



Mapping policies and programmes: the use of GIS to communicate spatial relationships in England

Cecilia Wong, Mark Baker

Centre for Urban Policy Studies, School of Environment and Development, the University of Manchester, HBS Building, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL, England; e-mail: cecilia.wong@manchester.ac.uk, mark.baker@manchester.ac.uk

Brian Webb ¶

School of Planning and Geography, Cardiff University, Glamorgan Building, King Edward VII Avenue, Cardiff CF10 3WA, Wales; e-mail: webbb1@cardiff.ac.uk

Stephen Hincks, Andreas Schulze-Baing

Centre for Urban Policy Studies, School of Environment and Development, the University of Manchester, HBS Building, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL, England; e-mail: stephen.hincks@manchester.ac.uk, andreas.schulze.baing@manchester.ac.uk

Received 28 May 2013; in revised form 8 August 2014; published online 21 April 2014

Abstract. It has long been acknowledged that there is a gap between the advancement of GIS in the research field and its application in planning practice. This paper demonstrates the potential for employing simple GIS mapping overlays as a way of communicating complex planning issues in a ‘language’ that is easily understandable and effective at stimulating policy debate, critical thinking, and learning. The analysis focuses on capturing the synergies and conflicts in two key planning challenges in England, progrowth and housing delivery agendas. In a political context where spatial evidence-based policy making has been eroded in recent years, the analysis demonstrates the need for policy makers to ‘think spatially, act spatially’ when developing different policies and programmes. The paper concludes that only by making spatial relationships of policies and programmes explicit in a manner that is easily understood by a range of actors, can different spatial scenarios and metaphors of future opportunities and challenges be developed to inform long-range development and planning.

Keywords: spatial planning, policy coordination, monitoring, GIS mapping

Introduction

The spatial complexity of area-based urban initiatives in Britain was famously described by the Audit Commission (1989, page 1) as “a patchwork quilt of complexity and idiosyncrasy.” The 1990s had witnessed a trend towards more strategic thinking in coordinating urban regeneration activities in Britain. This was perhaps best illustrated by the introduction of the Single Regeneration Budget in 1994, which was intended to simplify the existing regeneration funding regime by integrating a variety of programmes and initiatives that were traditionally coordinated by several individual government departments. Nevertheless, a decade later, the then Labour government regeneration minister, Lord Rooker, graphically described the still chaotic landscape of urban policy as “a bowl of spaghetti” (*Lords Hansard* 2003). In spite of the pledges made by the Labour government that they would deliver a more ‘joined-up’ policy landscape, the schizophrenic approach to policy planning and coordination that had been characteristic of previous political regimes continued throughout the 2000s (Baker and Wong, 2012).

¶ Corresponding author.

The introduction of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (HM Government, 2004) was intended to encourage improved spatial policy coordination. The act set out the basis for the transformation of the planning system in England from a ‘traditional land use’ to a ‘spatial’ orientated system by attempting to emphasise critical thinking about space and place as the basis for land-use intervention so as to encapsulate a broader meaning of planning (Shaw and Lord, 2009). The English spatial planning project has been critiqued for its political orientation (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2009) and for failing to address the longstanding disjunction between economic development and strategic planning across different spatial scales (Baker and Wong, 2012). A new Coalition government came to power in 2010 and very quickly revoked all regional-level strategies via the 2011 Localism Act (Pearce and Ayres, 2012). While the gravity shift to a more localised, open-source approach provides opportunities for developing more contextualised planning, critics fail to be convinced by the argument that this can be achieved in the absence of a well-articulated national spatial planning framework that provides the parameters for local planning authorities to deliver their policies in a coherent and coordinated manner (Baker and Wong, 2012).

The lack of any strategic spatial plan at the UK or England level led the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) to commission a study to map the policies and programmes of government departments, their agencies, and nondepartmental public bodies that have an explicit spatial expression. The Map for England initiative was launched in March 2012 with the aim of identifying patterns of spatial synergies and conflicts arising from existing government policies and programmes and to present these spatial synergies and conflicts through ‘diagrammatic mapping’. Since there is not a single place or data source within government that makes such maps available to view systematically, *A Map for England* (RTPI, 2014) was designed to encourage policy makers to think critically about space and place by enabling them to visualise and communicate spatial synergies and conflicts across policies and programmes.

Despite the advancement of GIS technology, there has long been a gap between its research development and its application in planning practice (Vonk et al, 2005), which Batty (2004, page 327) considers to be “the tragedy of the field.” The comments made by Gilfoyle and Wong (1998) in the late 1990s remain true today, that the large majority of GIS applications in British planning remain lower order activities of cartographic outputs, rather than being used for analysis and decision making. Technical complexity—real or perceived—is one of the major barriers inhibiting the use of decision-support tools, including GIS, in planning practice (Vonk et al, 2005). Therefore, the Map for England initiative was grounded in the notion that methodological and technical complexity should be minimised as far as possible and that analytical outputs should communicate results in a clear and uncomplicated style. Accordingly, use was made of simple GIS *overlays* as the starting point for analysing the spatial synergies and conflicts within and between government policies and programmes. The advantage of the overlay approach is that it can be applied with technical ease and it has the potential to produce understandable but powerful visualisations of spatial phenomena.

The use of simple GIS overlays can be traced back to McHarg’s (1969) book, *Design with Nature*, in which he set out a process for development-based decision making by overlaying ecological and built environment data in a visual manner that was easily understandable by a range of actors. In doing so he was able to highlight constraints and opportunities that could be used as part of an over-arching narrative within which planning-based decision making could occur. Largely missing from McHarg’s analysis, however, was the impact of government policies and programmes that also work to constrain and create opportunities. The Map for England study sought to bridge this gap and the study has been met with enthusiasm and sustained debate in planning practice and in the media. It has also been used by politicians

to help them to evidence and argue their points in public government committee hearings (see RTPI, 2014).

With this in mind, we aim to use the practical imperative of *A Map for England* to provide a policy-applied example of how a succinct and effective analytical approach can be used to communicate often complex and multisectoral spatial relationships to nontechnical audiences. Through two key planning challenges in England, progrowth and housing delivery agendas, we explore whether the pledges made by successive governments to improve the spatial coordination of policy following the use of the ‘patchwork quilt’ and ‘spaghetti bowl’ analogies has had any impact. We then demonstrate the merits of using GIS mapping overlays to monitor the impacts of spatial policy coordination and as a tool for stimulating reflective policy debate. In the next section we explore the conceptual debates regarding spatial policy coordination to foreground the various debates that emerge through the applied analysis in later sections of the paper.

Spatial policy coordination

The goals of planning are by their nature broad, varied, and complex and their delivery is reliant upon the action of a plurality of actors and agencies across operationally independent policy sectors (Albrechts, 2004). The endeavour to monitor and evaluate spatial planning has been focused largely on the challenge of identifying complex outcomes, but not on the process of policy development and coordination in terms of competing interests and practices across different policy sectors (Baker and Wong, 2006).

Since the publication of the European Spatial Development Perspective (European Commission, 1999), the emphasis on vertical coordination between different levels of government and horizontal coordination across policy sectors with a spatial perspective has underpinned the rationale for spatial planning and its formal monitoring processes. There is also a third dimension, of diagonal coordination, which demands that public and private institutions interact and cooperate to achieve policy goals (Priemus, 1999). Advocates argue that coordination can help to address a number of issues in the implementation of spatial policy frameworks (Peters, 1998). This first is redundancy which occurs when multiple actors are involved in the alleviation of the same problem, leading to a waste of resources and departmental conflicts over service to client groups. The second is lacunae which are caused when a lack of involvement by any department in a task leads to a gap in policy or implementation. This may be because relevant departments do not realise such a gap exists or because they believe the problem cannot be solved and that involvement would be a waste of resources. The third is incoherence which arises when departments deal with the same policy sphere but they are underpinned by different requirements and goals, leading to the emergence of conflicting policies.

The path to a coordinated policy framework is often impeded when actors are compelled to operate within their own limited institutional arena. Benz (2002) regards such inflexibility as ‘strict coupling’ which can lead to higher transaction costs as ever more empowered actors and institutions become involved in decision-making processes. The flipside of this situation is ‘decoupling’, whereby policy spheres are decentralised to the point where no interaction exists between institutions. ‘Loose coupling’, a balance between these two positions, is defined as an institutional environment whereby independent decisions taken in one arena will only have an impact on specific aspects of another, rather than completely changing it (Weick, 1985). In this environment, binding decisions are replaced by communication, information exchange and persuasion across arenas with the aim of collectively resolving problems where policies intersect (Benz, 2002). The use of predesigned and forced administrative efforts at coordination, even within one level of government, has consistently failed due to departmental struggles for power, departmental interest in protecting individual clienteles,

and personal concerns related to job security and career promotion (Kunzmann, 1998). The establishment of goal-directed, rather than serendipitous, networks is considered important by proponents seeking to overcome these problems (Agranoff and McGuire, 2003).

Likewise, it has been argued that a guidance approach can offer a more flexible route to establishing goal-directed networks designed to achieve short-term objectives (Jensen and Richardson, 2001). In theory, to bring about change, the guidance or visioning process would seek to formulate a conception of space and place that can be understood by a wide variety of actors, such that it results in a collective way of 'seeing' (Healey, 2007). The spirit of these ideas has found resonance with the 'planning-as-learning' approach advocated by Faludi (2000, page 300) in which "strategic spatial plans must be evaluated, not primarily in the light of their material outcomes, but for how they improve the understanding of decision makers of the present and future problems they face." However, critics have challenged the assumption that spatial planning, if undertaken collaboratively and transparently, will lead to better development on the grounds that marginal voices are often excluded from mainstream debates and that "intractable tensions may be eased at the level of producing strategic documents, only for problems to surface at the level of implementation" (Allmendinger and Haughton, 2009, page 2548).

Irrespective of the conceptual standpoint taken, it is clear that in analysing the practices associated with policy coordination and their outcomes attention needs to be paid to the interpretation of contextual variations and to their interaction with other policy initiatives as they coalesce to produce different spatial outcomes (Wong and Watkins, 2009). To Rittel and Webber (1973), only by laying out alternative understandings of problems, competing interests, priorities, and constraints, is it then possible to apply more formal analytical tools to understand a specific problem scenario. While complexities in planning issues can encourage policy makers to question normative assumptions and permit stakeholders to rethink the principles of spatial organisation and activities, the challenge lies in balancing the presentation of complex concepts in a form which is understandable by a range of actors. Scott (1998) has noted the historic ways in which governments work to skew decision making towards centralised systems of control and the favouring of expert knowledge away from the local level in order to force particular ways of 'seeing' policy problems and potential solutions. This often results in a high level of institutional and policy complexity, serving to marginalise particular groups or perspectives. The emphasis on centralised systems of governance and expert knowledge may help to explain why the use of GIS to help coordinate departmental policy processes has not been extensively utilised despite technological advancements (Vonk et al, 2005). The potential of GIS and digital platforms to share knowledge across departments and to disseminate ideas to the public stands in stark contrast to the maintenance of centralised management and closed expert policy networks.

We now turn to exploring how the application of a succinct spatial mapping analysis of government policies and programmes, coupled with a simple but effective visualisation approach using GIS, can enhance the monitoring of complex planning activities and encourage the development of alternative and critical ways of viewing a spatial policy problem (see Rae and Wong, 2012).

The appraisal of government policies and programmes

The Map for England study began with an exercise that systematically scanned policy documents and websites of different UK government departments and their agencies and nondepartmental public bodies (NDPBs). The exercise carried out in January 2012 covered a total of ninety-five relevant sources (Wong et al, 2012). These include documents and websites from the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills; the Department for Communities and Local Government; the Department for Environment, Food and

Rural Affairs; the Department for Transport; the Department for Culture, Media and Sport; HM Treasury; Home Office; Cabinet Office; British Waterways; Environment Agency; and Natural England.

The scanning exercise was undertaken with the aim of capturing the spatial and aspatial properties of various policy documents. Taking a lead from Harris and Hooper (2004), the exercise focused on two features: spatial references (eg, locational information) and spatial implications (eg, targeted funding frameworks, cross-boundary issues, and spatial concentrations). After appraising the ninety-five sources, just over a third (thirty-seven) were found to have an explicit spatial expression and/or spatial consequences in terms of having maps, diagrams, or clear data or text that specified the application of a policy to a particular defined area. The remaining two-thirds, nonetheless, consisted of policies or programmes that have clear spatial consequences and outcomes but do not articulate such characteristics explicitly. The analysis here focuses on these explicit spatial references, aiming to understand how government departments construct and think about space differently, and better understand how multiple concepts of space can often coexist and overlap the same geographical space (Rae and Wong, 2012).

It is telling then that not a single document attempted to provide an integrated spatial framework for all these policies and programmes or to frame how they cumulatively interact and affect spatial development in England. Crucially, among the documents that shied away from any spatial articulation of issues were the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (DCLG, 2012) and the majority of the existing Planning Policy Statements/Guidance. These are intended to form an integral part of the spatial planning system by providing an overarching framework for planning across England. Yet, despite the fact that the NPPF is an 'aspatial' document, it is clear that government policies and programmes do have spatial implications. In some instances these spatial implications are more explicit than in other instances, such as in the case of the high-speed rail network proposal and other projects set out in the National Infrastructure Plan (HM Treasury, 2011). Other mainstream government policies (eg, on supply-side measures for tackling nonemployment, on investment in flood risk prevention projects) also bear implications for the spatial distribution of economic activities and opportunities, particularly recognising the challenge of cross-border planning.

Administrative boundaries at regional and local levels are often ineffective at capturing functional economic or social interactions because spatial processes do not cease at jurisdictional boundaries (Brown and Hincks, 2008; Hincks and Wong, 2010). Rather, there are 'spillover effects' reflecting within-area and interarea linkages. This is perhaps most clear in the case of London, the South East, and the East of England regions, where three regions are affected by the role of London as a 'world city' and where a key policy area, the Thames Gateway, straddles regional boundaries. Elsewhere, there are also important functional (commuting and migration) links, for example, between parts of Derbyshire (in the East Midlands) and Sheffield (in Yorkshire and the Humber), and south Milton Keynes. Certain subregions, such as High Peak and Northern Cheshire, also have strong links into the Greater Manchester city-region. Relevant information with regard to these spatial functional connections can aid local authorities in the development of a balanced suite of strategies by taking account of key strategic issues such as the geographies of housing-market areas and the impacts of future water stress on development activity (Wong and Watkins, 2009). In the next section we outline the spatial context for future planning in England, focusing primarily on two policy challenges: progrowth and housing delivery agendas.

Mapping spatial synergies and conflicts in government policies and programmes

Planning is a future-oriented activity, and development across different local authority and partnership areas is very much affected by a combination of the physical constraints of landscape designation, the emerging development trends, and the government's own policies and programmes that exacerbate or reduce such trends. In recent years, a progrowth agenda has infiltrated various public policy arenas in England as the Coalition government has worked to develop a roadmap to bring the UK out of recession. The analysis here focuses on two features of this agenda: Growth Funds and city-regions, and future housing delivery. A core map was produced for each strategic planning issue. GIS overlay analysis was then used to impose different spatial contexts and different government policies and programmes onto the core map. These map overlays were used predominantly to display the spatial synergies and/or conflicts caused by the interaction of existing development trends and the progrowth policy interventions, and between government policies and programmes across different sectors and spatial scales. The analysis presented here is not meant to be comprehensive or exhaustive. Rather, it is intended to provide illustrative examples of the merits of thinking critically about the cumulative spatial impacts and opportunities brought by different policies and activities and the value of using simple analytical and visualisation techniques to communicate findings to nontechnical audiences.

Growth funds and core city-regions

In the *Unlocking Growth in Cities* (UGC) report (HM Government, 2011), the Deputy Prime Minister contended that “every city is different. So we are moving away from a one-size-fits-all model towards individual city deals” (page iii). The UGC report calls for core cities to submit proposals to unlock government resources to serve their own priorities by providing: a clear economic rationale for their city deal; a strong evidence base to support its implementation; an appropriately defined geography; and suitable governance structures and mechanisms, and criteria to assess the transparency of accountability. Of the four criteria used by government to make the assessment, the first three have an explicit spatial component. In order to demonstrate such spatial expression, the analysis here focuses on mapping the distribution of the £1 billion Regional Growth Fund (2nd Round) and the £500 million Growing Places Fund across the core city-region local enterprise partnerships (LEPs)⁽¹⁾ to expose the potential economic boosting effect in these areas. Figure 1 shows that whilst funding bids were submitted to the government from the core city-regions, the outcomes vary from place to place. Liverpool city-region clearly gains a much larger share of the pot in per capita population terms, followed by the West of England, and Greater Birmingham and Solihull. At the opposite end of the spectrum, the Leeds city-region has gained the least from the funding pot.

Since the government argues that cities are the economic drivers of growth, financial boosts from public expenditure can help to address wider issues faced by the core city-regions. Discrete analysis of Growth Fund allocations helps shed light on the ‘winners and losers’ in the distribution of funding. However, such analysis fails to reflect the potential policy synergies, conflicts, and missed opportunities that emerge as different policy agendas interact to affect the spatial economy. New infrastructure features prominently in the progrowth agenda, functioning to support new and existing economic activity. If the proposals for road network investment in the National Infrastructure Plan are superimposed on the Growth Fund map, it reveals that the road investment proposals will mostly benefit the M62 corridor

⁽¹⁾LEPs are business-led, locally initiated partnerships that are supposed to be designed to meet local contexts focused around achieving economic growth. They have varying geographic boundaries, but broadly consist of existing sets of local authorities or in some cases functional economic areas.




Figure 1. Combined Growth Funds and road network investment. (Full source data in appendix A.)

(Liverpool, Greater Manchester and Leeds city-regions) and its north–south connections with Yorkshire and the Humber, North East England, Nottingham, and Birmingham (figure 1).

In terms of synergies, across the M62 axis there is potential for Growth Fund and road network investment to deliver complementary economic development outcomes. The M62 corridor has long been the focus of policy initiatives culminating most recently in the now defunct Northern Way initiative (ODPM, 2004). This agenda aimed to anchor future economic development in northern England by exploiting the agglomerative benefits of the major urban areas along the M62. As advocates of agglomeration economics contend, transport connectivity is crucial to achieving economic returns (Krugman, 1998). As the

overlays illustrate, connectivity is a major strength of the corridor, to such an extent that the Chancellor of the Exchequer recently called for a new high-speed rail link—the so-called HS3—to be built along the M62 corridor to complement HS2 and existing transport connections (Watt, 2014).

However, the analysis is also helpful in pinpointing instances in which opportunities have been overlooked. One example is the absence of Growth Funding for East Yorkshire. The Hull city-region is located strategically at the eastern end of the M62 corridor but it has experienced decades of economic underperformance (see ODPM, 2006). This has stemmed largely from economic restructuring and the decline of the fishing industry since the late 1970s. Since undertaking this research, the Humber LEP has successfully attracted Growth Funding through subsequent rounds of funding allocations and the area is experiencing a renewed economic energy brought about through a growing green economy and investment in its seaport infrastructure. Nevertheless, the absence of early round Growth Funding is a case in point for demonstrating the utility of the simple overlay approach for capturing deficits in strategic–spatial policy making.

An alternative policy question might focus on the relationship between the distribution of Growth Funds and deprivation (figure 2). When deprivation data are combined with Growth Fund allocations, the relationship between the two policy frameworks suggests that the Liverpool and Greater Birmingham and Solihull city-regions will have access to policy levers to enable them to continue to address concentrated deprivation within their neighbourhoods by targeting new job creation. A further synergy is evident in the allocation of funds to the Bristol city-region. However, in contrast to the experience of Liverpool or Birmingham, the alleviation of area-based deprivation is likely to be of secondary consideration. The Bristol city-region is characterised by low unemployment rates and concentrations of deprivation when compared with many of its northern counterparts including Liverpool and Birmingham as well as Manchester, Leeds and Newcastle. Instead, the Bristol city-region has higher than average employment rates, a strong research capacity, a greater concentration of high-tech and knowledge-intensive industries, and higher population growth rates when compared with the other core cities (ODPM, 2006). Bristol has long benefited from its location on the M4 growth corridor and from comparatively strong development in the manufacturing and service sectors owing to sustained foreign direct investment since the 1980s (Gripaios et al, 1997). In short, Bristol has seemingly responded more effectively to economic restructuring since the late 1980s in comparison with other English core cities (ODPM, 2006), which means that the Growth Funding is likely to be used more strategically to consolidate existing capacity and further boost the economic performance of the city-region.

In shifting the analysis to overlay Growth Fund allocations and cumulative cuts in revenue spending power between 2010/11 and 2012/13 across English local authorities, an alternative policy angle to the previous two emerges (figure 3). The resulting patterns are not accidental. They reflect a recent change in policy which has seen the size and role of the public sector reduced in England as a result of austerity measures. As part of this agenda, Growth Funds have been allocated with the aim of stimulating private and voluntary sector activity. The intention is to encourage actors in these sectors to assume responsibilities that were once firmly under the remit of local authorities. In broad terms, the metropolitan local authorities, unitary authorities, and inner London boroughs face the most severe level of funding cuts per capita. A striking picture of local authority cuts is also evident along the M62 corridor. In this context, the Liverpool city-region has the highest level of growth funding, but its local authorities also face the highest levels of revenue cuts.

In contrast, the West of England city-region LEP received relatively high levels of Growth Funding but the cumulative reduction in revenue spending power per head




Figure 2. Combined Growth Funds and deprivation. (Full source data in appendix A.)

of population in Bristol has been less extreme than in other city-regions. Indeed, the revenue spending power of the Liverpool local authority is anticipated to fall by £329 per person between 2010/11 and 2014/15 compared with £117 per person in Bristol over the same period (Meegan et al, 2014). The reason for such extreme differences reflects the underlying social and economic conditions of the two cities. In the past, compared with Bristol, Liverpool, and the majority of other core cities have been much more reliant on redistributive formula grants and needs-based grants to support their deprived populations. The most extreme cuts to date in local authority budgets have been in the allocation of area-based grants which Bristol lost in 2007 meaning that there has been a period of relative adjustment in Bristol before cost-cutting exercises even began affecting




Figure 3. Combined Growth Funds and local authority funding cuts. (Full source data in appendix A.)

local areas following the financial crash (Meegan et al, 2014). Consequently, the combined impact of relatively manageable funding cuts, Growth Fund allocation, and a resilient local economy seemingly provide a strong platform for the Bristol area to continue to develop its competitive economic advantage.

What the overlay analysis of Growth Funds, deprivation, and spending cuts reveals is that the nature of the synergies and conflicts within and between different policy agendas is not always immediately clear. Indeed, both the Liverpool and Bristol city-region examples revealed the existence of context-specific synergies in the relationship between the Growth Fund policy framework, road network investments, and deprivation. This is a reflection of the malleability of the policy frameworks as they interact with the variable, and deeply entrenched,

spatial and structural characteristics that condition the economic performance of each place. The analysis also revealed instances where Growth Funds are delivering the government's intended shifts in the landscape of public sector funding, albeit to the detriment of the most vulnerable communities (eg, the Liverpool city-region) (Meegan et al, 2014). Moreover, 'sites' of contradiction were revealed where public expenditure cuts are not 'offset' at all through Growth Fund allocations. Inner London is perhaps the most striking example of this although such contradictions are also evident in Lancashire, North and East Yorkshire, and the West Midlands.

Future housing delivery

The NPPF makes it clear that the government's key housing objective is to increase significantly the delivery of new homes. However, it does not articulate the spatial aspects of housing supply and demand and fails to take account of the importance of strategic guidance when it comes to delivering new housing in the places where demand–supply pressures are most acute (Hincks and Baker, 2013). Instead, it requires local planning authorities (with neighbouring authorities where housing-market areas cross administrative boundaries) to prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess their full housing requirements in terms of the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures. They are also required to prepare a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability, and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified requirement for housing over the plan period. The outcomes of conducting SHMA and SHLAA are to determine the spatial requirements of different types of housing within the local plan.

The National Infrastructure Plan (HM Treasury, 2011), however, goes further in articulating the intersectoral connections between new housing delivery and infrastructure provision. It argues that new housing delivery has to be supported by infrastructure and that providers need certainty before making investment decisions. The National Infrastructure Plan makes reference to the land-supply proposals of emerging local plans and the need for local authorities to work together across boundaries to properly plan for infrastructure provision (para. 4.24) as well as potential funding sources (paragraph 4.5).

The designation of national parks and areas of outstanding natural beauty as protected environments and landscapes sets out physical restrictions on the development of land. The longstanding planning tool of national green belt policy, checking the unrestricted growth of the conurbations and major towns into their rural hinterlands, imposes further restrictions on development, often in areas with the greatest development pressures (Gallent, 2009). The overlay approach was used to examine the relationship between projected household growth and the wider spatial contexts that affect housing delivery as reflected within government policies and programmes. Figure 4 captures projected household growth between 2008 and 2033 and landscape designations. It shows clearly where there are potential 'sites' of conflict in government policy agendas. The most obvious site of conflict is in areas where population is predicted to increase by 35% and above that abut or intersect locations with high landscape value. Examples include the Yorkshire Dales, the coastal areas of Norfolk and Suffolk, and Devon.

With concern growing over climate change, large-scale housing developments will need to take account of future water supply challenges (eg, Arnell and Delaney, 2006). As shown in figure 5, areas on the eastern side of England (with the exception of the Yorkshire and Humber growth areas) tend to suffer from more serious levels of relative water stress (partly related to their higher levels of drought risk) compared with other parts of England. What is clear from the mapping exercise is that the areas with the highest levels of relative water stress intersect most acutely the areas where population levels are projected to increase by




Figure 4. Key landscape designations and household growth projections. (Full source data in appendix A.)

35% or more by 2033. Patterns of projected growth are largely located in areas surrounding major urban centres, exceptions being Manchester, some inner London boroughs, and parts of the urbanised Midlands. The growth areas tend to be periurban and commuter locations—reflecting processes of counter-urbanisation—that are accessible for work, have good services, are less densely populated than main urban areas, and have access to ‘green’ environments (Fontaine and Rounsevell, 2009).

Another key concern of housing delivery policy is how to address housing affordability within pressurised market contexts (eg, Bramley and Karley, 2005). Figure 6 illustrates the relationship between areas projected to have very high household growth rates and their




Figure 5. Relative water stress level and high household growth projection. (Full source data in appendix A.)

respective housing affordability ratios (normalised house price versus average household income). It is interesting to note the neat spatial ‘affordability divide’ drawn between the Severn Estuary and the Wash, the long standing North–South dividing line. Housing in high growth areas north of the dividing line is clearly much more affordable than in areas to the south of the line.

From a policy perspective, northern England—with its extensive portfolio of protected landscapes—is unlikely to suffer from water stress or acute housing affordability pressures at least in the medium term. This contrasts with the East of England where population growth is accelerating by virtue of spillover effects from a flourishing London and South




Figure 6. Housing affordability and high household growth projection. (Full source data in appendix A.)

East economy, but water stress and housing affordability pressures are also intensifying. The overlay analysis offers an accessible yet powerful discursive ‘frame’ that could be used to encourage more critical thinking about policy alternatives. In this context, this might involve developing more creative water management strategies in areas experiencing rapid growth in population or economic productivity. It might also involve policy makers analysing the quality of the land that is currently designated as green belt with the aim of redesignating land or thinking more creatively about derelict and vacant land in existing urban areas. But perhaps more significantly, the analysis clearly captures a cross-section of impacts associated with uneven economic growth in England. It is a further illustration of the need for more creative thinking about rebalancing the spatial economy away from London and the South

East towards second-tier cities which, on the whole, have latent capacity to accommodate growth (Champion and Townsend, 2013).

Discussion

Since assuming office in 2010, the Coalition government has progressed a narrative that one-size policy measures are inefficient at reflecting local circumstances and that power and decision-making responsibilities need to be devolved more extensively to local authorities to allow them to address local issues in context-specific ways (Baker and Wong, 2012). However, in implementing far-reaching changes to local and strategic planning in England, the government has failed to recognise the magnitude of the challenge associated with coordinating activities that cut across spatial and sectoral boundaries. The inclusion of a 'duty-to-cooperate' clause in the 2011 Localism Act places a legal obligation on local authorities and other public bodies to cooperate on strategic cross-boundary issues during plan preparation. However, a lack of spatial or sectoral guidance to accompany the clause has given rise to a host of problems at the local level (Geoghegan, 2014).

Crucially, the case studies analysed above have usefully demonstrated the potential fallacy of self-interested actions within government departments and the impacts that may result from poor-quality spatial policy coordination at the local level. While it is acknowledged that the mapping exercise is a simplistic way to explain complex problems that smooths away resource constraints and the politics of policy delivery, this simplicity is a necessary starting point for enhancing accountability in decision-making processes and for identifying the potential positive benefits that could be obtained by thinking critically about coordination practices as they affect the management of spatial processes and impacts, and the development of creative policy alternatives (see Peters, 1998).

The analysis of policies pertaining to progrowth and housing delivery agendas demonstrated that government policies and actions, even without a deliberate spatial framework, create spatial outcomes and, cumulatively, they create differential spatial impacts. While a progrowth policy framework has been consistently applied by Whitehall in recent years, a consistent lack of attention has been paid to the social and demographic drivers, such as deprivation and household formation, as well as the environmental drivers associated with climate change. This means that the allocation of Growth Funds has not followed any strategic rationale. Indeed, the Coalition government has been seemingly ambivalent about the challenges associated with alleviating area-based deprivation (eg, Birmingham and Solihull), the challenge of compensating for the effects of public expenditure cuts (eg, the Liverpool city-region), or the effects of consistently distributing funds to support high-growth areas (eg, Bristol). The analysis illustrates the variable nature of the synergies and conflicts of investment across different areas, which fail to optimise the limited resources that are available to manage spatial change.

At a policy level, the NPPF avoids any spatial steer with regard to future housing provision and simply delegates the task to the SHMA and SHLAA exercises at the local level. The analysis of future household projections (the best guess of future housing demand) clearly shows that the high-growth areas in Eastern England are likely to be in the least sustainable locations if there is no containment policy combined with brownfield new build targets, nor major infrastructure investments to improve their physical (road and rail) and broadband accessibility. More importantly, these areas are also classified by the Environment Agency as amongst those localities experiencing serious water stress. While each local authority can deal with the issue via their own local plan, the likelihood is that this approach will prove to be ineffective and inefficient as multiple authorities attempt to deal with the same issue independently and with only limited guidance from central government.

Methodologically, the overlay approach would seem to offer a simple but effective way of providing individuals with their own analytical space to interpret the patterns of the maps. This resonates with the loose coupling approach of decision making that provides space for alternative narratives to develop (Benz, 2002). With the advent of Internet and GIS technology, the overlay of different map layers of policies and programmes can be made available online as open-source materials to maximise access for the policy makers and stakeholders involved (Kingston, 2007). Moreover, this has the potential to bypass the politics of expert control of knowledge and analysis by empowering others to advocate their own analysis in order to engage in policy debate and argumentation (Tulloch, 2007).

Of course, one clear advantage of using mapping analysis rather than traditional statistical data is the flexibility of linking datasets and issues across different spatial scales and different locations (Huby et al, 2007; Martin, 1996). However, the availability of open datasets is highly variable in the UK. For instance, Natural England makes many of its spatial datasets available via a dedicated GIS website following the requirements of the European INSPIRE directive. The data are made available under the government's 'Open Government License' which allows free open access to the data without obtaining special permission. In other departments, datasets are not publicly available and maps only exist in printed form, embedded in PDF files, or by special Freedom of Information request. The UK government's dedicated data portal, led by the Cabinet Office, is a positive step in developing open access public information. However, of the 17 835 'datasets' presented on the portal (at the time of writing), 13 859 (78%) are listed as unavailable for download or are not openly licensed. Ultimately, efforts need to be intensified to further broaden and institutionalise the availability of public data from government departments, as well as to develop the leadership and culture to enforce open data standards.

There is not just a need for more public access to government data, but also for a more coordinated approach to using data produced by different government departments, in order to understand how multiple policies and practices spatially impact different places (see Webb, 2011). There are also lessons that can be learnt from experiences at the pan-European level. Many EU institutions conduct spatial analyses and monitoring exercises including Directorate-General for Mobility and Transport, Eurostat, and the European Environment Agency. Likewise, the Directorate-General for Regional Policy conducts in-house studies and funds the pan-European ESPON (European Observation Network for Territorial Development and Cohesion) programme. Equally, some of the EU member states have national institutions tasked to produce spatial analyses and conduct spatial monitoring, such as the German BBSR or the French DATAR. It is interesting to note that most of the analyses in the BBSR studies do not use the map overlay analysis discussed here. However, mapping overlays were used in a BBSR policy paper to develop three key future spatial development visions of Germany and to initiate policy debate on future development trajectories (Sinz and Aring, 2006).

In contrast, there is not a single institution remitted to oversee spatial monitoring or planning in England (or the UK). Research has found that ongoing policy fluxes at national and local levels is exacerbating analytical inertia and undermining the ability of the technical skill-bases of different institutions in different places to respond to the effects of spatial policy interactions (Shaw and Robinson, 2012). This issue is compounded because GIS and spatial analytical skills of graduates entering the planning profession are generally weak, and perhaps too often regarded as the preserve of a few highly specialised GIS or IT experts. The only relevant Learning Outcome specified by the RTPI (2012) in their *Policy Statement on Initial Planning Education* is a generalised statement that graduates should "demonstrate effective research, analytical, evaluative and appraisal skills and the ability to reach appropriate, evidence based decisions" (LO11) rather than a more specific reference to the merits of GIS and spatial analytical skills for planning practice. The RTPI, and UK planning

schools more generally, have a responsibility to ensure planning students are educated in the analysis of spatial data so that future professionals have sufficient knowledge and expertise to be comfortable with basic spatial data analysis and, in equal measure, the subsequent interpretation of such spatial data for application in a wider policy context.

Conclusion

We have examined the interplay between policy needs and spatial contexts via spatial mapping of the policies and programmes of UK government departments, their agencies, and NDPBs. The scanning and appraisal exercise of government documents, reports, and websites raised a series of questions around whether current government policy has the scope to respond to strategic spatial challenges in England. The analysis here illustrates that government policies and actions—even without a deliberate spatial framework—create spatial outcomes and that these, cumulatively, create stark spatial impacts. It is these kinds of acute tensions, synergies, and conflicts, emerging from different policy agendas and coupled with the asymmetric consequences of devolved political responsibilities, that need to be more clearly understood and monitored. This is not only relevant for England, but also for planning in other territorial contexts.

The GIS analysis of the two planning issues demonstrates that by overlaying different spatial expressions a spatial reference framework that captures synergies and conflicts in government policy making starts to emerge. Making these synergies and conflicts explicit could help to inform policy debate and encourage more effective critical thinking about spatial processes and impacts, and alternative policy scenarios. Indeed, the initial success of the Map for England initiative demonstrates that there is an appetite for critical thinking about coordination practices as they affect spatial processes, impacts, and policy interactions. Although the methodology is illustrated through the lens of planning issues in England, the mapping and visualisation methods are adaptable for application in other countries and at different spatial scales. Crucially, overcoming the gulf between GIS research and planning practice has, perhaps, never been so pressing given the opportunities for critical thinking and learning that could be engendered, as evidenced by the analyses undertaken in *A Map for England*.

Acknowledgements. The authors are grateful for the funding support from the Royal Town Planning Institute and to the three anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments.

References

- Agranoff R, McGuire M, 2003 *Collaborative Public Management: New Strategies for Local Governments* (Georgetown University Press, Washington, DC)
- Albrechts L, 2004, “Strategic (spatial) planning reexamined” *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* **31** 743–758
- Allmendinger P, Houghton G, 2009, “Critical reflections on spatial planning” *Environment and Planning A* **41** 2544–2599
- Arnell N W, Delaney K, 2006, “Adapting to climate change: public water supply in England and Wales” *Climatic Change* **78** 227–255
- Audit Commission, 1989 *Urban Regeneration and Economic Development: The Local Government Dimension* (HMSO, London)
- Baker M, Wong C, 2006, “Indicators and strategy monitoring: the case of the English regions” *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* **33** 661–683
- Baker M, Wong C, 2012, “The delusion of strategic spatial planning: what’s left after the Labour Government’s English regional experiment?” *Planning Practice and Research* **28** 83–103
- Batty M, 2004, “Editorial” *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* **31** 326–330
- Benz A, 2002, “How to reduce the burden of coordination in European spatial planning”, in *European Spatial Planning: Lessons for North America* Ed. A Faludi (The Lincoln Institute, Cambridge, MA) pp 139–158

-
- Bramley G, Karley N K, 2005, "How much extra affordable housing is needed in England?" *Housing Studies* **20** 685–715
- Brown P J B, Hincks S, 2008, "A framework for housing market area delineation: principles and application" *Urban Studies* **45** 2203–2223
- Champion T, Townsend A, 2013, "Great Britain's second-order city regions in recession" *Environment and Planning A* **45** 362–382
- DCLG, 2012 *National Planning Policy Framework* Department for Communities and Local Government, London
- DEFRA, 2008 *Future Water: The Government's Water Strategy for England* Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (The Stationery Office, London)
- European Commission, 1999 *European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union* (Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg)
- Faludi A, 2000, "The performance of spatial planning" *Planning Practice and Research* **15** 299–318
- Fontaine C M, Rounsevell M D A, 2009, "An agent-based approach to model future residential pressure on a regional landscape" *Landscape Ecology* **24** 1237–1254
- Gallent N, 2009, "The future of housing and homes" *Land Use Policy* **26** 93–102
- Geoghegan J, 2014, "Duty to cooperate hits local plans" *Planning* 17 January, <http://www.planningresource.co.uk/article/1227257/duty-cooperate-hits-local-plans>
- Gilfoyle I, Wong C, 1998, "Computer applications in planning: twenty years' experience of Cheshire County Council" *Planning Practice and Research* **13** 191–197
- Gripaios P, Gripaios R, Munday M, 1997, "The role of inward investment in urban economic development: the case of Bristol, Cardiff and Plymouth" *Urban Studies* **34** 579–603
- Harris N, Hooper A, 2004, "Rediscovering the 'spatial' in public policy and planning: an examination of the spatial content of sectoral policy documents" *Planning Theory and Practice* **5** 147–169
- Healey P, 2007 *Urban Complexity and Spatial Strategies: Towards a Relational Planning for Our Times* (Routledge, Abingdon, Oxon)
- Hincks S, Baker, M, 2013, "Housing market areas and the strategic planning of housing in England" *Town Planning Review* **84** 127–152
- Hincks S, Wong C, 2010, "The spatial interaction of housing and labour markets: commuting flow analysis of North West England" *Urban Studies* **47** 620–649
- HM Government, 2004 *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* (HMSO, London)
- HM Government, 2011 *Unlocking Growth in Cities* Cabinet Office, London, <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/regeneration/growthcities>
- HM Treasury, 2011 *National Infrastructure Plan 2011* (The Stationery Office, London), http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/national_infrastructure_plan2011.htm
- Huby M, Owen A, Cinderby S, 2007 "Reconciling socio-economic and environmental data in a GIS context: An example from rural England" *Applied Geography* **27** 1–13
- Jensen O, Richardson T, 2001, "Nested visions: new rationalities of space in European spatial planning" *Regional Studies* **35** 703–717
- Kingston R, 2007, "Public participation in local policy decision-making: the role of Web-based mapping" *The Cartographic Journal* **44** 138–144
- Krugman P, 1998, "What's new about the new economic geography?" *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* **14**(2) 7–17
- Kunzmann K, 1998, "Planning for spatial equity in Europe" *International Planning Studies* **3** 101–120
- Lords Hansard 2003, text for 1 April (230401-01), <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200203/ldhansrd/vo030401/text/30401-06.htm>
- McHarg I, 1969 *Design with Nature* (The Natural History Press, New York)
- Martin D, 1996 *Geographic Information Systems: Socioeconomic Applications* (Routledge, London)
- Meegan R, Kennett P, Jones G, Croft J, 2014, "Global economic crisis, austerity and neoliberal urban governance in England" *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* **7** 137–153
- ODPM, 2004 *Making it Happen: The Northern Way* Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, London
- ODPM, 2006 *State of the Cities Report* Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, London

-
- Pearce G, Ayres S, 2012, "Back to the local? Recalibrating the regional tier of governance in England" *Regional and Federal Studies* **22** 1–24
- Peters B G, 1998 *Managing Horizontal Government: The Politics of Coordination* Canadian Centre for Management Development, Ottawa
- Priemus H, 1999, "Four ministries, four spatial planning perspectives? Dutch evidence on the persistent problem of horizontal coordination" *European Planning Studies* **7** 563–585
- Rae A, Wong C, 2012, "Monitoring spatial planning policies: towards an analytical, adaptive and spatial approach to a 'wicked problem'" *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* **39** 880–896
- Rittel H, Webber M, 1973, "Dilemmas in a general theory of planning" *Policy Sciences* **4** 155–169
- RTPI, 2012 *Policy Statement on Initial Planning Education* (revised), Royal Town Planning Institute, London
- RTPI, 2014 *A Map for England* Royal Town Planning Institute, London, <http://www.rtpi.org.uk/knowledge/core-issues/map-for-england/>
- Scott J, 1998 *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (Yale University Press, New Haven, CT)
- Shaw D, Lord A, 2009, "From land-use to 'spatial planning': reflections on the reform of the English planning system" *Town Planning Review* **80** 415–436
- Shaw K, Robinson F, 2012, "From 'regionalism' to 'localism': opportunities and challenges for North East England" *Local Economy* **27** 232–250
- Sinz M, Aring J, 2006, "Neue Leitbilder der Raumentwicklung" *Raumforschung und Raumordnung* **64** 451–459
- Tulloch D, 2007, "Many, many maps: empowerment and online participatory mapping" *First Monday* **12**(20):2, http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue12_2/tulloch/index.html
- Vonk G, S Geertman, Schot P P, 2005, "Bottlenecks blocking widespread usage of planning support systems" *Environment and Planning A* **37** 909–924
- Watt N, 2014, "George Osborne calls for new Manchester to Leeds high-speed rail" *The Guardian* 23 June
- Webb B, 2011 *Federalism and the Institutional Dynamics of Intergovernmental Spatial Policy Coordination* (University of Manchester, Manchester)
- Weick K, 1985, "Cosmos vs. chaos: sense and nonsense in electronic contexts" *Organizational Dynamics* **14** 50–64
- Wong C, Watkins C, 2009, "Conceptualising spatial planning outcomes: towards an integrative measurement framework" *Town Planning Review* **80** 481–516
- Wong C, Baker M, Hincks S, Schultz-Baing A, Webb B, 2012 *A Map for England: Spatial Expression of Government Policies and Programmes* Royal Town Planning Institute, London

Appendix A
Table A1. Figure source data.

Figure	Data source
1	HM Government (2011) For road network investment: HM Treasury (2011)
2	Department for Communities and Local Government, The English Indices of Deprivation 2010, http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/corporate/statistics/indices2010 HM Government (2011)
3	HM Government (2011) Data compiled by <i>The Guardian</i> : http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2011/nov/16/local-authority-cuts-north-south Original data source: Newcastle Council using DCLG data, including NHB and Additional Council Tax Freeze Grant (but not police element), total area cut 10/11 in year cuts, 11/12 and 12/13 cuts. The calculations for an 'area' per capita figure: revenue spending power (including indicative new homes bonus)
4	For National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty: © Natural England, 2010, reproduced with the permission of Natural England. Data accessed from GIS Digital Boundary Datasets of Natural England, http://www.gis.naturalengland.org.uk , For Greenbelt: Static PDF Map from 2009 available at http://magic.defra.gov.uk/staticmaps/maps/gn_belt_col.pdf For 2008-based household projections to 2033, Department for Communities and Local Government Table 406, Household projections by district, http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/corporate/statistics/2033household1110
5	For areas of relative water stress see DEFRA (2008, page 22) For household growth data see figure 4
6	For housing affordability see Housing and Neighbourhood Monitor at http://sed-gis1.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/jrf_dev_wms/ . For household growth data see figure 4
