is finishing his thesis in Mexico City and he and Susana have a baby daughter. Sofia was born on 8<sup>th</sup> June 2004.



**Kuniko Shibata** 1998

"The state, planning and the public interest: historical development of regional and urban planning policy in Japan".

**Jorge Vera Garcia** 1998

"Liberalisation and local productive systems in Mexico: Productive linkages in agglomerations with different market orientation".

**Peng Sheng Weng** 1997

"The interaction between innovation systems and urbanisation".

**Murat Yalcintan** 1997

"Impacts of globalisation on the decision-making process of Istanbul Greater City municipality".

**Ertan Zibel** 1997

"Globalisation and the role of the Turkish State: Case study of urban policies in Istanbul".

**Iris Hauswirth** 1994

"Efficient organisations? Government export promotion in Britain and Germany from a new institutional economics perspective".

## **Completed PhD students during 2003/04**

**Abel Perez-Zamorano**

"Institutional Change And Its Impact On Organisation Of Production And Productivity: The Case Of Ejido In Mexico" Abel was awarded his PhD in June 2004 and has returned to his university teaching job in Mexico

**Sophia Skyers**

"Reconnecting People and Communities?" Sophia is working as a social policy analyst/researcher for CEMVO (council for Ethnic Minority Voluntary Organisation).

**Bo Tang**

"Urban planning and property development in China: Guangzhou and Hong Kong, 1978-1998" Bo was awarded his PhD in 2003 and continues with his university teaching job in Hong Kong.

## News from previous PhD students

### Yonn Dierwechter

Yonn continues his lecturing post at Washington State. He is currently on research leave looking at community/county planning dynamics as part of a project on cities regionalism. He is organizing a student study trip to Holland again this year.

### Asato Saito

Has taken a post as Assistant Professor in the Department of Japanese Studies (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences) at the National University of Singapore (NUS). He writes: "its a far cry from my old days in S504....I can see the ships coming into the port though quite far away. I really feel that it is worth while to get a PhD!"

## London: A new form of government and a new kind of plan.

Andy Thornley, LSE.

Reproduced from Urbanistica Nov 2003.

London has only had three strategic plans. There was the famous Abercrombie Plan produced during the war in 1944, formulated on the ideas of one professional mind. There was then Greater London Development Plan of the early 1980s but this was never officially adopted before the Greater London Council that produced it was abolished. This plan was the result of a large bureaucratic and technical effort. We now have the London Plan prepared by the new Greater London Authority (GLA). This, I would claim, is different again from the previous plans, having a strong political slant. Once more the plan is conditioned by the context in which it has been prepared – in this case the particular nature of the new Greater London Authority. I will outline some of the features of the new authority and the way this has conditioned the form of the plan. However before doing so let us look at the way that strategic planning was conducted before the establishment of the GLA in 2000.

The Greater London Council (GLC) was abolished in 1986 and there was then no local government for the whole of the metropolitan London area until 2000. The powers of the old GLC were re-allocated to central government, the lower tier of the London Boroughs or to some kind of joint body. The abolition of the GLC is generally regarded as a political act by a Thatcher government that was concerned about the power held by the metropolitan local authorities. The removal of this tier of government fitted into the political ideology of the period that stressed minimal intervention and market freedom. Some saw this as a welcome move that led to the strengthening of the Boroughs or an opportunity for spontaneous innovation through the creation of more action oriented, and financially efficient, ad hoc bodies (Hebbert, 1992). However the new arrangement lacked a co-ordinated strategic perspective with any power to implement policy. Eventually increasing concern was expressed from many quarters about the lack of an overall vision and leadership.





After the abolition of the GLC the London Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC) was set up to discuss strategic city-wide planning issues. This committee, made up of representatives from the Boroughs, prepared strategic planning reports but it was only an advisory body. It presented its ideas to central government who now prepared the strategic planning framework for London in the form of the statutory Strategic Planning Guidance for the city. In tune with the non-interventionist ideology of the period the guidance in 1989 was only a few pages long and simply set out the main parameters within which the local authorities should operate. So, as a result of the ideology of non-intervention and institutional fragmentation, very little strategic planning took place after the abolition of the GLC. LPAC produced its strategic policies but these had limited impact.

However from the late 1980s onwards there was increasing pressure for more concerted action. The City Corporation, a small local authority covering the financial district of the City of London with unique institutional arrangements based upon its medieval charter that privileges the business community, was active in commissioning reports and funding promotional bodies (Coopers & Lybrand Deloitte, 1991). LPAC also commissioned its own research on the needs of London as a centre of world business. These studies concluded that London was at a disadvantage in not having a single voice to promote the city. By the early 1990s central government had also accepted the view that more needed to be done to enhance London's competitive position and counteract its fragmented institutional structure. In 1992 central government set up the London Forum to promote the capital but the following year this was merged into London First, a similar body set up by the private sector. This set the pattern of private sector leadership with central government backing that was to dominate strategic thinking in London over the next five years (Newman and Thornley, 1997).

In the same year another initiative was announced called City Pride. The idea was that central government would give some financial backing to its three major cities if they produced visions or strategies to show how they could make themselves more successful in the competition with other cities in the world. They were asked to prepare a prospectus of future priorities and action which co-ordinated the public, private and voluntary sectors. In London the job of orchestrating this exercise was given to the private sector body London First. They organised the production of a vision document called the London Pride Perspective with membership from business, local authorities and the voluntary sector. Meanwhile central government itself was becoming more and more involved in strategic planning for the city as the problems of fragmentation continued. It established a Minister for London, a Cabinet Sub-Committee for the capital, the Government Office for London with representation from the different Ministries with interests in London policy, and produced a new enhanced Strategic Guidance for London. This time, illustrative of its greater importance, the guidance extended to seventy-five pages. In 1995 they also established the Joint London Advisory Panel to advise the Cabinet sub-committee. This new body consisted of the same membership as that of the London Pride Partnership led by London First. This arrangement illustrates again the close working relationship between central government and the private sector.

One of the features of this period was the proliferation of more and more organisations with complex inter-relationships. They lacked any clear channels of accountability and created a confused network that made it difficult to identify who was responsible for decisions. So, during the 1990s strategic planning for London was very weak. The most comprehensive work was being done by LPAC. However the influence of this work was handicapped by the advisory nature of the Committee. Central government, imbued with its New Right ideology, was not sympathetic to the idea of strategic planning. However the limitations of the fragmented governance of the city were becoming clear to the business sector. The fear of London losing its position in an era of global competition spurred the government into action. They became more interested in city-wide policies and visions and the outcome was the expanded strategic guidance and London Pride Prospectus. So the strategic policy vacuum was starting to be filled, not by a government for London, but by central government heavily influenced by representatives of the business sector.

In 1997 a major change took place in British politics when the Labour Party under Tony Blair won the election after eighteen years of Conservative rule. This was to have a significant effect on the institutional context for strategic planning in London. The Labour Party pledged itself to greater transparency in government, to tackle the issues of the proliferation of unaccountable ad hoc bodies and to devolve governmental power (Blair, 1996, 1998; DETR,

1998). They also indicated that they would give greater emphasis to issues such as social exclusion and environmental sustainability. Policy co-ordination or 'joined-up policy thinking' was one of their new slogans. These procedural and policy priorities heralded a major change to the governance of London and the approach to strategic planning.

In their election Manifesto the Labour Party included a commitment to an elected mayor for London. This was the first time that London has ever had an elected mayor. The old Mayor of London was simply a ceremonial post and only applied to that very small part of London, the City of London, covering the central financial district. It was hoped that the model would also be taken up by other British cities. The idea drew upon the experience of mayors in other parts of the world, particularly the US, Barcelona and Rome. The mayor was conceived as having strong executive powers. Alongside the mayor an elected Assembly would have a scrutiny and checking role. It was hoped that the strong mayor would overcome the problem of lack of political leadership in the capital and that the electoral processes would introduce greater transparency and accountability into strategic decision-making. One of the major features of the new model was that it would be a streamlined authority. There was no intention of returning to the huge bureaucracy that was a feature of the old Greater London Council. Having won the election in 1997 the Labour Party began the process of implementing the new political system. It was to take three years to set up.

The Greater London Authority (GLA) Act was passed by parliament in November 1999 and sets out the powers to be allocated to the mayor. In principle these powers are for policies having a strategic impact on London as a whole. The lower tier of government, the 32 London Boroughs and the City Corporation, continue to exist and the GLA must not duplicate their responsibilities. Many of the powers of the GLA therefore arise from taking over existing quangos, with some devolution from central government. The GLA has responsibility for policing the city through a new organisation called the Metropolitan Police Authority - this role was previously undertaken by central government. The GLA also has responsibility for three 'statutory organisations' (often referred to as the 'functional bodies'): Transport for London, the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority and the London Development Agency (LDA). In addition to having the responsibility for overseeing the operation of these bodies, the GLA also has other strategic and co-ordinating functions.

It should be noted that the mayor's geographical area of responsibility only extends over the old GLC area, i.e. the area within the Green Belt. This is of course not what might be termed the 'functional city-region'. Many people travel into and out of this area for employment and leisure purposes and many London facilities such as Gatwick and Stansted Airports lie outside the mayor's area. Therefore there will need to be considerable co-operation between the strategies for London produced by the mayor and the work of surrounding local authorities and regional agencies. How this will occur has yet to be resolved.

Most of the executive powers of the GLA are vested in the mayor. The mayor formulates policy, proposes a budget, co-ordinates all the different partners and makes appointments to the statutory bodies. A major task of the mayor is to develop strategies for the topics he or she has responsibility for. These have to be consistent with national policy. The mayor also has to produce an annual progress report followed by a 'State of London' debate and a twice-yearly 'People's Question Time'. The Assembly has twenty-five members of whom 14 are elected on an area or constituency basis and 11 on a London-wide basis. The role of the Assembly is to scrutinise the mayor's activity, make the appointments to the permanent executive and also some members of the statutory bodies. The mayor reports to the Assembly each month and answers questions. The mayor's proposals and budget are reported to the Assembly for endorsement. If they have a two-thirds majority the Assembly can request that the mayor makes amendments. The Assembly has the power to set up committees of investigation into topics of their choice and draw upon outside experts to provide advice and information.

One of the important features to note about the new arrangement is that the mayor does not have much financial autonomy (Travers, 2002). The GLA will take over the central government grants that previously went to the various transport operators and these will be paid to Transport for London. However this money can only be used for transport purposes. It will also inherit the existing public spending in London on police, fire, economic development

and regeneration. The important aspect of these funding arrangements is that central government still has a controlling influence and the mayor cannot switch funds between the different statutory bodies. Central government retains a reserve power to set a minimum level for the police budget. There will also be a small annual general-purpose grant from central government to cover the operating costs of the GLA. A very small amount of local taxes will come from a precept on the Boroughs. The GLA will also have access to a very limited amount of its own resources through new powers to impose congestion charging. The congestion charging scheme was implemented in 2003 and so far is proving successful.

The GLA Act sets out certain duties that the Mayor must perform. Reflecting the new co-ordinated objective, the mayor will produce an integrated transport strategy for London. The GLA will also have the duty to promote a sustainable approach to economic, social and environmental issues and this is reflected in the requirement to produce a number of environment strategies. These are an air quality strategy, a municipal waste management strategy, an ambient noise strategy, and a bio-diversity action plan. The mayor will produce a report on the state of London's environment every four years. The mayor also has the duty to promote culture in London and produce a cultural strategy. As already mentioned, a new body called the London Development Agency has been created to promote economic development and regeneration and produce the economic strategy (Syrett and Baldock, 2001).

As far as land-use planning is concerned the mayor will prepare a new kind of plan called the Spatial Development Strategy (SDS) – this was to be relabelled The London Plan by the Mayor. The requirement to prepare this strategy is set out in the GLA Act and its purpose is to provide a comprehensive and integrated strategy for land use across the Greater London area. This will give a strategic overview of planning in London and replace the Planning Guidance for London produced by central government. The SDS must conform to national planning policy but the detailed content of the SDS will be left to the mayor. The Act suggests that it should cover the land use dimension of transport, economic development, regeneration, housing, retail development, leisure and culture, environment, built heritage, waste management, use of energy and London's world city role. The London Borough's own plans will then have to conform to the new SDS. It can immediately be seen that this coverage overlaps the other strategies mentioned above. Co-ordination will therefore be a key requirement in the strategic policy work of the GLA. It has been suggested that the SDS could play a major role in this co-ordination by pulling together all the other strategies through their requirements and impact on land-use and development. However the co-ordination of the different strategies has proved to be a fraught business. Some strategies were given greater political priority and were prepared in advance of others. The first to appear were the economic and transport strategies and these were used to reinforce the mayor's priorities to improve transport and promote London's economy in a climate of increasing global economic competition. The various environmental strategies were very slow to appear and therefore had to fit the parameters already set by the earlier strategies. The London Plan therefore was in a difficult position to act as a co-ordinating instrument. As a statutory document it takes longer to prepare and needs to go through a more formal consultation process. A draft was prepared in early 2001 by officials in the GLA, based upon work previously carried out by LPAC with considerable input from the Boroughs. However the Mayor rejected this as not sufficiently reflecting his political priorities and requested more work. He prepared an informal document called *Towards the London Plan* (GLA, 2001) that expressed his political priorities and acted as a framework for the official plan with a heavy emphasis on developing London's world city role. The new Draft London Plan (GLA, 2002) was produced in 2002, was circulated for consultation, and an Examination in Public was held in March/April 2003.

The stance taken by the Mayor is conditioned by a number of background factors – two important ones are the history of the election process and the limited powers that have been allocated to the Mayor and the new authority. The election campaign in 2000 was extremely eventful. The original Conservative Party candidate, Jeffrey Archer, had to stand down because of serious accusations of perjury and was replaced by Steve Norris. However it was in the Labour Party's candidate selection process that the most significant events occurred. Ken Livingstone, a member of the Labour Party and the last leader of the old GLC, indicated he wished to stand. This presented a severe problem for the Prime Minister. Livingstone, renowned for his independent spirit, was not fully signed up to the New Labour approach. He

was thus a threat to Tony Blair's dominance and control over Labour Party thinking. New Labour placed considerable emphasis on orchestrating its image and policy presentation utilising market research and media influence. Blair did all he could to prevent the election of Livingstone saying that it would be a disaster for London. Several changes were made to the rules for electing the Labour candidate that would be to the detriment of Livingstone. Much effort was also spent on trying to influence opinions, for example through orchestrated newspaper articles attacking Livingstone and raising questions about his past actions, to undermine his credibility. A desperate search took place for a suitable alternative candidate but unfortunately for Blair the best he could find was Frank Dobson, Minister for Health, who totally lacked any charisma. The result of the Labour Party ballot was that Frank Dobson won the internal Party election by a very narrow majority. However it was clear to everyone that this was only because of the way the election process had been manipulated. At this point Livingstone decided he would stand as an independent candidate and was expelled from the Labour Party.

Livingstone won the election by a convincing margin. In the first round of voting he obtained 39% of the vote, the conservative candidate Norris was second with 27% and the Labour Party candidate Frank Dobson third with only 13% (there were then eight other candidates with lower votes). It was clear that a major factor in the electorate's behaviour was disapproval of the attempt by Blair and the Labour Party to fix the process. Many relished the prospect of Livingstone standing up to the perceived 'control-freakery' of central government. This outcome, with a strong mayor figure acting with autonomy from the Labour Party and central government, was not envisaged when the new structures were designed. This is a particular feature of interest in exploring the implementation of the new structures and regulations. The election for the Assembly resulted in no political party gaining overall control and thus the Assembly, already with limited powers, was further weakened. The result of the election was to produce a Mayor with strong personal views who had no allegiance to a political party or to central government. Nor did he have to worry about the possibility of the Assembly limiting his activity. He therefore has independence and a high public profile – however the way that central government has set up the GLA means that he has limited financial or legal autonomy. He is very reliant on other organisations such as the private sector, central government and the London Boroughs for the implementation of his policies.

The London Plan has to be viewed in this context. It is in many ways a vision document setting out hopes and aspirations. It does not explore the financial support for the plan or set out the details of implementation. It could also be said to be a political lobby document that seeks to influence those that are allocating the resources. This is primarily central government - responsible for the major infrastructure, such as new transport, on which the plan depends. The Mayor has already been in a long battle with central government over the way that the private sector should be involved in providing resources for the London underground. The private sector is of course another major player in the implementation process and Livingstone has spent a lot of time cultivating the support of private sector interest groups – especially those with an interest in the 'world city' functions such as financial and other high level professional services. The plan has been described as one that focuses particularly on such economic sectors and privileges the central areas of the city (Buck et al, 2002). Let us look at some of the features of the Plan.



The plan states that London has two strategic choices. It can either rein back its economic and population growth through policies of dispersal. This would take the pressure off the overloaded infrastructure but compromise its development as a world city and damage the whole UK economy. Alternatively it can accept the processes of economic and population growth and re-centralisation and create an adequate infrastructure to cope with this demand. This growth will then pay for the improvements in services and transport the city needs. This second option is the one adopted. The role of the plan is therefore to ensure that the Mayor can provide the facilities needed for the world city growth strategy, and to create policies to deal with the pressures that this increase in economic activity and population creates. This growth has to take place in a way that also creates social and environmental benefits, and the overall slogan is to 'to develop London as an exemplary sustainable world city'. To accommodate the growth a policy of intensification and increasing densities is adopted with the identification of Areas of Opportunity for major development, mainly large brown-field sites. The major area to accommodate economic development is around the fringe of the existing financial city centre, for example in major developments around Kings Cross and London Bridge Stations. Other growth areas are identified around the Canary Wharf Development. Attempts are also to be made to try and encourage growth in some of the other corridors that are currently suffering from deprivation— for example to the East.

One of the mayor's most controversial policies is to allow an increase in the development of tall buildings and this has been embodied in the Plan. Such buildings have been heavily constrained in the past through various heritage and building height limitation to protect historical views. Dramatic architectural gestures are nearly always appealing to mayors who like to leave their visible mark on the city, and Livingstone has been promoting an increase in tall buildings from an early stage of his tenure. An interim guidance policy was produced in October 2001 and this was incorporated into the London Plan. Two broader policies can be detected that lie behind the support of tall buildings. One is the desire to promote London as a World City and the need to ensure that the city has a good stock of suitable office accommodation to attract the global activities. It is expected that international companies favour modern tall buildings – as the London Plan states, tall buildings 'can offer a supply of premises suited to the needs of global firms – especially those in the finance and business services sector' (GLA, 2002, p.249). The City of London is a strong advocate of the policy as they say that the City is full and so the only option is to expand upwards. It is proposed that the tall building would be clustered in the Central Activity Zone (covering the City, West End and the South Bank) and the Canary Wharf area. Other suitable locations with smaller numbers would be around central railway nodes and the suburban office centre at Croydon. The plan stresses that such building should be built to the highest design standards and stimulate regeneration in the surrounding area. The second policy that underpins the tall building approach is that of increasing the population and employment density with the city. This needs to be done in a sustainable way and so the intensification of activity through tall buildings around locations with good public transport facilities contributes to this policy. However the tall building policy has been strongly opposed in some quarters, particularly those seeking to protect London's unique building heritage.

The transport policies in the plan are taken directly from the transport strategy and involve improving access to airports, ports and international rail termini, especially by public transport. For example three new express transit lines across London and two new tram systems are proposed by 2016. However it is not clear whether these will be financed. The plan has been much criticised because the transport elements cannot be built for some time, and are constantly being delayed. As noted the finance is in the hands of central government. It has also been noted that the transport proposals are not well related to the Areas of Opportunity identified, particularly those aimed to upgrade the poorer parts of the city.

The housing policy in the plan has two dimensions. One is to increase densities, as already mentioned, the other is to provide more affordable housing. Many people on lower income cannot afford to live in London, as the provision of social housing has dwindled and private housing costs have risen. This not only affects the low paid and unemployed but also workers in many of the essential services of the city, such as police, teachers, nurses, firemen and transport workers. This threatens the functioning of the city and its world city position. In the plan the Mayor is seeking to ensure that in all major housing developments, 50% of the housing built is affordable. The mayor has some powers over such large developments as they have to be referred to him from the London Borough who receive the planning

application. However the Boroughs are the housing authority and therefore responsible for all the smaller developments. In the plan the mayor has set overall targets for the provision of affordable housing in each Borough – these are either set at 50% or 35%. Many Boroughs are not happy with these targets and many are contesting them at the Examination in Public. Thus the Plan has been much conditioned by the individual political priorities of the Mayor. His antagonistic relationship with central government has meant that he has not felt constrained to automatically follow central government policies. Many of the policies in the plan do in fact reflect central government policy but in other cases he is using the plan to try and influence central government decisions over spending priorities. His lack of financial and implementation powers means that he has established a good relationship with the private sector and reached a consensus with business in promoting London's growth as a world city with the supportive policies on expanding central areas, allowing tall buildings and ensuring that there is affordable housing for the key workers needed to maintain the economic vitality of the city.

### *References*

- Blair, T. (1996), New Britain: My Vision of a Young Country, London: Fourth Estate.
- Blair, T. (1998), The Third Way: New Politics for the New Century, London: Fabian Society.
- Buck, N., Gordon, I., Hall, P., Harloe, M. and Kleinman, M. (2002), Working Capital: Life and Labour in Contemporary London, London and New York: Routledge
- Coopers & Lybrand Deloitte (1991) London, World City Moving into the Twentieth Century, London: HMSO.
- DETR (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions) (1998), Modern Government: In Touch with the People, London: The Stationery Office.
- GLA (2001), Towards the London Plan
- GLA (2002), Draft London Plan.
- Hebbert, M. (1992), 'Governing the Capital' in A.Thornley (ed) *The Crisis of London*, Routledge, London.
- McNeill, D. (2002) 'The Mayor and the World City Skyline: London's Tall Buildings Debate', International Planning Studies, 7 (4), pp. 325-334.
- Newman, P. and Thornley, A (1997) 'Fragmentation and centralisation in the governance of London: influencing the urban policy and planning agenda' Urban Studies, 34 (7).
- Syrett, S. and Baldock, R (eds) (2001), Governing London: Competitiveness and regeneration for a Global City, London: Middlesex University Press.
- Travers, T. (2002) 'Decentralisation London-style: The GLA and London Governance', Regional Studies, 36 (7), pp.779-788.



## **Did we miss your news?**

Please send your email to Andy Thornley for inclusion in **Planning Newsletter 21**:  
Email: [a.thornley@lse.ac.uk](mailto:a.thornley@lse.ac.uk)

**NAME:**

**MSc/PhD/Research Fee Year**

**PERSONAL NEWS:**

**NEWS OF RUPS COLLEAGUES:**

**In addition, you can update your details by visiting the Office of Development and Alumni Relations at <http://www.lse.ac.uk/> or register for alumni e-mail [here](#).**