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Spatial planning defined: new language to describe old ideas?
Spatial Planning and Structure Planning: similar ambitions?

Spatial Planning (2008):

- Spatial planning goes beyond traditional land use planning to bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function. This will include policies which can impact on land use by influencing the demands on, or need for development, but which are not capable of being delivered solely or mainly through the granting or refusal of planning permission and which may be implemented by other means.

Structure Planning (1970):

- The term structure is used here to mean the social, economic and physical systems of an area, so far as they are subject to planning control or influence. The structure is, in effect, the planning framework for an area and includes such matters as the distribution of the population, the activities and the relationships between them, the patterns of land use and the development the activities give rise to, together with the network of communications and the systems of utility services.
Some well-known precedents: strategic spatial thinking
Ebenezer Howard: Garden Cities of Tomorrow: The Three Magnets

- Town
- Country
- Town-Country

1898
Ebenezer Howard’s Garden City, 1898

A mixed use, medium density, fixed-size development: jobs, schools, shops, parks, countryside all within walking distance.
The Social City: Clusters of Garden Cities, linked by rapid transit system, 1898
The Three Magnets updated: One hundred years later

1998

Patrick Abercrombie
Five Town Silhouettes
Five Town Silhouettes
Five Town Silhouettes
Five Town Silhouettes
Developing a vocabulary of spatial concepts
A vocabulary of spatial concepts used in strategic planning

- Location
- Co-Location/Agglomeration
- Spatial Connectivity/Networks
- Spatial Organisation
- Spatial Distribution
- Spatial Form
- Spatial Vision
- Spatial Intensity/Density
- Functional Geography
- Spatial Equity
- Spatial Categorisation
- Spatial Dynamics
- Spill-over Effect
- Spatial Convergence
Spatial concepts describing the context of strategic planning

• Functional Geography
• Spatial Distribution
• Spatial Dynamics
Spatial concepts used in policy instruments

• Location
• Co-Location/Agglomeration
• Spatial Connectivity/Networks/Movement
• Spatial Organisation
• Spatial Form
• Spatial Categorisation
• Spatial Intensity/Density
Concepts that describe the spatial outcomes of policy

- Spatial Equity
- Spill-over Effect
- Spatial Convergence
- Spatial Vision
Functional geography: the city region

“City regions are the economic footprint of a city – the area over which key economic markets, such as labour markets, measured by travel-to-work areas, housing markets, and retail markets operate”. (NWRSS 2008)

The idea is not new: in the case of Merseyside, it has been debated – and sometimes implemented - many times over the last 70 years.
Using spatial concepts to analyse plans, past and present
Three case study plans

• The Longstreth Thompson Plan for the Liverpool City Region (Merseyside), 1944
• The Interim Planning Policy for Liverpool, 1965
• The Liverpool Core Strategy, 2012
Longstreth Thompson Plan prepared during World War II makes a conscious attempt to forecast the demand for particular land uses.

Main issue is reducing the level of congestion in the centre of the conurbation by planning for the decentralisation of population and employment - overspill.
Longstreth
Thompson Outline Plan for Merseyside 1944
The Plan considered the main corridors of movement and their relationship with land use activities.
The plan took explicit account of the functional geography of Merseyside, even if the data was old: 1921!
In 1965 the system of development plans was comprehensively reviewed by the Planning Advisory Group (PAG). The PAG report recommended the introduction of Structure Plans (strategic) and Local Plans (tactical).

Walter Bor, newly appointed City Planning Officer for Liverpool was a member of the PAG and decided, when the time came to review Liverpool’s development plan, to follow the new Structure Plan approach. This resulted in the Interim Planning Policy Statement, a plan that in some ways was ahead of its time.
North West England in the mid 1960s: no shortage of proposals

New Towns
Expanded Towns
Tidal Barrages
Office Developments
Industrial Developments
Dock Extension
Motorways, etc.

The mid 1960s were a period of high levels of investment in housing and infrastructure.
Interim Planning Policy Statement 1965

Note the spatial categorisation which is applied to both industrial and residential areas.
Spatial Form

The Interim Planning Policy Statement examined existing (1965) urban development in terms of its spatial form, reducing it to an abstract pattern.

The City Centre was the subject of a related plan prepared by consultant Graeme Shankland.
Density distributions

The Interim Planning Policy Statement examines density of development in concentric rings around the city centre, suggesting how this might change as a result of the plan’s proposals.
MALTS examined alternative land-use plans based on different spatial form configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative additional population projections</th>
<th>Local service employment for projected population*</th>
<th>Total population projection†</th>
<th>Total projected employment need‡</th>
<th>Employment not locationally determined by new residences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a 200,000</td>
<td>b 28,000</td>
<td>c 1,524,000</td>
<td>d 650,000</td>
<td>d-b 622,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>1,724,000</td>
<td>740,000</td>
<td>683,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>1,924,000</td>
<td>825,000</td>
<td>740,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*At rate of one-seventh of the resident population.
†Capacity of existing areas assumed as 1,324,000 (i.e. excluding committed overspill).
‡42.8 per cent of the population.

Fig. 20. Three population and employment assumptions.

Final plan was a ‘finger plan’
Example of spatial distribution map: multiple deprivation
Liverpool’s Spatial Vision 1

• The City's economy will be competitive and robust, having capitalised fully on the ability to generate growth of key sectors such as bio-manufacturing and the knowledge and creative industries, together with the development of the potential of other important assets such as the Port of Liverpool and Liverpool John Lennon Airport. The main centres for employment will be easily accessible to residents in disadvantaged parts of the City, particularly its inner areas, enabling them to benefit fully from the City's economic revival.

• The City Centre and adjoining Atlantic Gateway Strategic Investment Area will be at the heart of the City's economic renaissance. It will be a thriving regional centre for commercial, retail, cultural, civic, leisure and residential uses, with its river frontage a focus, in particular, for leisure and tourism activity. The internationally significant UNESCO World Heritage Site will have been sensitively managed, providing a catalyst for further economic regeneration within the City Centre and waterfront.
Liverpool’s Spatial Vision 2

• The inner urban area surrounding the City Centre will have been transformed by excellent neighbourhood design with major investment in housing, transport infrastructure, shopping facilities, public services and open spaces. This will have succeeded in increasing the population and re-establishing its residential neighbourhoods as attractive locations in which to live. A wide range of housing opportunities, located within walking distance of local services and good quality open space, will be available to meet residents’ needs and aspirations.

• The City's peripheral housing estates will have a balance of housing types and tenures. Elsewhere in Liverpool’s suburbs, those neighbourhoods that are currently attractive places to live will remain so, with important environmental and open space assets having been successfully protected.

• Outside the City Centre, Liverpool's district and local centres will serve as vibrant, dynamic and accessible focal points for communities, providing a range of community services and facilities to meet day-to-day needs.
Liverpool’s Spatial Vision 3

• The amount of vacant and derelict land and buildings will have been significantly reduced. New development will be energy-efficient and of high quality, respecting local character and the relationships between buildings and spaces.

• There will be a strong relationship between the built environment and the open space network, ensuring that open space performs a variety of functions and contributes to a vibrant and active community. Biodiversity will have been enhanced and the City’s nature reserves, parks and gardens and other green spaces will have been improved and made more accessible, particularly for residents in the City Centre and inner urban area.

• Liverpool will be a place of choice, for living, working, recreation and visiting.
Option One – Intensive Regeneration

Sub-Area 3 Outer Areas
10% of all new dwellings

- Total requirement 2008-2026 (net dwellings): 4048
- Supply in sites with planning permission at 1 April 2008 (net dwellings): 2896
- Additional dwellings required to be delivered through the LDF: 1152
- Population change, 2008-2026: -15000 to -8000

Priority Areas for economic growth:
- Priority focus for housing within the Outer Areas
- Priority Focus Inner Area HMR priority zones

Sub-Areas 1 & 2 City Centre & Inner Areas
90% of all new dwellings

- Total requirement, 2008-2026 (net dwellings): 36432
- Supply in sites with planning permission at 1 April 2008 (net dwellings): 10540
- Additional dwellings required to be delivered through the LDF: 25892
- Population change, 2008-2026: +42000 to +48000

Area of search for removal of land from the Green Belt to provide the world cargo centre and other facilities at the airport.

Picture 70 Diagrammatic Representation of Option 1 Intensive Regeneration
Comparisons and conclusions
Spatial concepts in three plans 1: the context of strategic planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Geography</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Distribution</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Dynamics</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spatial concepts in three plans 2: **policy instruments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Location/Agglomeration</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Connectivity</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Organisation</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Form</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Categorisation</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Intensity/Density</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Spatial concepts in three plans 3: spatial outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Equity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spill-over Effect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Convergence</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Vision</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

• Comparison shows that 1965 Plan puts greatest emphasis on spatial policy instruments; 2012 Plan puts stress on spatial context and spatial outcomes, but no convincing evidence that planning is now more spatial

• List of spatial concepts needs to be refined and a glossary of terms added

• Analytical framework capable of being applied more widely