

Report **March 2013**

RICS RESEARCH

Changing the Culture of Scottish Planning



Changing the Culture of Scottish Planning



Report for Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors

The views expressed by the author(s) are not necessarily those of RICS nor any body connected with RICS. Neither the authors, nor RICS accept any liability arising from the use of this publication.

The RICS Research Trust, a registered charity established by RICS in 1955 to support research and education in the field of surveying.

Copyright RICS 2013



RICS

the mark of
property
professionalism
worldwide

A report for Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors

Report written by:

Dr Andy Inch

Department of Town and Regional Planning,
University of Sheffield
a.inch@sheffield.ac.uk

RICS Research team

Dr. Clare Eriksson FRICS

Director of Global Research & Policy
ceriksson@rics.org

James Rowlands

Global Research & Policy Project Manager
jrowlands@rics.org

Amanprit Johal

Global Research & Policy Project Officer
ajohal@rics.org

Auriel Fielder

Global Research Co-ordinator
afielder@rics.org

Published by:

RICS, Parliament Square, London SW1P 3AD
United Kingdom

rics.org/research

Executive Summary.....	05
Purpose and Scope of the Report.....	05
Approach to the Study.....	05
Research Methods.....	06
Results.....	06
Conclusions and recommendations	08
1.0 Planning reform and ‘culture change’	10
2.0 Towards a framework for understanding culture change.....	12
2.1 Understanding the discourse of ‘culture change’.....	12
2.2 Governance cultures, culture change and planning reform	14
3.0 Conceptual Framework.....	15
4.0 Methodology.....	16
4.1 A two-stage research design.....	16
4.2 National level methods	17
4.3 Local level methods	19
4.4 Analysis.....	20
4.5 Dissemination and testing of results with participants.....	20
4.6 Limitations of the Methodology	20
4.7 Research Ethics	21
4.8 Conclusion.....	21
5.0 Shaping the culture change agenda at the national level.....	22
5.1 The planning system and governance in Scotland.....	22
5.2 Modernising Government, reforming planning	22
5.3 The reform proposals	26
5.4 Culture change as key to implementation?.....	28
5.5 Towards a shared understanding of culture change?.....	29
5.6 Culture change: initiatives and influences	30
5.7 Changing knowledges and practices	32
5.8 Changing the relations shaping practice.....	34
5.9 Changing roles and identities	36
5.10 Progress towards culture change?	38
6.0 Culture change in the City of Edinburgh	39
6.1 Background and Context.....	39
6.2 Towards a shared understanding of culture change?.....	41
6.3 Culture change: initiatives and influences	42
6.4 Changing knowledges and practices	44
6.5 Changing the relations shaping practice.....	47
6.6 Changing roles and identities	49
6.7 Progress towards culture change?	51
7.0 Analysis, conclusions and recommendations.....	52
7.1 Answering the research questions.....	54
7.2 Recommendations.....	56
8.0 References	58
9.0 Acknowledgements	61

This project has explored the culture change agenda that has accompanied the modernisation of the planning system in Scotland since 2006. The executive summary sets out the purpose and scope of the report, summarises the approach taken to the study of culture change, and the main findings and recommendations.

Purpose and Scope of the Report

Attempts to reform planning systems have increasingly focused attention on the need for change not just to their formal aspects (e.g. formal legislative requirements), but also the ways in which these systems are understood and approached by the various actors who make them work – the *culture* that underpins their operation. As a result, ‘culture change’ initiatives have become increasingly widespread as governments have sought to tackle perceived problems in the operation of planning systems.

This has certainly been true in Scotland, the empirical focus of this project, where planning reform has been presented as a process of ‘modernisation’ promising to remedy a range of perceived problems to make the system ‘fit for purpose’ (see e.g. Hayton, 2002; Poustie, 2007; Peel and Lloyd, 2006a; 2006b; Lloyd and Peel, 2009). In order to achieve the goals of reform it has been very widely claimed that a ‘culture change’ is required amongst all of the system’s users, but particularly professional planners in the public sector. Culture change has therefore been presented as key to fulfilling the promises of a new system, capable of transforming how planning is understood, and the practices that regulate urban development (Scottish Government, 2007; Prior, 2009). The aim of culture change has been to secure the commitment of a range of actors to the goals of modernisation, recognizing that successful reform requires a commitment to the new “ethos” that reform is seeking to introduce (Peel and Lloyd, 2007, p. 4).

Both the planning reform and culture change agendas in Scotland have been welcomed by a broad range of ‘stakeholders’, including the planning profession, development industry and community and environmental NGOs who have all seen modernisation as a means of shaping a better planning system. However, this raises questions about what exactly culture change means and what role it can play in helping to make a system that fits the diverse concerns of these various interests.

This project has therefore investigated what ‘culture change’ means to different actors, how it is influencing planning in practice, and whether it has helped to address the concerns of the property industry and others that prompted reform. It has therefore examined the politics of culture change, investigating the ways in which culture change has been understood and is now both shaping and being shaped by a range of actors through their everyday practices. In particular the project has sought to address key questions around whose interests are being met by reform and how reform and culture change are changing both ideas about planning and the way it is practiced. The project contributes a critical assessment of ‘culture change’ in the reform of Scotland’s land use planning system, and of what can be learned about the potential value of a critical focus on the ‘cultural’ dimensions of planning reform more generally. To explore these issues the following research questions were addressed:

1. To what extent is there a shared understanding of culture change and Scotland’s planning culture amongst different stakeholders in Scotland?
2. How have new practices been interpreted by professionals and other stakeholders, and have these required them to change their understanding of the purpose of planning?
3. Has reform resulted in the emergence of new more positive planning cultures that are better able to meet the needs of the system’s users, particularly the property industry?
4. What role can and does ‘culture change’ play in the implementation of planning reform?

Approach to the Study

Recognising that ‘culture’ can be a hard term to define, the work adopted a particular focus on the work that the discourse of ‘culture change’ has done to develop understanding of what was wrong with planning (problematization) and what needs to be done to make it work better (concrete images of a modern planning).

The study therefore focused attention on the range of different factors that have shaped how ‘culture change’ has been understood, and the ways in which the culture change agenda has sought to change three key dimensions of planning:

1. the knowledge actors draw on when planning, and the practices this requires them to engage in;
2. the social relations that shape the system’s operation, and;
3. the roles and identities of various actors involved in the process.

Research Methods

The research, which was conducted between September 2011 and October 2012, adopted a two-stage, qualitative approach to the study of Scotland's planning culture. The first stage involved interviews and documentary analysis conducted at the national level to try and understand how the modernisation and culture change agendas were framed, what the key influences shaping them were, and how key stakeholders understood the change that was required and the progress that had been made to date. In total, twelve semi-structured interviews were conducted at this level with representatives of the Scottish Government and its key agencies, planning professional representative bodies, development industry representatives, environmental and community organisations.

Following this, a second stage was conducted at the local level to examine the effects of culture change on planning practice. A case study approach was adopted, with the City of Edinburgh Council chosen as an example of a local authority that has positively embraced culture change and sought to bring about significant changes in the city's approach to planning and development. At this stage a further fifteen interviews were conducted with a range of actors including: local authority planners working in both development planning and development management; development interests working in the city; councillors; community organisations; and officers working in other council services (housing, regeneration, economic development). In addition documentary analysis of key council publications and local and national press reports were used as a means of further verifying and deepening the findings.

Results

In response to the research questions this report suggests:

- There is a generally shared understanding of culture change and Scotland's planning culture amongst different stakeholders in Scotland. The culture change agenda has been developed by the Scottish Government through an open, collaborative process that was widely commended and seen to have created a relatively clear consensus within the planning professional community about the need for change and the nature of the change required. This was reflected at the local level where there was considerable evidence of commitment to culture change.
- Analysis of the modernisation agenda at the national level suggested that reform represented a combination of aspirations for planning to become: 1) more efficient and responsive to market demands; 2) better able to integrate and spatially organise the strategic priorities of different public services; and 3) more inclusive, better able to respond to the needs and interests of affected communities.
- Over time potential tensions between these goals have, however, come to be clarified, leading to the prioritisation of goals of efficiency designed to make the planning system more responsive to the needs of the economy and development industry. This reflects a clear articulation of purpose by the Scottish Government, the changing economic climate, and perhaps also a tendency for culture change initiatives to focus on those aspects of performance considered most politically controversial and most easily manageable, particularly performance in development management.

Table 1 The old and the modern culture of planning in Scotland

Element of planning culture	Old system culture	Modern system culture
Knowledges and practices	Knowledge of statutory system. Bureaucratic processes and practices. Limited engagement with other stakeholders	Knowledge of how to work the statutory system to make development happen. Emphasis on improved project management/ knowledge of development economics
Relations of practice	Formal and bureaucratic, remote, quasi-legal	Outward looking, engagement with all stakeholders, willing to negotiate
Roles and identities	Bureaucratic, regulator, inhibitor of development, guardian of public interest standing in opposition to private sector	Dynamic facilitator of development; proactive seeking of solutions; guardian of public interest defined by collaboration with private sector

- It was generally felt that there had been progress towards culture change, and all actors recognised that the direction of change was positive – with many sharing a clear sense of the change required in knowledge and practices; social relations; and roles and identities (see table 1 reproduced above, also p.52).
- Change seemed to have gone further and been more widely and enthusiastically accepted within the public sector, perhaps reflecting the explicit targeting of culture change initiatives on the public sector. However, it was also very widely recognised that progress remained uneven.
- Other stakeholders outside of the public sector planning professional community were less convinced and suggested that there remained a problem of trust in relations between the public sector, development interests and communities that requires further work.
- The development industry in particular appeared less committed to culture change and continued to argue for a more market sensitive approach to planning in the public sector, claiming their own practices were guided by the logic and legitimacy of the market.
- Overall, whilst recognising the significance of culture in shaping change, the report cautions against ‘culture’ being seen as a panacea capable of overcoming some of the negative perceptions that exist about planning. Instead the report suggests that these are generated by a combination of a wider lack of public confidence in government, and structural differences of interest between different actors in the process. Recognition of this would help to ensure that expectations of what can be achieved by culture change are not overstated.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The report raises a range of issues for all stakeholders involved in planning in Scotland, suggesting that whilst progress has been made towards achieving some aspects of culture change, this has been uneven and remains very much a work in progress. Key recommendations include:

- A key challenge for the government and local authorities is how they can continue to sustain commitment to change and improvement beyond the 'buzz of reform'. With fundamental changes to the system now settling down, there is a need to find more sustainable ways of ensuring that all actors in the planning process continue to work to achieve change – particularly as the extent of progress remains contested and far from complete. Further sharing of how this has been proactively tackled in the past, including in the City of Edinburgh where staff development initiatives seemed well established, might provide a basis for considering how this can be done. This is a particular challenge in the context of the resource constraints facing both national and local government.
- The move towards new collaborative, relationship building practices has been broadly welcomed as a key change, symbolic of a new culture. However, as noted above, practice suggests that there are clear limits to collaboration and its capacity to shape consensus and build sustainable relationships of trust (cf. Tait, 2012). Though acceptance of the collaborative approach appears to have gone further in the public sector than the private sector, the focus on collaboration fosters a corporatist approach, building a strong professional community. However, it may also restrict the participation of 'outsiders'. More explicit acknowledgement of the limits of consensus, what is expected of all stakeholders in the process, and what can be expected from others in return may help to create a more robust planning culture. Particular effort should be made to ensure that non-professional and occasional users of the system are enabled to engage on an equal basis.
- There is a need to consider how to pursue culture change beyond the 'easy targets' of performance improvement that have so far been most widely addressed.
Work on a planning performance framework has begun to address the need for improved ways of thinking about the outcomes of planning activity, but dissemination and development of this should seek to ensure a much wider capacity within the planning profession to debate substantive outcomes and to discuss what planning should seek to achieve, and how this can best be realised. An overly managerial culture of 'performance' and process management needs to be balanced against a valuing of robust and confident professional and public debate about the purposes of planning.
In as far as they remain goals of modernisation, the more challenging issues raised by inclusion and integration require explicit targeting as progress towards them is less evident.
- Another important question that emerges from the work is how far change in Scotland's planning culture should go towards the goal of efficiency? Calls for planning services to be involved in attracting property investors to places (as suggested in Edinburgh) suggest an extension of the logic of the efficient system beyond traditional boundaries of planning activity. Moreover, the balance between efficiency, integration and inclusion requires continual debate as resources committed to any of these goals may limit ability to achieve the others. Each, if pursued to its logical limit, may threaten to fundamentally change the nature of planning as an activity. There is no ideal balance, but an ongoing culture of robust debate would help to ensure due consideration of how these tensions (referred to as 'governance paradoxes' in the report) are being resolved in planning.
- Related to this, fears that the window of political opportunity for changing negative perceptions of planning may be short-lived are potentially significant. However, all of those with a stake in public sector planning need to actively consider how best to respond to this pressure: either through debate and challenge, or by allowing such perceptions to further discipline the direction of change towards 'efficiency'.

- With resources constrained there is also a tendency to pull services back towards their statutory core, this may create pressures that work against more resource intensive collaborative modes of working. A further key issue is therefore how to ensure that resources are in place to deal with the somewhat ironic fact that more efficient development regulation is often more resource intensive for local planning authorities. Proposed changes to the planning fee regime in Scotland should be considered in this light.
- Finally a key issue, as highlighted in response to research question 4 below, seems to be how the wider public perception and 'culture' of planning in Scotland can be challenged. Work done to date has been primarily focused on change within public sector organisations and, to some extent, amongst private sector professionals. However, it is also clear that there remains a problem of public and political legitimacy for planning decisions.
- This is clearly related to the wider sense that public services are a problem, and that political leaders and the democratic process cannot be trusted (in Edinburgh, for example, the tram project has clearly exacerbated many of these perceptions). Whilst the wider problem requires a solution at an appropriate scale, the planning community should seek to be part of a reassertion of the value of democratically accountable, public decision-making based on robust debate. A focusing of attention on this wider culture change seems like a necessary further step to ensure a sustainable settlement for planning in Scotland.



Reforms have been introduced to planning systems throughout the world in recent years. This has included substantial change in each of the constituent parts of the United Kingdom since devolution in 1998. The basic premise of all such reform efforts has been a sense that planning as an activity has become a *problem* (Campbell, 2003), perceived as out of step with the diverse needs of contemporary societies and changing definitions of 'modern' governance.

One increasingly prominent feature of many such planning reform initiatives has been a concern to bring about change not just to the 'hard infrastructure' (the formal institutions, legal and policy frameworks that have traditionally dominated conceptions of statutory planning 'systems'), but also to the 'soft infrastructure' (Hull, 2000; Healey, 2006) or 'culture' of such systems (understood broadly as the attitudes of the various stakeholders that use these frameworks and the ways they approach their work¹). These *cultural* dimensions have therefore been presented as crucial to realising the promises of reform and "unlocking planning's potential"².

This has certainly been true in Scotland, the empirical focus of this project, where planning reform has been presented as a process of 'modernisation' promising to remedy a range of perceived problems to make the system 'fit for purpose' (see e.g. Hayton, 2002; Poustie, 2007; Peel and Lloyd, 2006a; 2006b; Lloyd and Peel, 2009). In order to achieve the goals of reform it has been very widely claimed that a 'culture change' is required amongst all of the system's users, but particularly professional planners in the public sector. Culture change has therefore been presented as key to fulfilling the promises of a new system, capable of transforming how planning is understood, and the practices that regulate urban development (Scottish Government, 2007; Prior, 2009). The aim of culture change has been to secure the commitment of a range of actors to the goals of modernisation, recognizing that successful reform requires a commitment to the new "ethos" that reform is seeking to introduce (Peel and Lloyd, 2007, p. 4).

Both the planning reform and culture change agendas in Scotland have been welcomed by a broad range of 'stakeholders', including the planning profession, development industry and community and environmental NGOs who have all seen modernisation as a means of shaping a better planning system. However, this raises questions about what exactly culture change means and what role it can play in helping to make a system that fits the diverse 'purposes' of these various interests.

Like 'modernisation'³ (a term it has become synonymous with in Scottish planning reform), 'culture change' has no fixed 'real world' referent and only becomes meaningful through articulation in particular contexts. It is an up-word that has typically been presented as a positive opportunity for realising change, however, it also functions as a strategy of problematisation, presenting concrete images of a desirable, "modern" culture that are contrasted with a problematic status quo. By presenting the attitudes and values of actors as a potential problem, moreover, culture change involves an explicit targeting of the identities of actors, signalling a managerial concern to use 'culture' as a tool through which to manipulate or govern the values of planners and other users of the planning system. It is important therefore that critical questions are asked of the uses of *culture change* in order to understand the work that it is doing to reshape planning.

To date in addition to chronicling the emergence and development of the reform agenda, particular academic interest has been focused on the extent to which reforms undertaken in Scotland since devolution represent a process of convergence or divergence from a set of shared historical roots as part of a 'United Kingdom' planning system (see e.g. Tewdwr-Jones, 2001; Allmendinger 2001; Lloyd and McCarthy, 2000; Lloyd and Peel, 2009). There has, however, been little explicit attention paid to how Scotland's planning 'culture' has been (re)defined through the reform process⁴, the change that different actors expect of it, and the extent to which this is being achieved through the new system (particularly in challenging economic circumstances). Given the hopes that have been invested in culture change, there is, therefore, a need for empirical attention to be directed to the meanings that are being attached to it in practice, and the role of planning cultures in shaping the performance of planning.

This project has therefore examined the politics of culture change, investigating the ways in which it has been understood and is now both shaping and being shaped by a range of actors through their everyday practices. In particular the project has sought to address key questions around whose interests are being met by reform and how reform and culture change are changing both ideas about planning and the way it is practiced. As such the project contributes a critical assessment of 'culture change' in the reform of Scotland's land use planning system, and of what can be learned about the potential value of a critical focus on the 'cultural' dimensions of planning reform more generally.

1 I will turn to definitions of 'culture change' in more detail below. 2 As suggested in the sub-title of *Delivering Planning Reform*, a key 'culture change' document in Scotland (Scottish Government, 2007). 3 This characterisation of the uses of modernisation comes from Finlayson (2003, 67). 4 More often culture change has been considered as part of the wider picture of reform but not investigated in its own right (see e.g. Lloyd and Peel, 2009; Prior, 2009).

This is made more significant by the fact that the role of culture change in the implementation of planning reform more broadly remains under-examined. For example, ‘culture change’ in English planning has been the subject of some work that has established the rationale for seeking cultural change (Shaw and Lord, 2007), and traced some of the cultural dimensions of adaptation to a new planning system (ibid; Inch, 2009; 2010). However, it has more often been assumed to be a positive and necessary dimension of the implementation of reform. For example, official evaluations of English planning reform in the mid-2000s have also often called for a “cultural” solution to perceived implementation problems (Baker Associates et al., 2008; RTPI, 2007).

Overall then the project sets out to address the following research questions:

1. To what extent is there a shared understanding of culture change and Scotland’s planning culture amongst different stakeholders in Scotland?
2. How have new practices been interpreted by professionals and other stakeholders, and have these required them to change their understanding of the purpose of planning?
3. Has reform resulted in the emergence of new more positive planning cultures that are better able to meet the needs of the system’s users, particularly the property industry?
4. What role can and does ‘culture change’ play in the implementation of planning reform?

In order to answer these questions effectively the project report is structured as follows: In section 2 below existing literature is reviewed on culture change in planning and on the nature of ‘planning cultures’. Following this a conceptual framework is outlined in section 3 through which to analyse culture change and planning reform in Scotland. In section 4 the methodology through which the work was conducted is described. Section 5 then describes the development of planning reform in Scotland and the framing of the culture change agenda, presenting an analysis of both the ways in which the existing system was problematized, and the images of a new, ‘modern’ planning that were to replace it. Section 6 then presents a case study of ‘culture change’ in the City of Edinburgh Council, assessing how culture change has been interpreted and implemented at the local level. Section 7 brings the previous two sections together, analysing them in the light of the conceptual framework developed in section 3 to present the project’s findings and address the overarching research questions presented above, summarizing the key conclusions emerging from the project and discussing the implications of the findings for the different stakeholders involved in Scottish planning.



In this section existing literature on culture change and planning cultures is reviewed to situate the contribution that the current project seeks to make and to shape a framework to guide the subsequent empirical analysis.

2.1 Understanding the discourse of ‘culture change’⁵

The discourse of *culture change* comes from managerial change theories that stress the value of securing employee commitment to organizational goals as a means of improving performance.

Alvesson and Sveningsson (2008) suggest that organisational culture was “discovered” from the late 1970’s onwards in a series of texts by management ‘gurus’ working within the human relations school of management thought (e.g. Peters and Waterman, 1982). This was founded on critiques of bureaucracy as a form of organisation that stifled the creative capacities of the workforce through the rigid definition of formal roles and rules (du Gay, 2000). The dominance of the bureaucratic ethos was associated with unimaginative compliance with rigid, organisational hierarchies, ill-suited to fostering the dynamism required of organisations competing in the new capitalism. This was based on a particular reading of Max Weber’s seminal account of the bureau, emphasising the development of a rationalised “*iron cage*” that led workers to understand only a limited part of an organisation’s work (ibid; Weber, 2006). Instead organisational ‘excellence’ came to be associated with a romantic conception of emancipating employees, freeing their innate creative capacities to identify fully with organisational goals (Stokes and Clegg, 2002). As such, organisational culture was understood, “*to structure the way people think, feel and act in organizations*” (du Gay, 1996a, p. 151). Culture therefore came to be seen as something an organisation *has*, a variable to be manipulated to regulate the relationship between organisational goals and the attitudes and dispositions of workers (Alvesson and Wilmott, 2002; Stapley, 1996).

The use of the discourse of culture change in the public sector can be considered part of the widespread adoption of private sector managerial techniques to drive performance improvement and counter the perceived inefficiency and ineffectiveness of the public sector workforce (Hoggett, 1996). The managerial remaking of the state has been fundamental to the successive waves of public sector reform that have been a hallmark of governments throughout the world in recent decades. The new public management (NPM) as it came to be known in the 1980s and 1990s has been most closely associated with the imposition of regimes of target-driven performance management and audit (Cochrane, 2004). In practice, however, managerialism has been a flexible set of discourses concerned with governing change in the public sector (Newman, 2001). Culture change has been an increasingly crucial element of this and has arguably been expanded in the 2000s to constitute a keyword for a new mode of governance – the ‘culture’ is now always an important part of the problem and solution to all governance challenges.

The discourse of culture change suggests a more positive concern with fostering commitment to reform rather than simply ensuring compliance to targets and the high-output, low commitment workforce that this relies upon (Newman, 2001; Hoggett, 1996). In particular culture change has been synonymous with images of transformational leadership in the public sector, and the creation of a cadre of managers committed to the NPM as a means of better delivering public services (Cochrane, 2004).

However, there are reasons for caution in accepting an unambiguously positive understanding of culture change. Public sector managerialism has been widely viewed as inimical to important values of public service, seeking to replace them with market based logics that represent a narrowing of the rationale for state activity (du Gay, 2000; Newman and Clarke, 2010). As a result, Cochrane (2004) suggests that the management of public sector organisations has been the site of 'culture wars' in recent decades between the traditional authority of the bureau-professional regimes that were established in the post-war period, and newly empowered managerial regimes seeking to instil market based discipline. A range of studies have therefore viewed managerialism as driving processes of deskilling and deprofessionalisation of professional labour through the imposition of performance management regimes (Ferlie et al., 1996; Exworthy and Halford, 1999). This has highlighted the narrowing of professional performances to managerially circumscribed forms of accountability, raising concerns that the purpose of the public sector has been undermined with a subsequent impact on the commitment of the public sector workforce (Hoggett, 2006). Managerial language such as culture change may therefore be viewed as part of an attack on the autonomy of public sector professionals.

The widespread adoption and acceptance of the language of culture change by professionals suggests the complexity of these processes of change, however, highlighting how managerialism and professionalism have become increasingly intertwined within new governance regimes. This has been understood variously as representing the incorporation of professionals within managerial regimes, the recapture of professional control, or a tense settlement between managerial and professional authority (Exworthy and Halford, 1999; Newman and Nutley, 2003).

Within this context of challenge and change in the public sector, the discourse of culture change has also been critically interpreted as representative of a new form of managerial control. Du Gay (2000) for example suggests that managerialism has been an 'identity project' designed to produce commitment to a new way of understanding public service based on new forms of appropriate behaviour and ways of understanding the self and the purpose of work. Within the field of organisational studies there has been extensive exploration of the link between managerial attempts to shape desirable 'cultures' and the 'identities' of workers (Alvesson and Wilmott, 2002). Understood as a managerial technology designed to manipulate the relationship between employees' identities and the goals of an organisation it becomes important to ask critical questions about both the culture that is being promoted through change initiatives, and the capacity (and desirability) of management actively shaping cultures and identities.

Within the literature there is some debate about the capacity for successfully changing the culture of an organisation (and it is worth noting that the challenge of changing the culture of a complex policy network, like planning, is likely to be more complex still). Some studies seem to suggest that culture can be manipulated, and that by introducing new practices and ways of working employees commitments (and potential opposition) can over time be brought into line with a new ethos (du Gay, 1996; Hoggett, 1996). Other studies, however, suggest that culture rather than being something that an organisation *has* (and can therefore control), is better conceived as what an organisation is (Schein, 1992; Newman and Nutley, 2003; Shaw, 2006; Alvesson & Svenningsson, 2008). Often drawing on more anthropological accounts of organisational life, such studies highlight the complexity of organisations and the presence of multiple sub-cultures and sources of alternative identifications that are likely to lead employees to rework or resist attempts to introduce a new ethos or to reshape their roles and understanding of their work. The possibility of successfully changing 'culture' therefore depends in part on the definition of culture that is employed. Where culture change is defined narrowly to mean changed practices success may be more achievable; where it signifies the production of a broader and longer lasting shift in identities and attitudes it is considered considerably more difficult to accomplish.

Having reviewed understandings of culture change the report now goes on to consider the range of concerns that have motivated planning reform initiatives globally and how planning's culture has been perceived as a particular problem requiring change.

2.2 Governance Cultures, Culture Change and Planning Reform

Whilst a particular ‘culture change’ agenda is the explicit object of analytical attention in this project, the approach adopted here also argues for the value of a cultural approach to improve understanding of planning as an activity and how it has come to be so widely seen as a problem area of public policy. This approach therefore fits with recent academic interest in the study of *planning cultures*. Motivated by concern about the potentially homogenizing impacts of globalisation, neoliberalism and managerialism on planning systems and practices, particular interest has been focused on exploring the variety of global planning cultures (Sanyal, 2005; Friedmann, 2005). Central to this has therefore been a conviction that culture *matters*, and that planning as a socially embedded activity is shaped and reshaped within contexts that remain distinctive despite the presence of global pressures and challenges.

In keeping with wider pressures for change in governance and public administration, it is, possible to identify a range of common concerns that have created the impression that planning cultures are somehow ‘problematic’ and out of step with the challenges of modern government. These concerns have been more or less present across many national locations:

- **Neoliberalisation:** the widespread adoption of principles of neoliberal political economy have been widely interpreted as representing a threat to the idea of planning – seeking to replace regulatory state regimes with the discipline of free markets (e.g. Sager, 2009).
- Associated with this process has been a **decline of faith in ‘public’ institutions and decision making** (Clarke, 2004), including political and democratic processes (Hay, 2007).
- **Managerialisation:** as described above, and linked to processes of neoliberalisation, the introduction of private sector managerial strategies has been a key form of state restructuring, designed to improve performance by introducing various forms of market-like discipline into the public sector
- **The shift from government to governance:** a further related shift has been the recognition that state agencies have limited power to govern from the centre, and must instead seek to shape networks of actors and influence through which to achieve public goals, requiring new forms of collaborative practice, partnership based initiatives and forms of public participation to develop and sustain the legitimacy of state initiatives. These have often created positive new images of collaborative public service and planning (e.g. Healey, 2006).

The coarticulation of these different pressures have been broadly felt across European governance cultures, often accompanied by reforms that have cast existing and past practices as out of step and requiring reform. As noted in the introduction, this has certainly been the case in relation to planning systems and there has been widespread academic concern within the discipline that it is facing a paradigm crisis (Graham and Marvin, 1999), that the idea (Campbell, 2003) or spirit and purpose (Tewdwr-Jones, 2008) of planning has been somehow lost in the face of these pressures.

In this way, reform of planning systems can be understood as part of a wider process of change to state agencies and actors. Such processes of change have, however, typically been far from straightforward and the tensions and contradictions generated by these different pressures for change (what Newman (2012) terms ‘governance paradoxes’) need to be actively managed to shape new governance cultures (there may well, for example, be clear tensions between governance cultures committed to goals of efficiency, integration or inclusion).

Planning and other governance networks must therefore be understood as complex assemblages (Li, 2007; Newman and Clarke, 2009), reflecting a diverse set of pressures and goals for public services, each of which may imply new and contradictory roles for public sector professionals in practice. In planning, for example, new roles have been suggested for planners as ‘market actors’ (Adams and Tiesdell, 2010), ‘network managers’ (Sehested, 2009), or facilitators of communication (e.g. Healey, 2006; Sager, 2009. See also Bradwell et al, 2007). In practice meanwhile, these and related roles are being combined as actors on the ground seek to make sense of new demands and to navigate the governance paradoxes that they face.

Moments of reform and culture change provide a privileged lens for thinking through the direction of change generated by these governance paradoxes and therefore contributing to debates about the nature of planning as an activity, and the kinds of cultures that should underpin different conceptions of planning in the public interest. As Lloyd and Peel (2009, p. 103) suggest the decade long gestation and introduction of reform in Scotland’s planning system can be understood as a fundamental process of debate about the spirit and purpose of land-use planning in a ‘modern’ Scotland; culture change can therefore be assessed as a process designed to bring about far reaching change to the planning culture in Scotland – in response to both exogenous and endogenous drivers of change.

3.0 Conceptual Framework



Research into planning cultures has sought to develop a deeper engagement with the situated practices of planning in different contexts – exploring the difference that different cultural contexts make to the practice of planning (e.g. Sanyal, 2005). Nevertheless, it has proven difficult to develop an effective definition of what a planning culture is, and therefore what it is that matters about culture. This is perhaps unsurprising given the complexity of the term ‘culture’ which Raymond Williams (1976, p. 76) famously described as one of the two or three most complex in the English language (not to mention the difficulty of defining planning as an activity [e.g. Wildavsky, 1973]).

Rather than seeking to define what constitutes a planning culture (which as Abram, (2012) notes may be an impossible or even undesirable task), this project therefore treats ‘culture change’ as a specific discourse designed to bring about change in the ways in which people think and act, relate to others, and understand themselves (change which may be more or less deep or profound depending on the understanding of culture change being employed).

Fairclough (1992⁶) suggests that discourses work to organise social life. Discursive change can therefore be seen as a reorganisation of social life. New discourses validate new knowledges and practices; social relations; and identities, and render others ‘old fashioned’ or out of step with the needs of society. Such discourses seek to become ‘hegemonic’, establishing themselves as uncontested frames of reference for all actors (Griggs, 2003).

Culture change is therefore a managerial technology premised on the problematisation of an existing state of affairs in order to bring a ‘culture’ into line with a new more desirable ethos. This requires explicit strategies and initiatives of culture change to be introduced. However, planning cultures are embedded within wider social and governance cultures that influence their trajectories of change, it is therefore also important to understand other drivers of change that may lie beyond the control of those seeking to implement specific changes. This project therefore seeks to assess how the culture of Scottish planning has been changed in recent years by focusing on the various factors that have driven change that has occurred in the knowledges and practices; social relations; roles and identities through which planning activity is ‘performed’.

⁶ See also Newman and Nutley (2003); Inch (2012)



In keeping with the analytical framework laid out above, the project has adopted an interpretive approach to the study of culture change in planning, recognising cultures as complex assemblages made up of different discourses and their attendant knowledges and practices; social relations; and roles and identities.

The project works from the assumption that cultures are therefore socially (discursively) constructed within a nexus of power relations. The framing and interpretation of new discourses is a contested process and any settlement around the meanings to be attached to a practice like planning are the contingent outcomes of past power struggles. Cultures are therefore both the framework within which actions are given meaning, but also a stake in ongoing processes of social and political change.

Interpretive approaches require in-depth qualitative methods, capable of accessing the 'situated knowledge' (Howarth, 2005) through which actors make sense of the world. This fits with a desire to develop approaches to the study of planning (Healey, 2007; Hillier, 2002) and planning cultures (Booth, 2005, Sanyal, 2005; Abram, 2012) that seek to generate 'thick description' of the ways that planning systems work and are given meaning, uncovering the complexity of discursive change. The section below describes how this framework was put into practice.

4.1 A two-stage research design

In order to explore the culture change agenda fully a two stage, mixed-method research design was adopted, using slightly different methodological approaches at each stage⁷:

- The aim of the first stage was to explore both the framing of the agenda and its subsequent interpretation by a range of actors involved in shaping planning policy at the national level in Scotland e.g. how the need for change and the change required were debated, constructed, articulated and communicated. This required an analysis of the articulation of discourses of reform at the national level. In so doing this stage of analysis allowed space to consider the extent to which the modernising planning agenda has been driven by particular governmental rationalities. This stage therefore drew on an understanding of planning's culture as framed by particular ideological discourses articulated at the national level, and filtered through the planning policy network.
- The second stage aimed to look at how those discourses had been interpreted in practice in one local planning authority. Adopting a case study approach allowed an in-depth exploration of culture change and the ideas of planning articulated in its name as they moved through the policy process and sought to produce changed planning practices; knowledge and ideas; relations and identities amongst the range of actors involved.

Below the methods used in each of these stages of research are outlined in more detail.

4.2 National level methods

1. Documentary analysis is a key resource for all forms of discourse analysis providing a means of reconstructing how particular moments are understood and key concepts come to be shaped and articulated. The aim of the documentary analysis at this level was to explore the development of the modernising planning and culture change agendas, assessing the ways in which these developed with a particular concern to understand the rationalities that shaped reform, and in particular:

- How the ‘problems’ that motivated reform and required culture change were constructed (in terms of the practices/ knowledge and ideas/ social relations/ identities through which planning was performed)
- How the goals of reform and culture change were constructed (e.g. the ‘new’ or ‘modern’ practices/ knowledge and ideas/ social relations/ identities through which a better planning was to be shaped)
- What were the strategies that were used to secure change

The following documentary sources were selected as a suitable corpus for this analysis:

- Government publications on planning and planning reform, and consultation responses to them
- Minutes and memoranda of evidence from Committee hearings into planning reform
- National Press coverage of planning reform (through website searches for ‘planning reform’ and ‘modernising planning’ of the two main national newspapers in Scotland ‘The Scotsman’ and ‘The Herald’)
- Coverage of reform in ‘Scottish Planner’ a bi-monthly publication produced by the Royal Town Planning Institute in Scotland

Where appropriate these sources were supplemented by further documents suggested by interviewees or discovered in the research process, e.g. other press articles, policy or think tank publications, and existing academic literature.

2. Semi-structured interviews are considered a good way of exploring how particular issues are constructed, and how actors reconstruct or narrate events (Arksey and Knight, 1999). They provide important insight into actors’ experiences and values (May, 2001). Howarth (2005) suggests that semi-structured interviews can be an important method for approaches that seek ‘thick’ descriptions of events and processes.

Interviews at the national level were focussed on understanding how actors within the policy community constructed the modernising planning agenda. The concern was to understand how actors sought to *justify* their interpretation of events, giving meaning to the actions they were engaged in shaping. Interviews therefore sought to understand how actors and the organisations they worked for understood, had sought to shape, and position themselves in relation to, the modernising planning agenda. As a result, the interviews were concerned less to ensure that actors offered a *true* account of events, but rather to critically explore the distortions that their interpretation of events might indicate, taking these seriously as “important windows” (Howarth, 2005: 339) into the construction and enactment of the planning reform agenda.

Rather than a list of interview questions, a schedule of topics was prepared with discussion, prompted by the interviewer working loosely around this guide (cf. Arksey and Knight, 1999; May, 2001). This schedule sought to explore:

- how different organisations / actors narrated the planning reform agenda
- the drivers of reform
- the aims and purpose of the new planning
- the case for change and the change required
- The emerging evidence of change and the initiatives through which this was to be achieved

In total twelve interviews were conducted at this stage with representatives of key organisations and agencies involved in shaping the planning reform and culture change agendas in Scotland. These organisations were:

- The Scottish Government (civil servants, the minister turned down an invitation to participate in the study)
- RTPi
- RICS Scotland
- Homes for Scotland
- Architecture and Design Scotland
- Scottish Heritage
- Scottish Environment Protection Agency
- Heads of Planning Scotland
- Convention of Scottish Local Authorities
- Confederation of British Industry
- Scottish Environment Link
- Planning Democracy

The sampling strategy for selecting participants involved an attempt to ‘map’ the key stakeholder interests involved in reform deliberations (cf. Yanow, 2000). This was based on the documentary analysis and a ‘snowballing’ strategy of asking participants to recommend the names of further suitable interviewees. Where possible existing personal contacts were used to arrange initial contact with interviewees, in all cases this was done via email with subsequent follow up phone calls where necessary. The range of organisations above represents a broadly accurate cross-section of key stakeholder interests including government, other governmental agencies (known as ‘key agencies’ in Scotland), development interests and community/ environmental NGOs. An original intention to conduct a smaller number of interviews and supplement this with focus groups in different locations around Scotland was dropped once it became clear that more interviews would be required to provide this kind of coverage. Interviews lasted between forty minutes and two and a half hours, they were digitally recorded and subsequently transcribed.



4.3 Local level methods

Following the national level stage of the research, the second stage of the work involved an in-depth case study of emerging practice in the reformed planning system, aiming to understand how culture change is being translated into the day to day workings of both development planning and development management.

Case studies have been widely used in research that seeks to access in-depth understandings (Flyvbjerg, 2001). They have also been described as particularly appropriate for research using discursive and interpretive methods (Howarth, 2005; Yanow, 2000). Case study methods have also been described as a useful means of assessing the locally embedded, and distinctive processes and outcomes of planning, and as offering the promise of a 'thick description' of dynamics of change to professional roles and cultures (Healey and Underwood, 1979). Such recommendations stem from recognition that planning is a heavily 'situated' practice (Campbell, 2003). If we take this insight seriously then methods, such as the case study, that allow a full exploration of context are vital.

The selection of the case study was informed by the analysis and interviews in stage 1 of the research. Given the aims of this stage of the research and limitations of time and resource, it was considered preferable to pursue a single case in more depth, rather than multiple cases with less depth. Anecdotal evidence from interviews at the national level (and from my own knowledge and experience of the planning system in Scotland) suggested that it would be difficult to find a case that could be considered 'representative' of Scotland's planning culture. Instead national level respondents felt that there was considerable diversity in the culture of local authorities across Scotland. It was therefore decided to choose a case which might be considered 'paradigmatic' (Flyvbjerg, 2001, 79), e.g. to represent an example of the new planning culture that reform has sought to promote and instil. As a result, the City of Edinburgh Council was chosen as an authority that, by their own admission, believed themselves to have a 'good story to tell' in relation to culture change.

Access to the case was negotiated via a senior officer in the council who the author had met previously whilst working in Scotland. He was able to arrange permission to meet with a range of officers in the council, and councillors as well as providing contact details for local development interests who could provide a private sector perspective on culture change in the city's planning culture.

In keeping with the overall approach a mix of methods was adopted to assess the local planning culture in Edinburgh. This allowed some verification of claims made by different actors (Yanow, 2000). *Semi-structured interviews* were again selected as the key method of enquiry. Interviews were conducted with a range of planners in both development planning and development management; service managers; officers in related council services (regeneration and housing/ economic development); councillors; local development interests and local community representatives. In total fifteen interviews were conducted, these lasted from forty minutes to two hours and were digitally recorded and subsequently transcribed. As above interviews, were viewed as a means of understanding how actors justified practice. In addition, however, interviews at this level also provided a means of exploring actors' understanding of the culture change agenda, how they positioned themselves in relation to it, and the change that it has implied for their practices; the knowledge and ideas of planning they enrol; the relationships through which planning is practiced; and their sense of professional identity. The interviews at this level sought to explore how a local planning culture was produced and reproduced through the lived experience of participants as recounted through their 'practice stories' (cf. Forester, 1999).

In addition to these interviews, a range of documentary evidence was also analysed as a means of triangulating and deepening the investigation. This included:

- Local newspaper reports and coverage
- Minutes of planning committee meetings and reports to the committee
- Local strategies and planning policy documents

In addition one meeting of the Council's 'development management managers and team leader's committee' was observed during one of my visits to the council.



4.4 Analysis

Within the wider approach to research outlined above, analysis is considered an ongoing part of any research project, starting from the choice of a particular research problematic, and requiring reflection on research practice (e.g. through the maintenance of notes on each interview). This extends into the writing up of the research, which is considered a further stage of analysis where new insights may emerge (Yanow, 2000; Johnson et al., 2004). Within the two-stage research design adopted in the project, ongoing analysis was particularly important, with insights from the national level informing the subsequent work at the local level. Given the nature of much of the work, analysis involved cultivating a particular practice of critical reading, or of interpreting actors' interpretations of events (cf. Morley and Hsing-Chen, 1996; Johnson et al., 2004). In Yanow's (2000) terms this involves a process of reading and re-reading, familiarisation and defamiliarisation, through which it becomes possible to critically interrogate texts and their meanings. Such analysis of qualitative data must therefore be accepted as a fluid interpretive practice (ibid.). However, all of the data generated was coded and sorted according to the key themes outlined in the conceptual framework above (practices, including practices of culture change; knowledge and ideas; social relations; roles and identities). In addition emergent themes were monitored to make sure that any other key information from the data that did not fit within this framework could be accounted for in the analysis.

4.5 Dissemination and testing of results with participants

The original project proposal contained an intention to conduct focus groups in each of the four city regions within Scotland to provide a further test of the validity of the project findings. Given changes to the available budget and time this proved impossible. Instead a seminar was held for participants in the case study at the City of Edinburgh Council on the 29th of October, 2012. All participants in stage 2 of the research were invited to attend, along with other members of staff from the council and Edinburgh based participants from stage 1. This provided a valuable means of testing findings with participants.

4.6 Limitations of the Methodology

Whilst considered broadly effective as a means of exploring the meanings and practices of culture change, the methodology adopted in the study has several limitations that are worth noting.

One significant limitation relates to the generalizability of the findings from the case study. Whilst the aim of the research was not to generate findings that could be generalizable across local authorities, or in different national contexts, it should be noted that Edinburgh as a relatively large, capital city authority is a very particular



case and some of the issues raised may therefore not be more widely applicable (though as the findings below do maintain, the experience of Edinburgh contains key lessons that can be shared more widely about the nature of culture change and the emerging planning culture in Scotland).

Secondly, the methods adopted in the study fall some way short of the desire for the study of planning cultures to become “almost an ethnographic exercise” (Booth, 2005; cf. Abram, 2012). This is due to restrictions of time and resource, however, it means that the account of Edinburgh’s planning culture is heavily reliant on the justifications of the actors involved and is unable to fully verify their statements. Moreover, it means that the study is unable to access some of the more fine-grained aspects of everyday practice that may have been affected by culture change.

Finally, it was also impossible to interview the full range of planning officers at work in the City of Edinburgh Council, let alone the range of stakeholders in the city, or the wider contexts of Scotland’s planning culture. The use of a key contact, provided an efficient means of gaining access to the case study, but does mean that the selection of participants may have been biased towards those who would be likely to help tell the ‘positive story’ the authority wished to recount. Indeed, interviewees did make reference to sub-cultures of resistance to this new culture within the authority, only some of which were represented in interviews. This is not considered a particular problem since the case was intended to explore the emerging

culture of a modernised planning within what was considered a ‘leading edge’ authority. Moreover, cultural ‘problems’ are frequently hard to locate within organisations (everyone can recognise the problem but sees it as lying elsewhere), but reference to their existence can allow research to assess the range of views present.

4.7 Research Ethics

The project was granted full ethical approval in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Town and Regional Planning at the University of Sheffield. All participants were provided with an information sheet and gave written consent to participate in the project.

4.8 Conclusion

Taken as a whole these methods provided an assessment of the aspirations for culture change, an in-depth exploration of how this has been mediated through local experience, and an analysis of whether culture change has helped to address the problems that motivated reform and has pointed towards a transformation of planning culture in Scotland – providing an effective means of answering the research questions. The next sections below go on to introduce the empirical work and its findings, starting with the national level of the research, recounting the emergence of the culture change agenda, how and why it has sought to transform planning practices.

This section reports on the empirical work conducted at the national level.

5.1 The planning system and governance in Scotland

The mechanics of the planning system in Scotland are largely a product of the post-war period which produced a distinctively *British* form of town and country planning. However, the distinctiveness of the Scottish *approach* to planning within this framework, what might be termed a distinctively Scottish planning *culture* has since been discussed (Rowan-Robinson, 1997; Lloyd and McCarthy, 2000). This has been seen to be rooted in the independence of Scotland's legal system and of key institutions such as local government within the constitutional settlement of the United Kingdom (Lloyd and Peel, 2009). Lloyd and Peel (2009) further argue that the particular socio-economic and political trajectories influencing Scotland have shaped a distinctive culture of governance that is relatively more corporatist, interventionist and pluralistic than that found in England. In planning it has been claimed that this has formed the basis for a particularly effective approach to strategic planning and the implementation of development plans (Hayton, 2002).

Devolution in 1998, and the reopening of a Scottish parliament with new powers to legislate on planning issues has intensified, if not resolved, academic debates about the distinctiveness or otherwise of planning in Scotland *viz-a-viz* the rest of the United Kingdom (see e.g. Tewdwr-Jones, 2001; Allmendinger 2001; Lloyd and McCarthy, 2000; Lloyd and Peel, 2009). The Scottish Parliament has certainly created an impetus towards new policy approaches, requiring a process of institution building and a reshaping of relations between different scales of governance both in Scotland and in the wider UK with the *potential* to create distinctive new trajectories (McConnell, 2004).

5.2 Modernising Government, reforming planning

Land-use planning was seen as an area of policy likely to be subject to reform under a Scottish Parliament, with the then Scottish Office initiating work to consider whether the system required change and the kind of reform that this might imply prior to devolution in the late 1990s (Lloyd and McCarthy, 2000). This was driven by concern as to whether the system was equipped to cope with new and emerging challenges including: land reform; the sustainable development agenda; moves towards more strategic integration of public services; and whether it was efficient and effective (*ibid.*).

The process that led to the passing of the 2006 Planning Etc (Scotland) Act was therefore a relatively long and "twisting path" (Peel and Lloyd, 2006a). Table 1, taken from Lloyd and Peel (2009, p. 110) neatly highlights the various consultations and issues that were considered as this agenda developed pre-2006. The table highlights that the reform agenda was the product of quite a long, deliberative process, the system that emerged was therefore influenced by a range of different drivers that shifted over time.

A central influence was the wider modernisation agenda for public services that was introduced with a strong reforming zeal by New Labour governments in Westminster. This created a climate of *change* driven by a new set of images of what 'modern' public services should look like. As Newman (2001) notes this was far from straightforward and there were notable tensions between efforts to create more efficient, effective, inclusive, and integrative services.

With a Labour dominated coalition administration elected in Scotland in the first two general elections to the Scottish parliament in 1999 and 2003, it is understandable that the overall agenda of the Scottish Executive was focused around a similar concern for *modernisation* (Lloyd and Peel, 2009), continuing a tradition of local government in Scotland being shaped by variations on UK wide policy approaches even within a context with increasing institutional scope for differentiation (McConnell, 2004).

Moreover, it is notable that many of these images and the language of modernisation were not subsequently challenged by the Scottish Nationalist Party once they were elected to office in 2007⁸ (McCafferty and Mooney, 2010), suggesting a relatively stable (and not politically contentious) understanding of the need for ongoing change to public service provision in Scotland (see also Christie Commission, 2011). This fits within the wider international context of concern for public sector reform discussed above, and the somewhat paradoxical set of pressures that have been put on the state and public services in a neoliberal context where they are widely represented as a problem but yet also subject to increasingly strong and diverse demands from citizens (cf. Lloyd and Peel, 2009).

Table 2

Twisting paths to planning reform (Lloyd and Peel, 2009, p. 110)

Year	Modernization measure
2001	Consultation Paper—Review of Strategic Planning—which addressed key elements of strategic planning practice and proposed that a National Planning Framework be prepared to enhance the strategic context of local land-use planning.
2002	Review of Strategic Planning—Conclusions and Next Steps—a report that documented the generally positive consultation responses to the Review and set out the steps to be followed in securing the modernization of land-use planning.
2003	Your Place, Your Plan—White Paper on Public Involvement in Planning—which examined a suite of issues around securing more effective civil engagement, including the potential of ‘Third Party Right of Appeals’
2003	Modernising Public Local Inquiries: A Consultation Paper—which explored ways of increasing the efficiency and transparency of the inquiry processes.
2003	Options for Change Research—a research report that explored in considerable detail the various potential component parts of a planning bill (Rowan Robinson, 2003).
2004	Making Development Plans Deliver Consultation Paper—which discussed the different forms of development plan that would be appropriate to complement the National Planning Framework. Attention was drawn to the importance of city-regions in Scotland.
2005	White Paper—which provided a statement of the composite proposals for change.
2005	Planning Bill—the draft legislation that was subject to Parliamentary Committee scrutiny and debate.
2006	Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006—passed in December by 149 votes to 13.

Desire to reform planning therefore fits within a wider concern for the modernisation of public services that has been strongly prevalent in many locations, but was a dominant feature of governance throughout the UK in the first decade of the twenty-first century. By comparison with the planning reform agenda in England which has been marked by a strong, negative rhetoric and repeated governmental announcements of the need to deal with a “broken system” (see e.g. Inch, 2012b), however, the rhetoric of reform in Scotland has typically been less strident, suggesting a broader acceptance of the value of the planning system as a part of the governance landscape in Scotland. Despite this, there has also been a clear view amongst various stakeholders that there was a need to introduce change to make sure the system is “fit for purpose”.

It was equally clear, however that different stakeholders held rather different views of the purpose of the planning system and this led to a shifting politics of reform. Three key ‘imagined systems’ can be highlighted to illustrate this point. These three imaginaries/ ideal types functioned both as critiques of existing practice and as models for the principles that should underpin reform, each corresponds to wider public service reform impulses but were applied to the particularities of the planning system in Scotland, and each was influential at different points in the reform process and subject to quite different interpretations by different actors:

1 The efficient system

Fitting with the managerial thrust of the wider modernisation agenda for public services has been a pervasive concern that the system is not as efficient or effective as it should be. This was a central concern of the Labour-Liberal Democrat coalition administrations (Lloyd and Peel, 2009). Key to this was concern at the speed with which applications for planning permission were processed, and also the failure of the system to produce relevant and up to date development plans.

The basic premise of a 'fit for purpose' and 'proportional' level of regulation and the need to drive performance improvement has received reasonably widespread support from the professional community in Scotland, though concern has also been expressed that many of the most widely used measures of performance are reductive and not a good way of assessing success:

I think recently there's more positive stories that come to Ministers, but still people rightly complain or show frustration about things that they're not happy with in the planning system. So a lot of that information is anecdotal about the performance of the planning system. And interestingly, what we have measured historically is performance against time. It's difficult to, although we are working on this, to have done very much more than that. Because time is an ingredient in quality and it's important for any applicant to know that they're going to get a reasonably quick service, but it also goes beyond speed. NL01, Civil Servant

However, the need for a more efficient system has also been promoted in a more critical way, articulated alongside concerns that overly-strong land use regulation was an unnecessary impediment to economic development, acting as an artificial distortion of markets in land and property. This neoliberal view has been an important driver of reform in many different locations in recent years, and was central to the New Labour agenda in government with the prioritisation of growth written into the Labour-Liberal Democrat coalition agreement as a key priority in Scotland (Lloyd and Peel, 2009).

There was a persistent feeling in interviews that property and development interests were not particularly proactive at seeking to influence early rounds of discussion about planning reform, largely becoming involved in reaction to the perceived threat posed by advocates of third party rights of appeal. However, desire for a more streamlined and market sensitive planning was a constant presence and these lobbies became more organised, coherent and influential as the process developed. Under the SNP and following the onset of the financial crisis such concerns gained renewed currency. The First Minister Alex Salmond's then newly appointed Council of Economic Advisors chose to investigate planning as a potential blockage to growth during their first session, highlighting that the issue had a high political profile in government (Scottish Council of Economic Advisors, 2008).

Some right wing lobby groups have continued to press the case for a radical rethink of planning (e.g. Mackay, 2004), however, this critical view seems to have been held in check by a commitment to exploring the potential of planning as a tool for delivering growth:

When we started the planning reform journey, our perception was that planning was seen as a barrier to development – full stop. I think that many would still say that it's perceived in that way, but the objective is to see the planning system as recognising its ability to facilitate good development – not any development – but to be able to facilitate good development and for there to be a general understanding and confidence that that's what the planning system will do, that it will not just resist development but it will promote good development. And in terms of culture change, I think that goes hand in hand with a problem-solving approach to regulation NL01, Civil Servant

Below it is suggested that the dominance of this perceived purpose of the planning system has strengthened over the course of the reform process, becoming an increasingly hegemonic influence.

2 The inclusive system

A second reform impulse which to some extent is in tension with the idea of a more efficient system, has been motivated by concern that the planning system was not as responsive as it needed to be to the needs of local communities and the wider public affected by planning decisions. This strand of reform was particularly strongly pursued in the build up to the passage of legislation, spearheaded by a concerted call for the introduction of third party rights of appeal (TPRA) by environmental and social NGOs (see e.g. LINK, 2004). Peel and Lloyd (2009) suggest that concern that the system was unresponsive and remote from communities was particularly associated with the Liberal-Democrat influence in the coalition administration before 2007. However, it also received considerable support from advocates of 'environmental justice' which surprised many when it became a strong policy discourse for a period in Scotland following a speech by then First Minister Jack McConnell in 2002 (Scandrett, 2010).

As with conceptions of an efficient system, there were quite diverse interpretations of what an inclusive system entailed amongst different stakeholder groups. Those advocating TPRA saw this as a demand to substantially increase community influence over development. Professional and development interests, however, tended to equate this goal with concerns that increasingly hostile public reactions posed a threat to development, requiring improved communication with the public without necessarily empowering them to the extent that they would be able to hold up development. Ultimately, it was the latter, weaker version of a more inclusive system that the Scottish Government endorsed by rejecting TPRA and instead seeking to promote early engagement through which it was claimed community concerns would be more able to influence plans and proposals, minimising conflict at the decision-making stage.

These three imagined systems provided the key problematisations of the existing planning system and concrete images of what a reformed planning system might look like. Whilst they are strikingly similar to the issues debated in England (see Inch, 2009), and developments there were undoubtedly watched with interest in Scotland (e.g. Rowan-Robinson, 2003) they were also articulated and shaped by the particularities of a planning tradition and politics of planning reform in Scotland that was distinct from that pertaining elsewhere. Reform reflected a clear

3 The integrative system

Concern to improve integration of public service provision has also been a strong feature of governance reform across many sectors and national contexts. In planning this has intersected with a long-standing belief that the discipline provides a logical vehicle for achieving strategic integration of policy priorities (e.g. Healey, 2007). This was a central driver behind the Royal Town Planning Institute's promotion of the idea of spatial planning from 2001 onwards (RTPI, 2001). Whilst the language of *spatial planning* through which the institute sought to promote this was not widely adopted in Scotland, a strong tradition of strategic planning has underpinned the planning professional community's thinking about reform and the need to ensure that planning is able to play a strong role in the development of more integrated public service provision. Key ambitions included ensuring that emerging plans were able to effectively integrate with strategies created by community planning partnerships (networks of local service providers) (Lloyd and Peel, 2007). In addition a desire to ensure effective national and regional level spatial strategy-making were key aims of the professional community from the outset of the reform agenda (Tewdwr-Jones, 2001; Lloyd and McCarthy, 2000).

Once again, however, it is possible to identify rather different interpretations of what an integrative planning system entails. A strong interpretation of integration would require planning to play a key role in strategic governance, coordinating the spatial impacts of community planning decision-making and offering creative responses to the challenges of producing better places. A weaker interpretation meanwhile would see integration as a means of ensuring efficiency and minimising the bureaucratic burden of regulation.

view amongst a wide range of stakeholders that the system did require some change to become 'fit for purpose'. As the preceding discussion suggests, however, what that purpose was, and how to interpret the change required was contested, with each of the imagined systems above potentially pointing towards quite different systems and planning cultures. The resulting reform package therefore reflected a corporatist political settlement designed to provide an acceptable articulation of the various purposes sought for a modern planning system.

5.3 The reform proposals

Perhaps understandably the ‘problematism’ of the performance of planning was at its strongest as the case for new legislation was made. By the time the white paper entitled *Modernising Planning* was published in 2005 (Scottish Executive, 2005), it was accepted that there was a widespread sense that the system was “*not serving Scotland well*” (4.1). However, whilst accepting that there was strong evidence that performance was not as good as it could be (particularly in relation to the production of up to date development plans), the White Paper also cautioned that such concerns may be overstated, highlighting a continued commitment to a consensual path to reform and suggesting that planning continued to be valued as a policy mechanism capable of contributing to the Scottish Governments’ key aims.

Whilst the need for integration with community planning was maintained, the chief concerns that the white paper responded to were related to goals of efficiency and inclusion, and particularly the need to ensure that the system effectively met the needs of both business and local communities. The key principles underpinning the proposals in the White Paper were:

- Fit for purpose: recognising a need to simplify the system and ensure that decisions are made proportionally.
- Efficient: ensuring up to date plans and a change from development control to development management to ensure that decisions are made in a proactive and timely manner
- Inclusive: trying to ensure that all stakeholders are able to get involved through early engagement in plans and decisions
- Sustainable: ensuring that environmental issues are fully considered in keeping with EU requirements for strategic environmental assessment and environmental impact assessment.

The subsequent legislation was presented as a generational reform for planning, representing the culmination of several years of deliberation; the first piece of planning legislation passed under the Scottish Parliament was viewed as a means of ensuring a more modern system that would effectively respond to the various problems that had motivated reform. Table 2 provides a summary of the key changes introduced by the 2006 Act.

Having been developed by a Labour-Liberal Democrat administration, the new planning system ultimately came to be implemented by the minority SNP administration elected in 2007. Initial fears that the SNP would not retain commitment to planning reform proved unfounded. However, in reviewing policy guidance and in a succession of announcements it also became clear, as discussed above, that the new government would commit the planning system to a narrower interpretation of its purpose, defining the achievement of “sustainable economic growth” as the overarching goal of the system (Scottish Government, 2009) and positioning planning within the portfolio of the Finance Minister John Swinney in a clear statement that it was largely viewed as a tool of economic policy. This reflected changing economic conditions and the onset of recession in 2007, but also suggested that planning was held in somewhat ambiguous esteem by a government willing to allow that it might provide an effective means of facilitating more balanced economic growth, but also suspicious of its potential to act as a barrier to ‘necessary’ development.

Several interviewees felt that the relationship built up between the then Chief Planner Jim McKinnon and John Swinney had been central to promoting a more positive commitment to the system and its potential contribution. However, many also felt that this was a somewhat fragile commitment, reliant on the system showing clear evidence of change and an ability to realise these promises:

What it does do is, it puts pressure on us to perform. Again, personally I don't have a big problem with that. I think as with any kind of profession, we need to continue to improve our performance – as simple as that. Some of the figures we've got are pretty bad... And behind it all, as I've said earlier on is, I personally think we've got a five year window to try and show that we actually can make that progress

NL02, Professional representative

This sentiment, however, suggested the increasing dominance of efficient system goals, and their capacity to discipline other conceptions of what the system should become. As is further discussed below, this has been one of the key features of culture change. Having introduced the planning reform agenda and suggested that over time there have been shifts in the purposes of reform which potentially point towards quite different reform impulses and ‘imagined systems’ attention is now turned more directly to the culture change agenda to question how it might be understood.

Table 3

Summary of key changes introduced by planning reform in Scotland

Headline Changes in 2006 Planning Etc Scotland Act and associated guidance	Brief description
Introduction of statutory national planning framework (NPF)	Previously produced on a non-statutory basis, the NPF has become the key statement of national strategic spatial planning
Removal of structure plans and replacement with strategic development plans in four city regions	Previous requirement for structure plans across Scotland rescinded to create more proportionate plan coverage and to recognise the differential needs of different areas of the country
Introduction of authority wide local development plans (LDPs)	LDPs to replace previous system of local plans that were seen as cumbersome, complex, and out of date. Aim to create shorter more relevant, map based plans
Change from development control to development management	A symbolic shift from being a regulatory controlling activity to being a process of facilitating development
Introduction of new hierarchy of development (national, major, minor, permitted)	To allow more proportionate handling of applications different systems introduced to deal with different classes of development, including requirements for new forms of pre-application consultation between developers and communities on major applications
Reform to appeal process, including introduction of local review bodies (LRBs)	Related to the above, attempt to ensure that appeal processes and mechanisms are proportionate to applications. LRBs controversially introduced to hear appeals on minor applications made under delegated powers. These appeals not to Sec. of State but heard by local authorities
Creation of single planning policy guidance document	Post legislation, previous system of multiple planning guidance notes merged into single, shorter document.

5.4 Culture change as key to implementation?

Even before the 2006 Act was passed it was widely recognised that legislation alone would not be enough to bring about modernisation. The White Paper recognised this, suggesting that:

The reforms proposed amount to a modernisation of the planning system. This modernisation will require a considerable change in the culture of planning and will place significant demands on those responsible for its implementation – particularly planning authorities

Scottish Executive, 2005

Instead there was a widespread focus on the need for a change in the culture of the system, encompassing a shift in the attitudes and approach to planning of all stakeholders. This was seen as key to ensuring effective implementation of reform and realising the promises of a 'modernised' planning.

Given that reform sought to respond to a variety of different perceived problems and visions of a modern system, it seems reasonable to question the extent to which the culture change agenda has come to represent an extension of the politics of reform by other means. This was certainly apparent in the evidence given to the Communities Committee Enquiry into the Planning Etc Scotland Bill (see Scottish Parliament, 2006). Evidence was taken in separate hearings sessions from the bill team, including academic advisors; planning professionals; business; local government, and community groups. All actors discussed the need for a culture change, identifying attitudinal problems that affected the performance of the system and led them to welcome change. However, it was equally clear that the culture change envisioned by different actors was quite different. Moreover it was also clear, that in perceiving cultural problems actors often saw problems related to the attitudes of others but were perhaps less willing to examine their own practices. The committee reported that there remained a problem of distrust between stakeholders at the heart of the system's culture.

The committee also noted, however, that the Scottish Government had been proactive in seeking to engage with all of the different stakeholders involved in shaping the reform agenda and suggested that a continued commitment to such an approach could provide an effective means of ensuring that the new system was able to realise the promises that had been made for it (Scottish Parliament, 2006).

In response the Scottish Government reiterated the need for culture change to be extended to include all actors in the planning process, seeking to proactively develop understanding and commitment to the agenda. Two key statements of this approach were the publication in 2007 of *Modernising the Planning System: unlocking planning's potential*, a joint statement by the Executive, RTPI and planning authorities of how they would approach implementation; and *Delivering Planning Reform* (Scottish Government, 2007a; 2008). The latter was in part a report on ongoing deliberations, setting out a written statement that aimed to generate a commitment to "shared objectives and joint actions" on the part of the Scottish government and its agencies, local authorities and the development industry. Perhaps understandably given the remit of their role these actions tended to focus on the need for change in the public sector, the culture of which had been recognised as a particular problem (see the 34 actions reported in the '*Delivering Planning Reform: final progress report*' published in 2010, of which only two related to the private sector [Scottish Government, 2010]).

The culture change agenda was therefore seen as a crucial part of the implementation of reform, running alongside the introduction of new statutory regulations, the communication of the changes implied by reform and a commitment to fulfilling the purposes of reform:

And the key change was to recognise that we have made major procedural changes but actually a lot that needed to improve the planning system was not about legislation, it was not about process, it was actually more about product and about the perception and engagement. NL01, Civil Servant

Under the SNP administration this was pursued with a view to better meeting the overarching objective of directing the system towards the attainment of 'sustainable economic growth', and there was a strong feeling amongst interviewees that this was not a political issue, but a managerial agenda for delivering a broadly shared agenda. The strong steer given by the government seemed by the time the research was conducted to have clarified any remaining political questions of how the efficient, inclusive and integrative systems would be combined, rendering culture change clearly managerial in the minds of those interviewed:

In terms of the politics. I don't think planning is considered a big "P" political issue up here. It's very much a policy issue that will aid an economic agenda. I don't think there would be even necessarily be that huge a political difference on that strategic goal...

NL03, Local Government Representative

5.5 Towards a shared understanding of culture change?

In interviews some professional planners expressed some doubts about the idea of culture change:

...in some respects as a planner I found it a little bit insulting that the whole thing was about culture change.

NL04, Key agency manager

Others suggested that the term had emerged as something of a buzzword from 2006 onwards and were concerned that its meaning was not entirely clear, perhaps fearing that it had become a catch all that encompassed all aspects of the change required by reform. However, most had come to accept its use and saw a clear need for attitudinal change in approaches to planning, and of the potential of culture change to play a positive role. In general the planning professional community and the development industry⁹ saw this change in terms of 'efficient system' goals:

Because the Act at the end of the day doesn't generate anything, it's only a set of rules and mechanisms that get you from one point to the other. If you want to positively encourage something you can use the Act to positively encourage it, if you want to negatively discourage something you can use it that way as well. So it's all down to understanding what everyone is trying to achieve out of this. And to me, culture change is the notion of the Scottish government's sustainable economic development as being the primary driver, becomes the same primary driver that every single person that's using the system is working towards.

NL06, Development industry spokesman

The need for change was often underpinned by the fear that there continued to be very different practices between and even within individual local planning authorities, and a sense that there were "dinosaur" planners who had not really grasped that new ways of working were required, or that the implications of sustainable economic growth were very much about a shift towards pro-development thinking and not the more environmental view of sustainability that had previously been held by many:

And not sustainable in the planning sense of sustainable, it was economic growth that's sustainable. Yeah. And I don't think a lot of people got that. I don't think a lot of people in planning got that.

NL04, Key agency manager

Whilst all accepted the need for an efficient system (suggesting that this had become a very difficult discourse to challenge), a minority of interviewees, typically those located away from day-to-day planning practice, expressed regret at the focus on efficiency and its potentially negative effects on the goals of inclusion and / or integration:

...planning remains wedded to the idea of a presumption in favour of economic development, wedded to a politics where politicians worship at the shrine of GDP and jobs as the only things that matter, while we have culturally a primacy of economics over politics, society and the environment, the planning system is simply an economic tool. So we needed to set what we were saying inside a cultural basis that said "no, actually there's a huge picture here that we've got to change, we have to achieve sustainable development, and sustainable development is not the same as sustainable economic growth"

NL05, Environmental NGO

⁹ Whilst acknowledging that the 'development industry' is a rather broad and heterogeneous stakeholder group, the discussion here assumes that the views gathered in this project are broadly representative of prevalent sentiments within the sector.

5.6 Culture change: initiatives and influences

By 2011-12 when the empirical work for this project was conducted the majority of the tasks highlighted in delivering planning reform were well on the way to completion (see Scottish Government, 2010). It was therefore possible to gain a sense of the key techniques through which culture change had been promoted.

Undoubtedly central to this was the idea of a *partnership* approach as emphasised by documents such as *Delivering Planning Reform* and commended by the Communities Committee. All of those interviewed at the national level spoke about the open approach to government that planning reform was seen to exemplify. For civil servants this was a central aspect of the wider culture of the Scottish Government, whilst for others it also represented a necessary response to the distribution of power in Scotland first in the form of coalition administrations, and then a minority SNP government which had no previous experience of government when first elected.

In relation to planning reform, the capacity of stakeholders to get access to ministers and civil servants was seen as very positive, a product of the relatively small size of Scotland and its policy communities (cf. Vigar, 2009):

Yeah I mean it's a small country. The best example I can give to you is that we were doing work for a London client a couple of years ago and he couldn't believe that we could get a meeting with one of the Cabinet Ministers and the Chief Planner, you know, he just couldn't believe we could do that within a couple of weeks. And it's because we're a small country, it's an accessible government, and from that perspective you know the term that they like to use is "open for business", you know. They certainly externally display that, and my experience is that they do deliver on that as well. NL06, Development Industry

The capacity and willingness of the Government to engage was summed up for many by the idea of getting everybody around a table at regular intervals. Moreover, for some officers in local government and key agencies the reform process had led to secondments and very regular meetings with Government officials:

But sometimes you feel you're working more at Victoria Quay [the Scottish Government] than in your own council building, less so now. In the lead up to the Planning Bill that was definitely the case, there were so many working groups. ECS01, Planning Manager¹⁰

This collaborative governance model, involving a search for consensus about the appropriate goals of reform and ways of realising change, was seen as setting the tone for the new culture of planning that the Government had sought to promote. It involved a strong push to improve communication and trust between different stakeholders to tackle perceived antagonisms, particularly between local authorities and the development sector.

The Scottish Government was also, however, wary of being seen to impose its authority on local government. As a result some of the potential powers in the new legislation to impose performance monitoring and improvements on authorities had not been exercised and the Government's approach has been to seek improvement through dialogue. Within this context it is not always clear, however, how conflict is handled or dissent expressed. For voices from outwith the stakeholder community of largely professional interests the closeness of relations between those on the 'inside' creates a clear sense of being at a distance from influence, suggesting the possibility of tensions between effective partnership and inclusive participation (cf. Newman, 2001):

But, you know, we've been subject to the abuse of the word "partnership" which you found in the Blair years and New Labour years, you know, civil servants are forever telling us "oh let's form a partnership, a nice partnership". And what the partnership means is that they are going to tell us what to do... It's a big issue in Scotland because a lot of the talk of partnership and a lot of the talk of consensus and everything is language which the civil service learned and uses, but in my estimation any close look at it ... would demonstrate that there's a lot less consensus going on.

NL05, Environmental NGO

In keeping with the overall 'open government' approach and the idea of facilitating rather than directing change, the Government had further sought to promote culture change through a range of other mechanisms. This included a considerable initial financial investment in skills and training initiatives delivered by the Improvement Service¹¹. In addition further initiatives included:

- articles in *Scottish Planner* (the Scottish planning profession's journal);
- the use of the website to present examples of good and bad practice, case studies and profiles of professionals working in new ways;
- 'roadshows' taking the message of planning reform to different locations, including planning schools;
- secondments and placements with the Scottish Government;
- promotion of the Scottish awards for planning.

This represented a proactive approach to communicating key messages about the new system and the approach required. With less financial resources now available a key issue for the Government has been (and remains) how to continue to develop such initiatives. One solution being pursued has been to work even more closely with key stakeholders to promote change, for example, sponsoring the work of Heads of Planning Scotland to help develop a long-promised new performance assessment framework, and supporting new forums being established by organisations such as the Royal Town Planning Institute.

¹⁰ In order to ensure anonymity of respondents case study interviews are referred to throughout by number and role/ position in organisation.

Certain interviews are quoted extensively, but throughout the quotations have been selected to represent broadly shared perspectives.

¹¹ The improvement service is an agency that works to improve skills within Government in Scotland.

All of these represented means of communicating the intentions of reform and working with those involved in implementation to monitor and consider good practice, suggesting a strong recognition on the part of the Government of the need to “take people with you” (NL01, Civil Servant).

Considerable quantities of this time and resource had been focused on communicating the new process in terms of new statutory requirements. Thus whilst professing to be concerned to move “beyond the process” many of those involved felt that the key driver of change had actually come from changing legal requirements and regulations:

So although there were other objectives, you know, you look at the government’s culture change page on their website, you know, there are lots of touchy feely soft objectives in there about quality and attitudes and all the rest of it, but it became quite a process driven operation. Get a new Act in. Get a new set of development plans. Speed up the decision making process on planning applications. Strip out all the minor stuff out of the system, focus on the big issues and get them done quicker. Which was fine as far as the development industry was concerned

NL07, Development industry representative

In relation to the case study below, this suggests that however culture change is presented legal requirements, and the introduction of new technologies and procedures (such as those associated with e-planning) are often stronger drivers of cultural change in *practice* than exhortations to attitudinal change (cf. Hoggett, 1996; Schein, 1992; Shaw, 2006). For several interviewees moreover, the onset of recession had been the single most significant driver of change bringing a new pragmatism to the reform agenda, focused around the efficient system and the facilitation of development.

Alongside the ‘partnership’ based collaborative approach it was also clear, however, that there was a continued reliance on performance targets to bring about changes in practice. For example, whilst undertaking the research, Audit Scotland published a report that suggested that performance improvements in this regard were progressing more slowly than had been hoped for, leading to negative press coverage of the system (Audit Scotland, 2011)¹².

The development industry generally approved of this focus on targets, though they also outwardly accepted the case made by strong voices in the public sector professional community that speed should not be seen as the only measure of the system’s qualities (see e.g. Heads of Planning Scotland, 2012). As civil servants suggested, the continued reliance on performance management and targets reflected the fact that many of the initiatives promoted to shape planning reform reflected those aspects of the agenda that had the highest political profile, and those the Government was most able to “get their teeth into” using available resources, expertise and levers. This had arguably led to a greater focus of attention in implementation on development management rather than development planning, and on quantitative targets rather than harder to measure, more intangible aspects of either place based outcomes or service quality. For similar reasons it was suggested that those aspects of the programme laid out in *Delivering Planning Reform* that were easiest to implement were those focused on central government and its agencies, for example improvements to the way key agencies engaged with the planning system had been developed through a series of working groups, whilst initiatives requiring wider shifts in local government, community attitudes or developer behaviours had proven more difficult to influence and effect.

¹² Alongside the earlier scrutiny from the Council of Economic Advisors, this suggests that external criticism and perception have also been important influences on the culture change agenda.

5.7 Changing knowledges and practices

In keeping with the dominance of the *efficient system*, interviews suggested that the emergent change in both the knowledges that were most valued within the system, and the practices of actors were those that related to making sure that the system was seen to be “*open for business*”. Within the public sector planning professional community this was seen as a key change, contrasting with past practices:

I look at files from the past and I'm just embarrassed at the kind of things that we were saying, at the sort of autocratic letter writing as opposed to “this is really interesting, can we sit around the table and have a conversation with you about it and work through this”, and being at odds with other agencies. So a lot more collaborative working you know, it's one of the most significant changes **NL04, Key agency manager**

All of those interviewed identified this as a positive shift with the potential to make planning more relevant to contemporary local government and better attuned to the realities of shaping development. Change towards a more market sensitive form of planning was seen to have accelerated as a result of changing economic conditions and the challenges of promoting development in the face of recession since 2007. Key new skills had clearly been validated as part of this change. This included project management, designed to ensure a good service to the customer (implicitly often meaning the applicant) and to deliver the certainty that developers seek and felt was missing from the system:

Quite often I think in the end what people are reeling against is this unpredictability of the decision as opposed to the process. Yes they have problems with the process, yes they don't think it should take 12 or 18 months to get a planning application to the point where it goes to the decision maker, yes they reel against being asked to pay for this, that and the next thing as part of the planning application as part of the development. But fundamentally, you know, quite often they'll say “we could put up with all that if at the end of the day when the planning department in a council gets to the end of this process and says ‘aye, OK, that looks like a good solution, we can recommend approval on that ...the problem then becomes, you know, who knows what happens when you get a decision, you know it can be overturned for the most irrational or seemingly irrational reasons. So the word that people keep trotting out in our line of business is “certainty”. **NL07, Development industry representative**

The use of planning performance agreements for major developments was widely presented as an example of emerging good practice in this regard (albeit they have only been used extensively in Edinburgh). In addition knowledge of financial viability and a willingness to consider policies and development proposals in the light of economic viability considerations was seen as a symbol

of the new planning culture, replacing the previous public sector antipathy to the market with a role in facilitating development and ensuring that it is ‘delivered’ on the ground.

In general the substantive knowledge that mattered most was of how to ensure that development could be “delivered” through the statutory system, requiring a rethinking of regulatory requirements that were seen as inhibiting development. For the most part this was viewed as a technical expertise rooted in the legal framework created by the new planning system, alongside a degree of professional judgement that seemed to be increasingly assessed as an ability to minimise or make proportional demands that would facilitate development.

In terms of practices this was most strongly symbolised by a willingness to collaborate towards the shared purpose of bringing about development, including a commitment to discussion about policies and proposals:

So just an example of, in the past you'd have had a planning authority go “well what am I supposed to do with that, I've got two different opinions here, both government agencies, which one do I plump for”, you know, “how do I feel today”. So that kind of thing I think has really changed for a lot of the agencies in particular. And that's certainly a culture change, our staff are picking up the phone to each other, they're meeting each other – you know when you know somebody, you've met them, you can pick up the phone and have a chat with them. Because there's a lot more going on where staff are being encouraged to get out there and get round the table with folk, it means it's easier to do. **NL04, Key agency manager**

The desire to develop new collaborative ways of working and more positive relations between the public and private sectors contributed to the frustration felt within the public sector about the continued emphasis on narrow measures of speed to judge the performance of the system. These were seen to drive practices in ways that emphasised more instrumental logics rather than a more holistic sense of what constituted good collaborative practice.

The development industry were outwardly supportive of the overall direction of change and saw positive signs of change in the move towards more proportionate and better coordinated regulation. This was perhaps particularly true in relation to the key agencies who had previously been seen as a major obstacle to development (cf. Haughton et al., 2010), but who had made a major coordinating effort to change their practices. However, they also felt that progress in this direction remained very uneven and the spectre of ‘old fashioned’ or ‘dinosaur’ practices remained strong in practice at the local level, often associated with inconsistent political decision-making, or the unreformed approach of individual case officers.

The reciprocal change required of the development industry to engage in more collaborative practices was also acknowledged by both sides to be a work in progress. Their knowledge of the “bottom line” and the discipline that free market competition imposed on their practices remained, however, and was clearly considered a valid form of knowledge that qualified their participation in more collaborative processes:

Because ultimately, I think I said that the beginning, nothing that we do is contrary to the plan because there is a set of criteria that starts out saying “these are all the things that we want to encourage, and these are all the things that we don’t want to encourage”. But sod’s law, all the things that you don’t want to encourage are the ones that make money. And in some way it’s because they’ve said that they don’t want it that that’s what makes it... you know **NL06, Development Industry**

Their engagement in new, more collaborative practices and relationships therefore appeared to be conditional on a test of whether it helped to promote development (or get their development approved) rather than necessarily being part of a substantive change of attitude. Where change had occurred meanwhile it was often seen as a result of new regulatory requirements, rather than a new spirit or planning ethos. For example, requirements for pre-application consultation on major developments were viewed as a major change, but commitment to these seemed to be largely a result of new legal requirements rather than a transformed commitment to shaping new relationships.

Given this emphasis on the knowledges and practices that could signal a more “open for business” planning system (characterised by more efficient and proportionate regulation and a desire to make development happen), knowledges and practices related to the *inclusive* and *integrative* systems often seemed to be subordinate, leading advocates of each to express some concern that they were not as prevalent as they should be. Moreover, those seeking to make a case for more integrative or inclusive goals did so within the framework of efficiency, suggesting the power of this as a hegemonic ‘frame’ through which the benefits of all changes would be assessed.

For example, two advocates of a broader integrative planning system presented the idea as a means of ensuring efficiency as part of a strategic approach to “preventative spend”, so that by ensuring better coordinated service delivery and infrastructure subsequent costs would be saved on e.g. health care. This argument was drawn from the Christie Commission (2011) on the Future Delivery of Public Services in Scotland, and was clearly an attempt to articulate

planning’s potential to contribute to a more effective form of integrated public service provision. More generally the key knowledge of integration that was stressed was the ability to ensure a more integrated regulatory framework, so that developers were able to more clearly understand the requirements of different government services. Changes to the ways in which the key agencies worked for example were seen as a positive example of what could be achieved, creating a more “joined up” approach to regulation that was both more efficient and more effective in improving the input they had to the planning process (though again this was acknowledged to be a work in progress that had been unevenly realised in practice).

Knowledges and practices related to inclusion were promoted within a narrower frame that required managing community expectations to increase acceptance of development, rather than offering real empowerment through direct democratic control. Key changes to practices seemed to be driven by new requirements for e.g. pre-application consultation amongst developers on major applications. Whilst it was felt that some had approached this with a genuine desire to work with communities, it was also widely acknowledged that many viewed the requirement as a public relations exercise. Moreover, the input that communities could expect to have into proposals at this stage was also felt to be limited. This seemed to have provided a pro-efficient system ‘fix’ to the contradiction between these two reform goals. Whilst the goal of opening up the system to more public input was taken seriously by the public sector planning community, it was also felt in practice that this was extremely hard to do as the ‘community’ was hard to identify and negotiate with. Moreover, participation was viewed with considerable ambivalence. Professionals often saw the community as a potential source of narrow, self-interested opposition and doubted their ability to understand the wider public interest benefits of development. For their part, community groups felt at a considerable disadvantage in the face of a heavily professionalised system that seemed to have its own logic, requiring considerable expertise (see e.g. Planning Democracy, 2012).

Finally, it is worth noting that the key knowledges and practices emphasised by almost all actors were related to the system and its processes. Though it was and remains central to the Government’s language of reform, there was less substantive discussion of knowledge about what constitutes better places, or ‘real world outcomes’, which often seemed distant from actors’ accounts of changes to practice. This was symbolised for several respondents by a sense that emerging development plans had not fully grasped the change required to become more map-based, and spatially focused.

5.8 Changing the relations shaping practice

The relationship between the public and private sectors had emerged as central to the promotion of the *efficient system* and considerable energy had been devoted to opening up consensus seeking lines of communication. As noted above, changes in these relationships were acknowledged, with the clear sense being that public sector practices were being encouraged to work more in line with the concerns of the development industry through more open communication. This was contrasted with the antagonistic way in which these relations had been handled in the past, and continued to be amongst pockets of resistance within the planning profession:

We've got a few dinosaurs, you know, as any organisation will have, you know, people who find it difficult to change and leave their old working practices behind. **ECS03, planning manager**

As noted above, particular changes were acknowledged in the ways in which the key agencies approached relationships with other stakeholders in the system; and in the way central government managed its relationships with professional stakeholders. However, despite these efforts the development industry continued to express doubts about the scope and extent of the change in relations:

And the difficulty is that, as far as I can see, the culture change – I think it would be unfair to say it hasn't materialised in any form but there are huge variations for the country in terms of how the Act is implemented and how development is viewed. There's huge inconsistencies and, as I've just said, it's quite clear that when a local authority wishes to encourage something it can move mountains to get things that they want through. And if they don't want to encourage something they can create mountains in its way. And I think that's the difficulty. And then you actually almost get down to individuals, you know, once you boil it down, that's the difficulty. And because we're such a small country as well it's hard to avoid individuals because they've got quite a lot of influence.

NL06, Development Industry

In particular, whilst relationships between professionals were understood to have improved, the development industry remained particularly critical of the political influences that shape local authority decision-making, and which they saw as frustratingly inconsistent. Whilst public sector planning professionals accepted the importance of democratic decision-making it also seemed that a key part of the agenda had been to 'train' councillors and seek to remove undue 'political' influence from planning decisions as far as possible (see case study below).



Beneath the apparent improvement in public-private relationships and outward expressions of commitment to a shared interest in better development, the development industry also seemed more open in admitting to a continued distrust. They were therefore more conditional in their commitment to more collaborative working relationships, admitting that the underlying scope for conflict between developers and authorities remained central to the system and that it could not be readily banished by calls for consensus:

Yeah, there are big perceptual differences, big ailments of trust, and a lack of understanding of how each other operates. And to be fair, again the government recognises this and it talks about cooperative working and more proportionate approach. It's looked at the whole issue about skills and training and knowledge and trying to....it sees that as part of the process, which is a very long term process, it's a matter of getting people to understand each other's roles, responsibilities, areas of expertise and trying to do something about forcing that interchange of ideas. But that's a long term change.

NL06, Development Industry spokesperson



As noted above, new requirements for developers to conduct preapplication consultation directly with local communities were also seen to have created new relationships, though these were viewed as emergent and as unlikely to lead to a transformation in the problematic relationship between local communities and new development.

This suggested that the relationships required of an inclusive system remained awkward with communities seen as somewhat elusive entities whose interests could not be readily established and with whom reliable relationships were problematic to build and sustain:

The difficulty that I have with engagement is that you always engage the usual suspects, I mean even the people who get involved in community councils. There's some very good community councils out there, but they're very much in the minority.

NL04, Key agency manager

For those outside of the stakeholder 'in' group therefore creating meaningful new relationships was considered difficult, with a strong perception that developers and local planning authorities were engaged in close relationships behind closed doors that excluded affected publics.

Moreover, the focus on developing and improving trust within the professional planning community had arguably led to less emphasis being placed on developing the relations required to effectively participate in wider governance processes such as community planning. This had led to fears that the system might remain marginalised within local governance:

I've a real worry that the planning profession in Scotland probably didn't engage with the community planning process as much as it should have, and both also the community planning profession, or discipline, or whatever it's called, didn't really think about planning as a mechanism either. And there's a need to try and see how we can make these things work together more cleverly **NL09, Planning professional body representative**

Having assessed the ways in which key relationships were being reimaged through modernisation and culture change I now move on to consider how the roles and identities of different stakeholders were being affected.

5.9 Changing roles and identities

Fitting with the validation of a ‘new’ conception of the knowledges, practices and relationships underpinning planning practice, interviews also probed the changes required of various actors in the planning process as their roles and identities changed in response to new practices and attitudes.

In general the public sector planning community saw the change as being a recognition of the value of more collaborative practices, aimed at facilitating development. Moreover, this was seen to provide a more positive, modern image to tackle the negative perceptions that were seen to have become widespread:

Do they do things differently – yes I would say. On the whole I think people have embraced that and I think they do understand they need to deal with people in a different way, particularly to get out a message about being responsive to development, that we’re not seen to be presenting a negative image.

ECS01, planning manager

I would hope that there are more people that are now more aware of their role in public service and facilitation than we might have had in the past. I think there’s more awareness now and I would like to see that increase around the need for personal commitment to project manage things, an awareness that particularly large scale developments that come to the planning system have taken quite a long time and a huge amount of money to get there, and they’re really important for communities. And so that more business-like delivery...

NL1, Civil Servant

This required a particular emphasis on the ‘new’ skills that would make planners more effective “market actors”, e.g. knowledge of development finance and project management (Adams and Tiesdall, 2010).

It was also recognised that this required a heightened degree of confidence and leadership to work through the possible tensions between making strong decisions and seeking to work collaboratively to make development happen:

*I think it’s someone who can be outward looking, someone who thinks about making things happen, about deliverability and viability, is confident is probably a key word, who is engaging – and I mean that they engage with others naturally be that a community or be that a developer but that they have that skill to work with people, so a people person. **NL09, Planning professional body representative***

*But still giving robust determinations, I think it would be good to see more of that. And that would go a long way to I think improving the reputation of the system. And equally, to try and highlight where things are not going to proceed, or look very unlikely, just to tell people. I think it’s quite hard to do that actually, and there is a bit of tension between that and trying to resolve difficulties – “this looks difficult, maybe if you do a study on that we could get over it”. But there is a bit of a tension there between giving somebody a straight answer, and trying to work over the longer term to approval. But I think that’s one of the key things. **NL1, Civil Servant***



These were understood to be key skills and dispositions required to improve the way the planning process worked. Typically they were presented as part of a 'pragmatic' commitment to a form of planning that "makes things happen". There was less sense that there were any substantive values to be promoted beyond a belief that the public interest lay in facilitating the development necessary for economic growth, provided that this was not environmentally damaging:

described my job ... as being that of a relationship manager. And I think that was certainly true of the way that I did that job, and it's true of the way I think some people manage the processes, because of course planning is just a process and it can only ever be as good as the people that are operating it. And there are some who are very proactive, who want to keep people talking....And I think the notion of development has been a bit of a dirty word. That's actually what we're all here to do, is to manage the environment in which we're working. **NL04, Key agency manager**

Whilst there was a general feeling that change was progressing, it was also recognised further improvement in key skills and dispositions was required:

And I also think another key thing that's going to be important is they have good project management skills. I don't think...well some of our members probably aren't as good at that as probably could be. And they're also knowledgeable, much more knowledgeable about money and economics is a key thing, and probably design as well. **NL09, Planning professional body representative**

Moreover, most interviewees also stressed that they saw this change as partial and ongoing, all spoke of the continued presence of professionals committed to older practices and values and who were therefore out of step with this new approach in their mistrust of collaborative working, continued adherence to a strong sense of a public-private sector divide, and / or slightly out-of-date commitment to environmental conservation rather than development (see the "dinosaurs" referred to above):

I think we're certainly heading in the right direction. There are still...there will always be people who won't fit that sort of job description. **NL10, Planning professional body representative**

This figure was typically always 'elsewhere', an 'other' capable of justifying continued failings in the system. She was also typically associated with a stubborn culture in the public sector, though some in the development industry also noted that change towards a more collaborative process could pose a threat to their roles and values:

I actually think my job is disappearing. I think the whole... way the new Act was framed was that...it hasn't materialised in this way but one of the ways it could have happened is that you could have ended up with consensus planning. And I think going back to what I started with, which as I said "we are a nuts and bolts planning consultancy", which ultimately means we argue with people. There's opposing views that we need to bring together. That's what we ultimately do. So once they've got rid of the planning solicitors.... they'll be putting the consultants next on the list. And, you know, we'll get to a point where....and it comes back to the other point I was making about the entrepreneurial aspect, if they remove that from the system then I'm not required. **NL6, Development industry spokesperson**

As the culture of the new system was developing then, there was a sense that planners' sense of self was altering, becoming more aligned with new skills, practices and emphases. Though this was understood to be uneven, for those in leadership roles within the planning policy community and particularly public sector professional communities the change seemed typically to be seen as a positive one with which many strongly identified. They often recounted how it sat comfortably with their own long-held conceptions of how planning should operate to "make things happen", whilst helping to make planners and the planning system more relevant to a modernized conception of 'efficient and effective' public service.

For those outside of this community, however, this change in the identity of the system was harder to see and amongst professionals it was clear that the dominant construction of the 'communities' identity was as a potentially problematic opponent of necessary development.

5.10 Progress towards culture change?

Interviewees at the national level suggested that culture change remained very much a work in progress. Most recognised that there were signs of progress towards a more efficient system. There was also a widespread consensus on the techniques through which change had been facilitated, and the positive nature of the reform process and the principles underpinning modernisation. For some, however, progress had been slow and this was still very much seen as a cultural problem:

*Certainly, you know, we've heard some people say "this hasn't worked, therefore we need to change it", it's almost a knee-jerk reaction you know in any walk of life, if something isn't working we need to change the model, the system, the structure, whatever it happens to be. The other view, which I think is much more widely held is "we've changed the system, we've all agreed that it looked like a better system, is it not working because the people that operate it are not making it work", you know, is it a people problem, is it an attitude problem, is it a skills and training problem, is it a culture problem? And I think the majority view is that it's the latter, it needs to be made to work in the way it was intended to work. And a lot of that is the soft changes in attitudes, skills, knowledge, motivation etc etc to make it work, rather than the mechanics. **NL07, Development industry representative***

Moreover, it was also apparent that there were continued issues of trust between the public and private sectors:

You know, that's another word in this whole culture thing, is trust. The public sector, or large parts of it, fundamentally do not trust the private sector.

NL07, Development industry representative

At a fundamental level these tensions should perhaps, however, be understood as structural, an inevitable feature of the opposing interests of different actors. The consensual or collaborative approach must therefore be viewed as a limited solution that probably cannot ultimately resolve underlying tensions.

The development industry also remained concerned about the consistency of decision-making between and even within planning authorities, and particularly the role of political decision-making which was seen as particularly capricious. Moreover, many respondents also emphasised that the system had not been fully tested as the onset of recession had led to a fall in the number of applications being dealt with. There was some concern that the collaborative approach was actually a very resource intensive way of managing development and that this could come under considerable strain once (or, if) economic circumstances change.

Underpinning this was a concern that the planning system was very much on trial, and that the threat of a continued negative perception of planning as a barrier to growth was ever present (this was frequently viewed in the light of ongoing processes of reform to the planning system in England). There was therefore a sense that the public sector planning professional community in particular had to work hard to 'deliver' the Government's desired change or face the consequences of being viewed as an anachronistic and overly-regulatory 'problem'. This seemed to represent the key dynamic underpinning moves towards a new culture, strengthening the hegemony of the efficient system, and leading to the subordination of integrative or inclusive goals. It was therefore apparent that the goals of reform had continued to be clarified and refined through the process of culture change, a subtle managerial extension of the politics of reform through which consent to new discourses (and attendant knowledges/ practices; relations; roles and identities) was being secured.

The report now moves down to the local level by considering the implementation of the culture change agenda in the City of Edinburgh.

6.1 Background and Context

The City of Edinburgh Council is the local authority responsible for Scotland's capital city. The total population of the city was 486,120 in 2010, representing 9.3% of the total population of Scotland. The rate of population growth in the city has also outstripped the rest of the country over the past three decades (City of Edinburgh Council, 2012a).

The City has an international reputation for the quality of its historic built environment much of which has been classified as a world heritage site since 1995 with substantial further coverage of conservation areas and listed buildings and monuments. This contributes to it being one of the most visited tourist destinations in the UK. In addition the city has one of the strongest economies of any UK city outside London, with strong service sector concentrations in financial services, higher education, and public services (including the Scottish Government) as well as tourism. Unemployment, whilst growing (Edinburgh City Council, 2012b economic strategy), remains below national levels (City of Edinburgh Council, 2012a). This combination of assets has given the city a reputation as one of the best places to live in the UK (Edinburgh Inspiring Capital, 2012).

However, this picture of success also perhaps masks a number of challenges, including substantial inequality and areas with concentrations of deprivation (Edinburgh Partnership, 2012). Moreover, success itself poses challenges of how to accommodate a growing population and the needs of a modern economy without compromising the historical and natural environment that are seen as key to the city's success.

At the time the research was conducted in 2012, the Council was led by a Labour – Scottish Nationalist Party coalition administration. Despite changes in political control, however, and the politicisation of certain key issues (notably the long drawn out and highly controversial process of developing a new tram network in the city), there remains a reasonably stable political settlement within the city over key priorities and the need to pursue a strategy of economic growth, accommodating development pressures as sustainably as possible. This has been strengthened since the onset of the recession in 2007, amidst fears that the crisis in financial services may have particularly negative impacts on the Edinburgh economy. The Council has therefore been committed to an 'economic resilience' programme whose aim has been to ensure that the city is seen as being business friendly and a good place to invest and create jobs (City of Edinburgh Council, 2012b). One central plank of this agenda had been to communicate that the city was "open for business", responding to a perception that in the past the authority had been considered rather difficult to work with and less than fully supportive of development.

The planning service had moved from the City Development Department to the Services for Communities Department on the 1st of January 2012 (each being one of five broader cross-service departments within the council). This organisational structure is in keeping with the tendency for contemporary local government to be characterised by a flatter structure, with larger organisational units. Within this structure planning is often a third or fourth tier function as in Edinburgh, something which has given rise to some concern within the profession about the perceived diminution of influence over strategic change within local government (e.g. NPF, 2008).

City Development contained the Council's economic development, transport and building standards and property functions, alongside the planning service, whilst Services for Communities is a larger, 'eclectic' collection of regulatory services, encompassing parks and green space, housing, trading standards, libraries and road services. For some of those interviewed this change was seen in somewhat negative terms:

We were in City Development up until last year then there was a structural change and we moved into a different department called Services for Communities, which means nothing to anybody at all, you know, "what on earth does that department deliver" you know...and I think at the moment we feel probably a little bit...we're very much a Cinderella service...I think in terms of profile and influence I feel that we may be a little bit lost... I do wonder whether, in City Development we were in a department called Development, you know, with Transport and Economic Development, and there was quite a nice marriage there of those services where they developed focus on a director called Director of City Development, you know, that sort of meant something. ECS03, Planning Manager

The change in organisational structure meant that, at the time of writing, the strategic priorities for the restructured department had not yet been updated so that there was no up-to-date plan articulating the ways in which the new department and the planning service combined together to work towards broader city-wide and national outcomes. However, officers were clear that the move did not fundamentally change the key goals underpinning the service, though it may have strengthened the focus on the 'customer experience'. These were set out in an updated service improvement plan (City of Edinburgh Council, 2012c), which sought to position the planning service in relation to key aspects of the council's corporate vision, and the wider Edinburgh Partnership's Single Outcomes Agreement with the Scottish Government (e.g. Edinburgh Partnership, 2012).

The local planning culture was described by councillors on both sides of the political spectrum in broadly similar terms:

I think Edinburgh is conservative with a small 'c'. It's quite sceptical of authority and, you know, in general has a poor view about planning. I mean if you think about Edinburgh you think about the conservation areas and the character of those conservation areas and you don't want monstrous carbuncles on the faces of wee friends or big friends and nor do you want nasty neighbours. **ECS05, Councillor**

The key challenge was therefore understood in relation to ensuring that 'necessary' growth and development could be accommodated without compromising the valued character and environment of the city. Political differences on the planning committee were seen less in party political terms and more in terms of different interpretations of what represented sustainable development, with a broad acceptance that the economy of the city had to grow but different views about how this might best be achieved.

The high profile and publicly very unpopular tram scheme could be seen as an example of the poor view of 'planning' held within the city, which often reflected wider urban development issues linked in the public mind to planning, even where these were not directly related to the actual responsibilities of the planning service – a source of frustration for some of the planners interviewed. The suspension of the Director of City Development in relation to allegations of corruption in the city's Property Repairs department during the period of the research was viewed as a further unfortunate influence on the wider context of public opinion.

The planning service itself is split into development planning and development management sections, with a structure of sub-teams on each. The development planning function is divided between responsibilities for the production of strategic and local development plans; conservation, built heritage and World Heritage; some major implementation projects; streetscape issues; street naming and an information team. The development management function is divided into two areas, east and west, which each have major and local development teams; a specialist building team dealing with conservation issues; an enforcement team and a development monitoring and appeals team. The structure of both of these functions had been reviewed and revised following the introduction of the 2006 Planning Etc Scotland Act as part of a proactive approach to dealing with the new system and seeking to ensure that the service was prepared to meet new challenges and to respond positively to the culture change agenda (City of Edinburgh Council, 2007a; 2007b; 2008).

In part this reflected a genuine enthusiasm for reform on the part of managers and senior officers, a number of whom had been actively involved in working groups and deliberations with the Scottish Government that had framed the modernisation agenda. The authority therefore recognised both the value of modernisation and that it required a fundamental change in approach to the practice of planning:

To deliver these ambitious reforms, the Government expects a renaissance in planning which in turn can only be realised if all those involved in the planning process change the way they think and work - not only those in the Council's Planning Service in Development Planning.

There is a need then for a cultural shift in attitudes and working practices. This requires both the skills and critical capacity in-house to deliver this agenda, combined with a willingness to practice planning in different ways. **Edinburgh City Council, 2007a, 6-7**

6.2 Towards a shared understanding of culture change?

As noted above, planning service managers were proactive in their approach to both modernisation and the culture change agenda. This was also related to the wider culture of the organisation which was described by officers and managers as modernising, focused on being ‘customer’ and service orientated with an ambition to be seen as one of the leading authorities in Scotland – modernisation and culture change had clearly given these officers a positive sense of purpose and identity as leading ‘performers’ and agents of necessary change:

And that led me into all the best value review of work which I then got involved departmentally out with planning service because the whole of city development’s covering transport planning, economic development, and leading on that sort of work for about 3 years...that’s given me a much broader perspective of where planning fits into the wider aspect of development. And I suppose when I reflect on it, that’s part of the reason why I’ve been a bit of an enthusiast for planning reform, because I could see what the planning sector was required to do if it was going to be part of delivering the bigger picture **ECS01, planning manager**

Managers also identified a strong capacity for change within the planning service:

But I actually think we’ve got a good capacity for change within this council, the council as a whole. It’s not to say we’ve managed change very well, there’s some big projects where I don’t think we’ve managed change well at all, but there is overall a recognition I think that this is a council which does change and wants to change, that’s part of the corporate ethos. And I think most staff accept that general principle. **ECS01, planning manager**

Officers identified the idea of culture change as emanating from managers and admitted to some initial scepticism as to its value, and some uncertainty as to its meaning:

It was very much a buzzword in 2006-7, I think it’s not quite as bad as it was, but yeah, it was used, banded around for all sorts of new bits and pieces that people were doing or kind of latched on. Just anything that somebody was doing that was a little bit different they would kind of badge it as “oh this is part of culture change”. **ECS05, development planner**

By the time the research was conducted there was a feeling that culture change had perhaps lost some of its ‘buzz’, however, there was also a clear acceptance of the need for change amongst officers. This was seen in particular in relation to becoming more ‘customer’ or service focused, changing attitudes towards relationships with others and especially the ways in which officers engaged with the development industry:

Well I think there was a huge gap between the public and private sector and a lot of public offices were seen as closed offices, you couldn’t even get into a planning office, you couldn’t go and speak to them, you couldn’t pick up a phone. I mean part of it was to try and break down that barrier and to make people work together, and to work together at an earlier stage as well, so it wasn’t post-decision **ECS05, development planner**

This represented an acceptance that practice pre-reform had been in some ways ‘a problem’, though many also felt that the culture of the authority had been at the forefront of this more modern culture pre-2006. It seemed apparent that there was a generally shared idea of the change required, and that practices and performance were moving in a positive direction, though it was also widely recognised that there remained pockets of resistance to change within the organisation. These were largely presented as an inevitable feature of organisational life, but one that maybe only represented a minority sub-culture. It seemed apparent that efforts to communicate a shared understanding of the change required from the top-down had therefore been largely successful, creating a set of shared frames about the purpose of the service (this is described in more detail below); though it was also suggested that this was as much a reflection of a pragmatic orientation amongst officers to “getting the job done” as a substantive or conscious decision to embrace the idea of ‘culture change’.



6.3 Culture change: initiatives and influences

Some officers identified a long-standing openness to change and innovation as a key feature of the organisation, this perhaps reflects a wider culture of ongoing reform and restructuring within local government in recent decades. It was also related to the introduction of new technologies, notably in recent years e-planning which was seen to have fundamentally changed aspects of the authority's practice (a process that was continuing through the increasing use of social media):

But in some ways I don't suppose it's been a sudden short, sharp shock. When I think about it and talk to you and actually thinking back change has been... we've been moving into a different world for some time now and I think the electronic working has enabled, you know, a lot more alternatives in the way you engage with people because now we're looking at things like Twitter and Facebook and other social networking media as a way of dealing with issues and consulting with the community and getting people's views.

ECS02, team leader

Changing economic conditions, and the commitment to the economic resilience agenda were also identified as key influences in promoting new ways of working, creating authority wide pressures for change in line with efficient system goals and helping to cement a pragmatic acceptance that the principle purpose of planning lay in facilitating development.

However, in addition to this wider flux and the technological drivers of change it was also apparent that the planning service had sought to consciously manage a process of change. The groundwork for this had been established pre-reform, following an audit of the planning service by the Scottish Government in 2005, a vision for the planning service had been put in place which was seen as providing a solid basis for taking forward the culture change agenda. Central to this had been a desire to ensure that all staff were working together towards a shared agenda (City of Edinburgh Council, 2006; 2007a; 2007b). Key principles established at that time had included:

- “We want Edinburgh’s Planning Service to be one of the best in Scotland, an exemplar of excellence that delivers quality on the ground.
- That will depend on the continuing support and commitment of each individual in the Planning Service willing to implement and adapt to change.
- We are determined to place planning policy ahead of development pressures, providing an up-to-date framework within which investment and development can take place with confidence - and provide a tool for assessing and determining planning applications.
- We will continue to emphasise and explore innovative ways of working and delivering quality on the ground, as evidenced by the design initiative and national awards, and explore innovative ways of involving the community. The development of customer service to a high standard is central to our approach.”

A concerted culture change programme had been further developed following the introduction of the new planning system in 2006. Managers suggested that this programme of change had been governed by a change management methodology used elsewhere in the council and designed to ensure that the service adapted successfully to what was perceived as a major period of change. Initially this had focused on communicating key reform messages to staff and ensuring that they were prepared to embrace change. The focus here had been on information sessions, workshops, and a series of working groups focused on internal communications. Following this, efforts were made to work with 'external stakeholders', including training with community groups; other local authority services; elected members and service users (City of Edinburgh Council, 2008).

In addition to these initiatives, several key innovations were presented as key culture change initiatives, symbolic of new ways of working. These included:

- An explicit focus on seeking external validation through, for example, nominations for prizes including the Scottish Awards for Quality in Planning and the UK wide RTPI Awards, and the securing of 'learning partner' status with the RTPI as a symbol of commitment to staff development and training.
- Active participation in a wide range of national planning forums, and the setting up and intensification of work with local forums, this includes a community council forum (supported by the creation of a new community liaison officer role designed to help manage pre-application consultation procedures from the local authority perspective); an urban design forum; and the creation of the Edinburgh Development Forum, bringing the local development sector into regular meetings with the authority. The latter had been nominated for an RTPI award and was seen as a key initiative, symbolic of a commitment to new collaborative ways of working with the development sector, and a key mechanism for changing relationships and correcting the perception that Edinburgh was not as development friendly as other cities.
- A further symbol of this was the production of the Edinburgh Planning Concordat, prepared under the auspices of the Edinburgh Chambers of Commerce, this set out a series of commitments about the kind of service that the authority would offer and the kinds of relationship being sought between the LPA and the development sector.
- Within development management, the shift to a structure of teams that reflected the culture change away from development control was also seen as crucial. Key to this was the creation of specific teams to deal with major applications and the widespread adoption of planning performance agreements to manage such applications. This was seen as an example of 'best practice' drawing on the need for improved project management to provide enhanced certainty for developers.
- At the time that the research was being conducted, the council was also investigating the possibility of developing (or refining) a 'one-door' approach to managing the various regulatory regimes involved in securing permission to develop. This was seen as symbolic of the problem solving approach to regulation being actively investigated and promoted by the Scottish Government, and a potential extension of existing practices designed to ensure effective 'customer service'.
- These and related initiatives were monitored through annual service improvement plans that sought to ensure an ongoing commitment to change in line with Scottish Government requirements.

These examples were presented as symbolic culture change initiatives, and represented a clear commitment to rethink practices through a conscious commitment to change, though it was also acknowledged that this remained an ongoing process that would require continuous work and was far from complete. These initiatives also represented a clear desire to move beyond narrow performance management targets, though it was equally clear that good performance against such targets remained a key part of the measurement of change and its effects:

I think we benchmark the other Scottish cities and we are the best performing overall of the four cities, in some cases by quite a margin, you know and we have no embarrassment about performance of the authority and planning that we deliver, but it's, the resource is not there to do something even better.
ECS02, team leader

6.4 Changing knowledges and practices

In keeping with the strong commitment to reform and change outlined above, for some there was a strong sense that the nature of the job – the practices of planning – had fundamentally changed in recent years:

I would argue that the job has fundamentally changed, and certainly from my perspective there is far more outward engagement than we ever had before. So things like the Edinburgh Development Forum didn't exist before. We're engaging with the stakeholders and the development industry, helping them understand how we're working, listening to their pressures and doing areas of joint work **ECS01, planning manager**

Though as noted above, it was also felt that this more 'outward looking' ethos had been part of initiatives within the council that pre-dated modernisation and the new planning system, and some felt it was central to the nature of planning work:

I think it's the nature of planners that we have to consider so many different aspects. No other service consults others in the way that planning does. For any development proposal we are the people who are generating the request for others to get involved to provide their specialist input. So I think there is something fundamental within the planning culture about the need to work with others. **ECS01, planning manager**

As noted above, absolutely central to this for all of those interviewed within the planning service was a heightened focus on 'customer' service and on collaborative engagement. All were clear that 'customer' should be considered a broad ranging concept applicable as much to an academic interviewer or community group as an applicant for planning permission:

I suppose it's about identifying who stakeholders are so it's all linked to customer services providing a more transparent, efficient planning function really and providing resources where it's needed... everybody is your customer, so it could be that you're a customer, someone in transport is a customer, the public is a customer, the council is...so I suppose everybody is really a customer, and I suppose it's about working with everybody to get the best...the best outcome. **ECS09, team leader**

However, it was also stressed that collaboration with the development industry had been a particular priority. The Edinburgh Development Forum, and planning performance agreements were presented as particularly important symbols of this focus on relationship building and collaborative, communicative practices.

An open approach to communication with stakeholders was also contrasted with a more old fashioned approach that had existed previously, but which was now much less prevalent:

...some people saw themselves as what used to be called development control and there was I think a negative attitude. You were there to stop things happening if they weren't acceptable. You weren't necessarily able to say to people "Well look effectually if you'd come in and talked beforehand we could have worked out the best way through this" and you could in fact have taken a much more positive and enabling role and helped people and part of the problem was that that takes time and resources so it was much easier if someone comes in, "It's not acceptable", bang, it's refused and it's out the door. **ECS02, team leader**

Representatives of the development industry recognised this commitment to change within the authority and the willingness of officers to meet and discuss development proposals, recognising that this put an equal onus on them to change their practices and to seek to engage more openly and less confrontationally with the authority:

Edinburgh have taken on the culture change thing better than most. I mean they will...the message is out there that, you know, "if you've got a major proposal come a speak to us as early as you want so that we can just deal with issues and start to work through them" **ECS07, development industry**

These changes to practice had led to new approaches to regulation, thus whilst the core knowledge of a particular statutory process that set public sector planners apart from other local authority officers remained largely unchanged, the ways in which this knowledge was deployed, and the skills required to do so were being recast. The statutory process and its 'heavy' quasi-judicial requirements were viewed as an occasional barrier to achieving goals of efficiency, integration and inclusion, however, it was generally seen as providing a sound frame to work within.

Reform had, however, also resulted in the validation of new forms of knowledge. It was widely accepted that knowledge of project management and financial viability had become particularly crucial in the context of efforts to present a professional, business-friendly service – clearly suggesting the prioritisation of efficient system goals and their close association with 'modern' planning practices.

Beyond the statutory process and the skills, knowledge and practices required to manage it, however, there appeared to be less explicit attention being paid to knowledge of what good outcomes actually meant in substantive terms. Whilst the language of outcomes was very apparent within the service, the relationship between, for example, the one-door approach to development regulation and improved place-making seemed to be more asserted, or implicitly understood rather than explicitly discussed. Claims to expert professional knowledge of what outcomes (e.g. what kind of development) contributed to making the city a better place were therefore rare.

Integrative system knowledge was also clearly valued within the authority, however, with an emphasis on working beyond traditional service boundaries. Perhaps unsurprisingly this seemed more marked in development planning, where the emphasis on engaging a wide range of stakeholders with the recently published 'main issues report' stage of local development plan preparation had led to a strong emphasis on collaboration for integration:

But I think it means a joined up process at all the government levels, so that's at national, city, region and local, and that includes all the key agencies. So a thoroughly seamless, joined up physical planning process that doesn't treat Transport in some box over here with it's own kind of transport objectives which has got nothing to do with the strategic development of the cities and city regions but is some sort of infrastructure box with a separate Minister who just decides what he wants to do on transport. So a seamless planning process, a seamless physical planning process at all government levels with all agencies, I think that's part of culture change so that everyone's...all the ducks are pointing in the same direction and all working towards the same objectives. But secondly, I think it's how we engage I suppose with the development industry, private sector and communities as the two big sort of groups out there that's part of the planning process. So I think the culture needs to be different in those respects as well.

ECS04, planning manager

In development management work on implementation initiatives related to, for example, new council house building, affordable housing provision, or the one door approach to development regulation had also led to an emphasis on integrative system knowledge and practices.

Overall, officers felt that the planning service was good at integration compared to other council services and saw planning as a natural vehicle for building effective relationships with regard to development regulation (see below). However, at the more strategic level of development planning it was acknowledged that generating capacity for effective integration remained difficult. This had been particularly true of engagement with the wider strategic development plan for the south-east Scotland city region which had been subject to political disagreement which it was felt had led to a less effective plan.

Inclusive system goals were also explicitly acknowledged as important by officers and continued engagement with community council forums was stressed as important, as was public engagement with the emerging development plan. A continued commitment to seeking community views and to ensuring training of community councils and the wider public were therefore seen as important practices. However, in general knowledge of how to engage was seen as somewhat elusive and perhaps impossible in the face of a public that was considered difficult to engage with:

On a personal level I've always considered myself a bit of a community champion in terms of the role of the community and planning, always been a bit frustrated that the system didn't really allow the community to engage in a particularly meaningful way. So aspects of pre-application engagement and so on are things which I have advocated in the past, so when it came to be proposed in planning reform that's something that I found rewarding. A little bit frustrating now perhaps that it's not worked out quite the way.... **ECS01, planning manager**

Tensions between the knowledges and practices of efficiency, integration and inclusion were also acknowledged. Thus whilst the ideal was to find a point of balance between these goals, it was also acknowledged that this was not always possible:

*I think the tension is there, some of the changes that are now being proposed will help. I'm not sure we can do much to resolve that tension. Is it a healthy tension to have that. It possibly is, to have an objective there about a more inclusive system, and yet at the same time try to make sure that you're keeping an eye on the efficiency, otherwise... My view is one might actually outbalance the other. If you go too much down line of community involvement then development would just take forever to happen. If you go too much down the line of service efficiency then you lose the objectives of quality, potentially some of the sustainability objectives as well. And depending where you are in the system you will have a different view on balancing it. **ECS01, planning manager***

Concern was also expressed about which of these changes to practices could or should be followed through. For the development industry the council's commitment to courting investment and ensuring an 'open for business' approach remained a work in progress that could be taken further through a more proactive engagement, for example with institutional investors in London to sell the benefits of investment in Edinburgh. This was about a continued emphasis on overcoming a reputation for not being sufficiently investment friendly.

However, it was also recognised within the council that the emphasis on collaboration and communication was a resource intensive practice that had only been possible due to the economic downturn and would perhaps be threatened by an upturn in the number of applications that development management had to process:

*I think we're running on pretty well the bare minimum. We've lost a number of people in recent years and they've not been replaced and we've... in recent years we've been moving people to fill the key gaps and we then, the vacancies where we think we can just about float, but it just mean that one or two areas where the service we're now providing people is a statutory service rather than having any additional advisory element **ECS2, team leader***

Ironically perhaps then the emphasis on collaboration to achieve more efficient delivery of development was itself less resource efficient in terms of providing local authority planning services. In this context, proposed reforms to the fee regime for planning applications were seen as an important material investment in sustaining changed practices.



6.5 Changing the relations shaping practice

Unsurprisingly given the emphasis on knowledge and practices related to collaboration, a key aspect of change had been on improving relations throughout the development process:

In the past people were, before you ever got started people were in entrenched positions and I think that's what was wrong with the attitude. It was just the way the system worked. In a way it's like how politics works, it's adversarial. You know, you're on opposite sides of the house, I mean you're the opposition. This is not working in the sense of working together and things like that and I think that's much more in the culture now as that's what we should be doing. **ECS02, team leader**

Central to this were relations with the development industry, as suggested by the valorization of new more market sensitive knowledges and practices, and the promise of managing projects better to increase certainty for the development sector – all clearly consistent with efficient system goals. The Edinburgh Development Forum was the key symbol of this, examples of shared research and intelligence gathering about aspects of the city's property market were, for example, seen as evidence of the mutual benefits that a more collaborative culture could bring. There was, however, some continued concern about how representative the Forum was of the 'development industry' which remains a rather elusive community, over time it was clear that attendance had been stronger amongst planning consultants and developers agents rather than developers and investors – suggesting that those private sector partners making most use of the forum were those who had most commercial interest in attendance.

In general officers expressed their support for this approach and for improved relations though some concerns were also expressed that this was a rather one-sided change that represented the public sector becoming more like the private sector. Whilst this was identified as a residual view and perhaps understood as somewhat heretical and old-fashioned, it was also reflected, for example, in the continued presence of some mistrust of the development industry's commitment to quality. The private sector's apparent reluctance to sign up to planning performance agreements, despite constantly arguing for the adoption of improved project management was seen as further evidence of this. This was felt to reflect the fact that developers were actually often reluctant to commit to project deadlines that might restrict their flexibility, delay in the planning process was therefore understood as something that developers as much as local authorities could be responsible for. In this regard, criticism of public sector practices, whilst broadly accepted, was also considered rather unbalanced.

Interviews with representatives of the development sector suggested that they recognised the value of the new approach and felt that relations had improved. However, as suggested by national level respondents, they were also clear that more collaborative practices were still only considered effective in as far as they made it more likely that development would be approved and their experiences remained uneven in this regard. They continued to press the need for efficient decision-making, and the value of development for the city. As noted above, some also questioned whether the authority could do more to build confidence in the city's property market by further expanding their role in attracting investment.

These views suggested that new relations were being courted and to some extent developed, however, they also raised issues about the extent to which local authority planning services should be directed towards shaping corporatist relations with developers and, if so, whether there are limits to this role or to the extent to which relations of trust can be forged within what remains a regulatory relationship. Some officers also doubted if more collaborative relationships would continue beyond the end of the recession, which had made the private sector much more willing to engage with the authority to negotiate development.

Within the planning service, whilst traditional professional rivalries were acknowledged, relationships between development planning and development management were seen to have improved since a recent move into the same part of the council offices, with physical proximity aiding collaboration and improving relations (suggesting the role of simple material and physical factors in shaping culture change). Moreover, as noted above, officers felt that the planning service was well placed to act as an integrator *within* the authority.

A series of cross-cutting implementation initiatives with economic development, transport, housing and regeneration colleagues were seen as evidence of planning's ability to play a positive relationship building role within the wider authority. However, it was also acknowledged that the wider reputation of the planning service remained a barrier in some instances, with some colleagues in economic development, for example, arguably continuing to hold a view of planning as a bureaucratic barrier to necessary development, rather than a positive contributor to the economic strength of the city.

Moreover, it was less clear that planning was in a position to influence corporate strategy or to take a lead role in such initiatives, and the difficulties encountered in the production of the strategic development plan had arguably not helped to promote planning as a tool for strategic policymaking. The recent move away from City Development was also felt by some to have worked against resolving these issues, moving planning into a relatively less coherent department.

Within development management there was a strong view that other regulatory services tended to see planning as an effective integrator, however, there was some concern that the one-door approach being developed could lead to other services off-loading further responsibility onto planning officers, or to a potentially problematic blurring of professional boundaries that could undermine the particular contribution of the planning service, suggesting a recognition of the limits of integration and the need to ensure that relationships continued to be clearly defined:

There are a number of functions which will very quickly refer things to planning because we're seen as the people who co-ordinate and brought together strands to provide a solution. The downside of that is sometimes that they will pass it because they think we can deal with it and they may have power to deal with it themselves. So I would hesitate to call it buck passing, but sometimes people can make a judgement, planning can probably do it better ECS02, team leader

If there was considerable evidence of new relationships being built in line with efficient system and integrative system goals, evidence of progress towards an inclusive system was somewhat harder to gauge. There was a clear recognition of the importance of community relationships and some commitment to new practices that were designed to ensure more effective relationships, however, the public was also generally spoken about as rather distant and hard to access.

Moreover, there was considerable unease about the capacity for vocal minorities or the 'usual suspects' to unduly influence planning decisions. This suggested that relationships with the wider public were more distant than those with professional stakeholders, and were often characterised as difficult, mediated by wider influences, including negative press coverage of the trams and recent property repairs scandal. Though many of the planners spoke of the importance of consultation and engagement to their view of planning, they also seemed to have accepted a certain distance and antagonism as characteristic of relations with the community.

There was some concern that the modernisation agenda had, in some cases, raised unrealistic expectations of the extent to which communities should be able to influence the process, and meetings with community groups were often characterised as difficult to manage – generally involving groups of dissatisfied citizens. For community groups, relations with the council were marked by considerable mistrust, and concern that their voices were not listened to as carefully as those of developers.

Relationships with the formal, representative democratic process were outwardly more formal and respectful. Councillor training was a strong commitment within the council and councillors saw the quasi-judicial nature of the planning committee as a key responsibility. However, it was also recognised that the democratic process introduced an element of politics into planning decision-making that could lead to unpredictable outcomes:

But there are times when you have to remember that they are political animals and they have a job to do that may require them to head in a certain direction. It may not be where you want to go but that's just the way life is... ECS09, team leader

Whilst officers respected this, it was also at times a source of frustration and remained a key concern of the development industry who saw political decision-making as a source of considerable and unwanted uncertainty. As in many other places this had led to pressure for increased use of delegated powers and to effectively limit the extent of political oversight over the planning process.

Overall, there was clear evidence of efforts to develop and improve relations, however, it also seemed apparent that there were still real limits to how far this had progressed, and doubts as to how far it could and should develop. Moreover, relationships that were aligned with efficient system goals seemed to have progressed more clearly than those which did not easily fit into this frame. As a result there was a sense of close, corporatist relations developing within the professional planning community, but less clear evidence that relations outside of this 'in' group had begun to change.

6.6 Changing roles and identities

All of the officers interviewed saw planning as an activity that contributed to the public interest:

Again planning by its nature is in the public interest, so I think it's quite interesting sometimes when you bring staff together from different services it's always the planner who is speaking more on behalf of the wider community interest, taking a broader view. A lot of other professions take a much narrower view of their involvement in development issues.

ECS01, planning manager

Most also expressed some commitment to an ethos of public service:

I think, as I said, I didn't find the profit motive sort of that exciting a driver if you like. I felt that I suppose the public interest and the public good was more important than a private profit motive if you like. So even though I can understand how that motive is arrived at, you know, through my training, it's not what I felt I wanted to drive my career on, I think that's what it was

ECS04, planning manager

Yes I think so [commitment reflects a public service ethos]. Yes I think that it's the fact that, it's a bit old fashioned now I suppose but being a public servant was something that appealed to me rather than being in it for what I could get if you see what I mean. That's not really the way I saw it. **ECS02, team leader**

Though this was seen to have been transformed in recent years as relations between the public and private sector changed, and there was a sense that younger officers had a less strong commitment to planning as a public service activity, with the public interest now equally upheld on either side of a transformed divide (rendering this an 'old fashioned' perspective).

The majority of officers were happy to identify with the overarching purpose of the system as it had been redefined since reform:

I mean I think the system's now designed to support is it sustainable and economic development or whatever the phrase is. I don't have a problem with that, you know, that's fine and in fact the promotion of you know sustainable development sits entirely comfortably within the professional ethos we, as members of staff, will have ... I don't think [the common good has] been entirely been lost. I think it's kind of got covered up a bit with some of the more recent thinking. But I think some of the recent thinking has been a realisation of how important the economic wellbeing is to the whole city and that the cities are the focus of the economic wellbeing of whole regions and the wider country so I think the promotion of development is necessary to promote the overall wellbeing so in a sense it is for the common good, but not quite in the way that people would see it **ECS02, team leader**

This was frequently related to a pragmatic orientation to planning, and an underlying motivation to guide and not restrict the way that places change – and seemed to represent a commitment to new identities as facilitators of development. As discussed above, reform had created new roles for a number of managers and officers who were therefore enthusiastic about change and modernisation, seeing new opportunities to practice what was seen as a more positive form of planning. This had valorized the skills and attitudes of those who had a clear pro-development focus and were comfortable to think of themselves as 'market actors', shaping property markets in the public interest (cf. Adams and Tiesdell, 2010):

RICS Research – Changing the Culture of Scottish Planning: Interpreting New Regulations, Shaping New Practices, Relationships and Identities

But it's helped me to have that sort of dual perspective [RTPI/ RICS] because it meant quite early on in my career I could see things from the other side, you know, you have a lot of meetings on discussions of negotiations with agents particularly but also developers, and funders quite often as well, we get investors and pension funds sometimes coming in. So I think having that RICS element just enables you to speak the same language, you know, talking about it and knowing where they're coming from. It's about a development equation, it's about the development profits, it's about a development that washes its face, it's no good building something if you can't get tenants, you know, all that sort of stuff. So it was easy, easier I think for me than others perhaps to just pick up on that, to know what's going on there. ECS04, planning manager

For those who felt less comfortable with efficient system goals there was a sense that they were out of step with the needs of a modern planning practice, as a result it was recognised that some such planners had begun to move on:

We've had one or two people who were adamant that the old way of doing things and thinking was the best but they've gradually just gone, you know, moved on, retired or whatever and now all the newer people are coming in, the graduates and trainees and students, you know are working in this new way. ECS04, planning manager

In general, however, this seemed to be a minority view and it seemed that modernisation had been successful to a large extent in producing not just changed practices and performance, but also a commitment to new ways of understanding the role of the planner – new professional identities and views of appropriate behaviour. Looking to the longer term, however, there was some concern about whether it would be possible to retain staff and maintain morale within a wider local government context marked by pay freezes and limited opportunities for career progression. It was also not clear to what extent this new image was widely appreciated and accepted outwith the professional community with whom the planners interacted on a regular basis, and this was seen as a potential threat to fully establishing the legitimacy of new roles and identities.

For the development industry there was less of a strong sense of a change in professional role or identity, with changed practices more a result of new requirements or new ways of working to secure permission, and market-based discipline continued to be the key claim to legitimacy of private sector actors interviewed.



6.7 Progress towards culture change?

The experience of the City of Edinburgh suggests considerable progress towards the realisation of a new planning culture within the local authority. This culture change had clearly been driven by wider priorities and changes beyond the level of the planning service. For example, new technology, corporate restructuring and even physical relocation, the wider perception of development in Edinburgh following the problems affecting the tram scheme, and perhaps most notably changing economic circumstances had all exerted considerable influence on actors' understandings of change and its effects. These factors interacted in complex ways with the explicit culture change drives coming from new legal requirements, changing policy emphases and the 'change management' approach adopted by service managers.

These latter factors, however, did represent a proactive commitment to embracing and shaping change, underpinned by a desire to promote a more 'modern' planning culture. A series of initiatives were presented as symbolic of commitment to new ways of working. Moreover, officers seemed generally to identify with the values underpinning the new system, suggesting that the change in culture went beyond the purely mechanical and had been internalised by many of those interviewed (even where this was considered a pragmatic adjustment to changed working conditions).

The emerging culture reflects a clear prioritisation of efficient system goals, with some emphasis on integrative goals and arguably a more problematic relation to inclusive system goals. This balance reflects the wider repurposing of the planning system at the national level and appeared to have become generally accepted within the authority, where it was aligned with wider corporate priorities.

For all of those interviewed culture change was, however, considered a work in progress rather than a finished project, a long term undertaking that would inevitably take time to be fully realised. It was widely felt amongst those I interviewed that there remained pockets of resistance or of commitment to 'old system' practices and attitudes, a residual culture that was clearly considered problematic, even amongst those few who admitted to such attitudes themselves. It was also understood that resource constraints and the wider economic climate represented external threats that could challenge commitment to new forms of collaborative practice and to the retention and development of staff committed to such practices.

The wider question of changing perceptions of the role of planning beyond the service also remained:

Yeah I think the perception that, you know "Edinburgh's not open for business", that's one that we're always fighting and, you know, I think it's wrong. The perception that planning is slow, that we can't make decisions or we're too...I suppose it's not transparent I suppose...we would really like to change that but that's a real uphill struggle. ECS09, team leader

This included a need to keep working to develop relations with officers in other council services and to push the corporate influence of the planning service. For those representatives of the development industry interviewed there was a willingness to recognise that the authority had changed and had become easier to do business with. However, this support for new ways of working remained conditional and underpinned by a mutual suspicion that seemed stronger, or more acceptable to articulate, amongst private sector actors. This was particularly directed at the political influence on planning decision-making, which was seen to lead to irrational and unpredictable outcomes and continued to cause great frustration. There was less sense of a fundamental culture change having affected private sector actors, whose market based rationality remained a legitimate justification for their behaviour, and rendered their participation in new modes of collaborative working at least somewhat conditional.

For community groups there was little sense that their power to influence decisions had been improved under the new system and those that were aware of the promise of a more inclusive planning culture typically felt that this had not emerged.

Having presented the analysis of views of the culture change agenda nationally, and its implementation within Edinburgh, it is possible to draw the two levels of analysis together. To do so the report returns first to the overall conceptual framework outlined in sections 1-3. It then returns to the research questions that were set out at the start of the study. Finally a series of recommendations are made for all actors in the planning process.

Sections 1-3 above presented an approach to thinking through the discourse of culture change and its role in shaping change to planning cultures. It was suggested that culture change had become a ‘keyword’ in the modernisation of planning in Scotland, working to validate new knowledges and practices; social relations and identities. This power rested, in part, on the problematisation of existing ways of conceiving of planning as an activity, as well as the presentation of concrete images of a ‘modern’ planning culture. It was also suggested that the process of culture change, far from being a neutral managerial technology to implement change, in fact involved the exercise of power to shape new ways of thinking and acting, representing an extension by other means of the politics of planning reform in Scotland.

In sections 5 and 6, this managerial, or depoliticised logic was very much apparent with culture change viewed as a logical counterpart to legislative change, a necessary element of implementation. This reflected the development of a relatively coherent consensus that the new planning system represented a new ‘settlement’ for planning, and a desire to move beyond the continuous rounds of deliberation that had presaged the passing of new legislation in 2006; this ‘settlement’ has been shaped by a professionalised governance community that has shown considerable capacity to generate corporatist collaborative agreement. However, there is a danger that such a settlement prevents open debate about the ways in which implementation influences the spirit and purpose of the planning system.

The analysis above suggests a narrowing or recombination of the aims of modernisation to prioritise ‘efficient’ system goals at the expense of more expansive conceptions of integrative or inclusive planning – a particular resolution of the ‘governance paradox’ that the modernisation of planning in Scotland has generated¹³. This seems to have occurred for a range of different reasons. The legitimate elected mandate of a changed government has clearly been significant, as have changed economic circumstances that have created pressure to further limit regulation of economic activity. The wider thrust of managerial and neoliberal state restructuring have also been dominant frames in shaping the Scottish Government’s agenda for public services more broadly, and in planning. Equally, however, the focus on efficient system goals seems at times to have reflected the tools and techniques available to the Government, and a tendency to focus on the most ‘measurable’ or ‘manageable’ goals of modernisation (arguably including a greater focus on development management than development planning).

Despite constant assertions of the need for change in the private sector, this also appears to have been particularly focused on the agencies of Government from the national to the local level. In this regard the perhaps more intangible and hard to achieve objectives associated with integration and inclusion have been less consistently pursued, and the wider transformation of relations beyond public sector planning has been relatively harder to effect.

In terms of the elements of Scotland’s planning culture identified in section 4: new knowledges and practices; new social relations; and new roles and identities. It was apparent that change had resulted in the validation of new ways of working and thinking in the public sector at least. This is outlined in table 3 below (accepting that such dichotomies are somewhat crude, they do nonetheless capture the essence of the change that has been articulated from a previous ‘problematic’ status to a new, ‘modern’ way of working).

Table 4 The old and the modern culture of planning in Scotland

Element of planning culture	Old system culture	Modern system culture
Knowledges and practices	Knowledge of statutory system. Bureaucratic processes and practices. Limited engagement with other stakeholders	Knowledge of how to emphasise statutory system to make development happen. Emphasis on improved project management / knowledge of development economics
Relations of practice	Formal and bureaucratic, remote, quasi-legal	Outward looking, engagement with all stakeholders, willing to negotiate
Roles and identities	Bureaucratic, regulator, inhibitor of development, guardian of public interest standing in opposition to private sector	Dynamic facilitator of development; proactive seeking of solutions; guardian of public interest defined by collaboration with private sector

¹³ One that has parallels with recent discussions of how planning can be used as a tool of post-political governance, managing problems to ensure that underlying political antagonisms are displaced or suppressed (see e.g. Allmendinger and Haughton, 2012).

At the local level, there was clear evidence that this new culture has begun to establish itself, in part at least as a result of proactive engagement with the idea of modernisation. This has led to a change in perception within the planning service in the City of Edinburgh Council. Culture change here seemed to have gone some way beyond a formal adherence to changed practices, becoming a hegemonic frame of reference, internalised in actors' understanding of their work. Acceptance of this change was generally presented in pragmatic terms with little sense that modernisation had raised dilemmas that challenged professionals' understanding of their practice (e.g. that individuals found themselves struggling with this resolution of the governance paradox of planning, something which contrasted somewhat with the findings of the author's previous work in England [see Inch, 2009]).

It is not clear that the same commitment to modernisation has been made in all of Scotland's 34 local planning authorities, and interviewees at the national level stressed the unevenness of progress across the country and even within individual authorities. However, it was felt that there had been a clear change in emphasis within representative bodies such as the RTPI and Heads of Planning Scotland that reflected the new culture of planning. Moreover, uneven progress was considered by many to be a natural part of the long-term process of culture change. There was also concern within the professional planning community that tangible progress needed to be made to ensure that the window of political opportunity available to improve planning's reputation was not missed.

It was less clear that culture change had spread beyond the boundaries of the planning service in Edinburgh; recognition of, and commitment to change amongst key external stakeholders including the development industry was considerably more equivocal.



7.1 Answering the research questions

Having presented this overarching analysis, it is now possible to return to the four research questions that framed this study at the outset. The answers to these questions help to further clarify key issues emerging from the study, including recommendations for how the culture change agenda should be assessed:

1. To what extent is there a shared understanding of culture change and Scotland's planning culture amongst different stakeholders in Scotland?

As suggested above, for those within the 'planning professional community' it seems that a shared understanding of culture change and what constitutes a 'modern' planning culture has clearly begun to emerge. This has been particularly focused around efficient system goals and the changes required of public sector agencies, particularly local planning authorities. It has become widely accepted that there was a cultural 'problem' that needed to be addressed. The collaborative approach to shaping the planning reform agenda, and to developing communication at the local level appears to have been successful in gaining the widespread acceptance of this message with 'collaboration for efficiency' emerging as a key practice for a modern planning culture.

Beyond public sector professionals, however, there appears to be less agreement that the required change is emerging, and the public sector planning community remains concerned by the threat that negative perceptions of planning and of the lack of progress might pose.

There also appear to be real limits to the scope for forging the new relations and understandings required to transform this perception and the way in which the planning system works. Mistrust continues to mark relations with both the development industry and particularly the wider 'public' or affected communities. In the case of the latter this reflects a sense that efficient system goals work against the achievement of inclusion. In the case of the development industry this may reflect different interpretations of efficiency and how far public sector practices need to be reformed – with the private sector clearly continuing to feel empowered to ask for greater change within local authorities.

Most likely these tensions can never be fully resolved. If this is the case there is a need for ongoing debate about the kind of culture that is dominant and the direction of change. Moreover, if collaborative practices cannot be expected to fully overcome problems of mistrust, there is arguably a need to revalidate the explicitly regulatory nature of planning activity in making firm decisions about what is and is not acceptable. In this regard the continued perception of 'political' decision-making as a 'problematic' part of planning's culture should be given further consideration. The resources and skills required to sustain a more collaborative style of planning also need to be considered. In the case of relations with the wider public it was also clear that many planners continue to feel uncomfortable and even to doubt the possibility of shaping improved relations.

If goals of integration and inclusion are also to be achieved there is therefore a need to consider how this might require further transformation of the relations of practice (particularly with other public services and 'communities'). The relative consensus within the tightly knit planning professional community in Scotland around 'efficient' system goals also therefore presents a potential danger - that other voices and concerns may struggle to be heard. There is therefore a question about how a relatively small governance community focused on generating 'consensus' can ensure that it makes space for robust and open debate.

2. How have new practices been interpreted by professionals and other stakeholders, and have these required them to change their understanding of the purpose of planning?

Both the case study in the City of Edinburgh Council and national level interviews with members of the public sector professional planning community suggested that commitment to modernisation and efficient system goals had gone some way beyond routine adaptation of practices (though this remained significant too). Many of those interviewed identified with change and related this to preexisting commitments and understanding of their work. This suggests a reshaping of the 'public interest' justification for planning in Scotland, encompassing a more explicit understanding of the role of planners as 'market actors' involved in shaping land

and property markets to ensure that the wider benefits of sustainable economic growth are achieved (cf. Adams and Tiesdell, 2010). Modernisation therefore seemed to have created welcome opportunities for new, more positive professional identities for many planners in the public sector. Though this was acknowledged as uneven and far from complete it seemed to be an increasingly dominant conception. Goals of inclusion and integration therefore appeared generally subordinate.

As noted above, with development understood as an important public good there was less sense of a reciprocal change in the private sector where market rationalities continued to provide a clear justification for actors' to pursue development in whatever way was most likely to be successful.

3. Has reform resulted in the emergence of new more positive planning cultures that are better able to meet the needs of the system's users, particularly the property industry?

In the case study, there was evidence of new relations being forged and new collaborative practices being recognised by a wide range of *professional* actors. As noted above, this was viewed in positive terms. The new system was generally understood to be 'fitter for purpose' and efficient system goals were accepted by most professionals. There were, however, differences of opinion about the extent to which change was emerging, and about how far this should go – marked by the continued presence of significant and persistent 'boundaries' and issues of trust between the perceptions of public and private sector actors. The system, nationally and locally, had become focused on new forms of collaboration, seeking to bridge those boundaries. The corporatist 'partnership based' approach that had emerged seemed more effective in shaping new professional cultures than in transforming wider perceptions of planning. There were also continued question marks around the resourcing of this new style of service and the capacity to maintain effective collaboration if economic circumstances change.

4. What role can and does 'culture change' play in the implementation of planning reform?

Most actors were willing to accept that there had been some progress towards achieving a new culture and the relatively small governance community involved in Scottish planning had clearly been effective in promoting new understandings. At the local level this also applied to the proactive approach adopted within the City of Edinburgh Council.

There was a strong consensus amongst all of those interviewed that attitudinal change was and remained vital to shaping an effective planning system – with continued perceptions that attitudes remained a problem in many parts of the system (albeit most actors continued to consider that those problems lay with others and not themselves). The reformed system was considered generally sound, though likely to be subject to some further minor adjustment. A continued sense that practices remained 'problematic' was therefore consistently related to 'cultural' problems.

The danger in attributing ongoing failings to cultural problems, however, lies in the difficulty of separating rhetoric from reality. 'Culture' readily becomes a catch all category to criticise planning practices, and a means of perpetuating negative perceptions where it is often difficult to ascertain if these are well founded or the result of a process that inevitably leaves some people dissatisfied. Progress in the City of Edinburgh suggested that the new culture was unlikely to completely transform the relations of planning practice. Though there may be scope for further improvement, issues of mistrust and negative perceptions are, to a large extent, unavoidable realities of the planning process.

The wider challenge of generating greater public legitimacy of planning activity and the right of public authorities to regulate new development in the public interest therefore remains key. Without this more fundamental change it is unlikely that perceptions of planning's culture will fundamentally change. The role of culture change in realising reform should not therefore be overstated. Whilst important it should not be seen as a panacea.

7.2 Recommendations

Following from the above, it is possible to identify some key recommendations and messages related to the culture change agenda.

- A key challenge for the government and local authorities is how they can continue to sustain commitment to change and improvement beyond the ‘buzz of reform’. With fundamental changes to the system now settling down, there is a need to find more sustainable ways of ensuring that all actors in the planning process continue to work to achieve change – particularly as the extent of progress remains contested and far from complete. Further sharing of how this has been proactively tackled in the past, including in the City of Edinburgh where staff development initiatives seemed well established, might provide a basis for considering how this can be done. This is a particular challenge in the context of the resource constraints facing both national and local government.
- The move towards new collaborative, relationship building practices has been broadly welcomed as a key change, symbolic of a new culture. However, as noted above, practice suggests that there are clear limits to collaboration and its capacity to shape consensus and build sustainable relationships of trust (cf. Tait, 2012). Though acceptance of the collaborative approach appears to have gone further in the public sector than the private sector, the focus on collaboration fosters a corporatist approach, building a strong *professional* community. However, it may also restrict the participation of ‘outsiders’. More explicit acknowledgement of the limits of consensus, what is expected of all stakeholders in the process, and what can be expected from others in return may help to create a more robust planning culture. Particular effort should be made to ensure that non-professional and occasional users of the system are enabled to engage on an equal basis.



- There is a need to consider how to pursue culture change beyond the ‘easy targets’ of performance improvement that have so far been most widely addressed.

Work on a planning performance framework has begun to address the need for improved ways of thinking about the outcomes of planning activity, but dissemination and development of this should seek to ensure a much wider capacity within the planning profession to debate substantive outcomes and to discuss what planning should seek to achieve, and how this can best be realised. An overly managerial culture of ‘performance’ and process management needs to be balanced against a valuing of robust and confident professional and public debate about the purposes of planning.

In as far as they remain goals of modernisation, the more challenging issues raised by inclusion and integration require explicit targeting as progress towards them is less evident.



- Another important question that emerges from the work is how far change in Scotland’s planning culture should go towards the goal of efficiency? Calls for planning services to be involved in attracting property investors to places (as suggested in Edinburgh) suggest an extension of the logic of the efficient system beyond traditional boundaries of planning activity. Moreover, the balance between efficiency, integration and inclusion requires continual debate as resources committed to any of these goals may limit ability to achieve the others. Each, if pursued to its logical limit, may threaten to fundamentally change the nature of planning as an activity. There is no ideal balance, but an ongoing culture of robust debate would help to ensure due consideration of how these tensions (referred to as ‘governance paradoxes’ in the report) are being resolved in planning.
- Related to this, fears that the window of political opportunity for changing negative perceptions of planning may be short-lived are potentially significant. However, all of those with a stake in public sector planning need to actively consider how best to respond to this pressure: either through debate and challenge, or by allowing such perceptions to further discipline the direction of change towards ‘efficiency’.
- With resources constrained there is also a tendency to pull services back towards their statutory core, this may create pressures that work against more resource intensive collaborative modes of working. A further key issue is therefore how to ensure that resources are in place to deal with the somewhat ironic fact that more efficient development regulation is often more resource intensive for local planning authorities. Proposed changes to the planning fee regime in Scotland should be considered in this light.
- Finally a key issue, as highlighted in response to research question 4 above, seems to be how the wider public perception and ‘culture’ of planning in Scotland can be challenged. Work done to date has been primarily focused on change within public sector organisations and, to some extent, amongst private sector professionals. However, it is also clear that there remains a problem of public and political legitimacy for planning decisions.

This is clearly related to the wider sense that public services are a problem, and that political leaders and the democratic process cannot be trusted (in Edinburgh, for example, the tram project has clearly exacerbated many of these perceptions). Whilst the wider problem requires a solution at an appropriate scale, the planning community should seek to be part of a reassertion of the value of democratically accountable, public decision-making based on robust debate. A focusing of attention on this wider culture change seems like a necessary further step to ensure a sustainable settlement for planning in Scotland.

- Abram, S. (2012) *Culture and Planning*, Aldershot, Ashgate
- Adams, D. and Tiesdell, S. (2009) Planners as Market Actors: rethinking state-market relations in land and property, *Planning Theory and Practice* 11 (2), 187-207
- Allmendinger, P. (2001) The head and the heart. National identity and urban planning in a devolved Scotland, *International Planning Studies*, 6(1), pp. 33–54.
- Allmendinger, P. and Haughton, G. (2012) Post-political spatial planning in England: a crisis of consensus, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37 (1) 89-103
- Alvesson, M. & Willmott, H. (2002) Identity regulation as organizational control... Available at http://www.jbs.cam.ac.uk/research/associates/pdfs/willmott_identity_regulation.pdf (accessed 30 August 2008).
- Alvesson, M. and Svenningsson, S. (2008) *Changing Organizational Culture: Cultural Change Work in Progress*, London, Routledge.
- Arksey and Knight, P. (1999) *Interviewing for Social Scientists: an introductory resource with examples*, London, Sage.
- Audit Scotland (2011) *Modernising the Planning System*, available from: http://www.auditscotland.gov.uk/docs/central/2011/nr_110915_modernising_planning.pdf accessed 20/6/2012
- Baker Associates et al. (2008) *Final Report: Spatial Plans in Practice: Supporting the Reform of Local Planning*, London, CLG.
- Booth, P. (2005) The Nature of Difference: traditions of law and government and their effects on planning in Britain and France. In: Sanyal, B. ed. (2005) *Comparative Planning Cultures*, Abingdon, Taylor and Francis, 259-284
- Bradwell et al. (2007) *Future Planners*, London, Demos.
- Campbell, H. (2003) Planning: An Idea of Value, *Town Planning Review*, 73 (3), 271-288
- Campbell, H. (ed.) (2003a) Interface: Reforming Planning Systems, *Planning Theory and Practice*, 4 (3), 347-348
- Christie Commission (2010) *Commission on the Future Delivery of Public Services*, Edinburgh, Scottish Government.
- City of Edinburgh Council (2007a) *Development Planning: A Structure for Culture Change*, Planning Committee 22 March 2007
- City of Edinburgh Council (2007b) *Development Management: A Structure for Culture Change*, Planning Committee 22 March 2007
- City of Edinburgh Council (2008) *Culture Change in Planning*, Planning Committee, 28 February, 2008.
- City of Edinburgh Council (2012a) *Edinburgh by Numbers 2012-13*, accessed from: http://www.edinburgh-inspiringcapital.com/pdf/Edinburgh_by_Numbers_2012-13.pdf 10/10/12
- City of Edinburgh Council (2012b) *Edinburgh Economic Strategy 2012-17*, accessed from: https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/file/8520/Economic_Strategy 10/10/12
- City of Edinburgh Council (2012c) *Modernising Planning: Business Plan and Service Improvement Plan 2012-2013*, Planning Committee 1 March
- Clarke, J. (2004) Dissolving the Public Realm? The Logics and Limits of Neo-liberalism, *Journal of Social Policy*, 33 (1), 27-48.
- Cochrane, A. (2004) Modernisation, Managerialism and the Culture Wars: Reshaping the Local Welfare State in England, *Local Government Studies*, 30 (4), 481-496.
- du Gay, P. (2000) *In Praise of Bureaucracy*, London, Sage.
- Edinburgh Inspiring Capital (2012) *Why live in Edinburgh?* Accessed from http://www.edinburgh-inspiringcapital.com/live/why_live_in_edinburgh.aspx 10/10/12
- Edinburgh Partnership (2012) *Edinburgh Partnership Single Outcome Agreement, 2012-2015*, The Edinburgh Partnership, Edinburgh
- Exworthy, M. and Halford, S. (1999) (eds.) *Professionals and the New Managerialism in the Public Sector*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) Introduction, in: Fairclough, N. (ed.) *Critical Language Awareness*, London, Longman.
- Ferlie, E., Pettigrew, A., Ashburner, L., Fitzgerald, L. (1996) *The New Public Management in Action*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Finlayson, A. (2003) *Making Sense of New Labour*, London, Lawrence and Wishart.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001) *Making Social Science Matter*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Forester, J. (1999) *The Deliberative Practitioner: encouraging participatory planning processes*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Friedmann J. (2005) Globalization and the emerging culture of planning. *Progress in Planning* 64(3): 183–234
- Graham, S. and Marvin, S. (2001) *Splintering Urbanism*, London, Routledge.
- Griggs, S. (2005) Problematising the Mobilisation of Hospital Directors, in: Howarth, D. and Torfing, J. (2005) *Discourse Theory in European Politics: identity, policy and governance*, Houndmills, Palgrave.
- Haughton, G., Allmendinger, P., Counsell, D., and Vigar, G. (2010) *The New Spatial Planning: Territorial Management with Soft Spaces and Fuzzy Boundaries*, London, Routledge.
- Hay, C. (2007) *Why we hate politics*, Cambridge, Polity
- Hayton, K (2002) Scottish Development Planning: on the brink of change, *Planning Practice and Research*, 17: 3, 317-330
- Heads of Planning Scotland (2012) *Planning Performance Framework* available from <http://www.hopscotland.org.uk/images/stories/Reports/hops%20planning%20performance%20framework.pdf> accessed 1/10/12
- Healey, P. and Underwood, J. (1979) Professional Values and Planning Practice, *Progress in Planning*, 9 (2)
- Healey, P. (2006) *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies*, London, MacMillan. 2nd edition.
- Healey, P. (2007) *Urban Complexity and Spatial Strategies: towards a relational planning for our times*, London, Routledge.
- Hillier, J. (2002) *Shadows of Power*, London, Routledge.
- Hoggett, P. (1996) New modes of control in the public services, *Public Administration*, 74 (1)
- Hoggett, P. (2006) Conflict, ambivalence, and the contested purpose of public organizations, *Human Relations*, 59 (2), 174-94.
- Howarth, D. (2005) Applying Discourse Theory: the method of articulation, in: Howarth, D. and Torfing, J. (2005) *Discourse Theory in European Politics: identity, policy and governance*, Houndmills, Palgrave.
- Hull, A. (2000) Modernizing Democracy: Constructing a Radical Reform of the Planning System?, *European Planning Studies* 8(6), 767-782.

- Inch, A. (2009) New planning, New Planner, unpublished PhD thesis, Oxford Brookes University
- Inch, A. (2010) Culture Change as Identity Regulation, *Planning Theory and Practice*, 11 (3), 359-374
- Inch, A. (2012a) 'Cultural work', spatial planning and the politics of renewing public sector planning professionalism in England, *Town Planning Review*, 83 (5), 513-532
- Inch, A. (2012b) Creating 'a generation of NIMBYs'? Interpreting the role of the state in managing the politics of urban development, *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 30(3) 520-535
- Johnson, R., Chambers, D., Raghuram, P., Tincknell, E. (2004) *The Practice of Cultural Studies*, London, Sage.
- Li, T. M. (2007) *The Will to Improve: Governmentality, Development and the Practice of Politics*, London, Duke University Press.
- LINK (2004) *10 myths about Third Party Rights of Appeal*, Edinburgh, Scottish Environment LINK.
- Lloyd, MG and Peel, Deborah (2007) *Community planning and land use planning in Scotland: A constructive interface?* Public Policy and Administration, 22 (3). pp. 353-366.
- Lloyd, G and Peel, D. (2009) New Labour and the Planning System in Scotland: An Overview of a Decade, *Planning Practice and Research*, 24 (1), 103-118
- Lloyd, G and McCarthy J. (2000) The Scottish Parliament, Regulation and Land Use Planning, *European Planning Studies*, 8 (2), 251-256
- McCafferty, P and Mooney, G (2010) Resisting the neoliberal 'modernisation' of public services in contemporary Scotland: the case of public sector workers, in Davidson, N, McCafferty, P and Miller, D eds. (2010) *Neoliberal Scotland: class and society in a stateless nation*, Cambridge, Cambridge Scholars, 161-182.
- McConnell, A (2004) *Scottish Local Government*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- MacKay, D. (2004) *The Planning Famine: Reforming Land Use Planning in Scotland*.
- The Policy Institute, Series: Economy No. 8 November, Edinburgh.
- May, T. (2001) *Social Research: issues, method and process (3rd edition)*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Morley, D. and Hsing-Chen, K. (eds.) Stuart Hall: *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, London, Routledge
- National Planning Forum (NPF) (2008) *Delivering Inspiring Places – The Role and Status of Planning*, retrieved from: <http://www.natplanforum.org.uk/docs2008.html>, 21 April, 2009.
- Newman, J. (2001) *Modernising Governance: New Labour, Policy and Society*, London, Sage.
- Newman, J. and Nutley, S. (2003) Transforming the probation service: 'what works', organisational change and professional identity, *Policy and Politics*, 31 (4), 547-63
- Newman, J. and Clarke, J. (2009) *Publics, Politics and Power: Remaking the Public in Public Services*, London, Sage.
- Newman, J (2012) *Working the Spaces of Power: Activism, Neoliberalism and Gendered Labour*, London, Bloomsbury
- Peel, D. and Lloyd, G. (2006a) The twisting paths to planning reform in Scotland, *International Planning Studies*, 11 (2), 89-107
- Peel, D. and Lloyd, M. G. (2006b) *The Land Use Planning System in Scotland – but not as we know it!*. Scottish Affairs, 57, 90-111.
- Peel, D. and Lloyd, G. (2007) Neo-traditional Planning. Towards a New Ethos for Land Use Planning, *Land Use Policy*, 24 (2), 396-403.
- Peters, T. and Waterman, R. (1982) *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's best run companies*, New York, Harper and Row.
- Poustie, M. (2007) Planning reforms in Scotland, *Journal of Planning and Environment Law*, 7, 489-517
- Planning Democracy (2012) *Revaluing Public Participation*, available from: <http://www.planningdemocracy.org.uk/2012/re-valuing-public-participation-discussion-report/> accessed 29/10/12
- Prior, A (2009) *The Herald of Culture Change*, Town and Country Planning, October.
- Rowan-Robinson, J. (1997) The organisation and effectiveness of the Scottish planning system, in: R. Macdonald & H. Thomas (Eds) *Nationality and Planning in Scotland and Wales*, pp. 32– 53 (Cardiff, University of Wales Press).
- Rowan Robinson, J. (2003) *Options for Change: Report to the Scottish Executive Development Department on the Content of a Possible Planning Bill*, Edinburgh, Scottish Executive Social Research.
- RTPI (2001a) *A New Vision for Planning: Delivering Sustainable Communities, Settlements and Places*, Retrieved from <http://www.rtpi.org.uk/download/245/RTPI-New-Vision-for-Planning.pdf>, 30 March 2007.
- RTPI (2007) *Shaping and Delivering Tomorrow's Places: Effective Practice in Spatial Planning*, London, RTPI.
- Sager, T. (2009) Planners' role: torn between dialogical ideals and neo-liberal realities, *European Planning Studies*, 17 (1), 65-84.
- Sanyal, B. ed. (2005) *Comparative Planning Cultures*, Abingdon, Taylor and Francis.
- Scandrett, E. (2010) Environmental justice in Scotland: incorporation and conflict, in: Davidson, N, McCafferty, P and Miller, D eds. (2010) *Neoliberal Scotland: class and society in a stateless nation*, Cambridge, Cambridge Scholars, 183-202.
- Schein, E.H. (1992) *Organisational Culture and Leadership*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Scottish Council of Economic Advisors (2008) *First Annual Report of the Scottish Council of Economic Advisors*, Edinburgh, Scottish Government
- Scottish Government (2005) *Modernising the Planning System: A White Paper*, Edinburgh, Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2007) *Modernising the Planning System. Unlocking Planning's Potential*, Edinburgh, Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2008) *Delivering Planning Reform*, Edinburgh, Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2009) *Scottish Planning Policy*, Edinburgh, Scottish Government
- Scottish Government (2010) *Delivering Planning Reform: Progress Report*, Edinburgh, Scottish Government.
- Scottish Parliament (2006) *Communities Committee, 5th Report: Stage 1 Report on the Planning (Etc) Scotland Bill*, Edinburgh, Scottish Parliament.

RICS Research – Changing the Culture of Scottish Planning: Interpreting New Regulations, Shaping New Practices, Relationships and Identities

- Sehested, K. (2009) Urban Planners as Network Managers and Metagovernors *Planning Theory & Practice*, 10 245-263
- Shaw, D. (2006) *Culture Change and Planning: Literature Review*, London, CLG.
- Shaw, D. and Lord, A. (2007) The cultural turn? Culture change and what it means for spatial planning, *Planning Practice and Research*, 22 (1), 63-78.
- Stapley, L. (1996) *The Personality of the Organisation: A Psycho-dynamic Explanation of Culture and Change*, London, Free Association Books.
- Stokes, J. and Clegg, S. (2002) Once Upon a Time in the Bureaucracy: Power and Public Sector Management, *Organization*, 9 (2), 225-247.
- Tait, M. (2012) Building trust in planning professionals: understanding the contested legitimacy of a planning decision *Town Planning Review* 83 (5), 597-618
- Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2001) Grasping the Thistle: The Search for Distinctiveness in the Devolved Scottish Planning System, *International Planning Studies*, 6 (2) 199-213
- Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2008) The complexity of planning reform: a search for the spirit and purpose of planning, *Town Planning Review*, 79 (6), 673-688.
- Weber, M. (2006) Bureaucracy, in: Sharma, A. and Gupta, A. (eds.) *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*, Oxford, Blackwell, 49-70.
- Wilsdovsky, A. (1973) If Planning is Everything, Maybe it's Nothing, *Policy Studies*, 4, 127-153.
- Williams, R. ([1973] 2010) *Keywords*, Fontana Press
- Yanow, D. (2000) *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis*, London, Sage.

9.0 Acknowledgements



I would like to thank all of those who participated in the project for their time and thoughts. I would also like to thank my family and friends for their patience and hospitality during my frequent trips north to Scotland.

RICS HQ

Parliament Square
London SW1P 3AD
United Kingdom

Worldwide media enquiries:

e pressoffice@rics.org

Contact Centre:

e contactrics@rics.org
t +44 (0)870 333 1600
f +44 (0)20 7334 3811

Advancing standards in land, property and construction.

RICS is **the world's leading qualification** when it comes to professional standards in land, property and construction.

In a world where more and more people, governments, banks and commercial organisations demand greater certainty of **professional standards and ethics**, attaining RICS status is the recognised **mark of property professionalism**.

Over **100 000 property professionals** working in the major established and emerging economies of the world have already recognised the importance of securing RICS status by becoming members.

RICS is an **independent** professional body originally established in the UK by Royal Charter. Since 1868, RICS has been committed to setting and upholding the **highest standards of excellence and integrity** – providing **impartial, authoritative advice** on key issues affecting businesses and society.

RICS is a **regulator** of both its individual members and firms enabling it to **maintain the highest standards** and providing the basis for **unparalleled client confidence** in the sector.

RICS has a worldwide network. For further information simply contact the relevant RICS office or our Contact Centre.

**Europe
(excluding United Kingdom and Ireland)**

Rue Ducale 67
1000 Brussels
Belgium

t +32 2 733 10 19
f +32 2 742 97 48
ricseurope@rics.org

United Kingdom

Parliament Square
London SW1P 3AD
United Kingdom

t +44 (0)870 333 1600
f +44 (0)207 334 3811
contactrics@rics.org

Oceania

Suite 2, Level 16
1 Castlereagh Street
Sydney, NSW 2000
Australia

t +61 2 9216 2333
f +61 2 9232 5591
info@rics.org.au

Asia

Room 2203
Hopewell Centre
183 Queen's Road East
Wanchai
Hong Kong

t +852 2537 7117
f +852 2537 2756
ricsasia@rics.org

Africa

PO Box 3400
Witkoppen 2068
South Africa

t +27 11 467 2857
f +27 86 514 0655
ricsafrica@rics.org

Middle East

Office G14, Block 3
Knowledge Village
Dubai
United Arab Emirates

t +971 4 375 3074
f +971 4 427 2498
ricsmenea@rics.org

Americas

One Grand Central Place
60 East 42nd Street
Suite 2810
New York 10165 – 2810
USA

t +1 212 847 7400
f +1 212 682 1295
ricsamericas@rics.org

Ireland

38 Merrion Square
Dublin 2
Ireland

t +353 1 644 5500
f +353 1 661 1797
ricsireland@rics.org

India

48 & 49 Centrum Plaza
Sector Road
Sector 53, Gurgaon – 122002
India

t +91 124 459 5400
f +91 124 459 5402
ricsindia@rics.org