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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores how an adherence to professional principles can be reconciled with a commitment to inclusive participatory planning processes in urban governance. Two themes are drawn together. First, the study concerns recent shifts in thinking about public participation that have resulted in innovative approaches to engaging citizens in urban governance processes through deliberative, interactive workshops and forums. Second, the study focuses on power relations that are inherent in such forums, particularly when a variety of different knowledges (expert and lay) interact. The two themes are brought together by focusing on the participatory practices of the urbanist movement – an urban form movement that draws specific principles from the urbanism of traditional towns and cities in order to create socially and environmentally sustainable places. Within urbanist participation, professional principles for the built environment and a commitment to a form of deliberative democracy are combined. In this study, the crucial question asked is: what is the nature and effect of the power relations on the democratic character of public involvement in participatory planning processes?

To explore this issue, two urbanist Enquiry by Design processes were selected as retrospective case studies. One case involved a regeneration project for an inner urban area of a north England industrial town, while the other case involved a greenfield urban extension in the south west of England. The empirical research, undertaken in mid 2005, comprised 52 semi-structured interviews, analysis of extensive background material, and site visits. Research participants were selected to capture a range of perspectives and experiences of each process.

To understand the power relations in the cases a two pronged approach was taken. The study was informed by literature from communicative planning theory and deliberative democracy. From this literature, an Ethic for Communicative Participation was developed as a heuristic device to evaluate urbanist participation. Concomitantly, to understand the nature of the power relations involved in the deliberative forum, the study employed a discourse theory perspective after Laclau and Mouffe (2001). Thus, power was understood as relational and imbricated within all social relations, while conflict was conceived of as an indicator of power.

The study found that the urbanist discourse, as a hegemonic project, had a significant effect on the nature of the participatory processes. In disseminating and instituting a particular vision for urban sustainability, the urbanist participatory process was found to be instrumental to realising the urbanist vision in each locality. As such, the cases studied displayed a thin commitment to democracy. Moreover, the discursive constructions of concepts of community, representation, consensus and participation evident in the cases, exposed a unified and homogeneous understanding of social groups. Consequently, the complexity of power relations and conflict inherent in the processes were bracketed, resulting in the exclusion of certain perspectives.

Nevertheless, the study illustrated the value in understanding the inherently antagonistic nature of the public sphere for both research and practice. The study supported emerging claims for a democratic politics in which antagonism is transformed into agonism – a space of reciprocity and mutual respect in which contestations over meanings can be articulated. In the cases, the participatory space allowed participants to challenge the hegemonic nature of the dominant discourses. Therefore, the thesis argues for two important ways to rethink power in both theory and in practice. First, there must be a willingness to engage with conflict and power. Second, there must be an interrogation of claims to unity or collectivity. Understanding the public sphere as inherently antagonistic, heterogeneous, and criss-crossed with complex power relations potentially provides conditions in which hegemonic forces can be contested. An agonistic politics has the potential to facilitate the open contestation of different knowledges and transform the dominant power relations such that an enhanced democracy can ensue.
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Chapter 1
Participation, Power and Problematisation

1.1 Introduction

While undertaking research for the current study in the United Kingdom, I attended a public meeting that had been organised by the local authority and a local Regeneration Steering Group. The meeting was unimpressive – indeed subsequent newspaper reports were headlined ‘Shambles’ and likened it to a Monty Python sketch (Nurse 2005). The venue was inappropriate. Poor acoustics resulted in the presentations being inaudible, which contributed to the already antagonistic atmosphere. The meeting was to present three consultation documents, which were to form part of the urban planning and development control for the area under a significantly revised planning system. The typical mystique and inaccessibility of planning systems tends to be compounded when new regimes are introduced. This was no exception, with planners and residents interviewed expressing confusion on how the new system would work. The public meeting was held halfway through a six week consultation period, in which local constituents were provided opportunities to complete questionnaires in response to the draft documents distributed. The public meeting was called as a result of recognition by the local authority that there was a poor response to questionnaires. The intention was to explain the consultation process, the documents and provide an alternative opportunity for local voices to be heard – a laudable intent. However, not only was the setting unsuitable, the use of a powerpoint computer presentation was very poor, and public speaking skills were minimal. Moreover, it seemed that the emphasis in the presentations was not about the options for regeneration contained in the documents, their merits, or how they had been developed even though that was a significant issue for residents in attendance. Rather the emphasis appeared to be about the Council defending its processes by indicating how many opportunities there had already been for consultation that had not been taken up.

A Council officer later indicated, in an interview, that it was a poor meeting (Council Officer N41). Consequently, the Council had organised to extend the consultation period, and run a series of smaller public meetings (with the same content) at different venues and

---

1 Participants in the current study have not been named to protect anonymity. The coding is explained in Chapter Four, Section 4.4.2
varying times – again a laudable response but one which was not fully cognisant of the issues. The Council evidently considered there were too many people at the original meeting. That there were multiple documents being consulted on, or a problem with the ‘draft options for response’ formula, insufficient prior (effective) consultation and information, all of which may have been factors in the antagonistic atmosphere. Moreover, a repeat of the same public meeting format was not a very innovative response, given the range of available consultation and participation tools now available. Interestingly, in interviews undertaken in the course of the present research prior to the public meeting, Council officers stated a commitment to enhanced democracy and the importance of getting people involved in the planning process (Council Officers N1, N4). Clearly, there was some incongruity between those intentions and the ability to enact them. Arguably, the Council, in this instance could have done better. However, in general (and this instance was no exception) there are a myriad of far greater, pervasive and vexing issues that constrain the ability of planners and urban governance officers to enhance the democratic character of their decision making.

Governments in many western countries consult their polities on ever increasing matters in the hope that democratic policy decisions are taken. Matters for consultation are wide ranging, depend on the nature of the governance system, the polity of a particular locality and extend well beyond the planning instance given above. Familiar examples include policy documents for service provision for specific groups such as older age groups or people with disabilities; strategies for specific community services, housing and education; financial plans; and plans for environmental protection, waste management, and development control. In urban planning and management, involving the public in policy decision making has been a common if not contested principle of planning practice for several decades. As early as 1969, Sherry Arnstein (1969:216) commented that ‘the idea of citizen participation is a little like eating spinach: no one is against it in principle because it is good for you’, an attitude also revealed by the practitioners involved in the story outlined above (Council Officers N1, N4).

Over the last 35 years, public participation has been treated as either a panacea or a curse and has waxed and waned in popularity (Jackson 2002). It has been defined, redefined, contested and theorised, yet the gap between theory and practice remains. More recently, it has re-emerged as part of an alternative vision of planning practice where many theorists suggest moving beyond the formulaic consultation on options already drafted by experts. More innovative modes of public involvement have been developed based on principles of
inclusivity, interaction and deliberation. This is the first theme on which the present research focuses. As Albrechts (2002:331) suggests:

A new type of planning has emerged that expands practical democratic deliberations rather than restricts them, that encourages diverse citizens’ voices rather than stifles them, and that directs resources to basic needs rather than to narrow private gain.

The second theme involves the play of power within such interactive modes of public involvement – particularly those power plays which might be induced by a professional ideology. The question is whether there is an irreconcilable tension between, on the one hand, professional ideology and expertise and, on the other, achieving meaningful public involvement in which the demos (the people) are heard and have a meaningful influence on decisions taken. This problem is exemplified in the increasing variety of popular paradigms that seek environmental and social sustainability in urban spaces and places. Moreover, some of these paradigms have become established political movements in which principles are promoted and disseminated with evangelical zeal. Examples include Smart Growth and the New Urbanism in the United States; the Movement for the Reconstruction of the European City, the Council for European Urbanism and the International Network for Traditional Building, Architecture and Urbanism (INTBAU) in Europe; and the work of The Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment and Traditional Urbanism in Britain. The common theme amongst all these groups is a fundamental concern that conventional development since World War II has created expansive, characterless conurbations, comprised of homogeneous, unsustainable urban sprawl, at the expense of community life. Instead these movements seek a model of the city derived from historic exemplars, as an organic ‘multi-functional urban area, interconnected with self-supportive concentrated nodes of development’ (Thompson-Fawcett and Bond 2003:164), that multiply into a polypolis of sustainable urban units, be they neighbourhoods, villages or quarters.

Discourses within this urbanist paradigm advocate particular approaches to public participation as part of the implementation of their visions for sustainable urban places. On the face of it, the nature of the participation processes fits Albrechts’ new type of planning, and is far more innovative than the formulaic conventional consultation model described earlier in the chapter. Therefore, the two core themes of the current study – an enhanced democracy through new forms of interactive and deliberative participation on one hand and the strong professional ideology evident in the emergent urbanist paradigm on the other hand – are brought together. Thus the question that underpins the present research is what are the
implications of urbanists’ firm adherence to normative design principles in light of the concomitant commitment to genuine participation? The current study explores this tension.

The following sections of the chapter introduce the primary focus in more detail, and define key concepts. The next section (1.2) provides a contextual statement on the role of public involvement in planning, and how enduring problematics in democratic theory also permeate the concept of enhancing democracy within urban governance. Section 1.3 introduces the relationship between those enduring problematics in public participation in planning processes and relationships of power. Definitions of the terms participation and power follow, before turning to the concepts of problematisation and discourse in Section 1.4. The two concepts – discourse and problematisation – serve to underpin the current study, allowing an understanding of the power relationships within participatory processes to develop. The penultimate section (1.5) introduces more specifically, the nature of the problem this research seeks to address, which rests on the tension between the two themes outlined above. That is, between the goals of contemporary and innovative participatory planning and the role of a professional ideology. The urbanist participatory technique and the popularised sustainability paradigm that favours its use are outlined as the phenomena under study. Finally, in concluding the Chapter, Section 1.6 provides a précis of the structure of the thesis.

1.2 Enhanced Democracy in Planning and Urban Governance

The acceptance (or otherwise) of participation in urban planning has changed over the last few decades. In the 1960s, an emphasis on social justice in local government brought public involvement in planning to the fore. Public involvement was promoted as a means to solve the ‘problems of our cities’ (Sewell and Coppock 1977:1); to meet the demands for groups and individuals to have a say in the management of their places (Ministry of Housing and Local Government 1969:1); to address the perceived failure of representative government in coping with the growing complexities of local polities (ibid); and to provide more information from which planners could make more ‘rational’ decisions (Simmie 1974:139). Experiments in a variety of participation approaches, academic and practitioner research on participatory planning, and ministerial advice was prolific in the 1960s and 70s in both the United Kingdom and the United States (for example, Arnstein 1969; Fagence 1977; Long 1975; Ministry of Housing and Local Government 1969; Sewell and Coppock 1977; Thornley 1977; see Jackson 2002 for review). In contrast, in the 1980s recognition of the difficulties in implementation, the additional expense, and frequent failure of
participatory approaches to improve decision-making resulted in a less zealous embrace of participatory ideals. Concomitantly the rise of neo-liberalism in many western democracies in the 1980s and early 90s prioritised the market and administrative efficiency (Atkinson and Cope 1997). The prevailing attitude was that public participation intervened unnecessarily in the market, delayed development and was therefore inefficient and risky.

However, at the beginning of the 21st century in many western nations there is evidence that the notion of public involvement and an enhanced democracy is once again finding favour. A shift from the neo-liberal or market fundamentalist orientation of the 1980s to what Anthony Giddens calls the ‘third way’ is evident. Centre left third way governments² promote both the traditional values of social democrats married with neoliberal principles of market efficiency. In this context, social justice ideals are once again brought to the fore in recognition of the diversity of people in urban spaces and places, acknowledgement of the active exclusion and marginalisation of difference, and the inability of the market to redress inequalities among the haves and the have-nots.

Concomitantly, several planning theorists argue that planning is in crisis (Albrechts and Denayer 2001; Beauregard 1996; Friedman 1987). The foundations of planning as professional practice lie in modernist desires to reform and improve the urban and regional conditions in which we live. In the middle of the twentieth century, planners were generally considered to be rational experts who were objective and technical in making the right decisions in the name of a unified public interest. However, planning theorists recognised a paradigm shift in planning that began, according to some, as early as the 1950s (Hall 1996, see also Healey 1997; Sandercock 1998). The political nature of planning and the far-reaching and often inequitable effects of planning decisions were recognised, along with the inadequacy of instrumental rationality to plan for diverse and multiple publics. Indeed Healey (1997:37) argued that:

... we are becoming increasingly aware of our cultural boundedness, our own biases and those of others. We recognise difference and differentiation in our systems of meaning, our ways of acting and our lifeworlds, and see around us not homogeneous values and ways of life, but cultural diversity. This leads to consciousness of differences between 'us' and 'others'. ... This reflects a broad-

² The third way refers to a political and economic orientation that attempts to find a way between traditional left and right, and to marry neo-liberal capitalism with traditional social democratic values (see Giddens 1999, 2000, 2001). Giddens suggests the third way is signified by 'a generic set of endeavours, common to the majority of left parties and thinkers in Europe and elsewhere' to renew 'social democracy in contemporary social conditions' (Giddens 2001:2). In the 1990s, left of centre governments including Britain, USA, Germany and New Zealand both overtly and under different terminology, instituted third way programmes (ibid).[0]
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Based shift in western thought, a shift in systems of meaning, and the parameters of dominant intellectual cultures.

This shift in western intellectual thought, reflected across social science disciplines and often described as the shift beyond modernity into the postmodern, questions the fundamental premises of modernism and the Enlightenment. As such it has presented planning with several ambiguities. To subscribe to postmodern sensibilities is to question instrumental rationality, which arguably provides planning practice with its professional status. In addition, the shift questions the underlying foundation of a progressive, reformist activity operating in a singular public interest. New modes of thinking and the complexities of increased mobility, globalisation and technology in contemporary life, have challenged the underlying notions that ground planning practice. The fundamental difficulty lies in decisions that are taken for a universalised collective polity but which have effects at the local and individual particularised level. Moreover, it is only recently that the universal/particular tension in planning has been problematised in terms of power and the inherently political nature of urban planning. The call for enhancing the democratic nature of decisions in urban planning and management is raised in western planning systems by both governments and theorists alike. But what does enhancing democracy really mean?

Citizen participation is often understood as ‘the normative core of democracy’ (Fischer 2000:1) and it is assumed that if we subscribe to democracy’s merits ‘then its evolution towards a more participatory form must naturally be a good thing’ (Campbell and Marshall 2000a:321). But why if, like eating spinach (Arnstein 1969), it is such a good thing, does it remain so problematic in practice? It is clearly not sufficient to suggest simply that urban managers and practitioners do not like to conduct public involvement processes (or eat spinach for that matter), as this would be an inaccurate generalisation on both scores. The intention behind enhancing democracy in planning decision making lies in the acknowledgement (made several decades ago now) of the potentially profound effects such decisions have on individuals’ lives. As a result, in recent years, some degree of public involvement is a statutory requirement in planning policy formulation in many western countries such as New Zealand, Australia, and the United Kingdom. In addition, there is no shortage of literature on participatory approaches and an increasing variety of innovative approaches which seek to address the gap between the ideal of enhanced democracy in planning decision making and its implementation (see Chapter Two).

Yet, the difficulty in achieving such enhanced democracy is pervasive and permeates broader discourses such as those in political theory, democratic theory and public
administration. At the root of the problematic lies the very impossibility of the ideal democracy. Comprised of the Greek words *demos* (the people) and *kratos* (strength or power) – the commonly accepted etymology of the term suggests power to the people. So the democratic ideal is to make decisions according to the collective will of the people. But how, in increasingly complex diverse societies, can the collective will be known? This problem has plagued democratic theorists for hundreds of years.

Democracy now is associated with systems of government based on principles of fairness, justice and equity in which the demos are given a voice in government by direct or representative means. So when planning theorists and practitioners advocate enhancing democracy in planning and urban management by public involvement processes, there is an inference that the demos will be given more power to influence the decisions being taken. However, as was the case in ancient Greece, the demos are defined explicitly and implicitly in certain ways which include and exclude individuals from exercising power. For Aristotle, the demos comprised citizens – or *bios* – referring to political life, that of articulate reasoning men in the public sphere. Distinct from bios is *zoe* – meaning life itself, natural life, the category encompassing animals, women, slaves and the poor. Fortunately, times have changed. However, the included are still defined implicitly by their capacity to participate in the prescribed way, by their ability to be political beings ³.

As noted at the beginning of the Chapter, the most common form of consultation involves writing submissions and commenting on options or draft policy documents. At a basic level this requires first, vigilance and a willingness of individuals to be informed about contemporary issues; second, the motivation to act; third, the time to respond; and fourth, the capacity to write a reasoned statement. But even the more innovative approaches to public involvement that have recently emerged require the capacity to be involved and entail an act of defining who is included and excluded. The act of defining occurs through decisions taken on process design, the agenda, who is affected, what knowledge is relevant, etc. – all of which involve a maze of power relationships (both positive and negative) inherent to the process.

Increased public involvement seeks to draw on local knowledge to inform decisions taken, to give those affected a voice in the process, to enhance social responsibility of places

³ I am indebted to Dr Mark Devenney of the School of Historical and Critical Studies at the University of Brighton, who provided this idea while teaching at the Victoria University Discourse Summer School in Wellington, 2006
and spaces in which people live, and to add legitimacy to local governance. The capacity to participate combined with the act of defining the process, are determining factors in how voices are heard. These issues are all questions of power – questions of the power of different contested or silenced knowledges – all of which are socially and historically constituted. Such questions of power in participatory processes underpin the current study.

1.3 Participation and Power

Before going further in defining the exact problem the research seeks to address, some clarification of concepts is required. The focus of this study lies in participatory planning, or active and interactive participation in planning processes, as a more progressive and democratic urban governance. A distinction is often made between consultation and participation. The example provided at the beginning of the Chapter is an example of consultation, a top down approach in which the public are informed of options and given opportunities for comment. Participatory involvement is based on interaction, deliberation and direct influence on the decisions taken (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister 2002; Sarkissian et al. 1997; see Chapter Two). Processes are inclusive, and are committed to hearing multiple voices and engendering social learning. Popular tools in participatory planning include community planning or design workshops, citizen juries, focus groups, Planning for Real®, charrettes, and Enquiry by Design (see Sarkissian 1997; Wates 1999). The following chapters apply this distinction between consultation and participatory planning.

The second key concept is power. Power, as it is understood in the current study, draws on Foucault’s relational conceptualisation. Power is not taken to be a thing, rather it is a relation between people or organisations that is dynamic and in flux. Therefore, power flows and is not a zero sum game – it both empowers and disempowers (Gilchrist and Taylor 1997). The focus on power in this research lies in the play and effect of power relations – where, how and why power operates in participatory planning, how it shapes meanings and understandings within the political space, how it operates to legitimise certain knowledges and marginalise others.

The most obvious power play within participatory planning processes is the interaction of local knowledge and expert knowledge. Typically, expert knowledge based on instrumental technical reason, which in turn is constituted by a range of different professional and governmental discourses, is privileged over the subjective local knowledges of those affected, even when their knowledge is sought via participatory processes. Local
knowledge involves specific insights about a locality, its history, events, and relationships (Fischer 2000). Local knowledge encompasses a range of emotional, historical attachments to place that are constituted over time and space and that are often overlooked because of a more rational technical understanding of what constitutes knowledge. In addition, non-rational or emotional knowledge may be deemed inappropriate in the formalised forum of a participatory process. However, the exclusion of particular knowledges reflects an implicit exclusion of individuals and identities at a deeper level that may subvert a genuine intention to include.

Furthermore, a purely rational, technical planning ignores the power plays inherent in professional activity. Flyvbjerg’s (1998a) analysis of rationality and power provides a useful example of the way rationality can be twisted in power plays that act to define a version of reality. In an extensive longitudinal study of planning in Aalborg, Denmark, Flyvbjerg finds that ‘the freedom to use ‘rationality’ and ‘rationalization’ in the service of power is a key element in enabling power to define reality’ (ibid:98). The concept of the public interest serves as an example of how this can occur. Decisions taken by planners and urban managers have been rationalised in the name of the public interest in order to protect individual property rights against private or sectoral interests in urban planning since the Second World War. Public interest is an amorphous, dynamic and contested concept, which differs over time and space, and as such can be drawn on as a rationalisation for actions; as a legitimating reason for decisions taken. In most instances, this kind of rationalisation may be benign with little impact outside the planning or council offices in which it is made. But there are instances where it is not remotely benign. It has the potential to be used as Flyvbjerg (ibid) states, ‘in the service of power’, by those whose interests are contrary to those the decision directly affects.

In participatory processes, such rational expertise can be used equally to set agendas and shape what is learned, such that participation has the potential to become a rationalising process for a particular professional ideology. Moreover, participatory processes may be used to lend weight to a claim for understanding the ‘public interest’, thus further legitimising decisions taken. As Campbell and Marshall (2000b:308) indicate, the public interest is a phrase that has ‘often been used to mystify rather than clarify’ and has been employed to ‘cast an aura of legitimacy’ over decisions where there is dissensus.

Knowledge and power are imbricated in social relations. Knowledge is power; reality and rationality are constructed and reconstructed by those with power (Flyvbjerg 1998a; Foucault 1980a). Rationalisation, presented as technical reasoned justification can be re-
presented as rationality and truth by those in power. That is, 'power produces rationality and rationality produces power' (Flyvbjerg 1998a:234). Decisions taken by experts may not be based on neutral objective scientifically informed knowledge but emerge from a complex web of politically motivated or ideologically driven decisions taken by altogether different actors (ibid, see also Fischler 2000). Expertise may be used to legitimise decisions to serve ulterior motives.

The power relations involved in participatory processes are not just confined to those between experts and locals, but pervade all communications, interactions, and decisions taken within the process. Why are some local views, opinions, experiences and identities given more weight than others? Differing local knowledges are contested within processes. Moreover, the margins between expertise and local knowledge are frequently unclear. Every player involved to whatever degree in a participatory process is involved in relations of power which are played out through what they know, what is said, what is not said, who and how they represent and are represented, how they participate, and how the individual identities are perceived by others in the participatory arena.

While the caution lies in the use of expert knowledge as a legitimising rationale for decisions taken, the conflation of rationality and rationalisation may not be helpful. Reason need not be our nemesis nor our saviour (Foucault 1984a; Rabinow 1984), rather the important questions should be:

*What* is this Reason that we use? What are its historical effects? What are its limits, and what are its dangers? How can we exist as rational beings, fortunately committed to practising a rationality that is unfortunately crisscrossed by intrinsic dangers? One should remain as close to this question as possible, keeping in mind that it is both central and extremely difficult to resolve (Foucault 1984a:249, emphasis original).

This question of reason and the nature of the rationalities employed in a any particular context is central to the perspective adopted in this research. The primary theme of this research is how to identify and reconcile the power of different knowledges in participatory urban planning processes. At the heart of this issue lies a myriad of power relations, some which empower, enable social learning and the building of social capital, and others which dis-empower, marginalise or manipulate, while at the same time, seeking to create better places within constraints imposed by urban policy directives. Recognition of the powers of planning and the political nature of planning are symptomatic of the criticisms of modernity that have permeated western thought over the last four decades or so. The ambit of these criticisms has led to fundamental questions being raised concerning the role of expert
knowledge, professionalism, notions of truth, and the rationalisation of political processes in order to balance the aims of achieving equitable democratic decisions with the kind of efficiency and accountability required in contemporary capitalist systems.


... we cannot just keep talking about power, power, power, the way 25 years ago so many articles about planning discovered, with an ‘Ahah!’ that planning was political, ... Today we need to be more specific about ‘power’ – and more clever too. Let us agree that power is pervasive; that it takes positive and negative forms; that it can enable or disable. But then let us try to specify when and how these kinds of power matter.

The task for the present research is to specify, in relation to two participatory planning events, what the effects of power are by drawing on the concepts of problematisation and discourse as a social practice (Foucault 2000; Howarth and Glynos 2007; Laclau and Mouffe 2001). The following section introduces the concepts of problematisation and discourse as they are employed in this thesis.

1.4 Problematisation and Discourse

Problematisation refers to the way in which a question or problem is posed or framed. Every framing forecloses on alternative readings and interpretations. Consequently, the way a question or issue is presented is instrumental in determining the options available for its solution. Problematisation can be described as a way of establishing and exploring a set of ethical and political problems in the present, by interrogating the way in which the problem is typically framed and seeking to find an alternative framing that will provide innovative and novel solutions (Foucault 1987, 2000; Howarth 2000a). Howarth (2000a: 135) describes the ‘ethos of problematisation’ as the exploration of ways in which ‘practices construct and normalise particular representations of issues’. The ethos of problematisation is employed in the present research at two levels. First, problematisation is understood as a way of reading – in short as a means ‘doing’ research – it is a means of critique which facilitates alternative readings, reveals new possibilities, ways of thinking about issues and courses of action.

Second, an ethos of problematisation necessarily understands that the research process is an inherently contingent practice that involves a series of decisive junctures in which the researcher takes decisions that forecloses on alternatives. Such junctures include decisions
on approach and methodology, the theoretical framework and literature reviewed, the subject of empirical investigation and methods used, the cases chosen, and the interpretation of data. For example, in the current study, the combination of problematisation, understanding the contingent nature of social relations and knowledge, and ideas drawn from Foucault, suggest a social constructionist post-structural approach. Commensurately, the political nature of participatory planning from this perspective points to a post-structural analysis of power relationships employing a theoretical framework derived from Laclau and Mouffe’s (2001) discourse theory.

In the current study, discourse is viewed as a social practice that provides a structured frame of reference or a lens with which to interpret the social world and which constitutes meanings attributable to social phenomena, relations and identities (Foucault 2002; Howarth 2005; Mills 2004). Discourses have an ideological effect, in that they can ‘make it virtually impossible to think outside them’ (Young 1981a:48). Discourses operate to include and exclude meanings from a sphere of reference. Thus discourses are political and embedded with power relations. Discourse theory, after Laclau and Mouffe (2001), provides a series of conceptual tools with which to analyse social phenomena. As Howarth (2000a:129) argues a discourse theory approach allows one to:

Seek to provide novel interpretations of events and practices by elucidating their meaning … [and] by analysing the way in which political forces and social actors construct meanings within incomplete and undecidable social structures. This is achieved by examining the particular structures within which social agents take decisions and articulate hegemonic projects and discursive formations.

In addition, a discourse theory approach enables the researcher to locate the phenomena under study – a ‘pressing real world problem’ – within its historical, social and political context (ibid). As a result, there is not only scope for critique but also the possibility to transform existing social relations, meanings and practices. Using a discourse theory approach, the present research will tease out how different knowledges are contested, included or excluded in two urbanist participatory planning processes. The following section explains what is meant by urbanist participatory planning.

---

*There are several different threads of discourse theory that fit within a post-structural perspective and extend Foucault’s conception of discourse: for example Laclau and Mouffe (2001) for a radical discourse theory; Baxter (2003) for a feminist post-structural methodology; Fairclough (1992) for textually oriented discourse analysis; Wodak and Meyer (2001), Weiss and Wodak (2003) for Critical Discourse Analysis.*
1.5 A Real World Problem

Central to this research, then, are questions of power. The real world problem that the study seeks to explore and address, concerns a technique of public involvement that is variously named Enquiry by Design, charrette or design workshop. It is predominantly used by a variety of groups of built environment professionals who can be described under the umbrella term urbanists – hence the frequent reference to urbanist participatory process or urbanist charrette. Urbanism, as used here, describes a set of interrelated discourses that share common principles that seek more compact, human oriented, mixed use (as opposed to car focused, sprawling, homogenous) urban forms, that enhance a sense of community and identity in the name of environmental and social sustainability (see Aldous 1992; Calthorpe 1993; Duany et al 2000; Katz 1994a; Thompson-Fawcett and Bond 2003).

From within urbanist discourses, an innovative technique for involving the public in urban planning seeks to achieve the necessary balance between democracy and efficiency as described in Section 1.2 above. The focus of the technique is an intensive five to ten day facilitated workshop which brings together a range of different knowledges from urban designers and architects to affected local people and groups in order to develop workable, realistic masterplans. The idea behind the process is that all those with relevant knowledge and information are present, so that the issues can be rigorously debated, discussed and resolved efficiently and effectively within the workshop period. Where masterplans are broadly endorsed by those involved, there is less scope for objection and implementation is more expedient. Urban design and architectural expertise, guided by urbanist principles, are fundamental to the approach. Most commonly, urbanist workshops are undertaken for urban extensions, regenerating town centres, and for visioning or future planning.

There are several reasons why the urbanist participatory process is understood as a pressing real world problem. First, the various urbanist discourses have emerged at a rapid rate and have had a variety of powerful and vociferous proponents. For example, the New Urbanism movement in the United States has been disseminated, promoted, and championed with evangelical fervour (Beauregard 2002; Fainstein 2000; Grant 2006). Moreover, the Prince of Wales in the United Kingdom has actively engaged in advocating and realising urbanist principles through: his charity, the Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment;
speeches; writing; and the Duchy of Cornwall’s development in Poundbury, Dorset. It is the ideological nature of the urbanist movement that is of interest. As suggested above, there is always a fundamental tension between expert and local knowledge and between the concept of expertise (with its associated professional ideology) and inclusive democratic principles. However, in a participatory process which is explicitly underpinned by a set of normative principles (as is the case with urbanist charrettes and workshops), but which claims to be inclusive of all those affected, that tension is potentially heightened. Indeed there is a possible paradox in the desire for inclusivity and a development process that adheres to a particular set of design principles. The specific question is: are voices within the process which do not conform with those principles heard, or is there an inherent bias because of the nature of the ideology behind the process?

Second, while there has been much research and debate on the physical sustainability of urbanist developments (for example, Ford 2001; Talen and Ellis 2002; Thompson-Fawcett and Bond 2003), there has been very little on the urbanists’ preferred approach to public involvement. Despite the lack of research, questions have been raised as to the urbanist commitment to democratic processes (Beauregard 2002; Grant 2006; Jackson 2002; Till 2001). Moreover, the urbanist paradigm has been criticised for being overly conservative, and not cognisant of the political implications of the urban forms and indeed social places it seeks to create (for example, Ellis 2002). As indicated in section 1.1 above, the power of process facilitators to shape agendas, and include or exclude certain knowledges and voices means that such claims if founded may have implications for questions of inclusivity in participatory processes.

Third, and on a more positive note, as a tool the urbanist charrette has qualities that, on the surface at least, cohere with claims for more deliberative or collaborative planning as advocated by a diverse discourse in planning theory (see Albrechts 2002; Forester 1989, 1999a; Healey 1997; Hillier 2002; Ploger 2004; Sandercock 1998). The interactive, inclusive forum of the workshop which encourages debate and argument is consistent with the requirements for a more communicative and agonistic planning praxis that seeks

---

5 The Duchy of Cornwall is a private landed estate with assets including approximately 54,764 hectares of land mostly in the South West of Britain. The Duchy’s primary function is to provide an income for the Duke of Cornwall, HRH the Prince of Wales, his family and heirs. HRH the Prince of Wales is the 24th Duke of Cornwall (see www.duchyofcornwall.org). Poundbury is an urban extension on the outskirts of the market town of Dorchester in Dorset. It has been designed according to urbanist principles and is frequently used as an exemplar of good urbanism.
equitable and just outcomes. There is a great deal of potential in the type of process for truly enhancing democratic processes in planning. However, the very fact that the urbanist charrette has the potential to be recognised as an exemplar is disquieting in light of the two concerns outlined above and because as yet, there is very little critical analysis of the political implications of the approach. The current study will contribute to addressing that gap. Three research questions are developed through the next two chapters, which establish a normative and an analytical frame for exploring the urbanist participation case studies. The three research questions are:

i. What discourses intersect in each urbanist participatory process?

ii. What relations of power are revealed through the operation of the discourses?

iii. What are the implications of the power relations for effective communicative participation?

The concepts that underpin these questions are explained in the following chapters, the outline of which is presented below.

1.6 Thesis Structure

This chapter has outlined the broad nature of the problem that will be addressed in the following Chapters – that is how to balance the need for inclusive participation processes that take account of the range of different knowledges with the role of a professional ideology that firmly adheres to normative principles. While the issues presented in the foregoing are not new, the range of popularised sustainability paradigms (such as the new urbanism) that are becoming prominent in contemporary urban governance and planning, are growing. As such there is a pressing need to understand the political implications of the structures and processes utilised within the paradigm.

The following Chapter situates the current study by reviewing the literature relevant to participatory planning. Initially, a brief outline of literature on public involvement and the way in which it has been theorised is undertaken. The review indicates that the pragmatic and empirical nature of literature on public involvement insufficiently accounts for power. Consequently, the chapter turns to theories of communicative, deliberative and collaborative planning. In reviewing and problematising the theory’s grounding, difficulties in the way power and power relations are interpreted emerge. To complement and augment the conceptual frame that is developed through the review of literature, theories of radical democracy are drawn on. At this point, a return to power and discourse in Chapter Three allows the theoretical framework to emerge. The Chapter focuses on the key assumptions
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and logics of discourse theory, to provide a means to explore the phenomena under study in such a way that alternative readings are possible. Chapter Four follows by presenting the research strategy and methods, before turning to a brief introduction to the urbanist participatory discourse in Chapter Five. Chapters Six and Seven (re)present the two case studies researched. Both are Enquiry by Design projects undertaken in England in late 2004. The two chapters interpret the findings of each case and reveal the nature of the meanings and understandings different agents had of the processes. In doing so, both chapters identify the discourses that arose and the power relations that ensued from those discourses, thereby addressing research question one and two for each case. In the interests of maintaining the coherence of the narrative of both cases, Chapters Six and Seven are substantial. However, they trace the Enquiry by Design process chronologically, each carrying the same broad structure. Finally, Chapter Eight offers explanations of the cases, and synthesises the previous chapters by focusing on the implications of the power relations revealed and thereby address research question three.

In broad terms, the thesis falls in two parts, the conceptual (Chapters Two and Three) and the empirical (Chapters Six and Seven), bridged by Chapters Four and Five which explain the research methods and the context for the cases respectively. To begin to establish the conceptual and theoretical framework, Chapter Two provides a review of participation literature.
Chapter 2

Participation, Power and Communication

2.1 Introduction

This chapter begins to problematise how a strong professional ideology impacts on the nature of a participatory planning process which seeks to be inclusive and community led. First, a brief review of literature reveals how the quantity of empirical and theoretical literature on public involvement spans a range of disciplines (section 2.2). It becomes evident that in planning, questions of power are recognised but for most, are not a dominant area of concern. What is of major concern in this literature is how to do participatory processes. The second point that emerges is the potential value of communicative planning theory, which becomes the focus of section 2.3. Communicative planning theory is a dominant line of thinking amongst theorists who seek a middle path in which planning maintains its legitimacy as a profession, but also recognises the complexities and inherent injustices in the globalised world. Communicative planning theorists draw on the ideas of Jurgen Habermas in promoting a planning practice that is interactive and deliberative. There are parallels between this approach to planning practice and the participatory process under study here – urbanist participatory techniques rely on interactive, discussion based problem solving in order to create a masterplan which has been endorsed by all those with a stake in the project. Although urbanist proponents do not describe themselves in terms of communicative planning theory, the practices they promote are in essence communicative. However, as the discourse on communicative planning reveals, there are inherent difficulties with the assumptions of the theory’s Habermasian roots and their application to the political, power riddled, messyness of participatory practice. Thus, section 2.4 explores these difficulties under three themes – first, the ‘ideal speech situation’ and its assumptions as applied in communicative planning theory; second, the issue of inclusivity; and third, the

---

1 Jurgen Habermas, a German philosopher and social theorist, takes his lineage from the Frankfurt School of critical theory. Throughout his work, Habermas has sought a normative foundation for social criticism and inquiry. In the Theory of Communicative Action (1984vi; 1987vII), through some 800 pages of dense text, Habermas provides a comprehensive social theory. He has three inter-related key objectives: first to develop a concept of communicative rationality as distinct from a reductive notion of instrumental reason; second, to establish a two-tier concept of society in which notions of ‘lifeworld’ and ‘system’ are integrated; and third, to pose a critical theory of modernity (McCarthy 1984:viii). Habermas argues for a theory of communicative rationality as the basis of a critical theory of society. He seeks a universal theory of how individual subjects...
paradox of consensus. Finally, section 2.5 concludes by proposing an *Ethic for Communicative Participation*.

2.2 Participatory Planning – Principles and ‘Good Practice’.

Literature on public involvement can be divided into four broad types – pragmatic handbooks, empirical research, typologies and collaborative planning theory. The first type, pragmatic how to handbooks can be dealt with swiftly. Pragmatic handbooks provide a range of different techniques for undertaking participation processes. In addition, they tend to identify barriers to and principles for good practice, generally derived from experience as practitioners (for example, Sanoff 2000; Sarkissian et al. 1997; Wates 1999; Wilcox 1994). Given the nature and purpose of such texts targeting an audience of practitioners, they often lack a theoretical component. As a result, they do not explain the basis for the principles articulated, nor do they inquire into the fundamental causes for barriers to participation. However, they do provide a useful starting point, and much of their substance is corroborated in the three other literature types discussed in this chapter. Empirical research and typologies of participation are explained in the subsequent two sub-sections, while collaborative planning theory, given its relevance for the present research is explored in section 2.3.

2.2.1 Empirical Research on Public Involvement

The second, and largest group of literature by volume, is that of academics reporting empirical research. The breadth of empirical literature shows the enormous quantity of research being undertaken on public involvement in a range of disciplines and sub-disciplines. For example, in the United States, researchers in environmental science and risk management have taken up investigating participation as their own discipline mandates a greater level of public input. The focus lies in identifying ‘good process’ as defined by theorists, practitioners and participants alike (for example, Chess and Purcell 1999; McDaniels, Gregory and Fields 1999; Tuler and Webl 1999; Webl and Tuler 2001; Webl, Tuler and Kreuger 2001); and exploring a variety of models for evaluating participatory processes (for example, Chess 2000; Rowe and Frewer 2000; Santos and Chess 2003). Researchers seek to ensure an appropriate balance is met between the technical and

make meanings together, or intersubjectively. Habermas strives to identify and reconstruct universal conditions for achieving possible mutual understanding (Habermas 1998a:21)
scientific knowledges required to inform decisions in environmental management and risk analysis with the need for transparent and fair processes that meet the mandate for enhanced public involvement.

Similarly, planning literature and research focuses predominantly on the ‘how, who, where and when of public involvement’ or the ‘operationalisation and refinement’ of processes (Campbell and Marshall 2000a:323). So there is a focus employing empirical studies to improve practice either by drawing out principles and constraints, or by exploring practitioner perceptions of processes (for example, Albrechts 2002; Bedford, et al. 2002; Harrison, et al. 2004; Wild and Marshall 1999). Public administration literature follows in a similar vein (for example, Lowndes, et al. 2001a, 2001b).

A subset of planning literature has emerged in the United States and Britain on urban regeneration. Authors tend to concentrate on policy requirements for participation, and how they measure up within the specific urban context. So again the focus lies in the ‘how, who, why, and where’ of participation but within a very specific policy and governance environment (for example, Atkinson and Cope 1997; Imrie and Raco 2003a; Jones 2003; Roberts and Sykes 2000). Within this literature though, there is a growing interest in questions of power and the role of local residents within organisations such as urban regeneration partnerships, developed to deliver regeneration programmes (for example, Atkinson 1999; Maginn 2004). In addition, there is a growing body of literature in planning that explores cultural difference and participation (for example, Cameron and Grant-Smith 2005; Sandercock 2000; Umemoto 2001). A key distinction between this literature and that identified above on operationalising and improving participatory processes lies in an explicit understanding of the transformative potential of participatory processes (a similar tendency is identified in the third group of discourses on collaborative planning explored below).

The emphasis on the potentially transformative nature of participatory processes differs from the majority of planning oriented participation literature and research. For example, several commentators have observed that participation literature inadequately addresses questions of power relationships and their effect within participatory processes (Atkinson and Cope 1997; Forester 1999b; Jones 2003; Maginn 2004). While the effect of power is often acknowledged in the above mentioned literature, there are few studies or commentaries that explore power plays in any depth, although there are exceptions within the field of urban regeneration (for example, Atkinson and Cope 1997; Gilchrist and Taylor 1997; Hart, Jones, and Bains 1997; Jones 2003; Maginn 2004). In a slightly different vein, the discourse on typologies comprises the third group of literature on participation.
2.2.2 Typologies of Public Involvement

The third body of literature is one that seeks to theorise the nature of the different participatory processes in terms of the level or depth of participation by members of the public. More recently the focus has shifted to identifying types in terms of goals and objectives of a process. These attempts to typologise participatory approaches have been popular (since Arnstein’s 1969 much cited Ladder of Participation) to find ways of defining, categorising, and characterising different methods, their appropriate uses, and their implications.

Arnstein’s (1969) Ladder presents a hierarchical typology of participation in terms of the amount of power devolved to the participants in the participatory process (see Figure 2.1). The Ladder shows a continuum of participation from degrees of ‘citizen power’ (the highest rungs), through ‘degrees of tokenism’ (middle rungs) to forms of ‘non-participation’ (lowest rungs), implying that the more citizen control in a process the better it is.

![Arnstein’s ladder of participation](image)

Figure 2.1 – Arnstein’s ladder of participation (Arnstein 1969:217)

More recent efforts at typologising participation have taken two directions. The first direction follows Arnstein’s lead in focusing on the level of power devolved to citizens. For example, Deshler and Sock (1985 cited in Sanoff 2000), adapt Arnstein’s ladder into two main levels of participation: pseudoparticipation and genuine participation (see Figure 2.2).
Genuine participation
- co-operation
- citizen control
- empowerment
- delegated power partnership

Pseudo-participation
- domestication
- assistencialism
- placation consultation
- informing therapy manipulation

Figure 2.2 – Diagramatic scheme of Deshler and Sock’s typology of participation (1985 cited in Sanoff 2000:8)

Pseudoparticipation includes subcategories entitled domestication (informing, therapy and manipulation) and assistencialism (placation and consultation). The subcategories of genuine participation are cooperation (partnership, delegated power) and citizen control (empowerment) (ibid). As with Arnstein, Deshler and Sock imply that more public involvement is the desirable ideal.

The alternative direction that typologies have taken is more pragmatic, setting out the level of public involvement that is appropriate for different conditions. For example, Wilcox (1994:15) uses five levels of involvement from highest to lowest: supporting independent initiatives; acting together where decisions are made together and a partnership is formed to implement outcomes; deciding together; consultation where feedback is taken on a number of options; and information is given about what is planned. In this typology, the role of the citizen in the process becomes central. The focus on power has shifted to the public’s role in decision-making rather than considering the question of how much power is devolved or the effects of different power plays. Power is therefore sidelined. Moreover, a further shift from Arnstein’s preference for citizen control lies in Wilcox’s acceptance that informing is an appropriate means in certain situations.

A second example is that of Wild and Marshall (1999), who extend Wilcox’s approach to analyse participation in Local Agenda 21 programmes in Britain (see Table 2.1). They specifically design their typology to provide a framework for assessing the level of participation; the scope of involvement; the methods and decision-making structures in empirical cases.
Table 2.1 – Wild and Marshall’s adaption of Wilcox’s typology of participation showing levels of participation and appropriate techniques (Wild and Marshall 1999:153)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level/Stance</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Deciding Together</th>
<th>Acting Together</th>
<th>Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical Process</td>
<td>Presentation and promotion</td>
<td>Communication and feedback</td>
<td>Consensus building</td>
<td>Partnership building</td>
<td>Community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Methods</td>
<td>Leaflets, media, video</td>
<td>Surveys, meetings, exhibitions</td>
<td>Workshops, planning for real, strategic choice</td>
<td>Partnership bodies</td>
<td>Advice, support, funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiator Stance</td>
<td>‘Here’s what we are going to do’</td>
<td>‘Here are our options, what do you think?’</td>
<td>‘We want to develop options and decide actions together’</td>
<td>‘We want to carry out joint decisions together’</td>
<td>‘we can help you achieve what you want within these guidelines’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wild and Marshall’s (1999) typology shows further acceptance that different levels of participation may be appropriate in different contexts. In addition, there is a more explicit and transparent link between the methods or techniques for involvement and the role of the public in the process, which is a common theme in the re-drafting of Arnstein’s typology (see Jackson 2001, 2002). However, these later interpretations omit Arnstein’s focus on the level of power devolved (Jackson 2001). While Arnstein’s terminology may be somewhat dated, the value in her approach lies in her recognition and warning that participatory processes involve inherent power relations, and that these can be manipulative. Her warning about manipulation and tokenism should not go unheeded. Power relations – both positive and negative – permeate all participatory planning processes.

Typologies provide a useful overview of approaches to participation, but at a fairly superficial level. They either fail to account for the messy and complex reality of participation as it occurs or they are overly simplistic about the relationship between a particular level of involvement and the power plays that result. Although Arnstein’s approach recognises the power of those organising participatory processes, it does not account for the way in which, even with greater levels of participation, manipulation can still occur where, for example, knowledge is used as a rationalisation to manipulate approval or consent for particular outcomes (see Flyvbjerg 1998a; also Chapter One). Moreover, it fails to acknowledge the nature of other relationships of power between, for example, different interest groups participating in the process. As Wild and Marshall (1999) observe, these typologies do not inquire into who is participating and more importantly, who is not, why they are not, and whether participation is providing opportunities to those ‘voices’ normally
excluded. Before moving onto the fourth set of literature, which is the subject of the next section, it is useful to reflect on the commonality between the three groups identified thus far.

2.2.3 Commonalities

The discussion thus far has provided an example of the breadth of literature on participation in planning. Interestingly, the three types – the pragmatic handbooks, the empirically based research, and typologies – identify similar principles and barriers for good practice which are summarised in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2 – Barriers and good practice principles derived from literature on participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints/Barriers</th>
<th>‘Good Practice’ Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty in defining, identifying and accessing affected people and groups;</td>
<td>• Stakeholders are provided with the opportunity to choose ‘how’ participation will occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty creating ‘truly’ inclusive spaces in which all voices can be heard</td>
<td>• Participation begins early in the decision-making process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of capacity and capacity building;</td>
<td>• Participants are informed of the nature of the process, the goals, and the way in which the outcomes will be implemented;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Struggles of day to day living constrain opportunities for participation;</td>
<td>• The right participatory tool or combination of tools are used for the context, objectives and circumstances;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Apathy about and/or distrust of participatory processes;</td>
<td>• All affected parties are provided with the opportunities to be involved in inclusive, accessible processes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distortions from professional elitism, antagonistic lobby groups, NIMBYism (not in my backyard);</td>
<td>• Processes are open, transparent, legitimate, honest and engender trust;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inappropriate process for the context; poorly planned and implemented process and/or lack of skills;</td>
<td>• Process organisers/initiators respect difference and work with all parties to resolve conflict;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Time consuming and expensive;</td>
<td>• Processes engender social learning and build social capital;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Constraints imposed by the administrative or institutional processes and systems;</td>
<td>• Processes produce creative outcomes, which are implemented with ongoing engagement of affected groups/individuals;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulty implementing outcomes, lack of follow through and continuity.</td>
<td>• Decisions taken reflect the participation in the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See Albrechts 2002; Jackson 2002; Lowndes, et al. 2001a, 2001b; Sarkissian et al. 1997; Selman 2001; Simrell King et al. 1998; Wates 1999.)

Table 2.2 reflects the applied nature of the literature reviewed thus far. It also shows the link between principles that are derived from seeking to address recognised constraints. However, while the articulation of principles and barriers reveal the pernicious difficulties of
certain aspects of participation, there is little literature that inquires into why there are certain constraints, and how they should be addressed. In addition, 'good practice' to some extent depends on perspective. While there is general coherence amongst the principles, certain inconsistencies reveal variations in perspective. For example, to allow participants to choose the nature of the participation suggests a bottom up approach. Conversely, where participants are informed of the process, goals and how outcomes will be implemented a more top down approach is reflected. As indicated in the typologies reviewed above, different levels of involvement are appropriate for different contexts which, in turn invokes variations in practice and the principles that guide it.

The difficulty of creating genuinely inclusive participatory processes has been reflected in participation literature for some time. The questions of how to increase participation, how to ensure processes are as inclusive as they can be, and how participants become empowered, continue to plague theorists. Despite the abundance of literature available, much of it provides analyses of empirical examples evaluated against good practice or a diverse set of different theoretical frames. While these are critical in establishing what actually goes on in practice, and how it might be improved, these studies do not tend to ask questions such as how and when power enables and disables (Forester 1999b). The focus remains on the nuts and bolts of making processes better, and for the most part persistently overlooks the issue of power relations within processes. Issues of inclusivity are not often identified in terms of power.

The body of literature that is closest to addressing how participatory processes might become more inclusive is communicative or collaborative planning theory. The remainder of this chapter problematises this theory, by closely exploring its underpinning assumptions in order to understand how it might serve as a framework for exploring power relations within an urbanist participatory process.

### 2.3 Planning Theory – Communicative Tendencies

Theories of collaborative planning, deliberative planning and communicative planning share a common thread in that they draw on Jurgen Habermas’ theory of communicative rationality to provide normative principles for planning practice. The theories have been debated extensively over the last 15 years, and although contested, have been given paradigmatic status by several planning theorists (Alexarder 1997; Innes 1996; Mandelbaum et al. 1996; Umemoto 2001; see Allmendinger and Tewdwr-Jones 2002 for review). The term communicative planning is used in the following chapters to refer to this broad
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discourse of planning theory. The purpose of this section is to problematise communicative planning theory, to explore its underlying assumptions and premises with a view to finding an appropriate way to explain power in an empirical setting.

Communicative planning theory is based on the premise that debate between all the relevant stakeholders, which is oriented towards agreement, is the most appropriate means of decision-making in planning and urban governance. The discussion arena is inclusive and power differentials are mitigated by meeting conditions of the Habermasian ideal speech situation which requires that debate is honest, open, legitimate, and sincere (discussed in more detail below). According to the ideal, the process is consensus building, in that argumentation continues until everyone is in agreement. Because the reasoning put forth is open, honest, sincere, and justified it is ultimately acceptable to all those involved – that is, the ‘force of the better argument’ holds sway (Habermas 1984:25). In this way, communicative theorists claim that a transformative learning ensues, as values and perspectives are shared, understood, and accepted as legitimate, allowing planning to proceed across difference.

Communicative planning theory lends itself to general planning practices such as policy making, regulatory processes for land use, and participatory processes – any area in which positions and values are negotiated. Of interest in this study is how communicative planning might be utilised or applied to participatory processes in land use development or urban transformations. Moreover, it has been used as an evaluative tool because of the criteria it establishes against which empirical examples can be assessed (for example, Bond 2002; Davoudi and Healey 1995; Hayward 2000; Helling 1998; Innes and Booher 1999a, 1999b; Tewdwr-Jones and Thomas 1998; van Driesche and Lane 2002; see Innes and Booher 2004 for a review).

Two key authors dominate as the main proponents of the theory – Patsy Healey and John Forester. Both theorists are influenced by Habermas’ ideal speech situation, but draw on other social theorists, thus providing subtle distinctions in their respective interpretations and application. Healey, based in the United Kingdom, derives what she terms Collaborative Planning from the sociology of Anthony Giddens in conjunction with Habermasian communicative theory. Through collaborative planning, Healey seeks to address the challenge of the ‘contemporary world’, which she understands as the need to reconcile the acknowledgement and celebration of difference and diversity with collective planning for co-existence in shared spaces. Healey (1997:44) asks ‘is it possible to reconstruct a public
realm within which we can debate and manage our collective concerns in as inclusive way as possible?’

Following Giddens’ structuration theory, Healey takes a subjectivist position, understanding that our identities, and the ways in which we understand, perceive and explain our realities are socially constructed through social relations. Healey (1997:45) argues, after Giddens, that these social relations link us to particular histories and geographies that structure our material and conceptual resources and experiences, and that ‘we are embedded within these structures’ that ‘carry power relations from one period to the next’. Structures form part of daily routines, day-to-day living, and are often taken for granted. Healey argues that at some point though, these structures were themselves socially constructed, actively created by human agency. Rather than separating out structure and agency as an oppositional dualism, structuration theory proposes a duality whereby agency and structure are inter-related, and iterative:

... structural forces work through the relational webs within which we live, as we both use and constitute the structures which surround us. Our ‘context’ is thus actively constituted through our actions. Equally we are implicated and constituted by the structuring forces which reach us through the relational webs within which we live. The structuring is therefore inside ourselves (ibid:46 emphasis original).

Thus, according to Healey (1997:47), Giddens’ structuration theory requires that ‘structures are shaped by agency, just as they in turn shape agency’ (emphasis original). A social constructionist position allows Healey (ibid:49) to envision ‘the micro-practices of everyday life [as] key sites for the mobilisation of transformative power’. By this she means that we have the capacity, given sufficient reflexivity and knowledge of the structuring forces, to change our positions and the way we think about things. Through Habermasian communicative ethics, Healey believes this transformative power can be realised. Thus Healey argues for a reconceptualisation of public policy making, and local environmental planning to involve ‘processes of intersubjective communication in the public sphere, through which dynamic mutual learning takes place’ and ideally, consensus is reached (ibid:55). For Healey (ibid:53) then, planning ‘becomes a process of interactive collective reasoning, carried out in the medium of language’.

Although similar in substance, Forester takes a slightly different approach. Unlike Healey, who prescribes a normative standard from which to judge practice, Forester starts with planning practice as communicative action. Forester (1989:3-4) understands planning as the ‘guidance of future action’ with the aim of enhancing ‘public welfare and social justice’. He takes planning practitioners’ work as the point from which to identify (theorise)
the skills needed for effective, democratic, progressive and ethical practice (see Forester 1989, 1993, 1998, 1999a, 1999b). Planning theory is:

... what planners need when they get stuck: another way to formulate a problem, a way to anticipate outcomes, a source of reminders about what is important, a way of paying attention that provides direction, strategy and coherence (Forester 1989:137).

Forester (1989:139) describes his approach as a critical theory which ‘assesses social and political-economic structures as systematic patterns of practical communicative interaction’. Through a progressive planning praxis, Forester (1989, 1999a) argues that, where planners listen astutely and make critical judgements about the quality of communications, mutual understanding and a transformative social learning can result. Planning practice can then become enabling and empowering rather than disabling through the power and politics of distorted communications – that is those that do not meet the ideal speech conditions (Forester 1989).

There are several other proponents of communicative planning theory, notably Judith Innes, and Charles Hoch. Other theorists, such as Jean Hillier, John Ploger, and Ernest Alexander have a favourable view of the communicative approach but combine different theories to counter perceived weaknesses. In addition, theorists of deliberative democracy are similarly influenced by Habermas’ theory of communicative action. Deliberative democracy is a branch of democratic theory and refers to the idea that:

Legitimate lawmaking issues from the public deliberation of citizens. As a normative account of legitimacy, deliberative democracy evokes ideals of rational legislation, participatory politics, and civic self-governance. In short it presents an ideal of political autonomy based on the practical reasoning of citizens (Bohman and Rehg 1997:ix).

Habermasian deliberative democrats include John Dryzek, Seyla Benhabib, John Elster, James Bohman. In addition, Iris Marion Young and Chantal Mouffe present a more radical view, which builds on similar literature. Figure 2.3 is adapted from previous work (see Bond 2002) and provides a basic summary of the conditions for and outcomes of communicative planning as it might be applied to a participatory process. The conditions and outcomes are derived from a review of a range of communicative and deliberative theorists’ work (Bohman 1997; Dryzek 1990; Forester 1989, 1999a; Gutmann and Thompson 2001; Healey 1997; Hillier 1993; Innes 1996).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONDITIONS FOR COMMUNICATIVE PLANNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Engenders trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Legitimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Opportunity of access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uncoerced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Power distortions are minimised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collective interest overrides self-interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES OF COMMUNICATIVE PLANNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Consensus or collective agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of shared understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acknowledgement of difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social learning – transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engenders sense of ownership of outcomes by participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3 – The conditions for and outcomes of communicative planning as an ideal or standard for effective participatory processes. (Source: Bond 2002)

There are parallels between the principles of good practice as shown in Table 2.1 above and the ideal characteristics of communicative theory. However, Figure 2.3 in effect does little more than provide principles for good practice and desired outcomes, it says little about power, except that it exists and should be mitigated. In fact, communicative planning does more than this by characterising the nature of argumentation and the claims made to justify particular arguments in the ideal speech situation. However, its reliance on providing an ideal is problematic, even though this ideal is acknowledged as an impossibility. The question is: what does this mean in terms of understanding the real effects of power relations? To explore this question, the following section examines the debate on communicative planning theory.

2.4 Debating Communicative Planning Theory – The Question of Power

Critics of communicative planning theory argue that it deals insufficiently with notions of difference, cultural diversity, and the politics of real life planning practice, and as such, is utopian (see Flyvbjerg 1998a, 2002; Hillier 1993; Huxley 2000; Huxley and Yiftachel 2000; McGuirk 2001; Tewdwyr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998). The question of power underlies these criticisms. For example, McGuirk (2001:196) argues that communicative planning theory ‘pays insufficient attention to the practical context of power relations in which planning practice is situated, thereby assuming away, rather than engaging with, the politics-laden interests that infiltrate planning deliberation’. Similarly, while Hillier (2002) supports
the normative principles that the theory provides, she (1993:95) argues that Habermasian analysis alone ‘does not allow sufficient consideration of the why and how issues of power relations’. In order to tease out why communicative planning deals insufficiently with questions of power, three key issues are explored – the nature of communication and ideal speech; inclusivity; and consensus.

2.4.1 Communication and Ideal Speech

As indicated above, communicative planning theory prescribes the nature of communication that is desirable in planning decision-making and participatory processes. Yet several theorists argue that communicative planning theory is overly idealistic and privileges a particular style of argumentation. Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger (1998:1981-2) make the case that participants may not always be honest, and ‘that individuals can deliberately obfuscate the facts and judgements for their own benefit and for the benefit of their own argument’. The problem of discovering participants’ honesty and motivations for involvement in public processes continues to plague academics and practitioners alike. Yet the ideal speech situation relies on this premise. To further understand the assumptions underlying Habermas’ theory of communication it is useful to turn to the conditions of the ideal speech situation.

For Habermas, the ability to reason is innate in every human being, and such reasoning occurs through the medium of language. Indeed, Habermas understands (after Wittgenstein) that the inherent objective or telos of language use lies in reaching understanding with others through reasoning. We speak and communicate because we wish for others to understand what we say and share our own understanding. We explain and justify our positions to facilitate this understanding in everyday communications. Thus communicative rationality is understood as the disposition of individuals who communicate through language (Habermas 1984). Mutual understanding is the aim of communications but communicative practice reaches its successful end in intersubjectively shared agreement, or consensus between parties. The rationality is implicit:

... in the fact that a communicatively achieved agreement must be based in the end on reasons. And the rationality of those who participate in this communicative practice is determined by whether, if necessary, they could, under suitable circumstances, provide reasons for their expressions (ibid:17-18 emphasis original).

These suitable conditions are that of the ideal speech situation, in which participants engage in argumentation where they are free to make claims and arguments in an arena that:
Excludes all force – whether it arises from within the process of reaching understanding itself or influences it from the outside – except the force of the better argument (and thus that it also excludes, on their part, all motives except that of a co-operative search for the truth) (Habermas 1984:25).

Consensus is the inevitable outcome of the ideal speech situation so long as argumentation can be ‘conducted openly enough and continued long enough’ (ibid:42). Thus, argumentation is central to Habermas’ theory, in that reasons given are capable of objective evaluation as to their validity. These validity claims – that is, the underlying validity of the reasons put forth in argumentation – are either accepted or rejected, and alternative claims put forth, until agreement (on the validity of the claims and therefore the argument) is reached. Validity claims must be ‘grounded’ or ‘redeemed’ through argument (ibid:26), and claims vary with the type of action and the particular context within which they occur (ibid:36). Validity claims fall under four types: comprehensibility, truth, truthfulness/sincerity, and normative rightness (Habermas 1998a:23). For Habermas (ibid:22-23), anyone acting communicatively must:

choose an intelligible expression so that speaker and hearer can comprehend one another. The speaker must have the intention of communicating a true proposition (or a proposition content, the existential presuppositions of which are satisfied) so that the hearer can share the knowledge of the speaker. The speaker must want to express her intentions truthfully so that the hearer can find the utterance of the speaker credible (can trust her). Finally, the speaker must choose an utterance that is right with respect to prevailing norms and values so that the hearer can accept the utterance, and both speaker and hearer can, in the utterance, thereby agree with one another with respect to a recognised normative background (emphasis original; see also 1984:307-8).

Thus the validity claims of comprehensibility, truth, truthfulness and normative rightness refer (respectively) to whether the argument is clear and understandable; is an accurate representation of facts; is sincere in regard to the speakers intention in making the statement; and is legitimate and appropriate for the speaker to make that claim as against the commonly held norms and values of that particular context (Habermas 1998a:92). Both

---

2 Not all statements that occur in argumentation are underpinned by validity claims. For example, Habermas suggests arbitrary demands such as imperatives that require a yes/no response in the ‘sense of the willingness or refusal to comply with the expression of another’s will’ are ‘power claims’ (1984:38). For Habermas, validity claims ‘mean that the hearer agrees or does not agree with a criticisable expression and does so in light of grounds or reasons; such positions are the expression of insight or understanding’ (ibid).

3 In later work, after the publication of The Theory Communicative Action first published in German in 1981, comprehensibility seemed to have been dropped in favour of propositional truth, truthfulness/sincerity, and normative rightness.
Forester (1989) and Healey (1997, 1998a) make direct links to these validity claims and the ideal speech situation. Forester argues:

Without comprehensibility in interaction, we have not meaning but confusion. Without a measure of sincerity, we have manipulation or deceit rather than trust. When a speaker’s claims are illegitimately made we have abuse rather than the exercise of authority. And when we cannot gauge the truth of what is claimed, we will be unable to tell the difference between reality and propaganda, fact and fantasy (1989:144 emphasis original).

Similarly, Healey (1997:265) argues that claims can be evaluated by their ‘comprehensibility, integrity, legitimacy and truth’. Thus, Healey and Forester take these ideal characteristics or qualities of speech as a standard to aspire to in planning and participatory practices and from which to evaluate the kinds of distortions that occur in everyday communications when these validity claims are not fulfilled. Distortions occur when the conditions for ideal speech are not met.

However, Flyvbjerg and Richardson (2002) question whether argumentation can be judged as good or bad on the basis of the validity claims put forth. In their view, Habermasian validity claims do not provide adequate criteria for assessing an argument. Similarly, Healey (and indeed Habermas) appears silent on the question of how in practice to identify the quality and nature of the validity claims made in argumentation. However, Forester (1989) recognises the issue and describes the art of critical listening as the answer. He (ibid) makes a distinction between hearing as passive and listening as active. Forester (ibid) elaborates:

Hearing is easy. Listening seems, mistakenly, not to be. We can hear words, but miss what is meant. We can hear what is intended, but miss what is important. We can hear what is important, but neglect the person speaking. As we listen though we can learn and nurture relationships as well. Listening is an action of being attentive (ibid:108).

For Forester, critical listening involves careful questioning, and listening with more than just one’s ears, but also with one’s eyes. Being attentive can engender mutual relationships, conversation, trust, and can render significant values, concerns, tensions and ambiguities visible in a respectful, supportive space (ibid). While this approach is valuable and necessary to ensure legitimate and inclusive practices, it does not address questions concerning the professional perspective of the planner, or the ideology of those with expert knowledge as outlined in Chapter One.

Habermas links ideology with what he describes as systematically distorted communications which is a form of strategic action rather than communicative action. Communicative action is oriented towards agreement, whereas strategic action is that
oriented towards self gain or the actor's own success (Habermas 1998b). Strategic action can be either openly acknowledged or concealed. Concealed strategic action can be conscious – where an actor consciously deceives others in the communicative arena such that they believe that all other conditions of ideal speech are met. Thus the strategic actor manipulates the outcome to their own needs. Or strategic action can be an unconscious deception of the actor's orientation towards success (Habermas 1984). This kind of self-deception results in systematically distorted communication (ibid), but will appear normalised and fair, thereby removing the very means by which it might be judged to be distorted (Eagleton 1991). This poses a significant problem. If the model of ideal speech is to serve as a useful tool in the evaluation of participatory events in the public sphere and the power relations that occur within, it must be possible to distil the nature of power relations that result in systematically distorted actions. Ideology is revisited in Chapter Three, while further discussion the concept of validity claims in Habermas' ideal speech situation are explored below.

A key question is why and in what circumstances certain validity claims or arguments are accepted over others. This links back to the Foucauldian question asserted in Chapter One – 'What is this Reason that we use?' (Foucault 1984a:249). The underlying premise of this question is the recognition that certain knowledges, ways of thinking and seeing prevail and dominate at different times. The way in which those knowledges are normalised means they are not contestable nor are the effects of their distortions visible. And as noted above, even if distortions were discernable, communicative planning theory does not provide a way of questioning the effect or reason for those distortions. The idea that communication in participatory processes should be inclusive, open, honest, sincere and legitimate is not new. As indicated above, participation literature has evoked such principles for good participatory practices (see section 2.2), and many of these elements 'are good old fashioned democratic common sense' (Hall 1996:392). While Healey refers to structures shaping individuals and contexts, the implications of the structural shaping for the way people argue and understand arguments is not made explicit. This is important and will be considered in relation to inclusivity in the following section.

2.4.2 Inclusivity

The objective of ensuring inclusivity by searching 'out the universe of those affected' to ensure that they are heard and influence the decisions taken, sets deliberative and collaborative processes apart from traditional planning (Healey 1997:267). The ideal of
inclusiveness also lies at the core of deliberative democracy as its key source of legitimacy (Benhabib 1996a; Dryzek 2001; Young 1996). There are two issues relevant to communicative planning theory. The first assumes it is possible to both identify who is likely to be affected and ensure their participation which is known to be problematic (see section 2.2 above). The second lies in the assumption that it is possible to achieve equality within the process, such that all voices are heard and considered equally in the decision-making process. Both issues are discussed in turn below.

**Equality of Process**

The issue of the inclusivity of all affected by the decisions to be made raises several questions both at a pragmatic and theoretical level. First, there is a question of definition or scope – what does ‘affect’ mean in practical terms? How, exactly does one determine who is affected, and to what extent should they be affected in order for them to be included? There are questions of practicalities – resources, the nature of the type of process, and its purpose – that are likely to determine how far the search for those affected will go. Related, and more problematic, is the question of ‘economy’ as Dryzek (2001:652) puts it. What if those affected are too numerous to be practically involved in deliberation, or at least, any meaningful and manageable deliberation? With a focus on how to achieve legitimacy, Dryzek (2001) reviews several possible solutions to this issue which involves ways of restricting numbers of participants and maintaining some degree of representation for those affected. The same position is implied by writers such as Young (1999:155) who suggest that ‘a deliberative process is legitimate only if all interests, opinions, and perspectives present in the polity are included in the deliberations’ rather than individuals. An alternative approach is where ‘those who do participate in the proceeding … call to mind the interests of those who do not participate’ (Dryzek 2001:655). Indeed, this is the approach favoured by Healey (1997:275) who suggests that ‘the inclusionary challenge is to prevent those not present from being absent’, through maintaining ‘active respect and appreciation’ for those not present (emphasis original). If representation then becomes the necessary means to facilitate inclusivity in the context of large populations (Dryzek 2001; Goodin 2000; Plotke 1997; Rancière 2006; Young 2000), what form should representation take?

The etymology of representation lies in the idea of something being made present again as in re-presentation (Pitkin 1967). From this, Pitkin (1967:9), in her seminal work, suggests a definition of representation as ‘the making present in some sense of something which is nevertheless not present literally or in fact’ (emphasis original). There are a variety
of different ways in which representation has been constructed. For example, authoritarian theorists suggest representation must be authorised by the represented. Similarly, accountability theorists argue representatives must be accountable for their actions after the fact. Both perspectives conceptualise representatives acting for others. However, there is no further specification on what the representative is required to do in the act of representation (ibid). Two further accounts emphasise how representatives stand for others either in a substituted mirror image or by symbolic connection. But standing for others takes no heed of the characteristic trait of representation which involves acting on behalf of others.

The ‘mandate – independence’ debate comes closer to explaining what representatives do in the act of representing, but the duality is not useful as the extreme of each position becomes something other than representation (Pitkin 1967). For instance, the mandate position emphasises the role of the representative as doing what the represented would want as a delegate, or a substitute. However, a pure delegate or substitute (were it possible) would be akin to direct participation – or as Laclau (1990:38-39) puts it ‘if the representative and the represented constitute the same and single will, the ‘re’ of representation disappears’. The independence position suggests that the representative acts on the other’s interests as a trustee, or an expert. But pure independence would generate too great a distance between the actions of the representative and the will of the represented. Representation in common usage tends to mix the middle grounds of both positions.

As a result, several theorists argue that representation should include both, allowing for the independent judgement of the representative, while they simultaneously act in a way that is consistent with the will of the represented (Bickford 1999; Mansbridge 1999; Pitkin 1967; Plotke 1997; Urbinati 2005; Young 2000). The requirement that there is some connection between parties and an understanding of the interests of the represented requires communication or dialogue (Plotke 1997; Young 2000). Representation therefore becomes a relation of mutuality that extends through space and time which establishes both authority and accountability (Young 2000). Representation then has the potential to address the economy question without compromising the democratic character of the process.

However, there are further difficulties. Assuming that the question of economy and the question of identification has been addressed, how does one ensure that those interests do participate? There is evidence to suggest that participation in the public sphere has dramatically reduced over the last decades (for example, Eliasoph 1998; Putnam 1993, 2000). The question is why do people, when given the opportunity to participate in a process which will produce outcomes that may affect their lives either directly or indirectly, decline
the opportunity to participate? Assuming individuals have full knowledge of the opportunity to participate and the potential effects of the proposal, the pros and cons can be weighed and a decision to participate or not can be made accordingly. But what if insufficient knowledge is available and the effects are unknown? Clearly, there are logistical reasons for non-participation, such as being unable to attend at the given time. There are issues of trust and legitimacy of the process – people may feel that there is no point in becoming involved because of a belief that their views will not be heard or that the decision has already been taken. However, there are arguably more systemic or structural reasons for non-participation. For example, some people may be too busy struggling with day to day living to contemplate attending such events even if they are aware of them. Others may find the nature of the process intimidating or be uncomfortable speaking in front of strangers.

Several commentators argue that a degree of social capacity is required for effective participation in democratic processes (Bohman 1997; Healey 1997; Knight and Johnson 1997). Resources are fundamental to the existence of that social capacity, including material wealth (Knight and Johnson 1997), knowledge, effective organisation, and access to the media (Fainstein 2000). Similarly, social capitalists argue that higher levels of social capital in a polity result in higher levels of participation (Putnam 1993, 2000). Another argument, which seeks to acknowledge and address the issue of non-participation involves the idea that direct action is a legitimate form of participation. Hillier (2002:335n5) refers to direct action as general lobbying activities such as survey evidence, petitions, lobbying politicians or key actors directly, letter-writing, demonstrations and sit-ins, rallies and marches, use of the media, and so on. Often direct action occurs when there is some disillusionment or distrust with other democratic processes (Young 2001). Direct action, or action that occurs outside conventional governance institutions is becoming increasingly important in local political spaces (Hillier 2002:91). Moreover, if direct action provides a voice for the voiceless, is it not also legitimate (ibid)?

Both Hillier (2002) and Young (2001) recognise that in reality it is often the already mobilised groups with resources and existing voice who participate in direct action. These are issues not easily addressed and deliberative theory fails to provide adequate answers (Young 2001). However, where direct action arises alongside and relating to a specific formal participatory process, questions must be asked relating to who acts, how they act, what their issues are, and why they have taken up direct action rather than taken part in the formal process. Moreover, equality of access is only part of the equation.
Equality within the process

The second key issue concerns equality within the process. Communicative planning theorists advocate an equality of voice in deliberations. Yet because of the Habermasian emphasis on the ideal speech situation involving the uncoerced force of the better argument, communicative theorists and deliberative democrats have been accused of treating the role of power in communication unrealistically. Young (1996:122) suggests:

Deliberative theorists tend to assume that bracketing political and economic power is sufficient to make speakers equal. This assumption fails to notice that the social power that can prevent people from being equal speakers derives not only from economic dependence or political domination but also from an internalised sense of the right one has to speak or not to speak, and from the devaluation of some peoples’ style of speech and the elevation of others.

Similarly, Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger (1998) argue that the theory says little about voice and resources, or the power of individuals within the process. Yet both Healey and Forester argue that cognisant of the power relations inherent in all planning processes and the potential for systematically distorted communications. They both argue for some notion of empowerment, whereby those who have a stake in the decisions to be made are provided with an opportunity to have a say in that process (see Forester 1989, 1999a; Healey 1997). The question of how such ‘giving voice’ is ensured, continues to plague both deliberative democrats and planning theorists. For example, Benhabib (1996a) asks how can we guard against deliberations in which agreement is achieved by silencing opposing or minority positions or by the imposition of the norms of a dominant majority?

The issue returns to the question of the ability of a model for practice to realise its intention to create inclusive equitable praxis when it is derived from a concept of communication which assumes equality within the public sphere. The reality is that not everyone is empowered in the same way to fulfil that role, nor are all claims to reason treated equally. Certainly Habermas, Forester and Healey all believe in the transformative potential of communicative speech, in which imbalances of power can be overcome and that people are capable of learning and changing positions in the process of communication, and are therefore capable of reaching agreement. Others concur. For example, Innes and Booher (2003:56) argue, ‘the remarkable reality is that, despite the obstacles, collaborative practices are being put to use’. This claim is based on empirical evidence and practical experience in a range of collaborative processes over more than a decade. Yet these studies too do not pay enough attention to the structural constraints which enable some people to speak in certain spheres while others are disabled, and which legitimises certain knowledges while excluding
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others (Young 2001). The exclusion of particular knowledges and positions is inherent to seeking consensus, and as such is the third issue relevant to questions of power.

2.4.3 Consensus

An ideal speech situation, will, in perfect conditions – that is where claims to openness, honesty, sincerity, and legitimacy are raised and accepted in uncoerced argumentation over a long enough period of time – result in mutual understanding and ultimately consensus. The focus is on process and procedural requirements for a good process rather than on outcomes. A Habermasian approach assumes that a good process results in consensus and this equates to good outcomes. However, the problematic nature of consensus is well debated both in planning and in deliberative theory. Indeed, Dryzek (2001:661) suggests that ‘the ideal of consensus has long been rejected by most deliberative democrats, ... though their opponents have not always noticed’.

However, several communicative planning theorists continue to posit consensus as an important goal of communicative processes (for example, Healey 1997, 1998a, 1998b; Innes 1996, Innes and Booher 1999a 1999b, 2003). And indeed, the issue leads back to the problematic identified in Chapter One – unless some agreement is sought, planning as an activity risks reverting to its pre-occupation with technocratic objective knowledge. How are decisions (with an intended universal effect) to be taken such that they justly account for the inevitably differential impact on (particular) values and knowledges of individuals? Surely some degree of agreement is necessary to enable planning to proceed. Some theorists prefer the lesser goal of achieving mutual understanding (for example, Forester 1989, 1999a), while others acknowledge that only in rare circumstances will consensus be achieved (for example, Hillier 2002, 2003; Ploger 2001, 2004). There are several issues that inter-relate both at the theoretical and pragmatic levels.

First there is the question of whether in fact consensus is desirable. In seeking consensus as an end-point in collaboration, there is an assumption that a collective, unanimous decision is possible. Healey (1997) clearly believes consensus is both desirable and possible, and yet, she recognises the diversity and complexity within our societies. She argues that consensus building processes can shift the nature of debates from a conflictual adversarial focus on competitive interests to discussion with a collective focus which generates mutual learning, new alliances, and is sensitive to diversity. She (1997:279) claims that this ‘rich’, ‘inclusive’ ‘culture-building’ process will ‘express a robust consensus’. In making this statement, Healey implicitly acknowledges that there are degrees
of consensus. But how strong must a consensus be in order to be legitimate and represent a good decision? Where strong consensus is achieved the outcome may be so weak as to be undesirable or unsustainable. Yet a strong consensus infers a high degree of democratic legitimacy. Conversely, where a weak consensus is achieved, the outcome may be more desirable (to some) and possibly more sustainable, yet with less democratic legitimacy. This relates to a significant problem of deliberative democracy and participatory planning. Does consensus as the goal of participatory or communicative planning result in better or more legitimate decisions? Arguably, consensus as it is enacted in many situations does not necessarily add legitimacy. Indeed, as noted above, this is the position to which many planning theorists and deliberative democrats sympathetic to the communicative model are coming (for example, Benhabib 1996a; Dryzek 2001; Hillier 2002; Young 2001).

The second issue is whether in fact consensus can be reached at all. As Mouffe (1999) argues, where there is a concept of collective agreement there is always an us/them dichotomy – there will always be those who disagree with the outcome, the constituted ‘other’. The issue is whether the constituted other is adversely affected, marginalised or disadvantaged by the decisions taken. The belief in the possibility of a collective agreement assumes that different positions and interests can be transcended in favour of some common unified good. Furthermore, Mouffe argues that ‘every consensus exists as a temporary result of a provisional hegemony, as a stabilization of power and that always entails some form of exclusion’ (Mouffe 1999:756). Clearly the goal of seeking consensus is inherently contradictory when viewed from a pluralist position which celebrates individuation and difference. Can it be assumed in any given situation that there are ‘sufficient shared understandings to appeal to’ in contexts of conflictual collective problem solving (Young 1996:125)?

One approach suggested by growing numbers of planning theorists rests in an understanding that conflict and antagonism lie at the heart of every planning negotiation, and that there is value in understanding agonism as being inherent in planning processes. This marks a shift away from Habermas’ notion of uncoerced argumentation. Gray (1995:116) traces the term agonistic to the Greek work agon, which has ‘the meaning both of a contest, competition or rivalrous encounter’. Agonism has been debated as a way forward for theories of pluralist democracy that moves away from both moral and interest based liberalism (see Benhabib 1996b). According to Hillier (2002, 2003), the term agonistic has been used by philosophers from Nietzsche, Arendt, and Foucault to political theorists Mouffe, Young, Connolly, Mansbridge and Wolin. Moreover, it is a concept that has
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recently emerged in planning theory (see Gunder 2003; Hillier 2002, 2003; Ploger 2004). A key distinction is made between antagonism (undesirable, power ridden, domination and disabling) and agonism (through which difference is recognised and power becomes enabling).

Foucault (2003:139) describes agonism as ‘a relationship which is at the same time reciprocal incitation and struggle; less of a face-to-face confrontation which paralyses both sides than a permanent provocation’. Mouffe (1995, 1999) provides a useful explanation, in which the ‘other’ in politics should be seen as an adversary rather than an enemy. An adversary is a legitimate enemy, who may have conflicting views, but the relationship is mutually respectful of the rights to voice and to defend values, positions and emotions. Moreover, the mutual respect inherent to a relationship between adversaries relies on a shared commitment to ethical and moral democratic principles (ibid). Similarly, Connolly (1998:122) describes agonistic respect as ‘a social relation of respect for the opponent against whom you define yourself even while you resist its imperatives and strive to delimit its spaces of hegemony’. Several planning theorists have drawn on this conception of adversary (for example, Hillier 2002, 2003; Ploger 2004).

Thus the concept of ‘other’ is fundamental to the distinction between antagonism and agonism. Where politics involves the refusal, avoidance or diffusion of antagonism such as in a Habermasian inspired deliberation in which the equalisation of all players is deemed possible, the inherent us/them relationship always results in exclusion or silencing of one party (Mouffe 1995, 2000). So where Mouffe starts from an acceptance of the essentially antagonistic nature of the public sphere, a Habermasian approach starts from an ideal of a harmonious and consensual public sphere, from which power and antagonism is bracketed. As Hillier (2002:39) suggests, ‘Habermas annuls differences between people. Participants become equal by bracketing difference. Difference is turned into exclusion’. However, by acknowledging the ineradicability of antagonism (Mouffe 1999) and by recognising ‘other’ as an adversary, critical co-player, or friendly enemy (Ploger 2004:72; Mouffe 2000), it may be possible to reorient the us/them distinction to avoid exclusion. As Mouffe (1995:263) argues:

The prime task of democratic politics is not to eliminate passions, not to relegate them to the private sphere in order to render rational consensus possible, but to mobilise these passions in such a way that promotes democratic designs. Far from jeopardising democracy, agonistic confrontation is in fact its very condition of existence.
Furthermore, Connolly (1998:123) describes the possibility of shifting antagonism to agonism as establishing a:

... space for politics [that] can be opened through a degree of reciprocity amid contestation; new possibilities for the negotiation of difference are created by identifying traces in the other of the sensibility one identifies in oneself locating in the self elements of the sensibility attributed to the other.

Recent work by planning theorists such as Hillier (2002, 2003), Gunder (2003) and Ploger (2004) acknowledge the inherent antagonism and agonism in planning practices. In particular they see the potential for democratic planning practices that address pluralism through reorienting an understanding of conflict to that of agonism. However, there remains questions of pragmatics. Indeed, Ploger (2004) suggests that recognising an agonistic planning practice is constrained by the very planning systems (at least in Denmark) that exist. Furthermore, he suggests that planning regimes prioritise legal and therefore antagonistic relations to institute permanent solutions to conflict, rather than providing a space for agonistic respectful disputes.

Even if the required shift in conceiving of conflictual relationships did occur, how, in planning practice, does an acknowledgement of the agonistic nature of planning help in producing sound outcomes or better decisions? If we accept that it is not possible to have a power neutral public sphere as per Habermas’ ideal speech situation, how does acknowledging an agonistic space help? In Habermas’ model, a good (ideal) process equates to good, just outcomes. As Forester (1999a:202) argues, the Habermasian model can be interpreted as ‘disturbingly ahistorical and overidealised’. However, neither Habermasian ideals nor an agonistic pluralism necessarily answers the key questions facing democratic theorists which is, according to Benhabib (1996b:8):

... are the people always wise? Are their decisions always just? Is the will that guides them always worthy of respect? Radical visions of agonistic politics are subject to the kinds of objections which liberal-constitutional theory articulates so well: the democratic demos may be unjust, racist, fickle, and capricious.

The answer is far from clear. The public sphere in which the types of planning processes under study are a part, are characterised by the plurality and complexity of contemporary polities, and are suffused with unceasing power relations and contestations. Yet as far as planning theory has adopted parts of Habermas’ theory, the notion of an uncoerced and power neutral public sphere is antithetical to the realities of participatory practices. However, communicative planning theory has value in articulating principles for an inclusionary planning that moves beyond the perceived limits of aggregative democracy which reduces decision making to an expression of preferences on options decided by others.
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(Laclau and Mouffe 2001). While there is always the possibility of an unjust demos, the recognition of ongoing agonism in the public sphere permeated by antagonism provides an entry point into a different kind of recognition of how power relations constitute and are constituted by communicative processes.

Thus power comes to the fore again in regard to consensus. If a consensus is achieved, for whom is it achieved? There are always those who win and those who lose, and those who will hold steadfastly to their position (Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998). But the question is who are the ‘losers’, and if, as Mouffe suggests every consensus is achieved through a hegemonising process, then how can equitable and just results ensue. Similarly, because consensus in a communicative act is achieved through the process of argumentation and the acceptance or rejection of validity claims, how do we know what the roots of those validity claims are? Are they similarly the product of hegemonic processes? There is still an inadequate understanding of power, and without such an understanding, relying on honest, open, sincere, and legitimate communication is problematic. How can such qualities be assessed? In particular, how can systematically distorted communications which are the effect of power relations, be identified when they are concealed (and unknown) to the participants in the process? What privilege does a researcher have in being able to discern their operation, if they are concealed to the participants because of the way in which they are normalised into everyday life? Even if the distortion were discernible to others within the process, there is an empirical difficulty in ensuring they are revealed to a researcher. It seems clear that the researcher would have to become involved in the communicative act itself. But then there may be further distortions caused by the presence of the researcher – a problem well recognised in ethnographic and feminist research (for example England 1994; Herbert 2000; McDowell 1992; Mullings 1999; Tedlock 2000). But even more fatal, is perhaps the difficulty in finding a way to tease out the ‘why and how’ of the power plays that cause the distortion in the first instance.

Two quite different propositions have emerged, albeit with the same goal – that is, to enhance the democratic nature of decision-making in the public sphere (Laclau and Mouffe 2001). On the one hand, the Habermasian inspired normative model seeks inclusive, just, deliberative arenas in which power is neutralised and consensus is achievable. On the other hand, a conception of the political sphere is posited in which antagonism is understood to be its primary condition of existence. The principle goal of a radical democratic politics lies in transforming antagonism between enemies into agonism between reciprocal, mutually respected adversaries. Thus a two pronged approach is proposed as the framework for the
current research. First, an evaluative framework is derived from taking a step away from the Habermasian roots of communicative planning theory, and yet maintaining selected normative principles, combined with an understanding of the inherent antagonism of the political sphere. To facilitate an evaluation, an Ethic for Communicative Participation is developed (see section 2.5). The second prong of the approach involves understanding the inherently antagonistic character of the social and employing a discourse theory perspective for the present research in order to ensure a power sensitive methodology for the study. The underlying premises of the two prongs are outlined in the following section while the discourse theory perspective is fully explained in the next chapter.

### 2.5 An Ethic for Communicative Participation

Communicative planning provides a model for participatory practice that advocates inclusive, open, honest, legitimate and sincere processes. Although it is clear that communicative planning theory has in many respects moved beyond a strict association with the ideal speech situation, its predisposition toward consensus and an associated conception of a power neutral public sphere is problematic. To address this problem, but maintain the normative principles valuable to participatory planning practice, a combination of communicative planning theory and agonistic planning forms the basis of an Ethic for Communicative Participation (see Figure 2.4).

The Ethic for Communicative Participation builds on the conditions for and outcomes of communicative planning as depicted in Figure 2.3 (after Bond 2002). The key differences are a rejection of the notion of an uncoerced deliberative space, as an impossible ideal that brackets inherent power relations (Young 1996). Rather than mitigate or minimise power distortions, power relations (positive and negative) are recognised as an inherent part of the process. Concomitantly, the antagonistic nature of social relations is recognised, with the goal to achieve an agonistic space for deliberation. The ideal of consensus is rejected in favour of a weaker form of shared understanding consistent with acknowledging the primacy of an agonistic politics. Similarly, rather than resolving conflict, the goal is to transform antagonism into agonism. In addition the Ethic maintains the core goals for participation of inclusivity, openness, honesty, and engendering trust to enhance the legitimacy of the process. Similarly, the transformative goals of communicative planning are retained – that is, that social learning occurs and that the process engenders a sense of ownership of the outcomes. As an ethic, it clearly has parallels with some principles of good practice articulated in the more pragmatic participation literature. It provides a model for planning
that seeks to achieve social justice and a more enhanced participative democracy. As a model, it provides an evaluative frame with which to assess effective participatory practice.

### An Ethic for Communicative Participation

**Conditions for communicative participatory process**

- Provides an equal opportunity of access to the process. That is, it is inclusive and representative
- Provides equal opportunities to participate in the process by:
  - Being open, honest, legitimate, and engendering trust, and
  - Acknowledge and address different capacities
- Transparent and legitimate
- Provides an agonistic space in which contestations, passion and emotion can be expressed with reciprocal care and respect for 'other'
- Recognition and awareness of inherent power plays within process. The effect of power plays are assessed through careful listening, interpretation, and facilitation.

**Outcomes of Communicative Participation**

- Shared understanding is achieved
- Social learning occurs:
  - Shared understandings are developed;
  - Collective interest over-rides self-interest, and
  - Antagonism is transformed into agonism
- The process engenders a sense of ownership of the outcomes

Figure 2.4 – An ethic for communicative participation, derived from the discourse on communicative planning theory as it has evolved

However, while the recognition of the inherently conflictual nature of political space is incorporated into the ethic, it says little about what is meant by power, and what its effects might be. Moreover, it places the role of assessing the power relations squarely on the shoulders of those organising the process, that is, the facilitators, interpreters and listeners. The primary problem this research seeks to address is the very power those players wield. Consequently, the second prong of the research approach addresses this problem by drawing on discourse theory after Laclau and Mouffe (2001) as an analytical means to explore the nature of power in participatory processes. A turn to post-structuralism, including the work of Foucault on power and discourse underpins discourse theory, and provides a way forward for the current study. The following chapter explains the nature of this second core
component of the research, and draws together the normative and analytical components which will be employed in the current study.
Chapter 3
Negotiating a Framework

3.1 Introduction

While Chapter Two established a normative framework for the present study, the task for this chapter is to establish the analytical framework with which to analyse the two urbanist participatory processes used as cases for the present study. This chapter traces the development of the framework, explaining the concepts and rationale that underlie it. First, the notion of power is discussed, teasing out a conceptualisation appropriate to both the questions for this study and the approach taken to answer them (section 3.2.1). The section turns to a Foucauldian understanding which is adopted for the research (section 3.2.2), in which power is inextricable with the construction of knowledge and the way in which meanings are framed. Accordingly, a concept of discourse as a means to undertake a power sensitive analysis of participatory planning processes is explored. As a result, section 3.3 links a Foucauldian conception of power to a framework of analysis derived from Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe’s theory of discourse. Laclau and Mouffe (2001:xix) seek to instigate a radical and plural democracy by a new hegemonic project of the left, which in turn requires a clear understanding of ‘the nature of power relations, and the dynamics of politics’. Their project is explained in their book Hegemony and Socialist Strategy, first published in 1985\(^1\). Subsequent publications by both authors individually have extended their basic premises\(^2\).

Laclau and Mouffe (2001) articulate a theory of discourse that promotes a radical democracy based on the idea that the social is inherently antagonistic. This theme was introduced in Chapter Two as a means to escape the exclusiveness of a process oriented towards consensus, in favour of an alternative understanding of planning, politics and democracy as agonistic. Moreover, Laclau and Mouffe argue that antagonism marks the contestation of different discourses for dominance, all a result of power plays within social space. The subsections within section 3.3 outline the key concepts that comprise Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory. Section 3.4 establishes those concepts within an analytical

\(^1\) Laclau and Mouffe (2001) is the second edition of Hegemony and Socialist Strategy.

\(^2\) For example, Laclau 1990, 1995, 1996; and Mouffe 1993, 2000, 2005
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framework that combines the communicative ethic for participation established in Chapter Two, and which is applied to the cases under study in the latter half of this thesis.

The aim, in employing this approach is to enable distortive power relations (or in Habermasian terms systematically distorted communications) to be exposed through a focus on the very conditions of possibility on which those communications rest and the assumptions that underpin them. This allows a move beyond the difficulty noted in Chapter Two of identifying hidden structurally determined power relations. By drawing on a framework of concepts within a discourse theoretical approach that focuses on the ways in which meanings are constituted and constitutive (after Laclau and Mouffe), combined with Foucauldian concept of power, the power relationships that occur within the two urbanist participatory processes under study can be understood at a structural level. The purpose of this chapter is twofold. First, it outlines how a path between the literature derived from communicative planning theory and discourse theory was negotiated in order to establish a theoretical framework for this study. Philosophically, there has been much debate about both the incompatibility and the synergies between theories underpinned by Habermas’ thought on one hand and Foucault’s on the other hand (Ashendon and Owen 1999; Devenney 2004; Hoy 1998; Kelly 1994). The current study contributes to these debates at an empirical level, seeking to draw together the critical nature of discourse theory at the analytical level with the normative framework of the communicative ethic. Second, it establishes a conceptual frame and appropriate research questions to address the research problem and objectives identified in Chapter One.

3.2 The Centrality of Power

Defining power is no small task and has plagued many, including philosophers and sociologists for centuries. Planning theory is no exception. As Clegg (1989:xv) argues, ‘there is no such thing as a single all embracing concept of power per se’. Nevertheless, he continues, there are ways of grouping different conceptualisations of power in accordance with the perspectives and understandings that underpin them. As suggested in Chapter Two, the recognition of the potential for power to corrupt, marginalise and manipulate in planning is not new, yet several theorists have lamented the lack of attention given to issues of power in planning (Flyvbjerg 1998a; Forester 1999a; Friedmann 1998; Hillier 2002; Yiftachel 1998). More crucially, few planning theorists have grappled with the questions of what is meant by power, nor its implications for public participation in planning processes. Given the many theories of power and many different perspectives which influence how it is
conceived, it is useful (following Clegg 1989; see also Dyrberg 1997; Hindess 1996; Scott 2001) to distinguish two main trajectories along which conceptualisations of power can be aligned. On one hand a traditional understanding of power can be traced from Hobbes' work in the seventeenth century through to what was known as the community power debate (Clegg 1989) and on to contemporary community power studies. On this understanding, power is derived from the actions of agents. The following sub-section traces this lineage. On the other hand, an alternative broader conception of power can be connected with the Florentine writer Nicollo Machiavelli who worked a century earlier than Hobbes. The alternative Machiavellian understanding of power has synergies with the work of Foucault, Actor Network Theorists such as Michel Callon and Bruno Latour, and many post-structuralists, post-colonialists, and post-marxists who draw on a relational non-derivative conception of power in order to understand social phenomena (Dyrberg 1997). It is this understanding of power that underpins the current study. Thus the second sub-section takes up Foucault's conceptualisations on power and provides a justification for its use in this study.

3.2.1 Traditional Conceptualisations in Community Power

Despite the centuries old challenge of grappling with concepts of power (as noted above), a desire among political scientists to find a systematic, scientifically rigorous means to empirically measure its exercise arose in the post world war period. Thus in the 1950s and 1960s the community power debate emerged. The debate is typically characterised as the opposition between the 'elitists' and the 'pluralists'. However, as the debate progressed the terms of engagement shifted to that between 'pluralists' and 'non-decision' theorists. The progression of the debate also marked a progression in the understanding of power from a single dimensional concept to a three dimensional perspective. The following provides an overview of the debate and its proponents' arguments in order to reveal how power has been traditionally understood and how this has contributed to contemporary understandings of power.

The first phase of the community power debate involved a series of sociological studies in the 1950s that asked what is the pattern of power in political communities and

---

3 Post-Marxist is the term that has been attributed to the work of Laclau and Mouffe, and theorists influenced by their work, including David Howarth, Jacob Torfing, Aletta Norval, and Yannis Stavrakakis, primarily emanating from the University of Essex Department of Government.
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what or who influences decision-making in the government of cities. It was found that power was held by a small number of policy makers, politicians and economic or business elites. Hence, the label ‘elitists’ was attributed to the work of key authors in this debate such as Mills (1953) and Hunter (1956). Both researchers employed a reputational methodology whereby carefully selected subjects (community members – upstanding citizens and professionals – who would be likely to have an understanding of where the power to make decisions lay) were questioned on who they considered to be the most influential in their communities. Those most commonly cited individuals were deemed to be those with influence and power – the power elite.

However, the elitists’ approach was challenged. For pluralists⁴ such as political scientist Robert Dahl (1957, 1961), power was understood as being dispersed in political communities rather than solely resting in the hands of a few elites. Moreover, they argued that the elitists were ‘methodologically slack’ and lacked a precise definition of what they meant by power (Clegg 1989:8; also Dahl 1957). Consequently, Dahl (1961) and other pluralists sought to specify an empirically measurable definition of power. Hence for pluralists, power was predominantly understood as ‘A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do’ (Dahl 1957:202-3). Power was therefore directly observable in the behaviour of agents making conscious decisions in order to support their own interests or preferences (Lukes 1974).

However, this agency model of power was in turn criticised by theorists claiming that it was too narrow and mono-dimensional (Ball 1975; Bachrach and Baratz 1962, 1970; Lukes 1974). Indeed, Lukes (1974) argued that there were many examples of observations made by Dahl in Who Governs (1961) which alluded to a conceptualisation of power that went beyond his own narrow definition and methodology and thus ‘represent[ed] an insight which this one dimensional view of power [wa]s unable to exploit’ (Lukes 1974:14). The nature of these ‘insights’ were picked up on by Bachrach and Baratz (1962) who developed a broader, two dimensional perspective. Power was considered to be in play even when its effects were not directly observable in the behaviour of others and their decision-making. Bachrach and Baratz (1962, 1970) suggested that power shapes how issues are considered or, more importantly, not considered. They evoked the concept of non-decisions which may

⁴ Although see Lukes (1974) regarding the misleading nature of the label pluralist for this group of political scientists.
arise when those with power do not listen to, hear, or consider the demands of the weaker party, or where the more powerful create an environment in which the weaker party feels unable to raise the issue because of anticipated opposition (Clegg 1989). In addition, Bachrach and Baratz (1962) argued that power is exercised through the ‘mobilisation of bias’ (after Schattschneider 1960:71). Here, power is operationalised (through, for example, organisation structure, dominant values and institutions) to ensure that certain issues ‘are organised into politics while others are organised out’ (ibid), which in turn ensures that the powerful maintain control of setting and shaping agendas and dominant systems of operation – that is, the ‘rules of the game’ (Bachrach and Baratz 1970:43). Thus the community power debate shifted to one that involved the pluralists and non-decision theorists (Ball 1975) and developed a broader conceptualisation of power.

The development of the second dimension was significant in that it provoked further theorisation on the effects of power and its often masked operation. However, according to Lukes (1974), it did not go far enough since Bachrach and Baratz’s formulation maintained an emphasis on the (covert or overt) effects of power which are (only) manifest when there is conflict over interests or preferences. Moreover, the duo stated that an absence of (overt or covert) conflict was an indicator of consensus (Bachrach and Baratz 1962). Thus, the two dimensional perspective continued to rely on the observable behaviour of agents pursuing their preferences as the indicator of power. In response, Lukes (1974:24) argued that there is a third dimension to power – he asked:

Is it not the supreme and most insidious exercise of power to prevent people, to whatever degree, from having grievances by shaping their perceptions, cognitions and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things, either because they can see or imagine no alternative to it, or because they see it as natural and unchangeable, or because they value it as divinely ordained and beneficial? To assume that the absence of grievance equals a genuine consensus is simply to rule out the possibility of false or manipulated consensus by definitional fiat.

So for the two dimensional view of power, conflict is actual and observable (albeit overt or covert), whereas in Lukes’ three dimensional view conflict can be ‘potential’ or ‘latent’ (1974:24). Latent conflict exists where the interests of the powerful are contrary to the ‘real interests’ of the less powerful who may be aware or unaware of what those real interests may be (ibid:25). For Lukes, the measure of the exercise of power lies in a counterfactual standard – the hypothetical actions that B (the agent subject to the exercise of power by A) would have undertaken had A not exercised power over him/her. However, Lukes maintains an essential commitment to the individual exercise of power, which in turn
requires the primacy of some fully knowing agent (A) intentionally acting in their interests - that is, making choices according to their preferences - to bring about an alternative eventuality (Clegg 1989; Dyrberg 1997). The intentionality implies a causal connection between the agent's exercise of power and its effect. While Lukes alludes to a structural dimension of power as distorting dominant ideologies, he falls victim to the same accusation he laid at Dahl's (1961) *Who Governs* (Lukes 1974; see above) - his underlying premises of agency oriented power deny an ability to engage with the full implications of his own insights into a broader structural understanding of the patterns of power in society.

Each of these three conceptions (first, second and third dimensional views) of power maintains, as its essential premise, the idea that A causes a change that is contrary to B's interests (Lukes 1974). So for these conceptualisations, agency is the underlying conduit of power (Clegg 1989). Power is therefore derived from agency - it does not exist outside of agents' exercise of it (Dyrberg 1997). On this view, to analyse the effects of power requires a focus on the question what is power and who has the power to influence, or make a difference. For Clegg (1989), these two characteristics - the agency model and the underlying foci of inquiry - provides the trajectory back to a Hobbesian understanding of power derived from the notion of sovereignty in which a person of authority, status or standing exercises their (often legitimised) will over others. This view of power does not enquire as to how political agents become situated such that they are able to exercise power.

The community power debate marked a defining moment in how power was conceptualised. It provoked a series of developments in understanding and researching power in the specific context of local governance and decision-making which extended into other academic debates and disciplines. For example, the predominance of the agency model of power provoked adherents to Marxist thought to engage in questions of structure and agency and the role of power in structures (for example, Poulantzas 1973; Whitt 1979; Wright 1985; see Clegg 1989 for review). In turn, the oppositional duality that forced a choice between structure or agency was recognised as obstructing more productive accounts of power which initiated alternative ways of conceptualising structure/agency (for example, Giddens 1976, 1984; Whitt 1979). Thus the community power debate became a crucial constituent to the variety of ways in which contemporary understandings of power are theorised and empirically investigated. Indeed, the prominence of this debate has been recently recognised as concepts of pluralist community power have been regenerated for their value in understanding specific power relations in local government decision and policy making arenas (see Harding 1996; Maginn 2004; Scott 2001).
Nevertheless, the agency oriented understanding of power omits consideration of the structural dimensions of power and the ways in which rationalities shape and are shaped by different knowledges generated through social systems, institutions, practices and crucially, the operation of discourses. As suggested in Chapter Two, these shaping processes are acts of power – but not ones that derive from the singular acts of agents (whether those agents be individuals, groups or organisations). For the purposes of this thesis an agency model of power does not provide an adequate lens to understand how a professional ideology impacts on the nature of involvement in a participatory process. A broader understanding of power is required. Here, the Machiavellian view of power is pertinent in that it asks what power does, what strategies of power are deployed and how power permeates and affects the political spaces in which participation occurs (Clegg 1989). The remainder of this section turns to the Machiavellian character of Foucault’s relational, non-derivative conceptualisation of power.

3.2.2 Foucault’s Relational Concept of Power

Foucault (1980a, 1978) takes a much broader view on power. He describes the agency oriented view of power as the juridico-discursive representation which takes power as either repressive or legitimised authority. Instead, Foucault escapes the confines of the juridico-discursive view by conceiving of power as an effect, which can be both productive (and positive), or negative. Thus, for Foucault (1980b:98) power is relational:

... not to be taken to be a phenomenon of one individual’s consolidated and homogeneous domination over others, or that of one group or class over others. ... Power must be analysed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localised here or there, never in anybody’s hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of its articulation. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application.

Power is understood to be immanent – inherent and continually entangled in all social relations (Sharp et al 2000). Power is not just repressive or authoritative. Foucault argues that the juridical or juridico-discursive conception of power is defined by a ‘repressive hypothesis’ that takes the dominant understanding of power as a negative force, which in turn masks the mechanisms and instruments that operate to normalise particular behaviours and knowledges and ostracise others at the level of local practices (Foucault 1978, 1980b, 1980c). The traditional view of power as repression ‘conceals and makes tolerable the more insidious forms of power by which social relations are organised, ordered and regulated’
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(Howarth 2000a:74; see Foucault 1978:86-89). Within these power relations, individuals, social systems and meanings are shaped and constituted.

There are three further elements of Foucault’s work on power that are useful here. First, Foucault (1977:27) conceptualises power and knowledge as inter-dependent power/knowledge:

We should admit ... that power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations.

Thus Foucault presents power as relational and inextricably connected with the construction of knowledge, and by extension to the construction of what is accepted as truth. Each culture or society maintains its own:

... regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true (Foucault 1980c:131).

Thus truth, power and knowledge are interconnected, because power is conceived of as non derivative and immanent – that is, it does not come from something or someone but is a constitutive part of a relationship. Foucault’s interest lies not in questions of who has power, what is their purpose and how are their interests fulfilled. Rather, Foucault’s interest focuses on understanding how people ‘govern (themselves and others) by the production of truth’ (Foucault 1991:79). Conceptualising the productive properties of power and its role in constituting different rationalities, truths, knowledges and identities provides an alternative lens with which to understand the effects of a professional ideology on public involvement.

Second, and related to the role of power in constructing ‘regimes of truth’ by which to govern, governmentality represents a concept of governmental rationality. Government is interpreted in a wide sense, meaning a type of practice that shapes, guides, or affects individuals and groups (Gordon 1991). The rationality of government presents a system of thinking about questions such as who is governing, what/who is being governed and what governing is. As Flint (2003:612-13) argues ‘governmental objectives are to be achieved, not through consistent acts of direct intervention, but rather through realigning subjects’ identities and by implicating subjects’ self-regulation within governmental aims’. Planning then, can be interpreted as a form of governmentality, as an activity aimed to shape urban and regional physical environments and the ‘conduct of conduct’ within those social spaces (Foucault 2003:138). When the concept of governmentality is brought to the fore, public
participation can be interpreted as ‘an institutionalised interaction permeated by criss-crossing, juxtaposed, or hierarchies of, power structure, distributing participation and influence in space and time’ (Ploger 2001:227). Through a lens of governmentality, the effects of the power plays inherent in managing, facilitating and structuring a participatory process become more visible as the rationalities of urban policy, planning practice and local governance become exposed.

The final key aspect of Foucault’s work that is of value for present purposes, lies in his concept of an ascending analysis of power. Foucault argues that under the traditional juridico-discursive representation, power is researched and understood in a descending fashion from those in authority such as the state or sovereign or their institutions. Questions asked are what authority or power is wielded from the state level or institutional level. In turn, this repressive, authoritative view of power obscures the mechanisms of power that operate through regulatory apparatuses and governmentality at the micro level, and their effect in shaping local practices and identities (Foucault 1980a). Above, Foucault’s (1980b:98) relational concept of power was discussed, in which he states individuals are ‘always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising’ power. Foucault alludes to the constitutive and shaping effects of power on individuals. He further states that:

... the individual is an effect of power, and at the same time, or precisely to the extent to which it is that effect, it is the element of its articulation. The individual which power has constituted is at the same time its vehicle (Foucault 1980b:98).

So power is conceived not only in its structural dimension, but also as something that is in play in producing interests and identities. This productive dimension shapes and constitutes individuals and their rationalities, ways of seeing and understanding prior to that individual then exercising power. For Dyrberg (1997:87), this is the circular nature of power, which recognises the inextricable links between ‘power, subject/identity, knowledge and authority’. Foucault argues that in order to capture this circularity, an analysis of power must be bottom up in an ascending fashion, because power plays exist always within the social. Moreover, by understanding power as relational and by undertaking an ascending analysis, the repressive hypothesis (that is, that all power is oppressive and forceful) can be avoided. Foucault’s (1980a:99) ascending analysis of power starts:

... from its infinitesimal mechanisms, which each have their own history, their own trajectory, their own techniques and tactics, and then see how these mechanisms of power have been – and continue to be – invested, colonised, utilised, involuted, transformed, displaced, extended etc., by ever more general mechanisms and by forms of global domination.
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Therefore, in an ascending analysis, ‘the aim is to grasp how the plethora of local power relations coalesce into general ones, whereby they become imbricated in various institutions’ at the macro level (Dyrberg 1997:106). Thus, for the empirical component of the current study, the investigation of case studies begins at the micro level in which the urbanist participatory processes were undertaken and then explores the governmentality that structured the processes at the contextual and macro level. At the macro level, the urban policy context and governance arrangements are central. The way in which an ascending analysis fits into the overall frame is discussed further in section 3.4 below. In the meantime, a principal apparatus of an ascending analysis lies in Foucault’s concept of discourse.

Discourse operates as a mechanism of power and is constituted by power, allowing an understanding ‘that truth is constructed and kept in place through a wide range of strategies which support and affirm it and which exclude and counter alternative versions of events’ (Mills 2003:76). By drawing on Laclau and Mouffe’s theory, which is strongly influenced by Foucault’s work, discourse becomes the primary category for an analysis of power in this study. For Foucault (1978:100-101) power and knowledge are joined through discourse and so:

Discourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it, any more than silences are. We must make allowance for the complex and unstable process whereby discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it.

As Dyrberg (1997) suggests, the operation of power as governmentality can be understood as hegemonic practices, which provides a rich conceptual tool for identifying the effect of power at this level. Neither hegemony nor ideology are terms Foucault favoured because of their essentialist Marxist roots (Howarth 2002). And it is for this reason that Laclau and Mouffe’s (2001) work is central to this study. They reconceptualise both ideology (as an effect of discourse) and hegemony (as the primary product of power relations) in their discourse theory in such a way that avoids the economistic and class based determinism inherent to classical Marxism. Laclau and Mouffe draw on Foucault’s concept of discourse in combination with a deconstruction of Marxist theory – their discourse theory is the subject of the next section.
3.3 Laclau and Mouffe’s Discourse Theory

While Laclau and Mouffe (2001) are strongly influenced by developments stemming from structuralism and Marxism, they claim that post-structuralism is the source and the terrain from which they have developed their theories. In order to understand the dynamics of politics and the inherent power plays within, they have developed an interlinked field of concepts drawn from a variety of intellectual sources. Crucial to their theory are the interrelated concepts of *articulation* which is instrumental in the constitution and maintenance of *discourse*, and its effect which can be exposed through an examination of *hegemony*. Before providing a more detailed account of the conceptual framework, it is useful to understand certain premises that underpin Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory.

For Laclau and Mouffe, the social sphere is inherently antagonistic. Politics refers to institutions and practices that order social relations within this conflictual social space (see Chapter Two, Mouffe 2005). Consistent with post-structural thought, Mouffe (2005) suggests that in the construction of a *we* there is always a necessary and different *other* that is instrumental in defining and constituting that *we*\(^5\). Thus identity is relational and *we/them* or *we/other* relationships always have the potential to become friend/enemy relations of antagonism. Therefore, in every social relation, there is the inherent potential for conflict. Concomitantly, every social relation is contingent, there is always the possibility that the *we/they* relation could be constituted differently. It follows therefore, that if every social relation is contingent and precarious, then every social order is likewise contingent and precarious, it could always be something other than it is. Therefore, for post-Marxists:

... every order is political and based on some form of exclusion. There are always other possibilities that have been repressed and that can be reactivated. The articulatory practices through which a certain order is established and the meaning of social institutions is fixed are ‘hegemonic practices’. Every hegemonic order is susceptible [to] being challenged by counter-hegemonic practices, i.e. practices which will attempt to disarticulate the existing order so as to install another form of hegemony (Mouffe 2005:19).

The process of articulation whereby meaning is established and fixed is the process of constituting discourses. Laclau and Mouffe understand that the articulation of discourses involves an inherent power play, whereby power is understood in its Foucauldian, relational sense, and in its tendency to constitute identity (Laclau 1990). What Laclau and Mouffe’s

---

\(^5\) In particular, Mouffe attributes the concept of a ‘constitutive outside’ to Staten’s reading of Derridean concepts in *Wittgenstein and Derrida* (1985).
approach allows, is a way of deciphering how different knowledges are prioritised in a participatory process, and in particular, the effect of the presence of a strong professional ideology. While Laclau and Mouffe’s approach is highly theoretical and presented in fairly dense text, it has been applied in a manner of different ways to different social phenomena. The following sub-sections outline the components of their approach, the concepts that are integral to it, and then reviews a number of ways in which it has been applied empirically.

3.3.1 Discourse as an Articulatory Practice

Discourse is understood by Laclau and Mouffe as a group or system of related terms or phrases and their associated meanings – that is ‘signifying sequences’ (Torfing 1999:85). However, the system of related terms is not closed or permanently fixed, but open to contestation and thereby a renegotiation of different meanings. A signifying sequence is made up of signs – words and concepts that confer meanings. From the structuralism of Ferdinand de Saussure, a sign is composed of a signifier (the sound image or expression) and a signified (the concept or content)⁶. Signification marks the joining of the signifier with a certain signified, which generates a particular meaning. Moreover, signs rely on their relationship with other signs for meaning. The difference between related signs confers meaning, providing the sign with its identity, but marking it in relation to other signs within the system – language is therefore a system of differences. For example, as Howarth (2000a:20) notes the sign mother is understood because of its relationship with father, daughter, son, grandmother and the like. The relations between these signs make up a signifying sequence or chain that we may recognise as family, kin or blood relationships. Moreover, the relationship between signifier and signified is not fixed and thus meaning shifts according to context, and is contingent on its relationship with other signs in that context (Howarth 2000a).

The last point leads to a fundamental characteristic of discourse as theorised by Laclau and Mouffe and their social ontology. Because meaning cannot be wholly or permanently fixed in discourse, discourse can never be a fully closed system. The concept of an open system that never reaches closure is the essence of post-structuralist thought. Meanings are always open to contestation and renegotiation. Inevitably, this has led to the charge of relativism, which is discussed further in section 3.3.5. For the moment, it is enough to say

---

⁶ Structuralism, and the idea that language does not provide a direct representation between object and descriptive word for that object, marks what has been described as the linguistic turn.
that discourse in this formulation, encapsulates the notion that the meaning of objects, actions and practices is constituted by (open) systems, reliant on an articulation of the differences and inter-relationships in signification (Howarth 2000a).

In Laclau and Mouffe’s (2001:105) terminology, discourse is ‘the structured totality arising from [an] articulatory practice’. The structured totality is the group of related signifiers and meanings, that have been constituted by an articulatory practice – that is any practice which fixes meaning such that the original element, entity or identity is altered (Laclau and Mouffe 2001). The constitution and maintenance of discourses involve articulatory practices that order and structure social relations through constructing and conferring meaning which is context dependent and contingent (Laclau and Mouffe 2001). The stability of the discourse is determined by how well meanings are fixed by the articulatory practices. Discourses vary in how sedimented or concrete they are. As such they can be temporary, fleeting systems of meaning, or enduring systems which are so sedimented as to be normalised and unnoticed in everyday life. Power is imbricated in the nature of the discourse, in terms of both, how sedimented it is or whether it can be successfully contested and rearticulated. Thus the fixity or unfixity of meaning is a key element in the creation, maintenance or disarticulation of discourses and is discussed below.

3.3.2 The Fixity or Unfixity of Meaning

The basic components of Laclau and Mouffe’s (2001:105) theory of discourse are outlined in the following often quoted passage:

We will call articulation any practice establishing a relation among elements such that their identity is modified as a result of the articulatory practice. The structured totality resulting from the articulatory practice, we will call discourse. The differential positions, insofar as they appear articulated within a discourse, we will call moments. By contrast we will call element any difference that is not discursively articulated.

The simple distinction between elements and moments is that elements have no fixed meaning (a signifier with no signified), whereas moments have been incorporated into distinct discourses (via articulation) and have meaning fixed (a signifier with a signified), albeit temporarily and partially. Meaning is only ever partially and temporarily fixed, to account for the contingent character of signification and the openness of the system. This allows for the play of meaning, for different significations to emerge in different contexts and the possibility of change in meaning over time and space. Displacement occurs when a signified slides or shifts and one discursive moment is substituted for another (Torfing 1999).
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The link between the fixity of meanings and discourse lies in the relations between signifying sequences, and the way in which meanings of different signifying sequences are knotted around a particular privileged signifier. This privileged signifier is a nodal point, and is instrumental in unifying a given discourse, providing a degree of fixity to the discourse (Torfing 1999:98). Nodal points can also become empty signifiers – a nodal point that has been elevated to a universal position whereby several discourses privilege it as a core concept of the discourse. For example, sustainability unites discourses on sustainability and as such has a key role in anchoring and defining discursive limits. Yet in effect it is ascribed so many different understandings by a variety of sustainability discourses, that without the substance of the particular discourses it has no meaning at all – hence it is empty (see Glynos 1999; Laclau 1990). Thus empty signifiers are dependent on particular discourses for their status, just as particular discourses become more fixed, more certain, more definite and therefore more dominant by identifying with an empty signifier. Other examples are democracy, community, nation, and class. Because of their delimiting and anchoring role, empty signifiers play a key part in hegemonic discourses (discussed further in section 3.3.4).

Laclau and Mouffe (2001) argue that meaning can only ever be partially fixed, although fixity around nodal points provides meaning that is relatively stable within a concrete (but always temporary, contested and open) discourse. The nodal point represents the centre and the fixation of meaning is a part of an ongoing flow of signification. A nodal point condenses meaning around it, by locating it within a relational web of meaning in a discourse. In line with other tenets of post-structuralism, Laclau and Mouffe (2001:110-111) argue that because all social relations, discourse and signification are inherently contingent, there can be no fully sutured, or closed structure. They extrapolate this understanding to ‘the social’, such that it is conceived of as ‘discursive space’ (ibid:x), and argue for the openness of the social primarily because there is no underlying universal condition of existence for its meaning – all meaning is mediated by language and via discourse. Thus the identity of every object and subject is precarious, and this precariousness ‘manifests itself as the continuous movement of differences’ (ibid:122). The dynamism and shifting nature of these relational webs of meanings open out into political spaces in which meanings are contested. Contestation in the form of antagonism marks the limits of discourse – thus antagonism is integral to discourse theory and is discussed in the following sub-section.
3.3.3 Social Antagonisms

For Laclau and Mouffe, systems of social relations are articulated sets of discourses. Discourses are political constructions that involve social antagonisms and power (Howarth 2000a). However, antagonism in this sense, differs from conflict between identities clashing over respective interests. Laclau and Mouffe argue that antagonism is the result of a social agent being unable to attain their identity because of the presence of an other, external and negative to it. The negativity blocks them from becoming what they seek to become (Howarth 2000a; Laclau and Mouffe 2001; Torfing 1999). This negativity is the 'constitutive outside' or the 'radical otherness' (Torfing 1999:124), and is defined precisely by being antithetical and external to the identity concerned. So 'the constitutive outside of discourse A ... is neither B nor non-A, but anti-A’ (ibid:124-5). The constitutive outside is constructed by the threatened identity as an enemy to blame for their inability to attain or fulfil their desired goal and to fully constitute their identity. Antagonisms reveal the precariousness and contingency of identities and the discourses that constitute them. As such they represent the limits of the discourse:

Antagonisms reveal the boundaries or political frontiers of a social formation, as they show the points where identity can no longer be stabilised in a meaningful system of differences [discourse], but is contested by forces which stand at the limit of that order (Howarth 2000a:106).

There are two logics (a conceptual frame with which to explain and characterise social phenomena) under which antagonisms operate in discursive formations – equivalence and difference. The logic of equivalence operates to construct the purely negative force, such that identities establish a shared common meaning in opposition to it. Because the external negativity that threatens the discourse must be negative to all identities within the discourse, identities within the discourse must reduce their differential meanings into a single shared identity that is constituted to counter (and therefore remains in negative relation to) the external negative identity. The particular negativity is constituted by condensing meaning (and therefore identities within the discourse) into an equivalential chain. So the common meaning of 'anti-A' (that is, in respect to the external negative threat that prevents them from achieving A) is shared amongst those identities who are otherwise distinct in their differential relations within the discourse. Howarth (2000a:107) explains: ‘if the terms a, b, and c are made equivalent (a≡b≡c) with respect to character d, then d must totally negate a, b, and c (d = (a,b,c)), thus subverting the original terms of the system'.
Identities are interpellated into discourses. Interpellation is a process of identification\(^7\), in which a subject’s identity is constituted in the construction of the discourse. Under a logic of equivalence, even though meanings are articulated in common in relation to the negativity, the subject positions that make up that identity remain, thus marking out that identity’s differences from others in the equivalential chain. So for example, a conservation group may become active in opposition to a proposal for clear felling native forest adjacent to a national park in a rural region of New Zealand. A range of individuals (new and existing members of the group) are interpellated into the conservation discourse, by their common opposition to the proposal by the forestry company – the enemy or negativity. The individuals have a range of different subject positions (for example, female, male, young, old, white, black, catholic, Muslim, local resident, new immigrant, Australian, Maori, Pakeha, New Zealand, etc.) but share one common identity, also a subject position, that is established in opposition to the logging proposal. The new identity is constituted through ‘points of temporary attachment’ to the shared subject position and result in the ‘successful “chaining” of the subject into the flow of discourse’ (Griggs and Howarth 2000:55). In the face of the common threat, the disparate subject positions become a unified force from which to fight it (Howarth 2000a). The logging proposal threatens the common identity associated with protecting native forestry, while at the same time, the new anti-logging discourse also threatens the forestry company’s identity. Neither side is able to achieve their identity as conservationist or as commercial logging company because of the threat posed by the other. Here, two frontiers are drawn on opposite sides of a political space resulting in a strong and polarised antagonism (Laclau and Mouffe 2001; Torfing 1999). Thus a logic of equivalence is instrumental in building antagonistic frontiers.

The logging proposal can be seen as a dislocation which occurs when an event or crisis arises for which there is no meaning or no means of symbolising within the established discursive space. Dislocation therefore destabilises the existing order (Torfing 1999). The dislocation threatens the identities of the conservation group members, such that they form new identities in response to the challenge – they are compelled to act as activists against the logging proposal. In that decision to act which occurs through the identification with the

\(^7\) Laclau and Mouffe retheorise Althusser’s original concept of interpellation which involved the idea of ‘hailing’, as though in the instant of having ones name called, identity is constituted (see Torfing 1999; Howarth 2000a). Laclau and Mouffe suggest a non-class process of identification, in which individuals are interpellated through the construction of discourses.
conservation discourse and the dislocatory effect of the logging proposal, they develop new political subjectivities (Howarth and Stavrakakis 2000:15). As those political subjectivities become stabilised, they become fixed subject positions that comprise the system of differences within a concrete discourse.

In contrast, the logic of difference has the opposite effect, and seeks to break existing chains of equivalence. It disperses the antagonism. So on one hand, the logic of equivalence condenses the range of meanings in a political space, thereby simplifying it. On the other hand, the logic of difference expands the range of meanings, making the political space more complex (Laclau and Mouffe 2001). The logic of difference breaks down social antagonisms operating under a logic of equivalence, by disarticulating fixed meanings such that they become floating signifiers, set to become rearticulated in different ways in expanding formations (Howarth 2000a; Howarth and Stavrakakis 2000). Antagonism under a logic of difference weakens polarised relations by creating more meanings, which in turn relegates the polar divisions to the margins of the social (Torfing 1999). In any particular situation both the logics of equivalence and difference may come into play, they are not mutually exclusive. Typically though, one will predominate over the other in a complex interaction. However, and ironically, discourses within a polarised, antagonistic political space, articulated under a logic of equivalence, are generally more stable than those under a logic of difference, because of the articulation of a shared common meaning (Laclau and Mouffe 2001)

Thus antagonisms and dislocations are central to forming political identities. Moreover, because antagonism is the result of the contestation of meaning, it is through antagonism that the limits of discourses are made visible. So not only is antagonism central to Laclau and Mouffe’s social ontology, it is also central to their concept of hegemony – the ‘central category of political analysis’ (2001:x) in their view. Hegemony is the subject of the next sub-section.

3.3.4 Hegemony

In Hegemony and Socialist Strategy, Laclau and Mouffe (2001) radicalise Gramsci’s concept of hegemony, by removing its class essentialism. Gramsci takes hegemony as political and moral leadership and a process of creating a new collective identity through the contingent articulation of social forces (Laclau and Mouffe 2001:67; Torfing 1999:108). Laclau and Mouffe (2001:69) argue that Gramsci ontologically prioritised social class as the universal underlying structuring principle of a hegemonic formation. So Laclau and Mouffe,
in deconstructing and re-theorising Gramsci’s hegemony, remove this residue by situating the concept within their own ontology. As a result they define hegemony as the process in which social practices seek to establish order in the face of contingency (Mouffe 2005). Thus hegemony is ‘an articulatory practice instituting nodal points that partially fix the meaning of the social in an organised system of difference’ (Torfing 1999:109). Hegemonic practices seek to construct and stabilise nodal points, which serve as anchors through which meaning is fixed in an unstable and contested discursive field (Howarth and Stavrakakis 2000:15).

So for Laclau and Mouffe, hegemonic practices occur within the field of discursivity under two conditions. First, the articulation must take place ‘through a confrontation with antagonistic articulatory practices ... in a field criss-crossed by antagonisms’ (2001:135). Second, there must be an articulation of floating elements into moments, such that a new political space is constructed (ibid). A discourse becomes hegemonic when a nodal point within the discourse is elevated to a universal such that it represents or speaks in the name of society, thereby naturalising discourse (Torfing 1999). So:

Hegemonic practices are an exemplary form of political activity that involves the articulation of different identities and subjectivities into a common project, while hegemonic formations are the outcomes of these projects’ endeavours to create new forms of social order from a variety of dispersed or dislocated elements (Howarth and Stavrakakis 2000:14).

Two further concepts are instrumental in Laclau’s later work, which helps to clarify the concept of hegemony – myth and imaginary. Given the premise of an open system, meaning is only ever partially fixed, no structure can fully achieve its identity, and no discourse can be exactly what it seeks to be. Therefore, no discourse is capable of fully hegemonising a field of discursivity (Howarth and Stavrakakis 2000; Torfing 1999). Otherwise there would be no possibility of change, or an alternative order. However, the illusion of that completion, of fully fixing meaning and achieving identity is necessary, and Laclau’s concept of myth provides a conceptual frame for that illusion. Laclau (1990:61) suggests ‘myth is a principle of reading’ a situation. Myths emerge as a result of dislocation, and are constructed in order to suture the dislocated space through constituting a new space of representation. Moreover, in suturing dislocated space, ‘myth functions as a surface on which dislocations and social demands can be inscribed’ (ibid:63). So myths provide a surface of inscription on which demands can be made which seek to fix or address crisis-like events that fundamentally challenge identities. So a myth represents a new discourse, or vision for the way the world would be if the dislocatory crisis was corrected. As such, myths act as a metaphor for an
absent fullness – that is the fullness of meaning or identity that cannot at present be achieved because of the dislocatory crisis (Torfing 1999:115). Once those demands are met, the metaphor becomes a literality – the demands are realised, and the surface of inscription is hegemonised. On the other hand, the nature of the myth can expand, such that it is the ‘unlimited horizon of inscription of any social demand and any possible dislocation’ (Laclau 1990:64). When this occurs it becomes an ‘imaginary’. Laclau provides the Enlightenment, positivism’s conception of progress, and communist society as examples of imaginaries where ‘the absolute limit which structures a field of intelligibility and is thus the condition of possibility for the emergence of any object’ (ibid). Thus an imaginary does not indicate a successful hegemonic formation because it is not actualised. Rather, it is a collective representation of ideas and images that are constructed within social processes, as a result of power relations, that unifies a whole social space at a particular point in time (Davila 1994). An imaginary represents an expansion of a myth such that it is constitutive of hegemonic projects that seek to enact it (Celik 2000).

There are parallels between ideology and the concepts of myth and imaginary. For Laclau, ideology is the mechanism that covers up the openness of the social, the contingency and precariousness of discourse, and that provides certainty and order. Ideology is invested in discourse (Fairclough 1992). So, again deriving from Marxist roots, Laclau retheorises ideology to fit with his social ontology, claiming that ‘we cannot do without a concept of misrecognition’ (Laclau 1990:92). He therefore deconstructs the classical Marxist conceptions of ideology, removing its essentialist components, and inverting it such that ideology no longer involves the misrecognition of a fully defined social agent, but rather is the ‘non-recognition of the precarious character’ or the unfixity of any identity (ibid). Thus he claims ‘the ideological would consist of those discursive forms through which a society tries to institute itself as such on the basis of closure, of the fixation of meaning, of the non-recognition of the infinite play of differences’ (ibid). Myth, imaginary and ideology are inter-related. Myth and imaginary draw together to explain the way in which ideology operates discursively to ensure the contingency of the social does not fully destabilise society (Torfing 1999). Thus ideology functions at the level of the discursive, and is an operation of hegemonic discourses and their effort to construct an ideological closure by articulating floating signifiers into a totalising discourse (ibid).

The previous subsections have outlined the conceptual tools that comprise Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory. These tools have been used in a wide range of different projects as a means to identify the nature of the power relations and hegemonic processes in play in
real social settings. However, there are several charges that have been laid against this account of discourse theory which should not be overlooked. The following sub-section takes up this task before concluding the chapter with an explanation of how the ethic of communicative participation developed in Chapter Two is integrated with the conceptual frame established here.

3.3.5 Application and Critique

Given the radical and political nature of Laclau and Mouffe's theory, it is not surprising that it has been the subject of criticism from a variety of perspectives (for example Critchley 2004; Devenney 2004; Eagleton 1991:215-220; Geras 1987; Mouzelis 1988; Norval 2004). There are two fundamental criticisms levelled at Laclau and Mouffe's theory at the philosophical level – idealism and relativism (see Howarth 2000a; Torfing 1999), both of which have been alluded to earlier in the Chapter.

The charge of idealism involves the claim that Laclau and Mouffe's work denies the existence of a reality external to thought: a criticism that stems from the rejection of Foucault's distinction between the discursive and non-discursive, and adhered to in other discourse approaches. By discursive exterior, Laclau and Mouffe do not suggest there is nothing outside of discourse, or that there is nothing but discourse. Rather they argue that all practices and action are meaningful, and that meaning does not arise outside of discourse. For Laclau and Mouffe, the meaning of all objects is constituted discursively. That is not to say that there is no real objective world, as Laclau and Mouffe (2001:108) state:

The fact that every object is constituted as an object of discourse has *nothing to do* with whether there is a world external to thought, or with the realism/idealism opposition. An earthquake or the falling of a brick is an event that certainly exists, in the sense that it occurs here and now, independently of my will. But whether their specificity as objects is constructed in terms of 'natural phenomena' or 'expressions of the wrath of God', depends upon the structuring of a discursive field. What is denied is not that such objects exist externally to thought, but the rather different assertion that they could constitute themselves as objects outside any discursive condition of emergence.

---

8 In the *Archaeology of Knowledge* Foucault (2002:50) makes repeated references to 'primary relations' that are independent of discourse and arise between 'institutions, techniques, social forms etc.' and are instrumental in the conditions of formations of the discursive – that is they are non-discursive prior to the articulation of the discourse. This distinction is however somewhat ambiguous. For a variety of interpretations see Brown and Cousins 1980; Dreyfus and Rabinow 1983:65-6; Howarth 2000a:64-66; Laclau and Mouffe 2001:106-7 Torfing 1999:90-91).
Nor does the denial of non-discursive or extra discursive practices suggest that all discourse is of a mental character rather than a material character. Signifier and signified are not 'juxtaposed' against one another, but rather form 'differential relational positions', such that meaning is conferred on the objective world in the form of discourse (Laclau and Mouffe 2001:108). Without the materiality of an object or action that is to be signified, there is no discourse. Thus Laclau and Mouffe steer a path towards what they call the ontology of the social, in which their position is neither idealist or realist but materialist (Howarth 2000a).

The second, related criticism lies in the charge of relativism. As Howarth (2000a:104) asks 'does their theory of discourse condemn us to a total free-play of meaning?' What makes one meaning better than another and what is the basis of that judgement? The role of critique comes into play, and is discussed in relation to traditional questions of research validity in the following Chapter (section 4.2.3). Discourse theory does not mean abandoning ethics as a basis for judgement (Torfing 1999)\(^9\). What it means is that ethical standards are discursively constructed, they are not universal standards of validity that emerge from some notion of transcendental reason. As discursive constructs, ethical values and indeed all actions, objects, and identities are open to challenge via dislocation and social antagonisms, whereby those constructs change. So discursive operations, themselves, limit the free play of meaning by their relationship with the constitutive outside. In addition, the partial fixation of meaning results in structures with a degree of closure and stability, which occurs where a nodal point knits together a chain of signifiers (Howarth 2000a).

Torfing (1999:189) also notes that those unsympathetic with postmodern and poststructural perspectives accuse Laclau and Mouffe of 'theoretical sophistry' suggesting that their discourse theory is too difficult to apply to concrete phenomena (discussed further in Chapter Four, section 4.2.3). Howarth makes a similar observation, suggesting that many misconstrue Laclau and Mouffe's ontology in regard to their concept of society (see Howarth 2000a:116-120). However, there have been numerous applications of Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory methodology which provide insightful and interesting explanations of contemporary phenomena. For example, empirical studies drawing a framework from Laclau and Mouffe's work include questions of nationalism and national identity

---

\(^9\) See *Laclau: A Critical Reader* edited by Critchley and Marchart (2004) for a number of papers on how political theorists understand the relationship between ethics and Laclau's work.
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(Stavrakakis 2005; Weaver 2005), historical and contemporary accounts of political hegemonic projects (Barros and Castagnola 2000; Bastow 1998, 2000; Bastow and Martin 2005; Buenfil Burgos 2000; Celik 2000; Clohesy 2000, 2001, 2005; de Vos 2005; Howarth 2000b; Howarth and Norval 1992; Reyes 2002, 2005), issues in local governance (Andersen 2005; Dreyer Hansen and Sorensen 2005), environmental politics (Hajer 2005; Stavrakakis 2000), media analysis (Chouliarki 2005), coalitions and agency in senior management of healthcare providers (Griggs 2005), the micro-politics of new social movements (Griggs and Howarth 2000) and an examination of a discourse that seeks to sell ‘a product that no one needs’ developed to increase milk production in cows (Traynier 2001).

Yet while the range of studies employing a discourse theory framework (after Laclau and Mouffe 2001) is expanding, only a few of the above examples involve work undertaken on governance at the micro level (for example, Dreyer Hanson and Sorensen 2005; Griggs and Howarth 2000). Moreover, at the time of writing, there appears to have been no work undertaken specifically on planning or participation in local governance using this approach. The current study thereby contributes to filling this gap. The following chapter explains why and specifically how the approach is employed in the two case studies, while below, the conceptual framework that will shape the empirical component of this study is presented.

3.4 A Framework

The key problem that the current study seeks to address is how the operation of power relations in discussion based participatory planning processes which are underpinned by a strong professional ideology affect the inclusivity of the process? More specifically, the research focuses on how different knowledges interact, what meanings are constituted in the process, and how the role of expert knowledge is imbricated in the interaction and the constitution of various understandings of the process. Chapter Two established the normative framework for the present research by drawing out key principles from communicative planning theory, and supplementing those with concepts from Mouffe’s radical democracy. In the present chapter, the task of problematisation has continued, this time at the level of researcher – the conceptual frame provided by Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory offers a novel way of examining power relations such that a new and alternative reading may be offered. The advantage is that sedimented and taken for granted practices and assumptions may be questioned which result in the emergence of novel solutions.
As an analytical framework for the present research, a Foucauldian understanding of power is adopted, such that it is immanent, relational, and constitutive of identities. In addition, it is inextricably related to knowledge. Synchronous with the power/knowledge relationship, discourse provides a means of exploring power relationships. What Laclau and Mouffe’s theory of discourse allows is a more specific focus on how meanings are constituted, and a way of understanding the limits of discourse through antagonisms. Moreover, the concept of hegemony provides a means to examine the implications of particular power relationships. Figure 3.1 shows the framework in relation to three key questions asked of the remainder of this research.

Figure 3.1 – Framework for the present research, showing inter-relationship between Chapters, the three research questions, the conceptual tools of discourse theory that will inform the way those questions are addressed
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The research questions presented in Chapter One are reiterated in the context of the foregoing framework from which they were derived.

1. What discourses intersect in each urbanist participatory process?
2. What relations of power are revealed through the operation of these discourses?
3. What are the implications of the power relations for effective communicative participation?

Thus the first and second research questions are addressed by drawing on the conceptual tools of discourse theory, exploring the nature of the discourses as they emerge in the two cases studied, and concomitantly, the character of the power relations that arise in each case. The analysis will focus on antagonisms and the way meanings are signified in each case. Consequently, the analysis lies at a structural level, rather than at the level of the constitution of subjectivities and identities. However, the analysis begins at the level of the local and the particular, consistent with Foucault’s ascending analysis. The core focus lies in how discourses shape the meanings that are constituted in the urbanist participatory process. In order to elucidate the nature of the power relations in operation in each case, the concepts of myth and imaginary are employed to explain the nature of any hegemonic power relations in the processes. Finally, the Ethic of Communicative Participation is drawn in at the normative level to address research question three regarding the implications of the power relations for communicative participation. This question is addressed in Chapter Eight, while questions one and two are addressed in the recontextualisation of the case studies in Chapters Six and Seven. The following chapter, explaining the research strategy for the current study, provides the link between the conceptual framework established in foregoing Chapters and the empirical component of the study.
Chapter 4  
Research Strategy and Methods

4.1 Introduction

The last two chapters established the conceptual framework for the study. This Chapter sets out precisely how and why that framework was employed in this research. Combined, the conceptual framework and the research strategy can be understood as bricolage. Bricolage involves the interweaving of different parts of the research, including borrowed perspectives, into a coherent whole where this ‘seems useful, richness enhancing, or theoretically heuristic’ (Lincoln and Guba 2000:167). In creating a bricolage, the researcher is an ‘interpretive bricoleur’ who works on the basis that ‘research is an interactive process, shaped by his or her personal history, biography, gender, social class, race, and ethnicity, and by those of the people in the setting’ (Denzin and Lincoln 2000a:4). Borrowing and interweaving of this nature is increasingly recognised in qualitative research. The boundaries surrounding research traditions in the social sciences are becoming ever more blurred, often blending different paradigms and perspectives in the effort to situate the researcher in relation to their research (Panelli 2004). The importance of bricolage lies in the way in which the strands or elements of the research project are woven together into a coherent logical whole. The elements of the research include not only the methodological approach in the conventional sense, but the interpretation and use of theory, the understandings underlying the way data are collected, analysed, interpreted, and represented, and finally the inter-relationships between those involved in the research process. A research path is never straightforward, and rarely follows an original vision. The winding trail of decisions and reasoning is a crucial element of the research process, and resonates within and between the relationships of the research, the researcher and the researched.

The remainder of this chapter articulates the bricolage for the current study, which is situated in a post-structural qualitative approach. The following section explains three key themes that constitute the approach – post-structuralism, discourse theory and reflexivity. From there, the research strategy is discussed. Section 4.3 details the rationale for employing a case study approach and the procedures for and associated problems with the selection of the cases. Section 4.4 explains the methods adopted. The way in which data were analysed is presented in section 4.5.
4.2 The Research Approach

Three conceptual frames underpin the current study. As indicated in Chapter Three, discourse theory provides the overall framework for the research, comprising both methodological assumptions and conceptual tools. Commensurate with a discourse theory approach, post-structuralism provides the philosophical underpinnings of the current research. And finally, consistent with post-structuralism and qualitative research, a high standard of reflexivity is required of ethical research. The following sub-sections on post-structuralism, positioning the research, and discourse theory flesh out these three core components.

4.2.1 Post-structuralism

Post-structuralism emerged in France in response to the formalism of linguistic structuralism and the essentialism of Marxist thought (Howarth 2000a; Pratt 2000; Sarup 1993; Young 1981b). A core group of French philosophers are credited with being the leading post-structuralist thinkers: Foucault, Derrida, Lacan, Baudrillard, Lyotard and Kristeva. A key feature of post-structuralism is the understanding of language as constitutive of society. Thus language, seen as an open system, became not a metaphor for social life (as early structuralists viewed it), but contingently related to and imbricated in social life. Despite general agreement at this level, post-structuralism is a broad perspective and is not clearly defined. Young (1981b:viii) attributes this to ‘the peculiar nature of an activity whose most characteristic aspect is its own refusal of a definition’. However, Pratt (2000:625) identifies several common themes of critique amongst post-structuralists, which are useful in articulating the position adopted in the study. First, because language is seen as constitutive of rather than reflective of reality, it can be understood as the medium for understanding the ways in which society is constituted and organised. Second, post-structuralists challenge the concept of the Cartesian subject (a unified, reasoning, self knowing subject), arguing instead that because of the constitutive effect of language, subjectivities are constantly in flux, changing and full of contradictions and disunity. They argue that subjectivities are at least partially constituted by the discursive structures within which they operate. Third, post-structuralists are anti-foundationalist in that they understand knowledge to be socially constructed, and deny the existence of any one single truth. Rather truth exists in relation to the discursive structures that frame it (Howarth 2000a). Fourth, given the understandings regarding the constitution of knowledge and the human subject, there is a concomitant necessity for a high degree of reflexivity (Young 1981b).
4.2.2 Positioning Myself in the Research

Qualitative research increasingly requires a reflexive approach to check the interpretive role of researcher and address the imbalance of power that lies between researcher and researched. Reflexivity is ‘self-critical sympathetic introspection and the self-conscious analytical scrutiny of the self as researcher’ (England 1994:82). The concept of positionality is one means to enact reflexivity in research by allowing the acknowledgement and possible mitigation of the effect of power imbalances. As McDowell (1992:409) suggests:

... we must recognise and take account of our own position, as well as that of our research participants, and write this into our research practice rather than continue to hanker after some idealized equality between us (emphasis original).

Positionality can be described as the facets of one’s life that constitute identity and influence the way research is conducted, interpreted and presented (England 1994; Shurmer-Smith 2002). Positioning myself in the research involves acknowledging my identity as a white New Zealand woman - wife/partner, mother, researcher, student, and teacher. These subject positions situate me within a dominant or hegemonic group in society, and as such my viewpoint is always partial despite my commitment to social justice. So although a focus of the current study is to understand processes of othering, my positioning influences and potentially limits my ability to understand those processes. However, through the acknowledgement of my positionality as a dynamic, relational and constitutive part of being a researcher, I can begin to be more reflexive about my relationships with, and influences on the researched. I am more likely to recognise the multiplicity of others’ perspectives by acknowledging my own as different and partial (Mullings 1999). Moreover, I am more able to acknowledge my own agency in the process of interpretation and re-presentation.

The concepts of displacement and the field are useful in acknowledging partiality and power in qualitative research. The field, as the site of fieldwork, is understood as socially constructed rather than an unproblematic physically delineated space. It is a space defined and interpreted by the researcher in the construction of the research project. As a result, the field is imbricated with positionality – the researcher creates the field, and yet the field is dynamic and always influenced by lived experience within it and beyond the researcher. As Katz (1994b:70) writes, ‘I am always, everywhere, in “the field”’. The construction of the field involves various ‘displacements’, which literally uproot, disturb and dislodge both researcher and researched (ibid:68, 72 n1).

In the current study, several displacements occurred. First, the field was displaced through my construction of it and its delineation in time and space. The following sections
of this chapter explain how the field for the current study was defined, through the choice of cases, the timeframe for research, research participants and methods used. Second there were displacements in terms of how I constituted the field of study. For example, the context of the case in Whitefield, in Nelson, north England, was very much more complex and fraught than the case in Newquay, in the south west of England. The contextual history was considered very relevant for the Whitefield case. Consequently, there were displacements in deciding what histories were relevant in each case. So displacements that occur in the field differed for each case study.

Third, I was displaced on entering the field – engaging in conversations, asking questions of others to explore their lived experience from outside. Again the nature of displacements varied in each case. In Whitefield, the physical environment was intimidating and foreign, which affected how contacts were established in the first instance. My positioning evoked a strong sense of being outside and other. Whereas, Newquay was more familiar terrain, more middle class. As researcher, I was positioned more comfortably – less outside. A further displacement occurred as a consequence of travelling abroad to conduct the research. While the distinctions between the United Kingdom and New Zealand are not huge, the dislocation involved in international travel, which constrained and intensified the timeframe for undertaking the research had implications for the way in which the research was conducted. These aspects are discussed further in sections 4.3 and 4.4 below. The fourth displacement occurs in writing the stories of the researched, whose subjectivities are displaced, and re-presented through my interpretations and inevitably selective re-telling. The process of re-presenting the stories of the researched is discussed further below in relation to discourse theory and defensibility (section 4.2.3).

By understanding the research process as a series of displacements, which are both constituted by and constitutive of my positionality, I can strive for the kind of ethical reflexivity I demand of my research. Through constant questioning, scrutiny and self-examination, I seek to write (in McDowell’s words) my positionality into my research, as a fundamental, essential and determining element, although acknowledging that full awareness is not achievable (Rose 1997). The characterisation of post-structural sensibilities and concomitant requirements for reflexivity outlined above are commensurate with the discourse theory perspective of Laclau and Mouffe that was explained in Chapter Three.
4.2.3 The Role of Discourse Theory

Discourse theory is more than a tool for analysing empirical data, it is a methodological approach (see Chapter Three). As such it differs from other research techniques utilising concepts of discourse to analyse social phenomena (for example, Fairclough 1992; Wetherell and Potter 1992). Consequently there are four implications in taking this approach as a constituent of the interpretive bricolage of the current study. The four implications involve the ontology assumed by a discourse theory perspective, understanding research as an articulatory practice and associated questions of validity, the role of conceptual tools in research, and finally critique as a political project. Each are explained below.

The Ontology of Discourse Theory

Commensurate with the discourse theory methodology, the current study is underpinned by a materialist ontology. That is, the meanings of material objects in the world are understood to be discursively (and therefore socially) constructed, although this does not deny their material existence (see Chapter Three, section 3.3.5). Epistemologically, this means too, that all knowledge is understood to be socially constructed. What a discourse theory perspective allows for the current study, is a coherent approach in which the assumptions of the materialist ontology, along with a grammar of concepts and logics (see Chapter Three), provide a common language to interpret and evaluate social phenomena (Howarth 2000a). The idea that all discourses (and therefore meanings and power relations inherent to them) are constituted through articulatory practices is essential to the research approach and to the current study. However, the concept of articulatory practice goes beyond the empirical data. The research process itself operates within discursive structures which shape the research process. Thus the research itself is an articulatory practice – a point explained further below.

Research as an Articulatory Practice

Acknowledging that all research is articulatory – a practice that constitutes alternative (contingent) meanings within a particular set of discourses – facilitates a recognition of the potential effects of the research process on the researched and on (in this case) the academic discourses that it might fit within or contest. Understanding the effects of doing research contributes to reflexive research practice. However, the assumption of a social constructivist ontology in which research is an interpretation open to contestation raises questions about
reliability, validity or generalisability – the traditional holy trinity of the social sciences (Kvale 1996). These issues have been much debated in qualitative research in the social sciences (ibid). Without necessarily accepting those three terms, at the core of the issue is the truthfulness, integrity, credibility, and meaningfulness of the research. New interpretations are shaped by the discursive context within which they emerge. They do not arise in a vacuum, but from within a broad set of discursive structures that constitute how social phenomena are interpreted and how research is undertaken. Those discourses operate at the level of the researcher and the researched. At the level of researcher, the articulation of the current study is situated within the requirements of a doctoral thesis and academic discourses of what constitutes ‘good’ urban research in human geography and planning. So the question for such qualitative research is whether the research provides new, plausible, meaningful explanations of social phenomena (Howarth 2000a), that are defensible (Kvale 1996).

The judgement of plausibility is undertaken by those within the discursive structures that are imbricated in the articulatory practice of doing the research – the academic communities (Howarth 2000a), and ‘anyone interested in and affected by the subject under study’ (Flyvbjerg 2004a:301). Moreover, the judgement of plausibility is interrelated with the defensibility of the research and therefore requires an ongoing dialogue (ibid). For the current study, the dialogue through which the plausibility and defensibility of the research is judged will occur at two levels. The formal requirements of a doctoral thesis, the examination process and subsequent publication in academic journals, require particular standards and involve certain formalised conversations – for example the process of examination in the case of the thesis, and refereeing in the case of publication. As a result the current study must be defensible within quite specific parameters. The second level through which dialogic questions of plausibility will arise is through the researched, who are affected by the research, the (re)presentation and interpretation of their experiences. Dialogue with the researched will be maintained in two ways in the current study. The (re)presentation of the current study falls in two main parts – the written and examinable doctoral thesis, and a condensed report predominantly focussing on the results and propositions that emerge from the research. The report will be made available to the research participants after the doctoral study is complete. The second way in which dialogue with the researched will be maintained is through a longitudinal approach to the cases. The
current study is the initial phase of a more longitudinal project, or series of discreet but inter-related detailed studies of the urban transformations in both localities\(^1\). Therefore, a longer term and reciprocal relationship is sought, whereby findings from previous research phases and lived experiences are shared.

However, the knowledge that a dialogue will ensue in which judgements as to plausibility will be made does not guarantee that the research is plausible or defensible. The parameters on which those judgements will be made must be understood and enacted throughout the research process. The previous section articulated how understanding the researcher’s positioning in this study makes a reflexive contribution to the research which contributes to addressing the power imbalance inherent in the research process and thereby enhances the credibility and meaningfulness of the resultant interpretations. The second aspect of reflexivity which contributes to the credibility of the current research involves considering how the research as a whole is crafted and whether each element of the research is defensible (Kvale 1996; Lincoln and Guba 2000). To establish such defensibility, the researcher is required to constantly check and question the means of data collection and the process of interpreting the findings (Kvale 1996). Sections 4.4 and 4.5 explain how the process of checking and questioning was embedded in the research methods employed for the current study. Meanwhile the following sub-sections continue to discuss the utility and implications of employing a discourse theory methodology in this study.

**The Grammar of Discourse Theory**

The third implication of adopting a discourse theory approach in the current study lies in the use of the ‘grammar’ of concepts and logics. While this opens up possibilities for alternative readings and critique, it also raises the possible charge of theoreticism. There is a risk of subsuming the empirical into the theoretical frame such that the social reality is read and interpreted for best fit in the theoretical framework, rather than using the conceptual tools to explain the social phenomena being researched. Following other discourse theorists, the present research guards against theoreticism in two ways (Howarth 2000a; Howarth and Glynos 2007). First, by problematising phenomena at the outset, the perspective remains problem driven (see Chapter One). The overall objective is to seek possible solutions

---

\(^1\) Here, I refer to a method of urban research that seeks to explore the life of an urban development project in a longitudinal, holistic and multidisciplinary way, rather than seeking just a snapshot (see Bond and Thompson-Fawcett 2008)
through innovative readings of real and pressing problems. Second, it would be entirely inconsistent with the ontological position already articulated to understand the concepts and logics inherent to discourse theory as given and absolute models for application on top of social phenomena. They serve a heuristic purpose to enhance and explore possible explanations, rather than as a model to test against empirical settings. Thus the goal in the present research is to ensure that the application of the concepts and logics is sufficiently flexible so that they can be ‘stretched’ and modified where appropriate in the research context (Howarth 2000a:139). In this light, the theoretical and the empirical are not disconnected, but in fact work in a holistic and integrated fashion. Consequently, discourse theory as it is employed in this study is ‘intimately connected to the social reality it describes and interprets, and cannot be falsified by the accounts of reality it facilitates’ (ibid).

So the essence of applying the grammar of concepts to the cases researched here lies in ensuring that the social reality speaks clearly and is not subsumed in the application of the concepts. The structure of the remaining chapters allows the social reality to be the focus. Chapters Six and Seven recontextualise the two case studies and are grounded in the empirical by presenting the detail of the participatory processes chronologically, tracing the events, the meanings and discourses that are articulated in the course of those events, and the logics of equivalence and difference that are evident in the articulation of the discourses. The final, and related implication of employing a discourse theory methodology in this study lies in the role of critique.

**Critique**

Typical of research that employs a discourse theory methodology, the current study is both critical and political. Indeed the concept of critique adopted in the current study is inherently political. The study is critical and political in that it relies on an ethos of problematisation (see Chapter One, section 1.4). The question underlying the study is to ask why the dominant readings of and meanings for social phenomena are as they are, and to ask what are the conditions of possibility or impossibility for those meanings to be articulated. Like discourse theorists, the current study understands that:

Critique should not consist of measuring a current state of affairs against some pre-established yardstick, defining once and for all what is right and good. It should

---

2 This point was made by Dr David Howarth while teaching at a Summer School on Applying Discourse Theory held at Victoria University, Wellington, in December 2006 (also see Howarth 2000a).
rather take the form of an attempt to deconstruct the closure invoked by ethical, normative, political, cultural, economic, and other discourses (Torfing 2005:20).

The important phrase to note in the above quote is ‘once and for all’ – critique does not involve employing universal normative standards as a yardstick for what is considered right and good. Rather critique refers to an examination and exploration of the ways in which decisions are taken in undecidable terrain, why certain possibilities were closed off as options for consideration and to what effect. In addition, the current study is political in that the research is understood as an articulatory practice (see above). Therefore, the positionality (see section 4.2.2) of the researcher comes into play because of their orientation within systems of beliefs, ethics, understandings of what is right and wrong, which thereby establishes a normative (albeit individual) frame from which judgements will be made. So while the conception of critique here eschews a universal normative standard from which to judge social phenomena, that does not mean there is no frame of reference for what is right or wrong – what is right or wrong is itself contingently and historically discursively constructed. However, where a critical stance is adopted, acknowledged and problematised, the assumptions within the stance are amenable to exposure, and the nature and value of critique as articulated above is enhanced.

The current study embraces a particular critical stance. At the heart of the study is a frame of reference that recognises the ‘multiplicity of voices that a pluralist society encompasses, and the complexity of the power structure that this network of differences implies’ (Mouffe 1999:757). Similarly, as noted above, the discourse theory perspective is underpinned by a political commitment to processes of othering and the effects of power. Concomitantly, the current study is motivated by a desire to institute a way of thinking about politics, democracy, and urban change that accounts for the effects of power. Chapter Two provided a review of a body of literature through which theorists articulate a similar normative vision. Hence, the Ethic for Communicative Participation is not established as a universalised blueprint for how all participatory projects should be enacted. Rather it is established as a heuristic device that provides principles through which the effects of power might be revealed in deliberative participatory processes.

---

3 This conception of critique has been much debated, particularly in relation to Derrida’s method of deconstruction and Foucault’s genealogical analyses. Both have been challenged for their apparent normative deficit (Ashendon and Owen 1999; Hoy 1986, 1998; McCarthy 1990; Rabinow 1984; Rorty 1986[9]).
In addition, the primary value of discourse theory as it is employed in this study, is that it ‘puts power and power struggles at the top of the agenda’ (Torfing 2005:23 emphasis original). Power and discourse are imbricated with one another (see Chapter Three), and through exploring the way in which discourses are contested and hegemonised, the questions asked in this research are: how is power legitimised? What hegemonic practices are implicated in legitimising power plays? Who is excluded by that hegemonic practice? The conceptual tools of discourse theory allow an analysis of the conditions through which certain subjects are empowered to speak and be heard, while others are excluded. Moreover, a discourse theory approach enables an understanding that facilitates an explanation of the broader effects of what is said, the way in which it is said, and interpreted within the wider social and political context. Thus the relationship between the micro level and the macro level can be highlighted so that the broader regional, national and even international influences on events at the local level can be brought into consideration in addressing the questions posed in this research.

At this level, the current study spans several disciplines and contributes differently to each. First, in urban analyses that draw on communicative planning theory (see Chapter Two), there has been a deficit in finding ways to marry a power sensitive means of analysis to the normative framework. The current study undertakes this task. Second, at the time of writing, there is little to indicate that discourse theory (after Laclau and Mouffe 2001) has been employed for micro-analyses of democratic urban governance processes - thereby contributing to the growing body of empirical studies that draw on the methodological approach. The remainder of the chapter explains how the methodological approach is employed for the current study.

4.3 Research Strategy – Case based

The current study incorporated three main temporal phases which:

i. explored a wide range of different relevant literatures and theories to establish a theoretical framework;

ii. established case study criteria, selected case study sites, identified appropriate methods, and collected data; and

iii. processed, analysed and re-presented data in synthesis with the theoretical framework.

While this presents a fairly linear progression in time, the reality involved over-laps, continual reflection, and the interweaving of ideas from theory to data and vice versa. Writing has also been ongoing throughout the research process. The remainder of the
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chapter explains the components of the empirical phases of research, which were often frustrating, surprising, but arguably the inevitable result of the journey that such research projects become. First, in this section, the case study approach and the selection process are explained. The remaining two sections (4.4 and 4.5) explain the methods used for data collection and data analysis respectively.

4.3.1 Case based

Case studies provide the means to investigate ‘a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident’ (Yin 2003:13). Case based research enables the conditions of the locality to be explored as they were entwined with the participatory process under study. Case study research focuses on the particular of each case – we learn from the specificities of each case which are emphasised precisely because each ‘case is a specific One’ (Stake 2000:237, emphasis original). Even where comparative inquiry seeks broader generalisations from several case studies, each case is a concentrated, detailed investigation of a single bounded case.

The nature and purpose of cases have been typologised in a variety of ways which tend to emphasise either the generalisability of several cases or the quality of the particular case (Eckstein 1975; Flyvbjerg 2001, 2004b; Stake 2000). For example, Stake (2000:237) describes an intrinsic case study as that which is studied because ‘first and last, the researcher wants a better understanding of the particular case’. Conversely, instrumental case studies are adopted ‘to provide insight into an issue or to redraw a generalisation’ (ibid).

The purpose of case based research in the current study is to focus on the intrinsic value of the particular case (ibid); as an ‘extreme’ (Flyvbjerg 2004b:426) or ‘exemplary’ case (Howarth 2000a). In the current study, the interest in the cases studied lay in the ‘particularity and ordinariness’ of each case itself (Stake 2000:437). The primary purpose was to understand how the nature of the professional ideology operated within each case. So the overall objective was to ensure that the cases were representative of urbanist participatory processes (see Chapters One and Five), thereby providing an assurance that a strong identifiable professional ideology underpinned the examples studied. The following section details the case study selection procedures.
4.3.2 Case Study Criteria

At the outset of the current study the intention was to examine three live or contemporary examples of urbanist participatory processes in different international contexts by using mixed methods, including participant observation, interviews and focus group interviews. The locations targeted for this purpose were England, the United States, and Australasia\(^4\) where the urbanist network is well established and easily identifiable (see Thompson-Fawcett 2003a; also Chapter Five), thereby facilitating access to appropriate contacts to assist with locating the cases.

However, difficulties were encountered in locating potential live cases (see section 4.3.3). The result was that the final selection of cases involved two retrospective studies of an urbanist participatory process entitled Enquiry by Design (henceforth EbD), undertaken in the United Kingdom in late 2004 (see Chapter Five). As a consequence the intended methods also changed, participant observation was not possible and focus groups proved difficult\(^5\). Before discussing the implications of the shift in methods, the original case study selection criteria are provided below.

The six criteria were established prior to the decision to focus solely on cases in the United Kingdom, and are listed below in order of importance. The criteria refer to workshop as a constituent part of the participatory process. As noted in Chapter One, and explained further in Chapter Five, the urbanist participatory process takes as its central component a multi-day interactive deliberative workshop involving a core group of about 40 participants.

i. *Contemporary or live urbanist process*

As indicated above, participant observation of the process was considered to be an appropriate method for identifying and understanding and getting close to the reality of the urbanist participatory process (Crang 2002; Gubrium and Holstein 1997; Shurmer Smith 2002; Silverman 1985; Tedlock 2000). Consequently, the study required cases that were contemporary or 'live'. For example, being present as an observer at the workshop phase may have provided an added dimension. Through participant

---

\(^4\) By Australasia, I refer primarily to New Zealand and Australia. While the urbanist network is strongest in Australia occasional urbanist processes are undertaken in New Zealand, most commonly facilitated by Australian consultants. Therefore, New Zealand was included in the initial search.

\(^5\) The intention was to run focus groups with local residents who had been involved in the urbanist participatory process to gain insight to the nature of the process from the residents' perspective. The advantage of attending the workshop event was that recruitment for groups would be relatively straightforward. However, it proved
observation, the nuances and dynamics of conversations, conflict, and the way issues are addressed can be observed first hand. Interviews and documentation then serve to corroborate and triangulate the researcher’s interpretations (Brewer and Hunter 1989; Howarth 2000a). Moreover, the contacts and rapport with informants is established early on, making the path for further interviewing more straightforward.

ii. Urbanist proponents and principles
As indicated, it was necessary that the case was facilitated by known proponents of the new urbanism in the USA and Australia, or neotraditional principles in the United Kingdom and Europe. The intention was to filter processes that were not urbanist (see Chapters One and Five). There have been many cases of ‘copycat’ urbanist development that are not genuinely seeking to fulfil urbanist principles, but rather recognise the commercial and promotional value in adopting the rhetoric (Ellis 2002; Talen 2000a). Similarly, there are many participatory processes that use a workshop style format, but do not focus on urban design or neo-traditional principles (for example, community visioning, Planning for Real). It is the combination of the workshop style process, the ideology of those facilitating the process, and its multidisciplinary nature that is of interest.

iii. Public process
Given the focus on inclusivity and power, it was necessary to ensure the process was (at least in part) open to the broader public. There were two key reasons for this requirement. First, the array and diversity of power relations within the process were likely to be greater than if only invited stakeholders, themselves likely to be experts in their field, were involved. Second, a process with public access is more inclusive and is consistent with the more innovative deliberative model of public involvement that is advocated in planning theory (see Chapter Two). Moreover, it emerged through the difficulties encountered in selecting cases, that the more open to public the process, the more likely access would be granted to the researcher.

impossible for a retrospective study, given there was no adequate record of which local residents had participated in the public open sessions of the processes.
iv. **Length of workshop**
In order to ensure the project was appropriately sized, the length of the workshop at the centre of the case had to be at minimum 5 days. This served to guard against two matters. First, shorter processes are often visioning or strategic planning exercises, without any commitment to implementation. While these are no less worthy of study, it was important to focus on a process with an urban design component, and that could be followed (in subsequent research projects) in the future through its implementation phase. The ability to build on and extend research at a later date is important. Longitudinal studies of participatory exercises are rare, which generally means that associated questions of capacity building and enhanced democracy over time cannot be addressed. Second, most genuine urbanist processes are longer than four days (Brown 2005; Lennertz 2003), thus further guarding against pseudo urbanist processes.

v. **A discrete planning issue**
The case required a focussed, discrete planning issue that would require a significant design component. The design component allows the professional ideology (in the form of normative design principles) to become manifest in a more explicit fashion. Examples include the development and design of an urban extension or the regeneration of a neighbourhood or town centre, where the design principles would be more explicitly expressed than in a visioning or strategic planning exercise.

vi. **Local Government involvement**
Lastly, it was preferable for the case to involve local government, either as initiators, or in partnership with the private sector. This criterion was added after being denied access to a case in Australasia, initiated and undertaken almost entirely by developers who engaged urbanist consultants. From this experience, it seemed more likely that access would be permitted if the public sector were directly involved in the process.

---

6 The case was a charrette being run by prominent Australasian urbanists for a coastal subdivision in Tauranga, New Zealand, in October 2004. Access was initially negotiated with the consultants running the process, and later revoked by the developer, arguing the risk was too great, particularly given my desire to interview a range of different individuals involved in the process.
Despite attempting to remain true to these criteria, the reality and difficulties experienced in locating appropriate cases meant that ultimately, flexibility, an open mind and a positive and respectful attitude were required throughout the selection process.

4.3.3 Case Selection and Access

The search for cases was protracted and difficult – extending from September 2004 through to mid 2005. The complexity of discovering when an appropriate process was being undertaken, gaining access, while simultaneously fulfilling logistical requirements of getting there in time to be a participant observer became insurmountable. There were several factors involved. First, contrary to prior information, there appeared to be very little in the way of urbanist participatory processes going on in Australasia\(^7\), with the exception of the process to which access was denied, mentioned above. Second, two funding bids failed, which made a broad international focus too financially onerous. And third, contacts at the organisation primarily responsible for running processes in Britain\(^8\), the Prince’s Foundation, had been positive about several processes tentatively scheduled in the New Year. However, fixed dates were not confirmed, and there was pressure to get into the field. By March 2005, the Prince’s Foundation indicated a further possible project scheduled for June. The decision to undertake fieldwork in that period was taken and travel arrangements made. The intention was to undertake the live proposed case if it eventuated, accompanied by a retrospective study of a similar case that was undergoing stages of implementation. Thus the research would focus on the same type of process but at different points in its progression. The final contingency plan was to undertake two different retrospective studies, which is what eventuated.

Interestingly, on reflection, when searching for retrospective studies, it emerged that the Whitefield case (reported as a retrospective study in Chapter Seven) was held a full month after initial contact with the Prince’s Foundation was established. Similarly, from late October 2004 to late April 2005, regular email and telephone contact was maintained with

\(^7\) This belief was based on the knowledge of an active community of urbanist consultants and their work over the last decade. In addition, a whole series of urbanist projects were underway in Melbourne as part of a large comprehensive strategic growth management exercise for the whole city (Melbourne 2030, see http://www.dse.vic.gov.au/melbourne2030/). However, it became clear early on that because of the scale and strategic orientation of the project it did not fit my initial criteria.

\(^8\) The organisation running urbanist processes in Britain is the Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment who have trademarked their ‘enquiry by design’ process modelled on the new urbanist charrette (see Chapter Five). Other organisations such as INTBAU and CEU both run similar types of process, but through an agreement with the Princes Foundation, only take on projects in Europe excluding England (Foundation 3).
Foundation staff, during which time a subsequent process in Crewkerne, England was held. That the Foundation maintained silence on these two processes suggests a reluctance to permit access as a participant observer. There were several possible factors at play that relate to the Foundation’s silence on the two potential cases and more generally to issues of access in research. First, researching from a distance provides a range of difficulties in access. In particular, and encountered in the current study, identifying and then being able to speak to the right individuals within the institution was problematic (Herod 1999). However, possibly the most significant barrier was an inability to make face to face contact with the Foundation staff early on, which meant that I was unknown, and trust and integrity were not established at an early time (Kvale 1996). Established networks, known contacts, a trusted referee all potentially contribute to more straightforward access (Herod 1999; Hirsch 1995). In the current study, the pre-existing networks between researcher and researched were weak, and arguably, this weakness was compounded by distance.

The second possible reason lies in the nature of the Foundation as an organisation. Negotiating access to the field has been well recognised as problematic particularly when studying elites, although this term is contested (Desmond 2004; Smith 2006; Woods 1998). Generally, elites are defined as organisations or individuals in organisations who have control of resources, the ability to make decisions that have a wide ranging effect on many others, display elements of exclusivity (Desmond 2004; Parry 1998), and have strong interconnected networks of influence (Oinas 1999). More often, they are simply referred to as those in positions of power (Smith 2006). In the current study, the Prince’s Foundation is clearly an organisation with status and power (see Chapters Five, Six and Seven). While the elite status of an organisation is not the only reason access might be difficult (Smith 2006), the fact that the Foundation was in control of each EbD event and more generally took ownership of the type of process (for example, through trademarking) means that in this regard their status was pertinent, whether defined as elite or not.

There are two particular factors related to the status of the Foundation that may have been the cause of difficulties in the current research. First, given the nature of the research, being present as an observer in a process which is potentially highly charged politically may raise concerns for the facilitators of the process. This was the principle reason given for being denied access in the Australasian case (as noted above). It was too politically and commercially sensitive, and too great a risk to have an (unknown) researcher present, talking to various stakeholders and potentially (unwittingly) disrupting proceedings. There is no reason to believe this argument did not apply to the Prince’s Foundation, particularly in
regard to the Whitefield project in the north west of England. The Whitefield process was politically and emotionally charged, in the national media spotlight, and due to a variety of factors the local authority as the client was considered by the Foundation to be unwilling (see Chapter Seven, section 7.3). The second reason, for which there is no explicit evidence in this case, lies in the nature of the urbanist discourse particularly in the United States. The discourse is renowned for its antagonistic stance against academic researchers (see Chapter Five). Elites are often recognised as doers and as such, research and academics’ interests and theory may be of little interest where it is not recognised as contributing to a pragmatic focus (Hirsch 1995). It is possible the Foundation were simply resistant to academic research on the EbD process. However, although it remained difficult to access some documentary material and arrange interviews with two senior personnel (discussed further below), eventually Foundation staff members were helpful and interviewees were generally forthcoming, friendly, welcoming, and in most instances seemingly candid.

Accordingly, the third and perhaps most likely reason for the difficulty in gaining access concerned the immediate context when fieldwork was undertaken. It became evident through interviewing for the Nelson case that the timing of my initial inquiry coincided with some kind of disruption and consequent restructuring within the senior personnel of the Foundation (see Chapter Seven, section 7.3). The difficulties of access are not consistent across space and time (Desmond 2004; Ward and Jones 1999). In particular, Desmond (2004) observes that in periods of contestation or in the development of new technologies or innovations, access for researchers may be compromised. While this may not result in denial of access, it may result in different quality of information which is discussed below in relation to interview methods undertaken for the current study. Similarly, Ward and Jones (1999) explain the concept of the mode of access as the contingent forces that come into play at the moment of seeking access to the field. In this sense, it is possible that all the factors suggested above came into play in the difficulties of access to a live EbD process.

The final choice of retrospective case studies was made out of a dozen EbD processes that had been held in the two years prior to the fieldwork period (mid 2005). The choice was based on the criteria established above (with the exception of criterion one). Three potential cases met the criteria, two greenfield projects in the south west of England, and one regeneration case – the Whitefield project in the north west of England. Finally the decision rested on an intrinsic interest in the cases (Stake 2000). The regeneration case was chosen for two reasons. First, it was the only EbD that had been undertaken for a regeneration project in England. Therefore a detailed analysis of the process would be of value, providing
a baseline for future research of similar projects. Second, it had a very complex history and a fascinating mix of social, political, cultural and environmental issues. Given that charrettes and similar urbanist processes have been simultaneously criticised (Sarkissian, et al. 1997) and promoted (McGlynn and Murrain 1994) in their ability to address large complex cases, it provided an excellent example to empirically investigate these claims.

The choice remained then, between two greenfield urban extensions. Again an intrinsic interest resulted in the selection of the Newquay Growth Area project on the north Cornish coast in the south west of England. The primary reason for selection was that the project was being developed and masterplanned by the same organisation who developed Poundbury, an exemplar urbanist urban extension in Dorset, England. The Cornish case’s connections with Poundbury guaranteed that it was an urbanist project. In addition, there has been previous research on Poundbury, from its inception through to lived experience (see Thompson-Fawcett 2003b; Thompson-Fawcett and Bond 2003, 2004). Undertaking detailed and in depth research on similar projects contributes to the body of research on the nature and effects of these types of urban transformations. Figure 4.1 shows the location of the two cases in England.

Figure 4.1 – Location of the two case studies within the United Kingdom. Whitefield located in Nelson, in East Lancashire, north west England and the Newquay Growth Area, in the Cornish resort town in the south west of England (Source: author).

The final point to note, is that while there are advantages to researching a live case (being a participant observer, gaining access to other participants who may be otherwise hard
to identify), there are also advantages to a retrospective case. Difficulties of access are diminished with the passing of time, as sensitive issues become sedimented into past events (Desmond 2004). Consequently, the potential threat of the researcher is lessened. This also has implications for the quality of information gathered (ibid). Participants are potentially more candid about events and issues that are in the past. Second, the relationship between researcher and researched shifts. In a live case, ethically, there is a sense of obligation to the organisers and facilitators of the process, which in turn shifts the power relationship. As an observer, the researcher has been granted the privileged right to participate in the process, which may have implications for what the researcher feels she can or cannot do, ask or say. Moreover, the researcher may be seen to be affiliated with the organisers of the process, which in turn has implications for how interviewees respond. Researching after the event provides the researcher with a degree of autonomy in the interviewing process. With the change to the case study approach, so too was there a change in research methods. Reliance on interviews and background documentation became the main sources of data, as detailed in the following section.

4.4 The Methods

The focus of the current study lies in understanding the meanings, experiences and knowledges of different participants who partook in the two EbD cases, in order to identify the discourses and concomitant power relationships that arose. Two qualitative methods were used – semi structured interviews and an analysis of background documentation and media coverage. The following three sections explain how the methods were undertaken and their rationale.

4.4.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

The primary data source for the current study were semi-structured interviews with participants in the EbD process in each case study. Interviews are an appropriate means to understand situated knowledges and lived experience, to acquire insights into the world from the interviewees positioning and gather rich, in depth data (Denzin and Lincoln 2000a; Holstein and Gubrium 2004; Hoggart, Lees and Davies 2002; Kvale 1996; Silverman 2004). For the current study, interviews were employed to gain an understanding of the EbD process as informants remembered it, to be able to reconstruct as far as possible how they experienced it, and to understand how the planning project was understood by those informants at the time of interviewing. However, interviewing does not simply involve the
transferral of knowledge from researcher to the researched (Holstein and Gubrium 2004). Rather they are ‘a construction site of knowledge’ (Kvale 1996:2) involving active subjects who are ‘always already active makers of meaning’ (Holstien and Gubrium 2004:145). Consequently, and consistent with a post-structural approach to research, interviews are understood as sites of complex power relations, through which meanings are constituted.

The power relationships between researcher and researched have long been recognised as ‘asymmetrical and potentially exploitative’ (England 1994:82). Moreover, there is an acknowledgement that sometimes it is the researcher who is more vulnerable particularly in interviews with elites (Desmond 2004; Herod 1999; McDowell 1992; Mullings 1999; Smith 2006). These power relationships are never static, but change as relationships between researcher and researched change (Mullings 1999). There are a number of ways in which theorists have sought to address the powerful role of the interviewer, and similarly a variety of different approaches to doing interviews. The enhanced reflexivity of qualitative research combined with an acknowledgement of researcher positioning was discussed earlier (section 4.2.2).

Two further approaches were employed as guiding principles in conducting the interviews in the current study. First, the ‘interviewer as supplicant’ approach involves an explicit acknowledgement of the interviewer’s need for information and the interviewee’s superior knowledge of the subject under study (Smith 1988:25). In this approach, the interviewer seeks ‘reciprocal relationships based on empathy and mutual respect, and often shar[es] their knowledge with those they research’ (England 1994:82). A similar approach is to understand the interviewee as an ‘active’ subject, who, with the interviewer develops in the course of the interview (Holstein and Gubrium 2004). As such, the interview is ‘a site of, and occasion for, producing reportable knowledge’ (ibid:141). That is, the contingency of the moment, the interview setting, the positionality of the researcher and the researched, the subject matter, and the broader temporal space in which the interview occurs all come into play and influence the interview. And most importantly, the interviewee is not considered to be passive, but is involved in (re)producing their knowledge in the interview context.

Along with the two principles discussed above, Kvale’s (1996) suggestions for framing the interview were utilised as a guide to conducting the interviews. As such, interviewees were initially contacted by letter, which introduced the nature of the topic, invited them to partake in an interview and provided a briefing as to what the interview would involve. Arrangements for the interview were confirmed in a follow-up telephone call. In total, 52 interviews were undertaken for both cases in June and July 2005. Interview length varied
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from 20 minutes to two and half hours. Two afternoons were spent with two different interviewees walking around the Whitefield EbD study area. The composition of research samples is discussed in the following section.

4.4.2 Interview Participants

While it was not possible, or even desirable, to speak with everyone involved in each process, a representative sample of individuals were selected from the lists of attendees provide by the Prince’s Foundation. Logistics of travel and time constraints limited the choices for some types of stakeholders. In addition, a snowballing technique was employed to identify other potential informants once in the field which allowed some access to members of the public who had attended parts of the process but were outside the Foundation’s lists. A summary of interviewees for each case is listed in Table 4.1, showing the interviewees’ organisation or organisation type, their profession, their role in the EbD and the specific codes used to identify participants in the following chapters.

Table 4.1 – Interviewees for each case study listed by profession, organisation and role in the EbD (*indicates the interview was conducted by telephone from New Zealand)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organisation / Role</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Role in EbD</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>architect</td>
<td>design team</td>
<td>Design Team N1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>urban designer</td>
<td>design team</td>
<td>Design Team N2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>sustainable building expert</td>
<td>design team</td>
<td>Design Team N3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Duchy of Cornwall</td>
<td>manager</td>
<td>design team</td>
<td>Design Team N4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>senior planners</td>
<td>core team</td>
<td>Council Officer N1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>manager of services</td>
<td>core team</td>
<td>Council Officer N3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>elected representative</td>
<td>core team</td>
<td>Council Officer N2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local business group</td>
<td>legal firm employee</td>
<td>core team</td>
<td>Councilor N1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>parish priest</td>
<td>core team/working group</td>
<td>Core Team N2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>senior teacher</td>
<td>core team/working group</td>
<td>Core Team N3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Health care provider</td>
<td>volunteer</td>
<td>core team/working group</td>
<td>Core Team N4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Registered social landlord</td>
<td>manager</td>
<td>core team/working group</td>
<td>Core Team N5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Gusti Veor resident</td>
<td>core team/working group</td>
<td>Core Team N6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>local businesses</td>
<td>core team/working group</td>
<td>Landowner N1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The different roles are explained in Chapter Five. Design team refers to the Foundation’s team of experts, instrumental in facilitating the process. The core team are local stakeholders who work with the design team throughout the workshop week. Tier B involves broader stakeholders who partake on day one and at a review session on day three. And tier C are the general public invited to specific public meetings.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organisation / Role</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Role/Experience in EbDs</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community group</td>
<td>volunteer</td>
<td>tier B</td>
<td>Community Group N1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aged care provider</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>working group</td>
<td>Working Group N1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local business group</td>
<td>local business</td>
<td>working group</td>
<td>Working Group N2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Whitefield, Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Whitefield, Nelson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organisation / Role</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Role/Experience in EbDs</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organisation / Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Whitefield, Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organisation / Role</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Role/Experience in EbDs</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organisation / Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organisation / Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Personal Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organisation / Role</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Role/Experience in EbDs</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior Foundation staff</td>
<td>urban designer/architect</td>
<td>facilitator, experience</td>
<td>Senior Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Organisation / Role</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Role/Experience in EbDs</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leon Krier (Newquay)</td>
<td>masterplanner/theoretician</td>
<td>masterplanner</td>
<td>Krier pers. comm. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Landowner (Newquay)</td>
<td>business person</td>
<td>core team</td>
<td>Landowner pers. comm. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Duchy of Cornwall (Newquay)</td>
<td>manager</td>
<td>design team</td>
<td>Design Team N4 pers. comm. 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Local Authority (Whitefield)</td>
<td>senior officer</td>
<td>core team</td>
<td>Council Officer W1 pers. comm. 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Three interviews in total were conducted by telephone (marked with * in Table 4.1). A number of participants who were not formally interviewed are referred to in Chapters Six and Seven as ‘pers. comm.’ (see Table 4.1). In Newquay a ten minute telephone conversation was undertaken with a landowner who did not have time for an interview. In 2005, a senior member of the Prince’s Foundation was spoken to while at a conference in New Zealand. In 2006, email and telephone contact was made with the project manager in Newquay and a senior local authority member in Whitefield (respectively). Both individuals had been interviewed in 2005. Finally, while in Newquay, the opportunity arose to attend two further events. First, I was invited to attend and observe the Building Code workshop that was held at Poundbury in early July which involved several interview participants and the masterplanner Leon Krier. References to observations made at the Building Code workshop are indicated by ‘observation notes’. During the workshop a twenty minute conversation with Krier about the EbD process was undertaken. Second, I attended a public meeting held as part of the regeneration proposals that were being consulted on at the time, and from which the story at the beginning of this thesis was drawn. Having established the understandings that guided the interview process and the characteristics of the participants, the following section reflects on the nature of the interviews.

4.4.3 Reflecting on the Interviews

Only three of the selected interviewees declined to be interviewed, two of whom showed goodwill but scheduling was not possible. One landowner in Newquay did not wish to be involved at all. In general though, interviewees were enthusiastic about the research. However, there was considerable variation in the nature of the talk and the emotion involved in the interviews. In particular, there was an evident difference between those with a local attachment to the place and those with an expert or professional position in relation to the place. Given the diversity of potential informants, questions of the effects the differential status of various interviewees might have on interviews was considered. However, consistent with emerging literature on the problematics of assuming a different ethical approach for more powerful or elite interviewees, the same approach was taken for all interviews (see Desmond 2004; Parry 1998; Smith 2006; Woods 1998;).

Each interview was guided by an interview schedule comprising a general list of topics to be covered (see Appendix A). Schedules differed for each case and according to the characteristics of the interviewees’ roles in the processes. Nevertheless, each schedule covered the same broad themes developed by reference to the theoretical framework in
Chapter Two and a broad understanding of the components of the EbD process. The interview schedules were flexible enough to allow the discussion to be sufficiently open so that when other interesting relevant topics emerged spontaneously, they could be explored (Kvale 1996). In addition, each informant was presented with both an information sheet with contact details, and a consent form to sign, in conformity with University of Otago ethics procedures. All interviews were taped, with the consent of the participant. In several instances the informant asked for the tape to be switched off. While the content of ‘off the record’ material was noted after the event, care was taken in the representation to ensure that faithfulness to the interviewee’s wishes was maintained. In addition, non verbal facets of the interview – posture, gesture, intonation, emotion, atmosphere – were noted as soon as possible after the event (Jones 2004; Kvale 1996). The notes not only contributed to understanding the context of the data source but provided a contribution to reflexivity (see section 4.2 above). For example, after each interview, the question asked was whether the parties to the interview seemed open, honest, comfortable, uncomfortable, guarded, or threatened? Reflections on why those characteristics emerged were also noted. These notes then prefaced the transcripts.

Access to two senior Foundation members instrumental in each EbD process was difficult. Despite persistent emails and telephone messages, contact was not established until returning to New Zealand. For one, there was simply no response until, surprisingly, an email was received a full year after the initial fieldwork. A successful telephone interview followed. For the other consultant, a telephone interview was set up not long after returning to New Zealand (August 2005), which itself was difficult. The difference in the nature of this interview compared to others, including the other telephone interviews was palpable. The effects of a long distance call, the nature of the Foundation, the profile of the interviewee, and his control of the situation left its mark. Rather than the interviewer maintaining control of the interview context (and the power balance inherent to it) as is often assumed in qualitative research, in this instance there was a sense of disempowerment on the part of the interviewer. The semi-structured open style of interviewing adopted for the study may not have been appropriate for this particular interviewee who appeared to be comfortable and familiar with controlling discussions (Hirsch 1995). The fact that the interview was conducted by telephone may have compounded the issue.

This example of a reversed power relationship between the interviewee and interviewer is recognised as a common problem in interviewing elites. Consequently, several commentators recommend different approaches to researching elites as opposed to non-elites
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(Cormode and Hughes 1999; see edited collections by Hertz and Imber 1995; Moyser and Wagstaff 1987). However, it is difficult to justify two different ethical approaches to interviewees within the same research project (given not all informants could be considered elites), or even for different groups generally, given the shifting and contingent nature of power relations (Smith 2006). In the current study, not every professional interviewee transferred the power of their professional roles to the context of the interview (ibid).

Two further examples reveal the variable nature of the way in which power was imbricated in the interviews. A senior executive of a Local Authority spoke candidly about the difficulties experienced in the EbD process, revealing frustration, vulnerability, and in some instances nervousness. In contrast, a politically savvy, very astute, senior representative of the Duchy of Cornwall, the leading developer of the Cornish case seemed to view the interview as a ‘moment of opportunity’ (Desmond 2004:267). Access was unproblematic, although in substance the interview contained political spin and rhetoric. Consequently, throughout all the interviews, the changing nature of power between the researcher and the researched was recognised as far as it was possible to do so (ibid; Rose 1997), thereby contributing to the reflexivity of the research as a whole.

4.4.4 Background Documents and Media Coverage

The availability of background documentation was variable. For both cases, information requested from a variety of organisations was willingly provided, and in several instances, sent at some cost, to New Zealand. In contrast, the information provided by the Foundation was (implicitly) restricted to that publicly available. Information was requested on EbDs, known to exist and that had been discussed in interviews. While, access to the information was not denied, it was never provided despite repeated requests. Similar experiences in research undertaken on elites have been recorded (see Desmond 2004; Sabot 1999). As Desmond (2004) notes, the nature of an organisation may not impact just on access but on the quality of material provided. However, the same factors that were relevant above in regard to access to case study processes apply (see section 4.3.2). In addition, researching from a distance was a significant limiting factor, in that direct contact and collection in person was not an option after departing from England.

Background documentation served as crucial contextual material, and provided valuable insights into the nature of each process and the way it was portrayed publicly. Secondary material included policy and planning documents, reports, and media coverage
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associated with each case. Observations and photographs of each site complemented the investigations.

Secondary material also served to guard against conflating what was said with what was done, which may arise through an over reliance on interview data (Dreyer Hansen and Sorenson 2005). Cross checking interview data with policy documents, press releases, public statements and written reports provided insights into a range of articulations in which inconsistencies between what was said, what was done, and what was publicly articulated were revealed. The goal for the current study was to discover whether different actors and discursive meanings were coherent in the stories revealed (ibid).

4.5 Data Analysis and Representation

This section addresses how data were analysed and then (re)presented in the doctoral thesis. These two aspects of the research process are discussed below.

4.5.1 Data Analysis

Consistent with a discourse theory approach, a discourse analysis of the data was undertaken. However, discourse analysis is a variable approach, with no single step by step method (Baxter 2003; Fairclough 1992; Howarth 2000a). The variance in ‘doing’ discourse analysis depends on the purpose, approach, and perspective of the analyst. Following Howarth (2005:336), in the current study, a distinction is made between discourse theory and the more generally denoted discourse analysis where the latter involves employing techniques to analyse situated talk as text. Discourse theory, as discussed earlier in the chapter involves a variety of conceptual tools to analyse social phenomena and a set of methodological assumptions.

Analysis involved drawing on the conceptual framework of discourse theory – that is, articulation, logics of equivalence and difference, dislocation, antagonism, and hegemonic myths and imaginaries – in order to discern the power relations imbricated in the way meanings were constructed, re-articulated, perpetuated and contested in each of the cases. In order to understand the role of discourses within the EbDs, the analysis was undertaken at both the textual and the contextual levels. In terms of a textual analysis of interview transcripts and background documents, the current study examined ‘things said’ in the Foucauldian sense. That is, it focused on what was said, how it was said, and from where it was said. In drawing on the discourse theory concepts, that analysis therefore examined how statements, practices, actions, events, incidents and conflicts or tensions produced, fixed,
altered or contested meanings in each case (Howarth 2005). The textual analysis was complemented by a contextual analysis of the data, which was achieved in two ways. First, by drawing on Foucault’s concept of governmentality and an ascending analysis of power (see Chapter Three, section 3.2.2), the data were analysed by initially focusing on what was said and then exploring how the contextual factors at play influenced what was said and the meanings attributed to those statements. Second, the conceptual tools of discourse theory imply a structural emphasis, whereby the social phenomena studied (here, the EbDs) are interpreted through the meanings articulated within discourses. Therefore, the contextual analysis sought to understand more broadly the interplay of discourses that were the effect of and effected by those meanings articulated and identified in the textual analysis.

Furthermore, the analysis investigated where and how statements and meanings were articulated, in order to reveal discontinuities and inconsistencies between statements and actions to facilitate explanation. The focus here was on the difference between what was said and the act of saying (Howarth 2005). Where stories were consistent, there was an indication that hegemonic meanings had been established or embraced, which became the basis for further interrogation of the normalised or sedimented meanings and their effect. Conversely, inconsistencies suggested meanings were discursively contested (ibid), marking the limits of discourse or the changing nature of discourses. So overall, analysis involved the identification of the range of discourses (and discursively constructed meanings) evident in the EbD processes under study, their construction, inter-relatedness and conditions of existence (in a Foucauldian sense). Further analysis was grounded in developing an understanding of the implications these discursive practices have on the people involved, the broader local context, the development proposal, and in terms of an approach to participatory and collaborative planning.

Post-structural approaches and discourse analysis are often criticised for the extreme openness of interpretation on which they are predicated, which can quickly become so relativistic as to be meaningless. To avoid this, the current study is grounded by relating the possible meanings back to the theoretical framework established in Chapter Two, the broader discourses of that framework and in seeking ways to address the research questions posed. In this respect a mixed inductive and deductive approach to analysis was followed (see Miles and Huberman 1994; Sarantakos 1993) which involved an iterative and reflexive tacking back and forth between data, theory and researcher positionality. In drawing out meanings and narratives from interviews, the interview context was recalled and checked against the interpretation for consistency and honesty.
In order to undertake the discourse analysis outlined above, all interviews were transcribed verbatim by professional audio typists. Each transcript was cross checked for accuracy. Interviews with more than one person, or of a poor quality with background noise were transcribed by the researcher. All transcripts, fieldnotes, and other supplementary material (as far as possible\textsuperscript{10}) were entered into Nvivo, a software packaged designed for qualitative analysis. The Nvivo software allows for detailed coding, at different levels and across different data sets, enabling coded text to be rigorously cross-referenced and recalled. Coding was used to group and categorise emerging discourses, patterns, themes, topics, and events. At the outset, codes were (deductively) generated from the theoretical framework, and then (inductively) from a first reading of transcripts and field notes. In the process of repeatedly revisiting the data, coding was (inductively) refined and then further refined, facilitated by the use of Nvivo. While a database package such as Nvivo ‘is no substitute for reading and thinking’ (Gibbs 2002:36), it provides an efficient means of storing, grouping and searching data. Computer facilitated analysis has been accused of isolating coded segments of text and thereby disconnecting them from foregoing statements within the interview. However, familiarity with the data and manual cross checking served to ensure that data were interpreted in light of the whole interview in a way that remained as faithful as possible to when and how the interviewees recalled their stories.

4.5.2 Recontextualisation and Articulation

The stories of the interviewees were interpreted and (re)presented or recontextualised in Chapters Six (Newquay) and Seven (Whitefield). The concept of recontextualisation recognises the constructed nature of interpreting interview data, and the role of researcher as author who speaks for those interviewed (Czarniaswka 2000, 2004; Denzin and Lincoln 2000a; Kvale 1996). As Czarniawska (2000:747) suggests ‘every reading is an interpretation and every interpretation is an association tying the text that is interpreted to other texts, other voices, other times, other places’. Thus what follows in is an interweaving of stories, recollections, re-interpretations from interviewees, entwined with other contextual meanings, and the framing of my positioning. Both chapters are necessarily long in order to maintain the narrative of each case, tracing the pattern of the EbD through its three main phases, the

\textsuperscript{10} Where supplementary data was not able to be entered into Nvivo (ie when it was not transferable into an appropriate format) manual coding, indexing, and searching was undertaken.
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pre-EbD phase, the EbD workshop and the post-EbD phase. To maintain respect and confidentiality, specific coding has been used for the interviewees (see table 4.1).

Crucial to this telling as a recontextualisation is faithfulness to the data, sought through allowing interviewees voices to be heard (Winchester 1996). The narrative shifts between a recontextualisation of the voices to interpretation, explanation and commentary employing the analytical tools of discourse theory. Consequently, terms such as antagonism, agonism, adversary, enemy, logic of equivalence, logic of difference, signification, etc. are used throughout the chapters. These terms are explained in Chapter Three. Note that the framing of discourse theory is essentially negative because of its understanding of the social sphere as inherently antagonistic, which involves a constitutive other or enemy. Consequently, the recontextualisation, particularly in the Whitefield case, may come across as being framed overly negatively. However, the reader is reminded that the terminology for antagonism and enemy have very specific meanings from a discourse theory perspective. As discussed in section 4.2, what is important in the recontextualisation is that it is a plausible, novel, respectful account of the two cases, or in Geertz’s words, ‘an honest story honestly told’ (1988:9).

4.6 Bricolage

The bricolage that constitutes the current study comprises an underlying critical stance shaped by post-structuralism and the materialist ontology of discourse theory. The assumptions inherent in the approach permeate the whole research process from the interpretation of theory through to the re-presentation of data. Reflexivity is a core requirement and is reflected here both in discussing the methodology and in reflecting on what was done and why.

From this point in the thesis, the empirical component becomes the focus, but is interwoven with the theoretical frame and methodology as already established. Chapter Five serves as an introduction to the case studies. It outlines in some detail the urbanist participatory technique, thus contextualising the two EbD processes that are represented in Chapters Six and Seven.
Chapter 5
Urbanist Participation

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the context for the empirical component of this study. It briefly explains the nature of the urbanist discourse as far as it is necessary to understand the urbanist participatory approach employed in the cases studied in this research. It therefore details the urbanist participatory technique, Enquiry by Design (EbD), and the urbanist ideology that underpins the technique. As indicated in Chapter One, urbanism, as used here, is a generic term for a series of popularised sustainability discourses that focus on creating sustainable urban places. Arguably the most dominant discourse in this regard is the New Urbanism in the United States. Moreover, the New Urbanist charrette was influential in the development of the EbD technique. Both the New Urbanism and British traditional urbanism are mutually influenced by one another (see Thompson-Fawcett 2003a) and so a broad understanding of the nature of the New Urbanist discourse elucidates the British counterpart, within which the EbD technique is situated. The following section, then, portrays an image of the New Urbanism, and outlines its British parallel. In so doing, this chapter introduces the role of a key organisation – the Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment (hereafter referred to as the Foundation) – which facilitated both EbD cases. Section 5.3 follows with an introduction to urbanist participation, while Section 5.4 focuses in on the charrette and EbD models. As such it is useful to draw both distinctions and similarities between the two processes. The two techniques are typically facilitated, promoted and taught by a network of elite urbanist practitioners on both sides of the Atlantic, who are mutually influenced by one another. The Chapter is informed by both literature and data analysed from interviews undertaken with urbanists involved in the case studies. Finally, Section 5.5 concludes the chapter by drawing out similarities with the Communicative Ethic established in Chapter Two.

5.2 Urbanism on Both Sides of the Atlantic

Urbanist discourses on both sides of the Atlantic developed in parallel. The New Urbanism in the United States is perhaps the most dominant, and as will be seen shortly, is renowned for being the most aggressively promoted. New Urbanism is an umbrella term for
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‘a movement in architecture and planning’ (Bohl 2000:762) that encompasses the work of various built environment professionals1 who share a common goal in advocating for:

design-based strategies founded on ‘traditional’ urban forms to help arrest suburban sprawl and inner-city decline and to build and rebuild neighbourhoods, towns and cities’ (ibid).

The underlying principles of the movement began to coalesce in the minds of the movement’s founders in the late 1980s, but the Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU), which formalised the group’s shared principles, was not established until 1993 (Fulton 1996). The CNU itself was modelled on the CIAM (Congrès Internationaux D’Architecture Moderne) and strongly influenced by European thinkers, both contemporary and from earlier times (Thompson-Fawcett 2003a). And in a similar vein to CIAM, the first three congresses of the CNU developed their urbanist principles into the Charter of the New Urbanism (CNU 2001), after the CIAM’s Athen’s Charter (Fulton 1996; Thompson-Fawcett 2003b). The principles articulated in the Charter guide urban design outcomes in urbanist charrettes, and represent the common ground for urbanist practitioners who may independently have differing approaches.

The design principles of the New Urbanism operate on different scales, from the building, lot and block; to the neighbourhood and district; and then to the city and region. In very general terms the principles articulated argue for ‘organising development into neighbourhoods that are diverse, compact, mixed use, pedestrian oriented, and transit friendly’ (Bohl 2000:762). As Bohl (2000:763) argues, for the New Urbanism, the neighbourhood is the basic building block2, and is characterised by:

- A 5-10 minute walk from centre to edge;
- A variety of housing types and land uses to encourage diversity;
- A mix of shops, services, and civic uses to satisfy local needs;
- Pedestrian oriented streets – narrow with street parking, wide footpaths and tree-lined to encourage, walking, interaction, safety and traffic calming;
- Low to medium rise buildings set close together and to the street for natural surveillance and to define the public realm;
- Well designed, safe, useable public space;

---

1 In the United States, renowned New Urbanists include Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk and their traditional neighbourhood development; pedestrian pockets and transit oriented development of Peter Calthorpe, Douglas Kelbaugh, and Bill Liebermann; and in Europe, the work of Leon Krier and his urban quarters (see Bohl 2000).
2 See also CNU 2001; Duany et al 2000; Katz 1994a; Thompson-Fawcett and Bond 2003.
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- A centre with shops and public transport which serves as a focal point; and
- A coherent (but varied) architectural form derived from the traditional building techniques of the area.

The New Urbanism has gained attention from critics and supporters both from within, and beyond the academy. Many who find aspects of the movement appealing have become wary. For example, Grant (2006:xvi) candidly states her position in the preface to her recent book, Planning the Good Community:

I have become wary of the evangelical zeal of the new urbanists, and the cult of celebrity that surrounds New Urbanism’s exponents. I find vitriol and hyperbole distasteful... New Urbanism now involves big dollars and huge egos. Some of the simplicity and promise of the concept has been lost in translation and accumulation.

Other critics have picked up on the doctrinal nature of the movement (see Beauregard 2002; Fainstein 2000; McCann 2002). Another notable characteristic, is the antagonistic attitude toward the academy by some leading proponents of the New Urbanism. Indeed, Duany (2005:vii) suggests that the ‘ascendancy of the New Urbanism’ is ‘the devil incarnate of academic discourse’. Described as the ‘patriarch’ of the New Urbanism (Krieger 1998:73), Duany (1998:40) suggests that there is no point in engaging in debate with the academy because, by and large, they do not build communities. Instead, he argues, academics just criticise those that seek to make better places without a full understanding of the processes and principles involved. Indeed, this position permeates the entire discourse, as can be seen by debates such as that between Duany (1998) and Krieger (1998) and articles such as Murrain’s (2002), entitled ‘Understand Urbanism and get off its Back’. This antagonistic ‘with us’ or ‘against us’ position does not allow for questioning the way in which the discourse is articulated, maintained and disseminated.

Interestingly, British urbanist discourse is less aggressive in its approach than the New Urbanism emanating from the United States. According to Tiesdell (2002), the reason is due largely to differences in the planning systems in Britain and the United States. British urbanism does however, have advocates in places of power as well as a core network of elite practitioners who work in disseminating ideas, education, and implementation. Moreover, there are strong connections between the American CNU and British urbanism which are multidirectional and complex (see Thompson-Fawcett 2003a). British urbanism emerged concomitantly with the New Urbanism. Yet a mutual multi-directional influence across the Atlantic between key figures in both movements contributes to the ongoing constitution of both discourses (ibid). In Britain, these key figures were HRH the Prince of Wales and
urbanist/theoretician Leon Krier (see Thompson-Fawcett 2003a; Thompson-Fawcett and Bond 2003).

During the 1980s and 1990s, the Prince of Wales became increasingly outspoken about car dependence, the lack of community, characterless modernist architecture and urban sprawl (see www.princeofwales.gov.uk/speechesandarticles/; Prince of Wales 1989). As a result he established the Prince’s Institute of Architecture and was instrumental in the development of the Urban Villages Group (later the Urban Villages Forum) under his own patronage (Thompson-Fawcett 2003a). The Urban Villages Forum was an early driver for the development of the urbanist discourse in Britain. The Prince, the initial Urban Villages Group and the Forum gained much of their urbanist principles from Krier’s work (ibid). They articulated their principles in two editions of the publication Urban Villages (Aldous 1992, 1997). In addition, they made significant progress in gaining Government endorsement of their approach through English Partnerships (the Government’s regeneration agency) and a variety of key figures who crossed from the Forum into prominent and influential Governmental roles (see Thompson-Fawcett 2003a). Consequently, the British ‘urban renaissance’, which underpins current urban policy in the United Kingdom, has strong affinities with principles articulated in the New Urbanism and the British urbanist discourse.

In the late 1990s, in the wake of the Princess of Wales’ death and a variety of efficiency mandates from the Royal Court, a variety of institutions under the Prince’s control were restructured. As a result the Prince’s Institute of Architecture, the Urban Villages Forum and two further organisations under the Prince’s patronage merged into the Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment (Urbanist 2, 3; Design Team N1). The Foundation took over the Institute for Architecture’s teaching programme and expanded its ambit to include project work, such as the two cases under study in this thesis. With minor modifications, the Foundation adopted the ‘ten commandments’ articulated in A Vision for

---

3 The concept of the urban renaissance emerged from the Urban Task Force’s (1999) report ‘Towards an Urban Renaissance’. The Task Force sought to understand and provide recommendations to address the decline of urban cities. It informed the Government’s Urban White Paper Our Towns and Cities: The Future. Delivering an Urban Renaissance (DETR 2000), and finally Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future (ODPM 2003) or what has become known as the Sustainable Communities Plan. The latter document has informed planning policy at all levels within Britain since it was published. It is underpinned by a series of broad principles about what makes sustainable places where people want to live, work and play. Moreover, it emphasises the importance of urban design, and the Prince’s Foundation explicitly connect their own urbanist principles with those of the Sustainable Communities Plan (Foundation 1, 2; Urbanist 2).

4 Coded identifiers for interviews undertaken for the current study are explained in Chapter Four, Section 4.4.2.
Britain, as the basis of their own work (Prince of Wales 1989:4-5). These principles are presented in Appendix B.

The Foundation’s principles differ slightly in prescription if not in content to those articulated in the Charter of the New Urbanism. Certainly the non-specific wording of the Foundation’s principles provides a wide berth for interpretation. In contrast, the original Urban Villages Forum principles were more specific and parallel closely the prescriptive and more detailed urban form elements of the CNU Charter (see Thompson-Fawcett and Bond 2003), revealing aspects of their common origins in the work of Krier. Significantly, for present purposes, both the CNU and the Foundation articulate a commitment to a democracy in the development of their masterplans and in the vision for their new communities.

5.3 Urbanist Participation

The CNU, as stated in the preamble to the Charter, is ‘committed to re-establishing the relationship between the art of building and the making of community, through citizen-based participatory planning and design’ (CNU 2001:no page). Further evidence lies in literature by prominent New Urbanists. For example, Duany et al (2000:226) argue for ‘true participatory planning’ by way of ‘community design workshops, citizen’s advisory committees, constant media coverage, and an ongoing feedback process’. Bohl (2000:790) also suggests New Urbanism has its ‘own public participation activities, including community visioning, urban design charrettes, and visual preference surveys’.

Similarly, from the early 1990s, the British urbanist discourse articulated a strong commitment to democratic principles and participatory planning primarily through the Urban Villages Group. Indeed, the publication Urban Villages is far more prescriptive and directive about how local groups and residents should be involved in the development process than the Congress’ stated commitment to citizen-based participatory planning (Thompson-Fawcett and Bond 2003, also see Aldous 1992; CNU 2001). For example, Urban Villages dedicates a chapter to how, on what, and why public involvement should be undertaken. Preferred approaches include market research, in-depth interviews with special interest groups, Planning for Real, and planning workshops (Aldous 1992:40), with the overall aim to ‘involve the interested public in a debate whose purpose is to achieve a common understanding of the issues and the objectives’ (ibid:41). The breadth of preferred
participatory approaches has changed with the establishment of the Foundation. Now the preferred approach is Enquiry by Design, a derivative of the New Urbanism’s charrette.

Interestingly, Enquiry by Design emanated from Australia, when in 1999, two Australian urbanists were invited to Britain by the newly formed Prince’s Foundation to run two ‘enquiry by design’ workshop events in Northampton and Basildon (The Prince’s Foundation 2000). These consultants had a long standing professional relationship with a British urbanist who had collaborated with urbanist practitioners on charrettes in America and Australia and later worked for the Foundation (Urbanist 2). He believed the phrase was probably first used in an Australian project he worked on, in the early 1990s, to explain the nature of the process as ‘enquiring by design’. By this it was meant that the act of designing is instrumental to the enquiry (ibid). Through the sessions within a workshop, ideas are tested for feasibility through drawing ‘in plan’ using large scale maps, so the enquiry is undertaken by way of drawing and design (discussed in more detail in the next Section). The Australian consultants adopted the name Enquiry by Design for workshops and charrettes undertaken in their consultancy from the mid 1990s (Urbanist 36). Certainly the two Australian consultants had strong links with CNU and their EbD process, while adapted for local conditions, was derived originally from the urbanist charrette (ibid). Moreover, the British urbanist in this tale promoted enquiry by design in an academic publication in 1994 (for example, McGlynn and Murrain 1994), even though the 1999 processes were the first in Britain under that name (Urbanist 2). The nature of the urbanist network across Australia, the United States and Britain is evident.

After the Northampton process in Britain, Enquiry by Design became the name associated with the charrette style process run by the Prince’s Foundation. Indeed, several representatives used charrette and EbD interchangeably, and suggested that the differences in the approaches were largely contextual (Urbanists 1, 2). The Foundation now runs courses on EbDs engaging urbanists from the United States based National Charrette Institute, which has direct CNU affiliations. Despite the nature of this networking and its Australian origins, the Foundation has become proprietorial of the EbD approach and in 2005 trademarked the process to ward off inauthentic hybrids (Foundation 1, 2). Nevertheless, the process is still

---

5 See Thompson-Fawcett and Bond (2003) for an analysis the similarities and differences between CNU’s and the Urban Villages Forum’s principles and comparative critique of project exemplars from each movement.

6 This interview was undertaken as part of previous research undertaken as part fulfilment of Masters in Regional and Resource Planning at the University of Otago in 2002. For full details see Bond (2002).
very similar to the charrette in structure and principle, as is discussed in the following section.

5.4 The Charrette and its Cousin - Enquiry by Design

The National Charrette Institute in the United States defines the new urbanist charrette as ‘a collaborative planning process that harnesses the talents and energies of all interested parties to create and support a feasible plan that represents transformative community change’ (www.nationalcharretteinstitute.org). Similarly, the EbD is described as a collaborative approach to masterplanning which offers ‘well resolved, ‘win-win’ solutions to multiple issues affecting the site and its surroundings’ (Prince’s Foundation 2000:12).

Urbanists claim charrettes and EbDs are ‘simultaneous and interactive’ rather than the conventional planning process which is said to be ‘sequential and reactive’ (Prince’s Foundation 2000:12; Rollison 1997:81; also see McGlynn and Murrain 1994; Morris and Kaufman 1996). The phrase refers to the time consuming and often inefficient practice of issuing draft policy, or options papers that are developed and then sent to various groups for comment or feedback, revised and issued as consultation draft documents for public submission, all of which may take many months. Collaborative problem solving and multi-disciplinary teamwork is said to be more efficient and effective in terms of both consultation and buy-in to the project (Prince’s Foundation 2000; Lennertz 2003; McGlynn and Murrain 1994).

Lennertz (2003) from the National Charrette Institute, suggests there are nine principles for the New Urbanist charrette that distinguish it from other processes given the name charrette. These principles are shared by EbD practitioners, and are summarised below:

i. Work collaboratively to achieve a shared vision and engender mutual ownership of the outcomes;

ii. Design cross-functionally so that the wisdom of all specialities, from expert designers to local knowledge are continually reflected in the designs;

iii. Use design (including tools such as graphics, sketches, drawings and images) to communicate ideas, facilitate a shared vision and create holistic solutions;

iv. Work in detail at the level of the block, building and street, and at the level of regional relationships with other centres, transport connections and landuses. Concurrent work at both levels allows critical issues to be addressed;

v. Constrain work schedules to apply reasonable pressure through a series of deadlines. Here time pressure facilitates creative problem solving;
vi. Communicate in short regular feedback loops to build trust and foster understanding and support for the outcomes;

vii. Work for at least four to seven consecutive days to allow for a minimum of three feedback loops, which are essential to facilitate shifts in participants’ perceptions and positions;

viii. Work on site so that local values, traditions and cultures can be understood. In addition the venue and information is easily accessible;

ix. Produce a buildable plan – that is, a charrette is not a visioning workshop. Implementation documents are a part of the outcome.

Both charrettes and EbDs have three distinct phases, the pre-workshop phase, the design workshop and the implementation phase. Each phase is discussed in turn, focusing primarily on EbDs. However, given the foundational status of charrettes, and the lack of literature on both, material for this section is derived from information produced by the new urbanist discourse on charrettes (including the National Charrette Institute) along with interviews with British urbanists experienced in facilitating EbDs.

5.4.1 Pre-Workshop Phase

The primary task of the pre-workshop phase is to set objectives and to ‘ensure that all the right information and all the right people are at the charrette [or EbD]’ (Lennertz 2003:12-4). According to one senior member of the foundation, a typical EbD pre-workshop might comprise four stages:

i. **Clarifying the brief** via a ‘scoping’ day with ‘key landowners, clients, local authority, anybody with any control who is likely to be affected’ to ‘get them all on the same page in terms of principles and ways of looking holistically at a particular problem’ (my emphasis) (Urbanist 1);

ii. **Identifying stakeholders and issues** via themed pre-workshops, on, for example, health, education, local services, housing, economic regeneration, transport, etc. The aim is to ‘bring a set of unravelled strands into a more coherent whole’ by bringing together different players’ perspectives to ‘talk generically about the principles of town making ... [and to] look holistically at problems’ (ibid).

iii. **Gathering information** from stakeholders on the identified themes via a series of intensive meetings and to identify further technical work that needs to been done, such as environmental assessments; and

iv. **Undertaking a site visit and public meeting** where the Foundation team would ‘start looking at the site in a bit more detail’. This is the first opportunity for the public to find out more about EbDs via an exhibition, which includes maps of the study area, and a public forum, including a presentation of what an EbD is and ‘when and where they can hear what we’re up to’ (my emphasis) (ibid).

The two emphasised phrases above are suggestive of the nature of inclusivity of the process, and how ‘the right people’ might be determined. The scope of ‘who’ is affected is
linked with whether or not they have ‘control’ in the decision making by this urbanist. There are two distinct roles articulated – one for stakeholders who have some expertise and one for the public who can hear about the project. Other urbanists and Foundation representatives interviewed were more general about who should be involved in the pre-EbD phase and for what purpose. For example, one purpose is to gain a thorough understanding of both the ‘technical’ information and the ‘political’ climate so that the design team is aware of all the issues and potential for conflict (Foundation 2). As such the pre-workshop phase is important for:

... diffusing tensions, listening to people, making people feel they are heard and having input, so when we get to the workshop, there’s not this pent up kind of frustration that can really derail the whole process. You get everybody there and it’s positive (ibid)

The added value of ensuring adequate political and technical knowledge lies in ensuring the people who ‘should’ be there (Foundation 1, 2; Urbanist 1; Core Team W1) are at the workshop, it generates a commitment to the process and ‘you have a fully endorsed product at the end of it’ (Urbanist 1). The ideal timeframe for the pre-EbD phase is six months (Urbanist 1; Foundation 1, 2). Stages two and three above might occur around four months prior to the EbD (Urbanist 1). Stage four and in particular the public session would occur one month to two weeks prior to the event.

Already here, there is an indication how participants in an EbD or charrette process are defined. The idea of those who ‘should’ be there is implicitly determined by the kind of knowledge or influence they have on the decision-making process (see statements in italics in the four stages of pre-workshop listed above). This is further emphasised by the ‘tiered’ system of categorising participants for involvement in the EbD workshop week.

5.4.2 EbD Workshop

Charrettes following the Institute’s model are at least 4-7 days long, whereas, EbDs are typically five days, running from Monday through to Friday. There is a distinction between EbDs and charrettes in the way the role of the public is described. For EbDs, stakeholders are categorised into tiers which determine the level of involvement. There are three tiers – A, B, and C, as shown in Table 5.1. For the most part, only tiers A and B are involved in significant parts of the EbD workshop (see Table 5.2). Tier A, the core team, play the greatest role in the EbD. The design team or Foundation team is a subset of the core team which includes the urban designers from the Foundation and specific (usually urbanist) consultants employed by the Foundation for their expertise.
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The core team comprise the design team, local experts, landowners and community representatives. The Foundation’s design team of approximately ten people ‘match’ their expertise against local ‘counterparts’ (Urbanist 1). In addition, the design team usually includes an architectural illustrator. To keep the process manageable, the Foundation generally tries to keep the core team numbers limited to 40 individuals or less. Generally, tier B has a larger membership and tends to include statutory agencies relevant to the process, ‘those who have some clout and say in the process’ (Urbanist 1). However, tier B’s involvement in the pre-EbD phase means that they are fully informed of what is going on. Finally, tier C comprises the general public, who are only involved in the two public meetings – one at the beginning or just prior to the even: (pre-EbD phase) and one on the last Friday of the workshop week. There is an acknowledgement of the reality that in urban restructuring or development some people have more ‘clout and say’ than others, and their input is prioritised as such. But there is also an acknowledgement of the ‘economy’ issue which, as indicated in Chapter Two, is problematic for deliberative forums – as such the EbD process is carefully structured. Large numbers within the workshop jeopardise the ability of designers to produce workable and well resolved masterplans.

Table 5.1 – Participants in an EbD (Source: Adapted from Prince’s Foundation 2005a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Core Team</td>
<td>Design Team as a subset of Core Team, includes the Foundation’s urban designers, and consultants (architects, transport planners etc) engaged specifically for their urbanist expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban designers, transport engineers, environmental experts, spatial planners, architects, sustainability experts, local authority, landowners, local community representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Technical Input/Statutory Agencies</td>
<td>Local transport operators, local business groups, environment agency, local health providers, other government agencies, local conservation groups, English heritage, residents groups, utility companies, local housing associations, education authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>All those with an interest in the site</td>
<td>General public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general format for the EbD week is set out in Table 5.2 and is very similar to the urbanist charrette. The first day comprises short concise briefings from all stakeholders, which aims is to get ‘everybody more or less on the same page’ (Urbanist 1) by exposing them to the diversity of positions and viewpoints that are coming together. The site tour provides an opportunity for the design team to show how urban design principles operate in relation to places familiar to stakeholders in order to ‘get a common vocabulary going between the stakeholders because talking in a similar language is very important’ (ibid).
Table 5.2 – Typical timetable of EbD week (Source: Urbanists 1, 2; Foundation 1, 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Tier(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Stakeholder Briefings / Presentations</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon</td>
<td>Site tour and design sessions</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>Public meeting</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Design Sessions interspersed with critique and site visits</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>Design Team meeting</td>
<td>Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Design Sessions interspersed with critique and site visits</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>Mid-charrette Review</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Design Sessions interspersed with critique and site visits</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>Late night design session</td>
<td>Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Final design session and preparation for final Public meeting</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Day one finishes with a public meeting, the purpose of which is to introduce local people to the EbD process, introduce urbanist principles, and to gain ‘local intelligence’ (ibid). The format of the meeting typically follows a presentation usually drawing extensively on graphics and images, followed by an open forum or small facilitated groups. Communicating through vivid imagery and slick presentations by ‘charismatic and compelling public speakers’ (Bressi 1994:xxxvi) is a fundamental component of the urbanist charrette, and a feature taken on in EbD practice. Clear and accessible communication and consensus is sought through:

... unusually powerful and carefully targeted presentations, a well-honed ability to advance their proposals as straightforward solutions to difficult problems, a persistence derived from their conviction and commitment to their ideas and a pragmatism that enables compromise (ibid)

The first of a series of design sessions typically follows the site tour on Day One. Initially design sessions focus on the structure of the town as a whole, and how the project site fits within that structure. Typically, in the urbanist discourse and in Krier’s work (see Economakis 1992; Krier 1998; Thompson-Fawcett 1998; Thompson-Fawcett and Bond 2003), the structure is considered as an organism. So the starting point for design lies in gaining an understanding of the ‘cellular structure’ of the organism, where the ‘walkable neighbourhoods and catchments are, ... [and] starting to look at some key blockages in the system’ (Urbanist 1). As with the charrette process, by the end of the week designs are refined, focussed and generally more detailed to the level of block and building often including architectural style and character. The design team’s ‘artistic skills’ (ibid) are a vital means of communication. ‘Landscape’ becomes the focus, where the team seek ‘to
nuance vistas, views, you know the townscape stuff and bring it to an art form’ (ibid). At this time, the illustrator’s role comes to the fore.

Following the principles of the charrette model articulated above, design sessions involve groups working ‘cross functionally’ either in their specialisms or in a more holistic way, with specialists from each field working together in groups. An EbD facilitator suggests that ‘cross-pollination’ allows people to see the other half of the conflict or position:

The reason it’s difficult to get people acting together and [difficult to get] the best fit solutions, is [because] people don’t understand in any context, or with any degree of certainty or reality, other peoples’ problems, ... [so in the EbD, people] are forced into a situation where they understand the balance and strategic and conflicting freedoms if you like of the situation (Urbanist 1).

Design sessions are typically interspersed with both site visits and critiques. The practice of going out on site exploring ideas, then drawing them in plan to ‘test’ how workable they are is a key feature of the charrette approach. A senior Foundation representative indicates that this enquiring through drawing serves two purposes – to act as a reality check on the designs that are emerging from the working groups and to break up the design sessions as ‘you can only keep your concentration for so long’ (Urbanist 1).

Critiques form an essential part of the ‘cycle of design and review’ (Lennertz 2003:12-5) and are usually ‘quite lively affairs’ (Urbanist 1). Each groups’ designs are reviewed, and feedback is sought. The design team then draws out the commonalities between the groups’ work as a basis for drawing up a hypothesis in the evening as a ‘best fit’ scenario. The hypothesis is then presented ‘in neat’ in the morning, critiqued, and groups continue to work building on that plan. So through the week the design team will produce perhaps three ‘hypotheses’, in a process of continual refinement and reflexivity. For EbDs, critique serves as a feedback loop amongst the core team. In addition, the EbD has one significant feedback loop beyond the core team at the ‘mid-charrette review’. This involves the presentation of the latest working hypotheses, which serves to show the direction of progress, gain feedback from tier B stakeholders and raise yet to be resolved issues for discussion. Moreover, it serves as an anchor or deadline for meeting certain targets.

The process of review and refine continues until the second last evening, when the final hypothesis is drawn up in neat by the design team typically working late into the night. Further refinements are drawn directly onto the plan throughout the day, and all diagrams and drawings are finished, digitally photographed, then loaded onto a powerpoint presentation. An EbD facilitator describes this hive of activity:
The charrette leader is frantically putting the argument together, ... [which is] critical because it has got to come in an order that sort of makes sense to people in terms of issues and the way we’re telling the story. So we’re typically putting together 70, 80 slides on a powerpoint and again the charrette managers and different group leaders are photographing all the work so there is a lot of photographing going on and the work is all coming in at different levels, some of the work has been done within the first hour because its just a diagram, some of the work’s you know, some of the landscape people might be colouring, getting through green pens like there’s no tomorrow. And that will only be finished literally 30 minutes before the presentation is due to begin, so you feel the noose closing in ... the general public are all starting to turn up and you’re still there with your laptop going at it (Urbanist 1)

The format for the final presentation is similar to that of the first public meeting. The masterplan is presented, followed by an opportunity for members of the public to comment, ‘to grill us, ask questions, make comments, swear at us, whatever they want’ (Urbanist 1). All comments are recorded which, along with other documentation from throughout the week, is collated into the EbD report. The report is then disseminated to the stakeholders in electronic form, and often posted on the local authority’s website.

5.4.3 Implementation

Implementation of the masterplan is variable, and depends on the project, the client and the context. Generally, the Foundation is engaged to conduct the EbD, and then produce the EbD report and supporting documentation. In some cases, the Foundation may be engaged for the delivery of the masterplan or some aspect of it, or to be involved in a committee, partnership body or organisation formed specifically to deliver the masterplan. There is little specified as to ‘good practice’ for the implementation phase, an aspect of the EbD that the Foundation are working on (Foundation 2). As a general approach interviewees indicated that ongoing involvement of the Foundation is favoured with further workshops to ensure ongoing collaboration in developing the masterplan (Urbanist 1; Foundation 1; Design Team W1). Similarly, there is a preference for the adoption of codes as planning instruments to ensure adherence to the principles of the masterplan (Design Team N1; Design Team W1; Design Team N4; Urbanist 1). The National Charrette Institute is more specific in regard to the implementation of charrettes – recommending a review of the work from the charrette immediately after the workshop week and a feedback session no more than six weeks later. The purpose here is to maintain momentum, engagement and ensure anyone who missed the charrette has an opportunity to be heard (Lennertz 2003). The EbD has no such prescription, but rather operates on a case by case basis.
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5.5 EbD as an Articulatory Practice

The urbanist project can be interpreted as a hegemonic discursive formation. As Glynos (1999:5) suggests, ‘hegemony bespeaks of a political relation in which a concrete political principle, policy or identity, begins to spread throughout the socio-political field’. The urbanist hegemonic project is comprised of several distinct but overlapping and interrelated discourses – in particular the New Urbanism in the United States and traditional urbanism in the United Kingdom. The inter-relationships are revealed by the way in which various individuals (for example, Duany, Krier, the Prince of Wales) worked to disseminate urbanist principles across the Atlantic, through the Congress for the New Urbanism and the (then) Urban Villages Forum (see Section 5.2). The discourse concomitantly operated at a pragmatic level to ensure that urbanist projects were realised. The dissemination of the urbanist project works through the articulation of a vision of good and sustainable urbanism, which is primarily defined by what it is not (that is, unsustainable sprawl) (see Duany et al. 2000; Katz 1994a; www.cnu.org). The principles and exemplar projects (such as Seaside and Poundbury among many others) represent an image of the ideal – the collective imaginary of the urbanist movement (see Chapter Three). The imaginary provides a frame of understanding – a ‘field of intelligibility’ (Laclau 1990:64) – for transforming unsustainable urban environments into sustainable communities.

The EbDs operate within that field of intelligibility, as an articulatory practice that constitutes new meanings which alter or shift the existing discursive structures in the social spaces in which they occur at the local level. Although these micro level articulations are instrumental in expanding the global level discourse, their variations, subtleties and distinctions are dependent on the individuals involved and the particularities of the local context. Consequently, in the articulation of discourses there is not only an inherent play of power, but a constant shift between the different levels of the particular and universal. In this sense, EbDs are articulations constitutive of and constituted by a range of different power plays (from micro level to the macro level) that potentially shape ways of thinking and understanding, and attribute particular meanings to social phenomena. How EbDs manifest this articulatory characteristic is the subject of the following two Chapters which recontextualise the two cases studied. Before turning to the cases, the foregoing discussion on EbDs combined with general statements and observations made by urbanists interviewed in the course of the research revealed several characteristics that situate the case studies in relation to the communicative ethic established in Chapter Two.
At a pragmatic level, EbDs and charrettes are very structured, with specific roles for specific groups of participants, and a reliance on urban design skill guided by urbanist principles. EbDs have been described by one Foundation representative as a ‘top-down bottom-up approach’ meaning that:

We don’t pretend to get the general public to tell us how to plan towns because we don’t expect them to know that for the most part. But what we do expect them to have is a great deal of common sense, and a great deal of local knowledge and concern that we need to take account of, and therefore we need to be challenged by them in order to come up with the best solution you know so its essential to us that we work with these people (Urbanist 1).

There are two incongruous points to note here that result from the inherent tension between its top down and bottom up character. First, what is common to both EbDs and charrette techniques is the prioritisation of expert knowledge. It is the design team of experts who:

... provide the necessary expertise to create a feasible plan that considers all relevant input. This team is the constant of the charrette, working day and night on site in the charrette studio to develop a holistic, feasible plan (www.charretteinstitute.org/charrette.html).

Both British and American urbanist discourses emphasise the physical environment through urban design expertise and a specific set of urban design principles. Despite these priorities, urbanists claim the EbD is:

An educative process ... you get people to understand the urbanism, you get people to understand how communities and neighbourhoods work, you get people to understand how communities can interact with local government (Design Team W1).

Similarly, an urbanist suggested that residents involved in EbDs get ‘knowledge’ and that ‘gives them essentially more power’, it ‘demystifies a hell of a lot of what goes on’ in planning and amongst built environment professionals (Urbanist 2). Moreover, he suggested that the facilitation team:

Spend an enormous amount of time explaining to [participants] how these things [EbDs] work, explaining why they can’t always get what they think is automatically their right, they hear different people[’s views] ... they realise that it’s an incredibly messy process, it’s incredibly value laden (ibid).

The design team member added that the intensity of the process was also ‘incredibly important’ in that the design team were seen to be ‘working their rocks off’ and were seen to ‘be there all hours of the day and night’ (Urbanist 2). The evidence of hard work on site:

... with [the residents’] environment, their lives, their buildings, their places and their spaces ... [shows a] commitment to attempt to get it right for them and its
visible ... [so that] even if, in the end they don’t get what they want at least they have a better idea for why they didn’t (ibid).

So an EbD has a social learning agenda, despite its focus on producing feasible urbanist masterplans. This leads to the second point, that both EbDs and charrettes resemble (at a theoretical level at any rate) the deliberative, interactive planning style advocated by planning theorists (and deliberative democrats) identified in Chapter Two. Table 5.3 shows a comparison between the process and outcomes of EbDs, as derived from the review above, and the Communicative Ethic established in Chapter Two.

Table 5.3 – Process and outcome principles for an EbD compared with the Communicative Ethic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EbD Process Principles for an EbD</th>
<th>Communicative Ethic Conditions for Communicative Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborative, interactive, multidisciplinary;</td>
<td>• Provides an equal opportunity of access to the process. That is, it is inclusive and representative;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inclusive of those who 'should be there', 'interested' or 'affected' parties (Foundation 1,2; Urbanist 2);</td>
<td>• Provides equal opportunities to participate in the process by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expert and local knowledge are integrated (Lennertz 2003);</td>
<td>- Being open, honest, and engendering trust;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design and drawing as tools for communication;</td>
<td>- Acknowledging and addressing different capacities and knowledges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feedback loops by way of design-review-design cycle;</td>
<td>• Transparent and legitimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transparent;</td>
<td>• Provides an agonistic space in which contestations, passions and emotion can be expressed with reciprocal care and respect for 'other';</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tensions diffused;</td>
<td>• Facilitators are aware of inherent power plays. The effect of power plays are assessed through careful, critical listening, interpretation, and facilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Underpinned by appropriate technical information;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guided by urbanist principles;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carefully facilitated and structured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcomes of an EbD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes of an EbD</th>
<th>Outcomes of Communicative Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 'Well resolved win-win solutions' (Prince's Foundation 2000:21);</td>
<td>• Shared understandings are achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared understandings, build consensus (Design Team W1; Urbanist 1,2);</td>
<td>• Social Learning occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a feasible, holistic masterplan (Urbanist 2); a 'buildable' plan, not a vision or a wish-list (Lennertz 2003);</td>
<td>• Conflict is effectively resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Product is 'fully endorsed' (Design Team W1; Urbanist 1) and engenders ownership of the outcomes (Foundation 1,2);</td>
<td>• The process engenders a sense of ownership of the outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educativ (Design Team W1; Urbanist 2) and empowering (Urbanist 2);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides appropriate implementation documents (<a href="http://www.nationalcharretteinstitute.org">www.nationalcharretteinstitute.org</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The key distinctions between the process and outcomes of the EbD and the communicative ethic lie in the specificity of the outputs of the EbD as a technique for producing a masterplan. But there are significant parallels, particularly in terms of learning, shared understanding, and engendering ownership of the outcomes. Comparing the inclusivity criteria suggests they may be more strongly articulated in the communicative discourse than in the urbanist discourse. However, within the urbanist principles for EbDs and charrettes, different knowledges come together and are integrated, legitimacy and transparency is sought through feedback loops, and drawing and design are tools for increasing accessibility to information presented. Yet, the role of power and the potential for urbanist principles to potentially undermine, rather than just underpin the process is not explicitly stated.

While there is little literature on new urbanist participatory processes, there is even less on EbDs and how they are situated in the British urbanist discourse. Therefore, it is useful to draw on the literature on the New Urbanism, given its inter-relations with British urbanist discourse. Grant (2006) notes, in relation to the New Urbanism, that a closer look reveals the tension between the stated commitment to democracy and its enactment. Leading new urbanists Duany et al (2000:226) argue for ‘true participatory planning’, but prioritise the use of urban design principles to address difficulties of adequate community representation. So here, rather than turn to addressing the issue of poor representation, they maintain that ‘unfortunately, principles are often forgotten in the name of a democratic process’ (ibid:227n). According to Grant (2006) urban design principles are prioritised over democratic process, thus resulting in a weak commitment to democracy.

Similarly, the potential for principles to impact on notions of true participation tends not to be problematised, although some acknowledge it. For example, Bohl (2000:791) a practicing New Urbanist, notes ‘the negative side’ of urbanist participatory approaches is that urbanists’ ‘advocacy of traditional forms introduces the risk that designers will manipulate the participation process by using the very [urban design] tools they provide for judging the alternatives’. So the very problematic that is the focus of this thesis is acknowledged as a negative but not as something that should be addressed or explored further. It is simply a given risk associated with a more democratic approach.

Given the prominence of the design team in EbDs and charrettes, they wield considerable governmental power (see Chapter Three), not only in synthesising information, but (re)presenting that information in drawn form, by directing attention to a specific set of urban design principles, by deciding who the ‘right’ people are, and what the ‘right’
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information is. The question, to keep in mind in the following two chapters, is how do they make these decisions and to what effect? I turn now to the cases, both of which followed the above EbD format fairly closely. Chapter Six presents the Newquay case, a greenfield urban extension in Cornwall, England, while Chapter Seven presents the rather more conflictual story of Whitefield, an urban regeneration project in Nelson in the northwest of England.
Chapter 6 – The Newquay Case Study
Visions and Visionaries

6.1 Newquay – a Cornish Seaside Resort

Located on the north coast of Cornwall (see Figure 6.1), Newquay was originally known as Towan Blistra. It began as an iron age hill fort, became an industrial centre, and later developed into a small pilchards fishing port. In 1439, its name changed when a ‘new quay’ was constructed near what is now the town centre. As the fishing industry waned, the mining industry took over, and the port became central to the export of Cornish tin, lead and china clay. A tramway was adapted for steam transport in 1874 and passenger services soon followed, which marked the beginning of the development of Newquay as a premier holiday resort. Rapid growth ensued.

The town centre is situated on the waterfront. The urban area has extended to the north and south along the coast, but is constrained by topographical features, which have resulted in growth inland over the last fifty years (Petter 2004). The reliance on summer tourism results in the permanent population of 22,000 swelling to over 100,000 in peak season. Approximately 750,000 visitors per year place increasing pressure on local infrastructure (Surf Capital Steering Group 2004). More significantly, and typical of tourist based economies, wages tend to be low, employment seasonal, and property prices high. In recognition of the need to diversify and regenerate the town, Newquay has been re-inventing itself. It has promoted itself as the ‘Surf Capital of the UK’ where surf symbolises not only the pre-eminence and quality of surfing in the region, but the wild, rugged topography and golden sandy beaches that characterise the coastline (Restormel Borough Council 2006:6).

As part of the regeneration initiatives instigated by Restormel Borough Council (hereafter referred to as Restormel), the Newquay Growth Area was allocated as an urban extension in the Local Plan (Restormel Borough Council 2001). The purpose of the Growth Area was to provide employment land, affordable housing, community facilities and open market housing. The Council required the combined owners of the land, now a joint venture called the Chapel Town Partnership, to produce a ‘comprehensive’ masterplan for the site. With that objective, the Chapel Town Partnership engaged the Prince’s Foundation and masterplanner, Leon Krier, to undertake an Enquiry by Design (EbD) which was held in October 2004. The EbD was to provide for ‘extensive consultation’ in the creation of a masterplan that met local needs and reflected the identity of the area.
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Figure 6.1 – Map of Cornwall showing location of the three largest towns – Newquay on the north coast, St Austell on the south coast, and Truro inland to the south (Source: author)

This chapter (re)presents the case study of the Newquay EbD, by tracing the chronology of the process. Consistent with the framework established in Chapter Three, each phase of the EbD process is explored focusing on two core elements of discourse. First, in order to explain the meanings constituted by and within the process, the analysis involved identifying how particular signifiers were articulated, and their effect. Second, given that antagonism marks the limits of discourse, the nature of antagonisms that arose in the process were investigated. The chapter shifts between an interpretation of the analysis and discussions of the discourses, and their associated power relations. Therefore, this chapter (re)presents the results of the discourse analysis and concomitantly addresses research questions one and two for the Newquay case. That is, the chapter identifies the discourses that interact in the EbD (research question one) and reveal the power relations that result from the operation of those discourses (research question two).

The chapter is structured around the three core parts of the EbD process. In order to contextualise the first phase, section 6.2 provides relevant background information on the
site and introduces the landowners in the project and the nature of their inter-relationships. Subsequently, section 6.3 explains the lead in period of the EbD, including sub-sections on the three key players in the project, the intention of the EbD, and the two substantive components of the pre-EbD phase – the briefing session and the composition of the working groups. Section 6.4 then analyses the operation of the workshop itself, and the antagonisms that arose within. Core themes within the EbD are discussed in subsections on inclusivity, further tensions between key players, a charge of predetermination and a misunderstanding on architectural style. Finally, sections 6.5 and 6.6 explore the post EbD period focusing (respectively) on the perceptions of the process and the implementation of the masterplan up until the time of writing. The Chapter concludes in section 6.7, by identifying the range and nature of the discourses and the resultant power relations evident within the EbD process.

6.2 The Newquay Growth Area – Boundaries

The Newquay Growth Area encompasses approximately 220 hectares to the east of central Newquay (see Figures 6.2 and 6.3). The site is bounded by Trencrek and Trevenson Roads on the existing urban boundary, Henver Road to the north, the A3058 (or Quintrell Road) to the north east, Chapel Lane to the east, and the A392 to the south. It encompasses the small hamlets of Gusti Veor and Gusti Vean, which are nestled in rolling farmland. Chapel Stream runs west to east through the site and includes areas of wetland. Henver Road and the playing fields of Newquay Tretherras School are the highest points, overlooking the undulating farmland.

The Chapel Town Partnership comprises approximately 14 individuals and organisations, who each own land within the area, with holdings that range in size from two hectares to just over 100 hectares. The owner of the largest portion of land (approximately 50% to the north of the railway) is the Duchy of Cornwall (see Figure 6.4). The Duchy of Cornwall is a private landed estate, with assets including approximately 54,764 hectares of land, mostly in the South West of Britain. As will be seen, the Duchy plays a leading role in the Newquay Growth Area development and is a dominant player throughout the process. The role of the landowners is revisited after explaining how the site became a ‘growth’ area.
Figure 6.2 – Newquay and the Growth Area on the eastern urban boundary (Source: author)

Figure 6.3 – Aerial picture of the Newquay Growth Area, looking North-Northwest with key landmarks noted (Source: Duchy of Cornwall)
6.2.1 The Planning Context – Historical Foundations

Since the late 1980s, the Newquay Growth Area has been identified as potential urban extension. One of the landowners tentatively recalled that ‘the first meeting that took place with a view to [the development] happening was with Prince Charles and Local Authority members ... in 1987 (Landowner N1). Another, interviewee deduced a similar timeframe from interactions with the Duchy of Cornwall also in the late 1980s (Core Team N6). Subsequently, the Growth Area’s journey through the formal planning process started as a part of the Draft Newquay Local Plan in 1991. However, that process was interrupted after an amendment to legislation required local authorities to develop single borough wide local plans\(^1\). Consequently, the Draft Newquay Local Plan was set aside and the Growth Area was

\(^1\) Prior to 1991, Restormel Borough Council had four Local Plans in operation for their administrative area – the St Austell Local Plan (adopted 1984); the Central Restormel Local Plan (adopted 1987); the Countryside Local Plan (adopted in 1985) and the Newquay Area Local Plan (in draft published 1991). An amendment to the
allocated as a development envelop in the new borough-wide Local Plan which was not adopted until 2001.  

However, it was another two years before a decision to move ahead with the development was made in principle between all the owners. Restormel required that the site be comprehensively masterplanned because it was large and in multiple ownership (Restormel Borough Council 2001). Despite the prerequisite for comprehensive masterplanning, the Local Plan specified certain required components and their general location. Figure 6.5 shows the development envelop as it was presented in the 2001 Local Plan. The allocation for the Growth Area was for 1168 houses at a density of 32 houses per hectare, 12 hectares of employment/industrial land, 1.7 hectares of mixed use, a local centre, a site for a primary school, playing fields and open space. The area outside the development envelop but inside the boundaries of Chapel Lane, the A 392 and Henver Road remained an area of ‘search for future development’ (Council Officer N5; Restormel Borough Council 2001, 2005).

Two key problems arose in relation to the Growth Area during the process of drafting the Local Plan and following its adoption. First, a directive, issued from central Government in 2000, required local authorities to prioritise the development of brownfield land over greenfield land. So despite having almost completed the formal allocation in the Local Plan, the new policy guidance from Government placed the entire justification for the Growth Area in question. The length of time it took for the Local Plan to be adopted further contributed to weakening the rationalization for the Growth Area. In 2003, there was an ‘over-provision’ of housing development across the Borough (Council Officer N4).

---

Town and Country Planning Act in 1991 required that the Council combine these four plans into one Local Plan for the whole Borough.

2 In the English planning system, a development envelop is an area marked in a Local Plan which has been allocated for existing or proposed developments.

3 The prioritisation of brownfield land over greenfield land for housing was articulated in Planning Policy Guidance 3 Housing first published by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in 2000. In November 2006, it was cancelled as part of the programme of gradually replacing all Planning Policy Guidance notes with Planning Policy Statements. The same principle appears in Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing, published by the department of Communities and Local Government in 2006. From May 2006, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister was superseded by the Communities and Local Government department which now takes responsibility for planning and urban policy.

4 Under the system of development control, figures for the quantity of new housing developments are set at the regional level, guided by central Government policy and research. Prior to 2004, housing provision figures for Cornwall were provided in the Cornwall Structure Plan (Cornwall County Council 1997). Provision for Newquay was derived from those regional figures and incorporated into Restormel’s Local Plan. Whether or not there is ‘housing need’ in accordance with the housing provision figures in the Local Plan is a determining
order to be able to justify progressing development, there needed to be strong argument for its 'planning gain' – that is, benefits to the Borough by addressing broader planning policy requirements articulated in the Local Plan. Consequently, the case was made that the Growth Area would provide much needed employment land and affordable housing. Thus, ‘the Growth Area survived … and emerged as a firm proposal in the Local Plan’ in 2001 (Design Team N4). The second obstruction to progressing the development of the Growth Area was the relationship between the landowners of the site, which is discussed below.

Figure 6.5 – Allocation for the Newquay Growth Area as formalised in Restormel Borough Council’s Local Plan, 2001 (Source: Adapted from Restormel Borough Council 2001)

6.2.2 The Landowners

The landowners of the Growth Area comprised local residents, business people, a small consortium, a local development company, and the Duchy of Cornwall. The characters and relationships between the landowners permeated both the process of allocating the Growth Area in the Local Plan and the EbD. One interviewee described the landowners as a factor in granting planning permission for new housing developments (see www.communities.gov.uk; www.planningportal.gov.uk).
‘fairly quirky and diverse group’ (Design Team N1), while another suggested ‘there are enough characters amongst the landowners for a Daphne Du Maurier novel’ (Design Team N4). Indeed, interviewees frequently referred to the antagonistic relationship between two of the landowners in particular. For example, a Duchy representative recalls ‘the electricity in some of the meetings in the early days’ and that ‘there are still certain factions who can’t be in the same room together at the same time’ (Design Team N4).

Given the requirement for collaborative masterplanning, the antagonism between landowners caused particular problems. While the Local Plan-making process encouraged an adversarial relationship between individual land owners who argued their own position through the drafting and the subsequent Public Inquiry5, progressing the requirements of the plan once adopted, required collaborative working. Indeed, one landowner suggested the Council did nothing to facilitate the required shift (Landowner N1). A Council officer recalled the frustration that tension between the owners caused both during the Local Plan preparation and after it had been formally adopted:

The biggest problem of having the Growth Area since we started work on it [in the 1990s] was getting landowners to agree with each other .... two of the main landowners hated each other and didn’t like talking to each other. .... We spent all this time getting the thing into the Local Plan and then we weren’t able to get the agreement of the landowners. And we also had issues with some of our politicians at the time and we were in a very difficult situation .... One of the politicians was, if you like, friends with one of these landowners and the other important one was friends with the other one, ... and it just wasn’t very easy to take anything forward (Council Officer N5).

So not only was there conflict between landowners throughout the process of plan-making, but allegiances between local government politicians and the conflicting landowners meant the discord became imbricated within the operations of Council. This put the planning department in ‘a very difficult position’ in relation to the elected politicians, which, in the view of one Council officer, would have ‘made it very difficult for [Restormel] to take the lead’ (ibid). Consequently, prior to the Local Plan’s adoption, the Council invited the Duchy to take the lead in co-ordinating the landowners in a joint venture and to address the ‘political situation’ between them (ibid).

---

5 Local Plan development involves a lengthy process of drafting, public consultation, and, if contested, review in a Local Public Inquiry by a Planning Inspector. The Public Inquiry for Restormel’s Local Plan was held in 1996.
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The Duchy takes the Lead

There were several reasons for inviting the Duchy to take the lead. Crucially, as one Council officer recognised, the Duchy owned:

... half the land, and also they've got this expertise with the Prince’s Foundation and can call on all these people and we felt that they were really well placed to take the lead and try and bring all the land owners together (Council Officer N5).

Indeed, several interviewees noted how effective the Duchy was at bringing the landowners to an agreement, by spending 'a huge amount of time over the years to try and galvanise [the owners] into thinking a way forward' (Design Team N1). Moreover, interviewees indicated that the proposal would not have happened had the Duchy not been involved and taken a lead role, because the owners were too fragmented (Core Team N3, N6; Councillor N2).

However, some antagonism between key landowners remained and was evident at the EbD:

One of the landowners, knows [the development is] going to happen, so he may as well get on board. He’s going to be made very wealthy. All right, he’ll lose his land and what he thought he bought ten years ago, you know don’t fight what’s coming. The other guy is the opposite. He’s going to fight and fight (Working Group N1).

Furthermore, in mid-2005, the dissenting landowner continued to feel that he had no control, and that the planners and the Duchy had the control over the future of the site (pers. comm. 2005). He also suggested that another landowner of a small acreage felt similarly (ibid)6. So while some argued that the Duchy was instrumental in alleviating the tension between the landowners, at least one landowner resisted and felt marginalised by the process.

Council’s perception that the Duchy was ‘well placed’ to take the lead alluded to the nature of the Duchy as an organisation and how it was discursively signified. The Duchy could call on expertise and bring something bigger to fruition than other developers as indicated by the Council officer quoted above. In addition, the nature of their authority and position within British society was instrumental in their ability both to weave a route through the politics and to get things done. These two aspects of the Duchy’s role in Newquay are discussed in turn below.

---

6 I was unable to corroborate this as the landowner declined to be interviewed. There were however others who suggested the tension between landowners was not confined to just one dissenter (Design Team N1; Core Team N6; Core Team N5; Landowner pers comm. 2005).
Access to Resources

The Duchy, as a developer, was uniquely situated because of the nature of the resources and expertise that they could call on (Working Group N1; Core Team N1) – a position that they freely acknowledged:

Other landowners, I quite understand, find it hard because they get one shot … they only have one piece of land. The Duchy has got all sorts of things which are development possibilities because of its historic land ownership and size. And so we’re never impatient in that sense, what we want to do is see the right size come forward and then get the best out of them. That is the mission. So ours is a privileged position and it does inform the way in which we make choices (Design Team N4).

The production of A Pattern Book of Urban and Architectural Form - Newquay (Petter 2004)\(^7\) was a further example of the resources that the Duchy had access to. The Pattern Book served to document vernacular architecture in Newquay and was intended to guide architectural style and building practice in Restormel Borough as a whole. The Pattern Book played a significant role in the EbD process. It signified the nature of the resources available to the Duchy, their professionalism, and authority, and did so at an early stage in the process. The Pattern Book also served as a strategic document. Consistent with a characteristic of the urbanist charrette process (see Chapter Five), it used inspiring, aesthetic drawings, imagery and formatting to communicate its message. A design team member indicated it ‘actually galvanised enthusiasm for the whole Growth Area project’ (Design Team N1). Similarly, a Duchy representative suggested the landowners ‘sort of gathered [around the Pattern Book] like children around the maypole’ (Design Team N4). Several interviewees were impressed by the document (Resident N6; Core Team N6; Design Team N1; Councillor N2). This latter point on the effect of the Pattern Book points to the second aspect of the way in which the Duchy was signified in the Newquay process.

---

\(^7\) Pattern books are documents that provide a record of vernacular architectural forms and typologies of a locality over time and provide a guide for developers and architects who seek to adhere to the local traditional building styles and techniques. The Pattern Book for Newquay was initiated by the Prince’s Foundation as a ‘flagship’ project to explore how the concept could be used in the United Kingdom (Design Team N1). Given the proposed development at Newquay, the Duchy’s lead role, and the Prince of Wales’ desire for the Duchy and the Foundation to work together where possible, Newquay became the subject matter for the Pattern Book. Pattern books are regaining popularity in the United States, and are promoted by the New Urbanism movement. Consequently, the Foundation engaged two new urbanist consultants from the United States to advise and assist in its production. The Pattern Book was researched in 2003 and then produced by a team from the Duchy of Cornwall, the Prince’s Foundation and consultants from Robert Adam Architects in 2004, prior to the EbD commencing.
A Unique Organisation

The Duchy’s authority, standing and presence within British society, placed it in a unique position. There were two sides to this coin however. On one side, its authority provided an enabling capacity, but on the other, it provoked a degree of suspicion. The two sides of the coin were clearly recognised by interviewees.

Consistent with the Duchy’s ability to access resources, interviewees noted the Duchy had ‘clout’ (Working Group N2; Core Team N1). While other wealthy organisations may have resources and clout, the distinction in this case lay in what the Duchy symbolised. Interviewees recognised that the Duchy was capable of ‘opening doors’ that may be locked to others (Core Team N3), and was ‘one of those bodies in the United Kingdom that could cut across all sorts of things that other bodies would find very difficult to do’ (Core Team N2). In addition, the Duchy presented quality (Residents N3, N6; Council Officer N4).

On other side of the coin, there was a degree of suspicion, particularly of the Duchy as a wealthy organisation with business acuity. Interviewees described the Duchy as ‘a very, very mighty organisation’ (Working Group N2; emphasis original), ‘some of the most rapacious land owners in Cornwall’ (Community Group N1), and that ‘people are just suspicious of their power’ (Core Team N3). So despite the recognition that there was an intention to develop the Growth Area ‘sympathetically’ (Councillor N2), the key goal of ensuring a profitable return was not lost on many (Councillor N2; Community Group N1).

For example, a local resident suggested:

The Duchy is a quality product but there is still a commercial product and they’re not in there for the love of Cornwall or for the love of Newquay or anything else. It’s a financial plan (Resident N6).

In addition, there was recognition that agents of the Duchy were strategic in their business dealings with others. For example, one interviewee suggested ‘there is a need to know basis on which [the Duchy] work, you know, and if you ask a question, they won’t lie, but you need to know the right question to ask’ (Core Team N3). Another local stakeholder had a similar view, but took a different tack. She suggested the Duchy was:

... financially very astute. They have to be in order to do what they do and I don’t know whether they always play the game in the way that they should play it, but I’ve got nothing to base that on other than a gut feeling. But that’s the nature of the game isn’t it. ... there’s no way about it, the Duchy is a very rich organisation and they’re not going to do anything to damage their financial standing (Working Group N2).

But what is it in the nature of the Duchy of Cornwall that leads to these two contrasting viewpoints that seem to be held by interviewees simultaneously?
6.2.3 The Power of the Duchy – Extraordinary and Ordinary

The Duchy’s power lies in more than just the wealth and resources to which they have access. The Duchy is signified as a part of the Monarchy and closely connected with HRH the Prince of Wales. Several interviewees treated the Duchy and the Prince synonymously when they referred to the most significant landowner of the Growth Area (Councillors N1, N2; Core Team N2; Resident N4), while others recognised the role of the Prince in heading the Duchy (Core Team N2; Working Group N2). Billig (1992), in one of the few studies on the nature of the British monarchy, suggested that such views lie in the paradox between both the ordinary and extraordinary perceptions of the royal family. Billig found that while the monarchy represents social hierarchy, nationhood, and inequality, and is perceived as extraordinary; in contemporary society it is simultaneously regarded with a lack of deference, as ordinary and human with recognised weaknesses, failures in judgement and flaws. This juxtaposition allows the mystery of the royal family, its wealth and authority to be sustained. Concomitantly, the disparity and inequality is diminished through techniques of demystification, reducing the extraordinary to ordinary (ibid). In the Newquay case, interviewees noted the (extraordinary) power, wealth, the access to resources, expertise and quality associated with the Duchy of Cornwall and HRH the Prince of Wales, while simultaneously demystifying the organisation through cynical suspicion of the (ordinary) business acuity and financial motivations of the organisation.

According to Billig (1992) another method of demystification lies in the allocation of ‘jobs’ to members of the royal family. He argued that the job of the royal family was to provide role models, figureheads, and ambassadors. In particular, the Prince of Wales’ architectural project is seen as a legitimate ‘job’ (ibid:85; see also 206). Certainly, amongst interviewees, there was little question of the Prince’s right to be using ‘his’ Foundation to run an EbD and lead the development of what was seen to be his land – irrespective of the fact that there were other landowners involved. The role of the Prince was normalised by the recognition of his job, in promoting sustainable urban development by example.

---

8 Billig (1992) suggests this lack of research on the nature of the monarchy in Britain is because the monarchy is subject to an ideology that operates to ensure no problem is identified with the Monarchy as an institution. Therefore it is not worthy of academic study. This is compounded by the popular media’s fascination with all manner of ‘royal’ problems that are sensationalised and obsessed over in trivialised detail which places the Monarchy further outside academic interest.
As Royalty, the identity of HRH the Prince of Wales is entrenched in English culture (Billig 1992), something often lost on those from outside Britain’s borders. As one interviewee put it:

People have known him all their lives, ... they know that he used to, well he still does talk to flowers and plants, and goes on about organic farming and this, that and the other, and he did 30, 40 years ago. People thought he was off his trolley! But the funny thing is that it’s all come about largely. I mean his ideas on architecture ... criticising this, that and the other, but people do listen. Oh they may think “oh the old fool what’s he on about now”, but they listen and it does make a difference (Councillor N2).

To some extent then, local people attributed a sense of familiarity, certainty and reassurance to the activities of HRH the Prince of Wales (and by implication the Duchy). Moreover, there was recognition of the intent to produce a finished product that met the principles and high quality articulated by the Prince of Wales. But at the same time, this increased the pressure on the Duchy to ensure it met those expectations. As a Duchy representative indicated:

This is so close to our heart and because of the potential for adverse publicity and also for getting it wrong commercially, coupled with the horror, which would be the worst outcome in many ways, would be the fact that we have let down the other landowners. So we are playing for pretty high stakes (Design Team N4).

The determination to produce a development that was consistent with the image of the Prince, his urbanist principles and the Duchy became clearer as the events of the EbD unravelled. Not only was the Duchy’s ‘mission’ to be patient and ‘get the best’ out of the development (ibid) as noted above, but to fulfil the Prince’s job of providing exemplars of those urbanist principles. Billig (1992:69) also notes that for Royals, ‘charisma and credibility are their trade’ in undertaking their jobs. Certainly the character of the Duchy’s Project Manager for the Growth Area was noted by many. One interviewee described him as ‘fantastic’, and commented ‘you’re trying to get what you want ... and that’s about being nice and charming and whatever and then you meet [the Duchy’s Project Manager], who’s like the very best in the world at it’ (Core Team N3). A member of the design team suggested the Duchy’s Project Manager was ‘a tremendously important character’ who was a ‘very, very good catalyst for bringing people together’, with remarkable skills in ‘finding a way through the politics’ (Design Team N1).

The Duchy is a powerful organisation that has, given the nature of its public profile, a very well developed public face (enacted through the charismatic agency of their employees). It is vital to the integrity of the organisation and indeed the Royal Family in Britain, to be seen to be transparent and credible. Thus the power and authority the Duchy is
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capable of wielding as a part of an extraordinary Royal institution, enables them to enact their ideologies in a way few other organisations could. Moreover, as an institution, the discursive significations of the Prince of Wales (and the Duchy) are sedimented into social life in the United Kingdom, which leaves their roles and activities in relation to their jobs beyond question.

6.2.4 Antecedent Power Plays

The foregoing analysis suggests that already, clear power plays were evident prior to entering the first phase of the EbD. First, the governmentality of the Local Authority in allocating the Growth Area for development, and more significantly in requiring joint working by the landowners in masterplanning the site was resisted by at least one landowner. Second, the role and authority of the Duchy and the Prince of Wales was simultaneously accepted and contested. While the Duchy was invited to take the lead, they were only invited to do so because of the nature of the organisation. But what was consistently overlooked was how the Duchy and HRH the Prince of Wales were signified as ideologically charged symbols of paternalism, hierarchy and inequality (Billig 1992). These themes developed and increased in complexity as the EbD process unraveled.

So from 2001, after the Local Plan was adopted, the Duchy took a leading role in coordinating the various landowners into action that resulted in the decision taken in 2003 to move forward with a development. However, it was not just the Duchy who was instrumental in this regard. Several interviewees recounted a meeting initiated by the local authority in light of the weakening justifications for the allocation of the Growth Area (see section 6.2.1). The meeting, held in mid-2003, involved key landowners and planning officers. A Council officer remembered they told the landowners ‘if you don’t get your act together and we get this sorted out, then basically we could argue that we don’t need the Growth Area at all, then you’ll get nothing’ (Council Officer N5). This ‘use it or lose it’ message was corroborated by a landowner. He recalled a Council officer instructing the landowners to ‘start behaving like grown ups rather than little children’, to go away and discuss progressing the Growth Area or not, and to be sure to be ‘singing from the same hymn sheet’ on returning (Landowner N2). The decision was to progress the development. Consequently, towards the end of 2003, the decision to undertake an EbD was made (Design Team N4), and progress on the Growth Area stepped up a gear.
6.3 Phase One – Lead-in to the EbD Workshop

The lead-in phase of the EbD ran from late May to October 2004. A Duchy representative gave three reasons for choosing an EbD run by the Prince’s Foundation over other approaches to participation (Design Team N4). First, a collaborative working relationship with the Foundation had already been established through the development of the Pattern Book. Second, the collaboration between the Foundation and the Duchy was something HRH the Prince of Wales had expressed a desire to foster (ibid; Design Team N2). And third, a Duchy representative explained:

Having had four or five years working [in Newquay] with local people, [I had] a pretty good understanding of what was at the forefront of their thinking and I also had detected what I call an air of anticipation, that people wanted to see added value out of this project, and that people felt ... that the population at large here was tired of being consulted. There had been so much consultation about what do we do about Newquay, how do we solve it’s problems, what about regeneration, ... You know the public had been consulted about just about everything going, over the period and I think that they didn’t want just to be asked, I think they wanted to be physically and spiritually to be engaged’ in the process and that’s what formed my decision to go the EbD route (Design Team N4; my emphasis).

Two points of interest emerge from these justifications for choosing an EbD. First, the requirement for a collaborative relationship between the Duchy and the Foundation, and second, the intention, revealed in the emphasis in the quote above, to engage local people both physically and spiritually. These points are discussed below.

6.3.1 Working Together – The Duchy and Foundation

A Duchy representative described the relationship between the Duchy and the Foundation as a rather unique client-consultant relationship. He recalled a ‘frank meeting between the parties’ in early in 2004 to discuss the EbD, in which the Duchy considered themselves as the client, and therefore ‘dictated’ how ‘things [were] to be done’ (Design Team N4). Ordinarily, the Foundation would take a directive management role in running an EbD according to a client’s brief. However, in this instance, a Duchy representative indicated that because of the ‘high stakes’ and the need to get it ‘right’ commercially and publicly (as suggested in section 6.2.3), they needed to maintain ‘command and control’ of the process (ibid).

The perceived necessity for ‘command and control’ is evident throughout the EbD process, particularly in what seems to have been a difficult relationship between the Duchy and the Foundation. In particular, it resulted in two substantive differences between the Newquay EbD and a typical process run by the Foundation. First, at the Duchy’s request,
working groups were established after the pre-workshop or briefing session (discussed in section 6.3.3). The second, perhaps most significant change involved the appointment of urbanist Leon Krier as the masterplanner for the project (see Chapter Five). As indicated in Chapter Five, Krier has been a ‘mentor’ to HRH the Prince of Wales on matters of architecture and urbanism since the 1980s (Thompson-Fawcett 2003:258). Similarly, the Duchy’s relationship with Krier goes back to the early development of Poundbury in the late 1980s, for which he was (and continues to be) masterplanner. However, their relationship began hesitantly, as the Duchy warily took on urbanist principles for the development of Poundbury (Thompson-Fawcett 1998). Nevertheless, at the time of the EbD, the Duchy viewed Krier as ‘the leading … masterplanner in Europe. He certainly, in terms of theory … is without challenge’ and is a ‘true master at his craft’ (Design Team N4). The Duchy and the Prince sought to ensure that Krier was the masterplanner for the Growth Area even though the senior urban designers at the Foundation were also highly regarded urbanist masterplanners. While both the Foundation and Krier are embedded in the urbanist discourse in Europe, in Newquay they were, in effect, two consultancies engaged to provide overlapping services to the Duchy. Both identities carried the authority of their discourse, the authority of their Royal Patron, and were capable in most instances of choosing the work they undertook. However, as indicated, the Foundation and the Duchy were directed to work together in this instance.

Yet some suggested the Foundation and the Duchy have not always had a good relationship (Urbanist 2). A Duchy representative suggested you ‘could write a short play about the chemistry that operates [between] the Foundation, the master planning team and the Duchy’, and characterised their relationship as involving ‘creative tension’ (Design Team N4). Moreover, ‘it has to do with egos, there’s no point beating around the bush on this’ (ibid). Others involved in the EbD also noted, ‘there were some areas of quite high tension between the Foundation and [Krier]’ (Design Team N2), and there was ‘definitely a conflict’ (Council Officer N4).

While all three identities (Krier, the Duchy and the Foundation) adhered to similar visions of urbanism, the objectives and roles of each in the Newquay case differed, which resulted in friction within the design team. The conflict between the Foundation team and the Duchy and Krier is revisited in section 6.4.2 in relation to the EbD workshop. For the moment, it is enough to note its historic presence.

Three points are important. First, the antagonisms resulted in part from the way in which the Duchy felt it necessary to maintain ‘command and control’ of the project. Second,
HRH the Prince of Wales directed that the Foundation and the Duchy (with Krier as masterplanner) work together. And third, in effect Krier and the Foundation team were competing with one another to assert their own identities as masterplanners. All three aspects have implications, explored further in sections 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 for the way in which the EbD process as a whole was played out. The following section returns to the pre-EbD phase, turning first to the intentions of the EbD and the framework in which those intentions were articulated.

6.3.2 The Intention of the EbD – to Physically and Spiritually Engage

The purpose of the EbD was to create a masterplan for the site collaboratively (Prince’s Foundation 2004a; Prince’s Foundation 2005a). In order to understand how ‘collaboratively’ was signified in this context, it is useful to explore articulations about what the EbD was intended to achieve, how it would facilitate collaboration, and who would be involved in that collaboration. In the introduction of section 6.3, a Duchy representative was quoted indicating an intention to ensure the public were ‘physically and spiritually’ ‘engaged’ in the EbD process. But what does this mean in terms of the EbD process and how was it to be achieved? A range of additional related nodal points fixed the meaning articulated by the Duchy for participation in the EbD.

A central nodal point, ‘extensive consultation’, served to anchor the meanings attributed to the nature of participation in this regard. Media reports on the EbD repeatedly used the phrase ‘extensive public consultation’ (Bond 2003a; Bond 2003b; Bond 2003c; Bond 2004b; Green 2004; Walker 2004a), a phrase also used by a Duchy representative in an interview for the current research. He described Duchy policy such that it would always ‘consult extensively on any development proposal’ (Design Team N4). But what does extensive consultation signify? The representative provided a clue. He suggested that in the past ‘people felt consultation was informing the public about what was going to happen and asking some questions, rather than engaging the public ab initio to say “how shall we handle this proposal”’ (Design Team N4). Clearly engaging was signified as more than informing in terms of the level of public involvement, which is entirely consistent with participation literature reviewed in Chapter Two.

Similarly, HRH the Prince of Wales was cited in a local newspaper that reported the EbD: ‘In my view we can only build truly successful and enduring places by fully involving the local community in the process of designing them’ (Bond 2004a:2, my emphasis). The Prince’s position in this regard was affirmed by a Duchy representative who claimed that the
Prince of Wales ‘is probably the great advocate of the consultation process’ (Design Team N4, emphasis original). So there was a clear commitment, evident in articulations by both HRH the Prince of Wales and the Duchy of Cornwall, to a high level of public involvement rather than consultation as merely stating a preference on given options. Extensive consultation involves fully engaging local residents. Further evidence of how participation was signified by the project proponents lies in media coverage.

Media coverage that was consistent across several local newspapers throughout the Pre-Workshop phase suggested there were specific press releases from the Duchy and the Foundation on the EbD process. Press coverage stated that the EbD was to ensure the masterplan ‘meets local needs and reflects the character of the area’ (Bond 2004b; Jobson 2004a), a phrase reiterated in the EbD Summary Report (Prince’s Foundation 2005a:8). In addition, local newspapers suggested residents ‘will be invited to take part in an intensive five-day session to shape the plans and vision for the growth area’ (Walker, 2004b:19) and that the ‘Prince is keen that the Newquay venture yields another exemplar development [like Poundbury] with as much local input and support as possible’ (Jobson 2004b; Jobson 2004c). The public were, on several occasions beseeched by Duchy representatives for their help to ‘secure the best possible development for Newquay’ (Walker 2004b:19). For example, four months prior to the EbD week a Duchy representative was reported stating ‘we cannot do it alone and over the next few months we will be bringing together all those who have a part to play in helping to fulfil the community’s aspirations for the area’ (Walker 2004b:19; also see Bond 2004c; Jobson 2004b).

Members of the Prince’s Foundation were also quoted in local press coverage. For example, a senior member of the Foundation was cited ‘it’s not just about bringing the community in at the end and saying what we think’ (Bond 2004c). In another article, the same Foundation member is quoted at length:

Consultation usually means everything has been decided and you are asked whether you like it or not. EbD involves a lot of pre-organisation and building a consensus with the local citizens, landowners and the developers as we design. We are guided by an Eastern proverb ‘tell me; I forget. Show me; I remember. Involve me; I understand.’ It is a non-adversarial approach but it does not mean that there won’t be ding dong battles (Jobson 2004a).

More explicitly, the opportunities for public involvement were explained. A Foundation representative was cited: ‘This is an interactive process that relies on participation. The public come in at the beginning to input into the designs and then at the end to see what the experts have put together’ (Walker 2004a). In addition, according to
background documents, the whole EbD process was intended to be ‘fully inclusive’ (Duchy of Cornwall, Briefing Session Agenda). A letter that outlined the process was sent out to local residents living in streets adjacent to the site and other stakeholders. It stated that the EbD event would be where:

... you will be able to help us prepare the Master Plan; finalise the Pattern Book and settle the Development Principles, exploring designs for key elements of the scheme so that the character can be established’ (Letter from Duchy dated 12th May 2004).

From the media, background documents and from interviews with Duchy and Foundation representatives, several repeated phrases fixed the signification for the role of participation in the Newquay process. These nodal points (in italics below and derived from the analysis of interviews and media reports presented above) reveal that the intention of the EbD was to collaboratively create a masterplan. The EbD was a means to provide for extensive consultation, that is, to engage the local community both physically and spiritually by allowing them to participate, shape, provide input and thereby be fully involved in the process of designing the Growth Area. Consequently, the final design outcome was intended to be a consensual vision that met local needs and reflects local identity. These organising metaphors and their articulation infer far more than consultation (as feedback on options). Rather they indicate an inclusive and participatory process in which local people will have the opportunity to provide direct input into the evolution of the masterplan.

The question for the remainder of the chapter is: how well were these intentions achieved? Moreover, the use of such nodal points raises further questions about who the local community or local people were and what local identity meant. The first two phases of the EbD – the lead in period and the workshop itself – were key to achieving these intentions and revealing answers to how some of these nodal points were signified. The lead in period involved two stages, a two day briefing session held in June 2004 (section 6.3.3), and the establishment of six working groups (section 6.3.4) who were responsible for compiling necessary information that would feed into the EbD event held in October 2004.

6.3.3 The Briefing Session

The briefing session, held over two days in June 2004 at Newquay Tretherras School, was initially described by a Duchy representative as a ‘pathfinder consultation’ in which:

... for a couple of days, we invite everybody in whom we have identified [an interest in the Growth Area] and advertise to the world at large “[do] you want to participate”, so we build up a really big database of people and skills. And we simply asked them “what are the issues which will inform this development?” (Design Team N4)
As outlined in the Briefing Session report, the purpose of the event was threefold:

- To explain the EbD process;
- To ensure all those who should be involved in the process are identified at an early stage, with the help of the local community;
- To begin to understand local issues which may affect the development, and for which technical information will need to be prepared prior to the EbD.\(^9\)

The programme for the two day event is set out in Appendix C. Day one was principally consultation with broader stakeholders. It comprised two sessions—one for invited attendees (a wide range of agency representatives and interest groups) and one open to the public. Day two involved a series of sessions for specific groups of stakeholders. In addition, there was an exhibition about EbDs and examples of work from other projects.

The pathfinder or briefing session here differs only marginally from the pre-workshop typical of the Foundation’s EbD model (see Chapter Five). Two key differences lay in the timing of the open public session (four months prior rather than four weeks prior) and the organisation of the technical workshops divided by stakeholders interest and sector, rather than by topic (for example, transport, education, housing etc). While the latter is unlikely to have had a significant impact on the process given the establishment of working groups divided by topic (see section 6.3.4), the timing of the public open session had implications for claims to inclusivity and intentions publicised in the media. Ultimately, it was the only opportunity for the public to provide their input prior to the completion of the EbD workshop because there was no public meeting at the beginning of the workshop week. This point is taken up in section 6.4.1.

However, the Duchy and the Foundation sought to reach a wide range of stakeholders. In addition to coverage in local newspapers, the Duchy sent out approximately 550 letters to potential participants in May 2004, which included residents of streets surrounding the Growth Area, local community groups, voluntary organisations, builders and developers, registered social landlords, and any other agencies or groups who might have an interest. The format of the letter was simple, informative and accessible, with a pro forma reply and return addressed envelope. It simply asked if the recipient wished to be involved in the

\(^9\) At the time of the Briefing Session the exact dates for the EbD were not set. The indication was that it would be held in Autumn of that year. Media reports, and a letter from the Foundation to members listed on the Duchy’s database indicate the dates for the EbD week were set in early July (Letter from the Prince’s Foundation dated 15\(^{th}\) July 2004; Green 2004; Walker 2004a).
process. From responses to this mailshot\(^{10}\), a database of just over 100 potential participants was compiled and follow-up telephone contact was made to confirm attendance at the Briefing Session. Key personnel from the Foundation, the Duchy, and the Duchy’s masterplanner were in attendance throughout. Extensive notes were taken from all sessions, which formed the body of the *Briefing Session Summary Report* (Prince’s Foundation 2004a), which was disseminated in July to all those in the Duchy’s database who had expressed an interest in participating and being kept informed\(^{11}\). Media reports indicated ‘more than 100 people’ (Walker 2004b:19) attended the public meeting, giving their views, aspirations and concerns for the site.

Local perceptions of the event from interviewees were varied. One local resident gained a great deal from attending:

> It was an evening thing and we got there about half past six or something and first of all you could look at all the displays and they had loads of stuff up to show you what was going on, what it was all about, the areas, some of the ideas, some of the possibilities, a lot of explanatory stuff first of all, and get the refreshment and so on, and then you moved into another bigger room ... and they had a presentation given by ... [someone from the Foundation] and he sort of introduced it and then other people talked through and explained what the different roles were going to be and so, yeah and that really started opening our eyes. And then at the end of that session we were asked to divide up in to groups, each with a leader and then were asked what do you think about it. What are the concerns that would be uppermost in your minds about such a big development and everybody then was encouraged to bring out different ideas ... and yes I found it very, very useful and that was the first time I’d really started thinking about it so I went in as a bit of an ignoramus really and yes, it was a real eye opener (Resident N2).

She further suggested that the mood was ‘very positive’ and that the opportunity to be involved was appreciated (ibid). A local stakeholder suggested that the involvement of people like Krier and the Foundation was reassuring. He suggested that:

> There was a bit of excitement about “oh crikey, this isn’t going to be your bog standard speculative development. It’s going to, it’s got a shape and form and somebody has a view about what it is going to look like”. That was quite good fun being involved in that (Core Team N3).

At the public meeting, feedback forms were available for people to take away and complete at their leisure. In the *Briefing Session Report*, eight forms received were

---

\(^{10}\) The Duchy received 116 replies prior to the 1\(^{st}\) June, of which 79 responded affirmatively to being involved further, and 34 declined. Those who responded affirmatively were grouped according to their interest, and invited to attend relevant parts of the Briefing Session.

\(^{11}\) The Duchy’s database was an ongoing compilation of those who expressed an interest in the process, initially from the first large mailshot in May, and subsequently from the Briefing Session and later phases of the EbD.
summarised. Of these, two were very negative, stating that it was an ‘awful project’, ‘far too large’, and expressed ‘concern’ at the ‘loss of natural habitat for wildlife’ (Prince’s Foundation 2004a:9). Other comments identified issues that needed to be addressed, such as the flooding of Chapel Stream and traffic on Trencreck/Trevenson Road (ibid).

The technical meetings on Day Two of the Briefing Session were to inform the groups on the ‘purpose’ of the EbD, to ensure the EbD was a ‘fully inclusive process’, that ‘the most relevant representatives’ were involved and committed to the EbD process and to ensure that ‘all necessary technical information [was] gathered prior to the EbD’ (Duchy of Cornwall and Prince’s Foundation, Briefing Session Agendas). In response to attendance at one of these meetings, enthusiasm was expressed in a letter dated June 16th 2004 from one organisation representative: ‘everyone here has been very impressed by the fact that the Enquiry by Design ethos consists of consultation and participation and at the seemingly real and effective levels at which they will both function’ (letter to Foundation from Newquay Regeneration Forum, dated 16th June 2004, emphasis original).

With the exception of a small number of strong views in opposition to the project, the Briefing Session was well received by both locals and stakeholders who attended. Moreover, it served its purpose. It informed those in attendance about the EbD; it allowed the organisers to gain an understanding of the issues (as perceived by those in attendance); and it began to tease out the information and research required for the EbD event itself. There was clearly an attempt to spread the net widely in terms of gaining attendance at all the sessions. In turn, this allowed a range of stakeholders to be identified, extended the Duchy’s database, and facilitated the selection of potential working group members and EbD workshop participants. How far reaching it was in terms of the wider residents of Newquay, is questionable. Moreover, it was the only opportunity for many residents to have their voice heard prior to the EbD workshop (still four months away). So while the Duchy made a great effort to ensure the Briefing Session was inclusive, and specifically invited all those who were considered to be most affected (for example, local residents adjacent to the site), the fact remains that only 100 of a permanent population of just over 20,000 came to the public meeting. Furthermore, the event was held over two week days rather than a weekend, which prioritised public sector stakeholders over voluntary and private sector groups. The issue of the prioritisation of different knowledges and stakeholders is considered in sections 6.3.4 and 6.4.1, and the issue of representation and scale are explored further in Chapter Eight as it emerges in both cases.
On its own, the Briefing Session, as a form of participation, was fairly effective. Certainly, for one resident (Resident N2 quoted above), the space for discussion in small groups at the public meeting was conducive to meaningful interaction. Clearly she learned from the event, as others indicated they did (Residents N6, N5). Moreover, there was little to suggest there was a lack of credibility, trust, honesty, or legitimacy in the Briefing Session. However, in terms of an analysis of the power relationships involved, the process needs to be situated within the context of the whole EbD process. Thus the issue of the effectiveness and the power relationship within the pre-EbD phase are reconsidered in the final sub-section of the analysis on the EbD workshop (section 6.4.5), and again in the conclusion to the chapter (section 6.7). In the meantime, the analysis of the second component of the pre-EbD phase – the working groups – is (re)presented.

6.3.4 Working Groups

It was during the Briefing Session that the decision to establish six working groups was taken between the Duchy and Foundation staff (Design Team N4). These groups comprised Education, Employment and Business, Environment and Ecology, Health, Transport, and Housing. Each group met four or five times over the period between the Briefing Session and the workshop week, four months later.

At the Briefing Session an invitation was extended to various participants to volunteer for the working groups. Each working group was given a ‘Draft Template’ to use as a guide for early meeting agendas, which stated the purpose of the working groups – to ‘ensure that issues which were raised at the initial Enquiry by Design briefing session are addressed, and that technical information required for the Enquiry by Design is collated prior to October’ (Prince’s Foundation 2004a). Each group was then provided with a timetable of meetings and a list of agenda items that were to be addressed and/or amended ‘as appropriate’. The breakdown of each working group, a summary of its agenda and the composition of its membership is provided in Appendix D.

The composition of the groups emerged from an initial list provided by the Foundation and the Duchy, following the Briefing Session. The first meeting of each working group involved a discussion on who else should be involved, which resulted in additional members

---

12 Although it remains unclear which sessions the invitation to partake in a working group was extended to, it seems highly likely that it was not extended to those at the public open session on the evening of day one because all those in the working groups represented an interest of an organisation or profession.
being co-opted in several instances. One group member recalled ‘people were volunteered in their presence or absence’ and at early meetings ‘there were discussions about whether [group membership] needed to be broadened, whether other people needed to be brought in and whether there were any gaps that needed to be plugged’ (Working Group N2). Despite this intention to seek a broad representation of interests in each group, an examination of the composition of the groups reveals the dominance of public sector organisations and professionals, as opposed to voluntary groups or private sector representatives. The agendas also demonstrate a focus on targeted information gathering for the workshop. These groups had specific tasks and the membership was sought that would enable those tasks to be carried out.

Indeed, several interviewees expressed dissatisfaction over the composition of the groups and the way in which they were established. For example, a potential end-user with extensive broader knowledge in the topic, claimed his organisation had to ‘kick and scream and scratch [their] way in’ to the appropriate working group (Working Group N1) and felt that while they did make a valuable contribution it would have been more beneficial if they had been involved much earlier in the process. A further example indicated that perhaps access to the groups was not open to anyone. A local business person said that they had asked to be involved in a particular group relevant to his area of business but was told the group ‘was full’ (Resident N4). However the relevant working group leader suggested:

We didn’t have to go searching for anybody. ... I don’t think anyone was denied to join “no you can’t be a part”. What did happen a few times was, we said, “actually your interest would be better served [on] this group as opposed to that group”. Once said, “oh of course I see”. So you had to mix them around a bit but I don’t know of anyone being [told] “oh sorry, the group’s too large, we can’t have you.” There was nothing of that nature (Core Team N2).

Here, there may have been a breakdown in communication. Or, perhaps there was a bias towards higher level organisations and expertise, rather than local views. In reviewing the lists of working group members in the Summary Report, the local business person suggested they were ‘heavily weighted by big organisations’ (Resident N4). Of the estimated twenty names listed for the Business and Employment group, he noted ‘there are only four residents. I would have liked to have seen a bigger group’ (ibid). Ultimately, he expressed disappointment that there were not ‘other voices in there’ (ibid). This view was shared by members of the Business and Employment group, who thought that more local private sector representatives should have been involved (Working Group N2; Councillor N2; Council Officer N5). Arguably to some extent, their lack of involvement may have been
alleviated by the Newquay Business Needs Survey that the group commissioned\textsuperscript{13}. However, the lack of local residents or ‘ordinary people’ (Councillor N1) involved in the working groups with local knowledge was noted by others (Councillors N1, N2; Resident N4). What this points to is a particular articulation of inclusivity.

\textit{Signifying Inclusivity}

As noted in Chapter Five, the purpose of the pre-EbD phase is to ensure the ‘right information’ and the ‘right people’ are present at the workshop event (Lennertz 2003:12-14; see also section 5.3.1). The emphasis on the notion of ‘right’ information and people is evident in the Newquay case in the agendas of each working group (see Appendix D) and in the intention of the briefing session (see section 6.3.3). There was however, little explicit indication who those participants ‘should’ be. Chapter Five quoted one urbanist suggesting that those with some ‘clout and say in the process’ (Urbanist 1) should be involved in the technical workshops, while members of the public attended the public meeting in the briefing session to ‘find out when and where they can hear what we’re up to’ (Urbanist 1; see section 5.4.1). Such a statement suggests a weak reading of inclusivity, as those with influence rather than those affected as claimed by other urbanists (Urbanist 2; Design Team N2; Lennertz 2003). Thus there is variation within the urbanist discourse on how those who identify with it frame inclusivity and participation, indicating that the signification for these terms is not firmly fixed. Nevertheless, the composition of working groups indicates there is a higher relative value placed on participants with certain public sector roles and their knowledge in the EbD process.

Understandings given by interviewees of their roles in and the purpose of the working groups lend further light on this issue. Group members suggested their purpose was to ‘forecast what [the education] needs would be in the 20-50 year time scale, how big an area [needed] to be allocated’ (Core Team N6); to suggest ‘how much employment land we thought we needed, what sort of employment we needed’ (Councillor N2); ‘looking [at] what sort of housing [we] wanted to deliver and what it should be’ (Core Team N5). There was clear evidence that some members of one group were focused primarily on the interests represented within the group and so they ‘didn’t need to go out and talk to anybody else’

\textsuperscript{13} The Duchy offered to consider any proposals for additional research that needed to be commissioned. Where the Duchy agreed it was necessary for the EbD, they agreed to fund it. One such project was the Newquay
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(Core Team N4). Built environment professionals held similar views. For example, when asked whether the working groups were involved in networking out into the community, a local authority officer suggested ‘it was more a question of us bringing to those groups what we knew professionally from our own roles. The public involvement was obviously through the actual public sessions’ of the workshop (Council Officer N4). In addition, as noted above, the scheduling of meetings (week-day in business hours) suggests a professional public sector bias.

The ‘right’ people refers to those with the relevant technical skills and knowledge, and those able to make decisions on key issues – hence the bias toward public sector agencies and senior level figures. The purpose of the working groups was not to provide a forum for inclusive ‘public’ involvement by gaining broad representation of the wider communities of Newquay. Rather the intention was to provide a mechanism to enable the inclusion of the requisite technical information at the EbD. The implications are significant in terms of perpetuating existing power relationships since the knowledges that were potentially marginalised (local and emotional) were those already on the margins. As will be seen, this phase sets the scene for the EbD in terms of who is included and who is excluded. The issue of inclusivity is discussed in relation to the EbD in the following section (section 6.4.1) and again, given its importance, in Chapter Eight.

6.4 EbD Workshop

The EbD workshop was held from Monday 25th October to Friday 29th October 2004. Table 6.1 shows the different tiers of participants involved. The timetable for the week is presented in Appendix E. The timetable followed the typical format as depicted in Chapter Five, with two main exceptions. First, as noted earlier, there was no public meeting on the first evening, thus tier C’s involvement was confined to the final public meeting. Second, the involvement of Leon Krier as masterplanner resulted in changes to the ordinary operating mechanisms of the EbD. However, this is not reflected in the timetable, which was provided to the core team participants (tier A). The design team are likely to have been working to a more detailed programme, well beyond the public schedule (see Appendix E).

Business Needs Survey that the Employment and Business group undertook. It was a comprehensive survey sent out to all businesses within the three central Newquay TR7 postcodes, and the TR8 postcode.
Table 6.1 – Stakeholder membership for each tier of participants involved in the EbD workshop (Prince’s Foundation 2005a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Team</th>
<th>Foundation urban designers, architects and traffic engineers, consultants to the Foundation (eg environmental and traffic consultants), the masterplanner and his assistant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier A (Core Team)</td>
<td>Foundation’s Design Team plus Restormel Borough Council planners (Large Projects team, conservation, environment, economic development), Cornwall County Council planners (transport, spatial, waste, education), elected representatives, Chapel Town Partnership members, Registered Social Landlords, Surf Capital Steering Group, selected working group members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier B</td>
<td>Regional Government organisations (eg South West Regional Development Agency, Environment Agency, CABE) primary healthcare organisations, builders, architects, developers, voluntary organisations, interest groups, potential end-users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier C</td>
<td>The general public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section focuses on two key themes that emerged in the analysis of the EbD workshop. The first theme is inclusivity, which arose as a result of the inconsistency between the promoted intentions of the EbD (as outlined in section 6.3.2) and the actual means to achieve those intentions given the limited involvement of tier C participants (residents and the public). The following subsection (6.4.1) explores this issue. The second theme involves a series of antagonisms between various parties which mark out the limits of discourse and thus the discursive power plays involved. These include antagonism between the masterplanner and the Foundation (section 6.4.2); between the core team and the masterplanner (section 6.4.3), and between advocates of traditional architecture against proponents of modernist architecture (section 6.4.4).

6.4.1 Inclusivity Revisited

In section 6.3.2, the nodal points that articulated the intentions of the EbD as extensive consultation and spiritual and physical engagement signified the intention to provide an opportunity for a high level of inclusivity and involvement by local people. The contrast between opportunities for involvement presented to the three tiers is marked. Thus the following is divided into two subsections, one discussing inclusivity of tier C and the other of tiers A and B.

**Extensive Consultation – Tier C?**

Tier C participants’ involvement in the EbD workshop was limited to the final public meeting. The opportunities for *shaping* and providing *input* into the outcomes (see section 6.3.2) were limited to the briefing session for tier C participants. Yet interestingly, views on
the inclusivity of the process were mixed and only a few interviewees suggested that it was insufficiently inclusive. However, most of those interviewed were involved in working groups and in the core team, and therefore had more involvement in the process than tier C participants.

Of the five tier C residents interviewed, only one expressed a strong dissatisfaction regarding the opportunities for involvement. He suggested there were ‘a lot of people in Newquay who haven’t been involved at all and when you say to them, “well what do you know about the Enquiry by Design”, I am sure they say “well what is it?”’ (Resident N4). A family member present during the interview stated she was ‘absolutely outraged’, because at the time, simultaneous consultation was being undertaken on a variety of planning issues that meant one thing is ‘almost like a smoke screen for the other’ (ibid).

There were several indications that other groups felt excluded. A core team member recognised in 2005 that ‘one or two [people] do feel disenfranchised’ (Landowner N1). Not all Gusti Veor residents were enamoured with their level of involvement, even though they had a representative at the workshop during the whole process. One resident stated:

We thought the four, five or six residents in [Gusti Veor] weren’t really [(sighs)] very important to [the Duchy’s] plans ... and not enough in our view, not enough consideration was give to those people who live right in the heart of the [development] (Resident N1).

Similarly, another Gusti Veor resident indicated that the residents of Henver Road ‘were either unaware or chose to ignore’ the process (Core Team N6). It became apparent after the EbD that this concern was justified. An action group of Henver Road residents formed and launched a petition opposing the development in mid 2005 (Green 2005; Wherry 2005) and the group remained active in 2006 (Hartley 2006). It was difficult to know how many residents from Henver Road actually attended the public open sessions of the EbD. The one resident interviewed from Henver Road spoke glowingly of the briefing session and the information he had received, although he was unable to attend the final meeting of the EbD (resident N5). Although it was noted at the Briefing Session that there was a need to ‘identify a representative’ of Henver Road residents to attend the workshop (Prince’s Foundation 2004a:10) there was no evidence that this occurred. However, residents of Henver Road whose properties back onto the Growth Area were a part of the original mail shot sent out prior to the Briefing Session. Therefore, they were arguably given an opportunity to be involved, but not as more than tier C residents and clearly this was insufficient for some. Nevertheless, the Henver Road action group members considered the
development affected them and consequently, they had a right to be involved in the process. Public participation was signified as a right.

In contrast, other tier C residents were pleased just to have the opportunity to be involved (Residents N3, N5). For example, one resident suggested that ‘everybody was just so pleased to express a view’ and that ‘it [wa]s nice to have had a little input and then to be kept informed about what is going on’ (Resident N2). Another resident suggested (reiterated by Core Team N1) that it was the Duchy’s land to do what they wish with – ‘fair play to ‘em [sic], let them build another town’ (Resident N3). Public participation was signified as an opportunity, not a ‘right’, even when the development proposal would impact on individuals’ lives, although arguably, not to a significant extent. As such any opportunity to be involved was seen as a bonus.

While it was difficult to know how widespread either view (participation as a right or participation as an opportunity) was amongst Newquay residents, there was a general acceptance by those involved in the core team that the EbD process was more inclusive of local residents than consultation processes typically adopted by the local authorities. One local stakeholder suggested:

The community to a degree felt engaged in the growth area process, where they actually don’t feel engaged in what is going on in the rest of the town [on regeneration and the Newquay Action Framework] because it was put out and you know discussions were held behind closed doors (Working Group N2).

This view was shared by a local resident who said there was a ‘real feel of consultation with the public which you don’t often get [or] feel with the [Local Authorities] .... I felt that [with] the growth area that they were prepared to listen’ (Resident N6). Members of the core team were similarly positive about the level of involvement provided for local people (Core Team N2, N1; Council Officer N1). For example, a landowner argued that ‘overall ... people had the opportunity to make their views known’ (Landowner N1). Another core team member felt strongly that:

The community benefits are massive. ... the inclusive nature of the process ... There was a vaguely sort of spiritual, emotional moment at the end of the process when they reported back when people had engaged with what they were doing and are genuinely quite excited about the outcome (Core Team N3).

However, because core team and working group members had been intensively involved in the workshop process, there may have been a tendency to conflate local involvement with tier A and B enthusiasm. Membership at the final public meeting was not recorded. If all core team members, tier B participants and working group members had
attended the meeting, the numbers would have come close to 140 very quickly – the number the media reported that were present in the audience (Batchelor 2004).

So while several tier C residents expressed a sense of engagement in the process, it is open to question whether local residents across Newquay were engaged, or more to the point felt marginalised\(^\text{14}\). The limited opportunities for involvement would not have precluded achieving engagement per se. Several factors may have contributed to a sense of engagement – the extensive and persuasive media coverage; small group discussions and feedback at the Briefing Session; the quality of the presentations; the perception that it is part of a wider engagement with experts; the extensive dissemination of information including documents; and the authority of the Duchy and the Foundation. In addition, two factors may have contributed to the way in which the process was generally signified as inclusive, irrespective of the actual practice and scope for inclusion. First, experience of local authority consultation via public meetings (such as the example provided at the very outset of this thesis) in contrast to the very different workshop style collaborative nature of the EbD. Second, its persuasive and rhetorical promotional statements in the media may have contributed to a belief that that is what eventuated. Nevertheless, the question is whether the opportunity for tier C participants to participate in two public meetings five months apart constitutes extensive consultation? The way in which the process was symbolised convincingly signifies it as considerably more than consultation. However in practice, for tier C residents the EbD process falls short of meeting its articulated intentions.

While a lack of inclusivity did not predominate as a criticism of the process, clearly the main approach for gaining local input was via representation rather than direct involvement, a point not made clear in the articulations concerning the intentions of the process presented in the media (see section 6.3.2). So what was the nature of the representation? As indicated, a well regarded Gusti Veor resident represented the views of residents in the hamlet at both the EbD and in one of the working groups (Resident N1, Core Team N6), but there was no apparent local representative of other streets around the site. The lack of ordinary Newquay residents represented on the core team and in tier B was evident. It is to this issue that the following sub-section turns.

\(^{14}\) Access to ‘excluded voices’ was limited in the current study. This issue is discussed in Chapter Eight.
Extensive Consultation – Core Team and Tier B?

The majority of core team members represented organisations with a particular technical role to play, rather than resident views even though many were residents themselves. Table 6.2 summarises the composition of the core team as shown in the EbD report. The open door nature of the workshop means the list is not definitive – some invited core team members did not stay for the entire workshop week, while others from tier B or working groups ‘dipped’ in and out if required (Design Team N3). However it was indicative of the composition of the core team and parallels the structure of the working groups.

The combination of Council officers, landowners, public/private partnerships, and potential end-users (those shaded grey in Table 5.2) made up three quarters of the core team (note the table excludes the design team of approximately thirteen built environment professionals). All these groups had either a technical role to play (for example the Council Officers) or a significant interest in the project. Even those who appeared to represent larger groups within the Newquay area such as the Parish of the Most Holy Trinity, the Newquay Old Society and the local Freemasons were primarily interested in securing new premises within the Growth Area (Core Team N1, N2, N4; Design Team N3). Indeed, one design team member recalled one of these groups’ representatives was ‘obsessive’ about achieving their goal and suggested ‘the danger is that you get one relatively small vested interest group who then have a disproportionate voice or say’ (Design Team N3). In fact this group was not on the original core team list, but was marked as tier B (Prince’s Foundation 2005a). However, because they had the time and interest, the group was ‘there all the time’ (ibid).

The remaining quarter of the core team represented wider members of the Newquay area, by elected representation and through parishes. Although the local representation on the core team was much greater than that of the working groups (see section 6.3.4), it remained heavily weighted toward technical knowledge and end users.
Table 6.2 – Representation of local organisations on the core team (Prince’s Foundation 2005a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local organisations represented in core team</th>
<th>No. of representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Town Partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall County Council – officers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restormel Borough Council - officers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall County Council – elected</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restormel Borough Council - elected</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newquay Town Council – elected</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public / private organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newquay Regeneration Forum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surf Capital Steering Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremorvah Industries(^\text{15})</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Friends (health care charity)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newquay Tretherras Secondary School</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential end-users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered social landlords</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newquay Old Society (heritage organisation)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish of the Most Holy Trinity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freemasons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Care (aged care)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups/community organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newquay Society for the Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local churches/parishes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gusti Veor resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, the composition of tier B further emphasised the marginalisation of ‘community’ representatives by focusing on those with a specific interest, role or technical knowledge (see Table 6.3). Not only were the same organisations represented, but the proportion of built environment professionals and council officers (almost half tier B) lay in stark contrast to the small number of local interest groups and associations present. So while potential end-users such as businesses, community groups, builders and developers all had a role in tier B or the core team, the users of affordable housing have been omitted, as have representatives of neighbouring streets (except Gusti Veor), local recreation groups, non mainstream religious groups, non religious groups, conservation groups, and young people\(^\text{16}\).

\(^{15}\) Tremorvah Industries is a supported business under Cornwall County Council’s community development programme. It provides a range of supported employment opportunities to individuals with disabilities (see www.cornwall.gov.uk).

\(^{16}\) Based on 2001 census, figures for Restormel Borough indicate that the area is predominantly white British (99%) and Christian (75%). However, 20% of Restormel residents indicated they had no religion, and a further
Again, the prioritisation of expert technical knowledge and direct interest over more emotional place based attachments to the Growth Area were evident. So while the urbanist EbD process claims to be inclusive of all affected by the proposal (see Chapter Five), the meaning attributed to ‘affected’ is cast narrowly within the discourse – it is a direct tangible effect on interests. Moreover, positive impacts are prioritised over negative impacts – the potential end-users of the growth area are given far more representation than the residents of

9% did not state a religion. Very small proportions of other ethnic and religious groupings live within the borough, but no one group has a representation of over 0.5% (see www.cornwall.gov.uk).
Gusti Veor, Gusti Vean, Trevenson and Henver Roads, some of whom may perceive the proposal as a negative impact on their current lifestyles.

**Who are the 'right' people?**

What does the foregoing analysis mean for the way in which the right people were defined in the Newquay EbD? The prioritisation of members with expert knowledge privileges a certain kind of rationality and reason. Those considered to be affected by the development were construed narrowly and positively, suggesting that within the core team at least, passion, emotion and conflict were marginalised. The marginalisation of conflict and emotion confirms concerns articulated by Day (2003) and Grant (2006). Rather, the right people are those instrumental in decision making, or who speak rationally, endorse the principles, gain something from the proposal, or offer technical knowledge regarding its implementation (Duany 2003; Urbanist 2).

In the Newquay case, there was evidence that reason and expertise were qualities sought in core team participants. In addition, there was a disjunction between the methods for including tier C participants with the appeals to inclusivity identified in section 6.3.2. The question of representation is considered in Chapter Eight, as it was an issue that arose in the Whitefield EbD and as noted in Chapter Two is a key problematic in deliberative participatory approaches. In the meantime, the remainder of this section turns to the antagonisms that were evident in the EbD workshop, starting with that between the Prince’s Foundation and the masterplanner.

### 6.4.2 The Masterplanner and the Foundation

A key aspect of an EbD workshop is the collaboration between different knowledges simultaneously and testing ideas through drawing as they emerge in discussion amongst stakeholders gathered together in a space simulating a design studio on or near the site (see Chapter Five). The EbD was held at Newquay Tretherras School, overlooking the Growth Area (see Figure 6.2, section 6.2). However, the masterplanner worked off-site, which had several implications that are explored in this sub-section. Three themes emerged. First, the mechanism that facilitated work between the two physically separate parts of the core team is discussed below. Under the subsequent heading ‘Krier’s Political Agency’, the way in which participants perceived Krier sheds light on how he was able to dictate the way he worked. The final part of the sub-section explores the source of the tension that arose between the Foundation and the master planner.
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**Basecamp and the Headland**

The principle reason for the separation between Krier and the rest of the design team was because Krier did not feel he could work with everyone around at the EbD workshop (Design Team N4). So Krier chose to situate himself at the Headland Hotel, a prominent four star hotel, with stunning sea views.

A Duchy representative recalled:

> When [Krier] came in October I said, “ok Leo how do you want to play this?” And he said [(mimicking Krier’s accent)] “I don’t want to be up at that bloody school with everybody clinging around, I can’t work”. So he wanted the room in the corner up here [at the Headland Hotel] as his bedroom and I organised that for him, and he wanted the room over in that corner on the ground floor, ... [(in Krier’s accent)] “this is where I’m going to do my work”. So he looked down the beach and up over the hill, double aspect room, “this will be fantastic” (Design Team N4).

Ultimately Krier’s position was accepted by the Foundation team, one of whom suggested Krier prefers to:

> ... work with his own concentration, that’s how he likes to work, rather than with like 70 people badgering him, which is fine because ... [he] is the masterplanner and you don’t want to put him into a situation where you’re going to get the worst out of the guy (Urbanist 1).

The Foundation member further stated that his team was ‘very open with everyone, that that was the way it was, in that we had to rationalise our processes with [Krier’s] because he was the masterplanner’ (ibid). However, not all members of the Foundation team articulated the same level of acceptance. A representative suggested that the involvement of a ‘starchitect’ (that is, the masterplanner) was difficult and resulted in tension between the Foundation team and Krier (Design Team N2).

The mechanics of the week were described as ‘effectively running parallel strands’ (Urbanist 1) whereby the core team with the Foundation’s design team worked at ‘base camp’ (Design Team N4) at the school on site. The core team worked on:

> ... all the drawing and testing all the hypotheses and ... doing all the educational stuff to bring people out of their boxes and then [Krier] was working generically from his knowledge of the site, ... and working urbanistically and we were going back to his studio ... after two thirds of a day with our hypothesis, and [would] feed our hypothesis into his hypothesis and he would end up doing the iteration ... we would literally unravel our drawing and put it there, and he would then critique our drawing, we would critique his drawing and tell him all the things that wouldn’t work (Urbanist 1).
The suggestion that Krier was working from his own knowledge of the site will be revisited shortly in relation to his views on public involvement. For the moment, it is necessary to understand the nature of Krier’s political agency and how others perceived him.

**Krier’s Political Agency**

There were a range of contradictory perceptions of Krier’s character. Several interviewees indicated that because of Krier’s personality there was some advantage in maintaining distance:

The core team up at base camp at the School, I think, quite like the detachment because Leo’s one of those very dominating, alarming men, in a way, who if you don’t present information terribly well, he will either be disappointed or you know embarrass you. People I think quite liked that detachment (Design Team N4).

Another interviewee involved in the core team considered that Krier had ‘an incredibly forceful personality’ and articulated ‘very strongly held opinions about what is right and what is wrong’ (Design Team N3). Consequently, the interviewee suggested that perhaps it was ‘quite a wise thing to keep his distance’ in order to avoid ‘other participants sort of being dominated and cajoled into a particular view’ (ibid). Certainly, a forceful and righteous belief in urbanist principles is a characteristic of other leading urbanists such as Duany (see Chapter Five).

Perceptions of Krier were diverse and plentiful. While both the Duchy and Foundation staff agreed that Krier is a genius (Design Team N4; Urbanists 1, 2). Duchy representatives went further by suggesting ‘the great man’ is ‘absolutely outstanding’, has ‘enormous presence’ and is ‘a true master at his craft’ (Design Team N4). Other EbD participants thought he was ‘brilliant’ (Resident N3; Council Officer N4); ‘realistic’, ‘down to earth’ and ‘honest’ (Resident N2); ‘inspirational’ (Core Team N6); ‘larger than life’ (Councillor N2); ‘mad but fantastic’, ‘the ultimate theoretical thinker’ (Core Team N3); ‘like the mad professor’ (Core Team N5); a bit like ‘Dr Who’ (Council Officer N4); and ‘eccentric’ (Councillor N2; Council Officer N5). Yet others described him as ‘egotistical’ (Community Group N1); ‘a prat’ (Landowner N1); ‘dogmatic’ (Design Team N1); and ‘like some sort of god who would waft in and out occasionally’ (Design Team N3). One interviewee suggested that Krier’s colleagues were both in awe of him and feared him and so ‘no one was going to stand up to him and ... peg him back and say “you’re wrong” ... he clearly wasn’t going to listen to anyone’ (Council Officer N4). The sheer quantity and range of opinions on Krier were indicative of the strength of his presence within the workshop. It also resulted in tension between the Foundation team and the masterplanner.
Discursive Tension – Participation versus Expertise

While the tension between the Foundation and Krier can be read as a clash of egos (as indicated above section 6.3.1), in discursive terms it can be interpreted as a mutual threat to each identity (see Chapter Three). Both Krier and the Foundation designers sought to fulfil their respective identities as masterplanners. As noted in Chapter Five, the Foundation team leading the workshop are typically responsible for drafting each iteration of the masterplan through the week until the final copy is complete for the public meeting review. The presence of Krier as the masterplanner in Newquay prevented the Foundation team from fully articulating their identities as masterplanners facilitating an EbD event. So the Foundation team worked with groups in the core team, drafted plans according to discussions, and then took all the drawings to Krier in the late afternoon for him to compile a single ‘good’ copy overnight, which would then be presented to the core team the following morning for them to continue working on. Conversely, Krier’s ability to do his job as masterplanner was threatened by both the EbD process, local involvement (that may undermine his expertise and vision), and the expertise of the masterplanners in the Foundation team.

There is a further level of complexity however, in that Krier’s personality and ability was held in high esteem, which in turn threatened various identities within the core team. For example, the phrase in the above quotation described the school as ‘base camp’, while the glory of climbing and summiting the mountain is undertaken in splendid isolation at the Headland Hotel. Similarly, Krier’s appointment and ability to choose how he undertook his work, forces the Foundation team to ‘rationalise’ their process, not vice versa. Perhaps the most significant aspect of the antagonism lies in Krier’s attitude to public involvement.

Krier does not believe in the need for active public involvement in urban design or masterplanning. When asked what his perspective on public participation or consultation was, he suggested that if the design and outcome is good – that is, if the planners get it right – there is no need for public involvement. Expertise in good urbanism is sufficient (pers. comm. 2005; also see Krier 1992). Thus he takes a rather ‘top-down’ approach to masterplanning. Similarly, a Duchy representative explained Krier’s approach to public participation as:

[Krier] understands the big picture, he understands a really well made point, but if somebody expresses prejudice or a loose opinion or if you find, for want of a better word, a bureaucrat imposing diktat on the situation, ... Leo just says “I told you this is a ridiculous process why do we actually do this”. And that’s where he spiritually doesn’t quite get the picture because it’s in part a political process ... it’s rather like
going to the races you know, you’re going to hear lots of tips and you’ve just got to work out which ones you are going to listen to, and you’ve got to filter, channel that information. Leo takes it all in, if somebody says something, you know he listens, it matters, but it is a ridiculous view so that’s it (Design Team N4).

So while the senior members of the Foundation and Krier adhered to and were instrumental in constituting the same discursive formation on European urbanism, they each articulated different meanings for their roles as masterplanners, and the process of masterplanning in Newquay. Given Krier’s faith in expertise, the site could tell him what he needed to know, as alluded to above (see subsection on ‘Basecamp and the Headland’) in the quote by a Foundation team member (Urbanist 1). Conversely, the Foundation perceived value in local knowledge being reflected in the process and showed elements of commitment to public participation. The conflict between the Foundation and Krier can therefore also be interpreted as a contest over the fixing of meanings on participation within the urbanist discourse. Variation on the signification of participation was noted earlier in relation to working groups and inclusivity (section 6.3.4). The lack of fixity of the meaning of participation within the urbanist discourse suggests that participation might be at the margins of the discourse (Howarth 2000a; see Chapter Three). Certainly, it indicates that participation was a floating signifier within the urbanist discourse as articulated in the political space of the Newquay EbD such that it was signified differently across space and time – that is, attributed varying meanings in different times and places within the urbanist discourse.

A Foundation representative suggested that Krier’s hands-off involvement did not have ‘any detrimental effect, it was just that that’s the way it was mechanically slightly different’ (Urbanist 1). Nevertheless, it meant the final iteration of the masterplan was the result of an additional layer of interpretation, once removed from the source of debate and collaboration at ‘base camp’. Moreover, the additional layer of interpretation was by someone (Krier) who did not have a basic commitment to the value of other non-expert knowledges. This distant (in time and space from the core team) interpretation resulted in several interviewees suggesting there was some predetermination in the masterplan.

### 6.4.3 Predetermination?

A number of interviewees noted that the interpretation of their input into the masterplan was compromised by the urbanist ideology of Krier, and to a lesser extent, the Foundation and the Duchy. The diversity of views as to the level of predetermination is shown in Table 6.4. Some participants held a mild view, while others held quite strong
views that the masterplan was predetermined. Interestingly, many interviewees commented on it unprompted. Moreover, there is no clear pattern in the roles held by interviewees and their perception on predetermination. Interviewees in the core team who felt the translation of information was transparent were in the minority. Most of these interviewees accepted that Krier and the Foundation were driven by an urbanist ideology. However, many were clearly concerned that the ideology had too much influence on the outcomes. There are further aspects of the workshop that add weight to the legitimacy of these concerns.

Table 6.4 – Interviewees’ perceptions on the translation of information in the EbD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translation Appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know which came first, the chicken or the egg, because there were stages where they were working on the master plan and it was obvious that things weren’t going to work in quite the way that was first put out, and then there were discussions and then it was altered. So I think that the one did feed off the other quite successfully (Core Team N8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[The Foundation team] were very good at assisting, whilst not taking over. … There was a lot of good professionalism there … [but not] so professional that they were actually steering you (Core Team N2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I was to be a little more cynical and then certainly a technique that I use is you know, well tell your people what you want them to think. You know so there was, in that sense, some good brainwashing, but I think that’s entirely appropriate, because none of us are town planning experts (Working Group N1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slight concern with translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It worked previously [in Poundbury] and you modified the local condition down there but you’re not modifying it for the local conditions here and that’s why you get this tunnel vision effect (Community Group N1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[At the end of the day we had a] 3 minute slot or five minute slot to quickly go through the key points we’d discussed …[that summary then got taken away] and their master plan people would the next day produce what they felt was a fair representation of the works put in by the six or eight groups, as being this is what came out of yesterday’s meeting whereas to my mind it didn’t reflect the full issues. So there was often in the morning slight conflict (Council Officer N1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerned by a level of predetermination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some people had the view that we were being railroaded into this design because they, the masterplanners were up at the hotel working away developing the ideas that we were supposed to be coming up with. Yeah and that was probably a fair criticism but I think what they were doing was inevitable in terms of the actual layout of the designs (Council Officer N4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basically if you’re not very careful you find that people get the impression [Krier’s] already, he had already come up with the answers you know (Council Officer N5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of us felt that … [The Foundation team were] really sort of pushing in a certain direction rather than it being a completely inclusive process. You know, they were trying to, they were trying to impose, I’m not sure if they actually were, but there was an impression created there that they were trying to impose, as facilitators in the core group, they were trying to impose their view of what it should be like on what everybody was saying (ibid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a little bit of [pause] what shall we call it … artistic licence this is what I’m saying that they knew what they wanted before they started sort of thing. Therefore we’ll guide it all into what we want to a certain degree. Therefore when the plan came up for the next morning, it wasn’t quite what it was when it went to bed the night before (Councillor N2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concern that outcomes were significantly predetermined

It was almost cut and dried (Resident N1)

... Their mind was made up. That's the impression we got (Ibid)

I think there was a lot of concern aired by people and I can understand why they aired it, that they were being driven (deliberate pause) by the Prince's Foundation and some of the key facilitators were, it was almost as if the stuff that came up in the evening or whenever the results or the next day, as the results of the previous day's work it's almost, I think some people thought that it was a fait accompli, that we were going to go had already been decided and we were just being steered there and that I think some people I think questioned whether, I'm not saying I was one of them but some people did question the validity of the exercise (Core Team N5)

There was a feeling I think amongst [some members of] the working groups ... that in fact, the vision for this new development had virtually already been decided, that an element of lip service in this particular case was being paid to the whole consultative process and that stems from the fact that Leon Krier has very definite views on how developments take place. I don't know if you've seen Poundbury, in, near Dorchester, so the principles are well known, and one doesn't disagree with all the principles don't get me wrong. But we knew that there had been some initial drawings ... when we came back in our various working groups with suggestions and alternatives and they were passed on in the evening [to the Foundation] ... and also went through to Leon Krier, they came back the following day and there was Leon Krier's vision again that we were presented the following day (Council Officer N4)

We got to the point where we were starting to work things up, the consensus that I voiced on behalf of myself and others was 'here we are, we've all given up a great deal of our valuable time for this week and in effect you're taking no notice of what we're saying to you'. You've got your agenda, you're drawing up these schemes, we've suggested amendments and changes, which you say oh yeah well do that, and we then get the ... set of worked up plans ... none of the suggestions being made were being incorporated. Are we wasting our time? (Landowner N1)

... In [Krier's] comment in the report 'when I was first appointed to do or look at Newquay three years ago' right, that hasn't changed so what we've got in the EbD week wasn't coming out of the EbD week, it was three years work of still, consultation, not so much consultation but Leo's vision for that being given in the public arena (Ibid)

I suspect that the outcomes were predetermined outcomes. I mean I don't think an organisation like the Duchy goes to the expense of doing something like this with a totally open book and a clean sheet. I mean broadly speaking, they knew what they wanted, what they wanted to come out of it. I mean we're not that naive... and maybe [the] community involvement did make some difference and maybe it did feed something into the equation that they might have forgotten or not regarded as quite so important, but I can't think that it was, you know, all of the decisions that were made in that week were only made in that week and the outcome only came from the decisions that went on, you know the workshops that took place. Because you know, somebody somewhere knew what they wanted as the outcome of that process, and it's part of scoring the community consultation brownie points (Working Group N2).

Krier was engaged by the Duchy in 2001 and produced a ‘masterplan sketch’ which was published in the Pattern Book (Petter 2004). The date on the ‘sketch’ was clearly marked 2002, indicating there was a considerable amount of work done sometime prior to the EbD, as suggested by one interviewee quoted in the table above. However, this work was not concealed. For example, Krier suggested in the Summary Report, ‘the masterplan that evolved since my appointment in 2001 has been submitted to a detailed testing by the Enquiry by Design process’ (Prince’s Foundation 2035a:17). Moreover, in the same document, a section that outlined the process is headed ‘Testing the Masterplan of Leon Krier’. However, this contradicts at least one of the intentions of the EbD presented in the media by Foundation staff (see section 6.3.2 above), that EbDs enable communities to help shape the design of a masterplan rather than commenting on a draft. Again, this shows the
tension between the identities of the Foundation and Krier, in terms of their articulations in and of the process. The question now is, how much did the original masterplan change as a result of the EbD workshop – how much shaping was achieved by the EbD participants? Figures 6.6 and 6.7 show the original ‘sketch’ of 2002 and the masterplan as it was produced in the *Summary Report*. Both show a similar layout of quarters or urban villages that, according to Krier, would constitute sustainable growth in accordance with Newquay’s topography.

The commentary for the ‘sketch’ published in the *Pattern Book* was written by Krier in a language that is certain of how the urban extension was envisaged – with a ‘future by-pass [which] will provide a definitive urban edge to the south and east’, a ‘new north-south avenue … which will form the back-bone of the growth area’, the ‘Chapel Stream linear park and lake’, ‘a new railway station’, ‘prominent locations for schools and community buildings, and a ‘legible urban network’ (Petter 2004:10). Interestingly, whole sentences and paragraphs have been lifted from the *Pattern Book* and reproduced in the *Summary Report* (2005), which adds to a suggestion that the ‘sketch’ was changed little in the process of the EbD. While the core team were instrumental in adding detail to the EbD masterplan, the bones of the development remained the same.

Moreover, EbD participants who suggested a significant level of predetermination (see last section of Table 6.7) expressed concern that it was Krier’s vision for the site that had dominated. Several interviewees indicated the tension between the core team’s input during the day and Krier’s interpretation of it overnight, reproduced in good copy for the following morning. For example, one interviewee noted Krier’s iterations of the masterplan through the week were presented in the morning as ‘these mysterious things … handed down like tablets of stone from on high’ (Design Team N3). And as indicated above, others were very aware of the deference with which Krier and his work were treated. Thus the charge of predetermination was a resistance to the authority and power of Krier working remotely, off-site, in a system in which his interpretation of the core team’s work was privileged. A photograph of Krier on the front of the *Summary Report* and shown in the final public meeting with the title ‘The Vision’ (see Figure 6.8) completes the symbolism. It leaves little doubt as to who the visionary is.
Figure 6.6 – ‘Sketch’ masterplan dated 2002, by Leon Krier published in the *Pattern Book* (Source: Petter 2004:10)

Figure 6.7 – EbD Masterplan as presented in the final presentation and the *Summary Report* (Source: Princes Foundation 2005a:23)
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Figure 6.8 – Image entitled ‘Masterplanner of the Newquay Growth Area’ in the frontispiece of the Summary Report (Source: Prince’s Foundation 2005a)

Yet what does this mean for the role of participants in the EbD? There is never a completely clean slate on entering a participatory process and the developer will inevitably have a ‘vision’. Indeed, it was clear from the outset that the vision for the Growth Area was well established. Early media reports suggested the development would be ‘built on a similar template as the Prince’s Poundbury Village’ (Bond 2003a, 2003d; see section 6.4.4). All of those interviewed were broadly aware of the Prince of Wales’ views on architecture and urbanism. And while preparatory work is part and parcel of the pre-EbD phase of the EbD, the question is, as one interviewee noted:

How much [do you do] in advance and how much [do] you respond to the input you get. And [Krier] had come to the scheme with a fairly well thought through plan which could have gone one of two ways. It could have been seen to be a stitch up and therefore this is your sort of final offer or it could have been seen to be an essential part of the process and to react against. I think in the event actually it was the latter (Design Team N1).

17 The Prince’s Foundation was not actually involved in the development of Poundbury, however it is a common misconception that they were. Poundbury was developed by the Duchy of Cornwall, with Krier as masterplanner. However, the Foundation frequently use Poundbury as an exemplar to demonstrate their principles of good urbanism.
The foregoing discussion indicates that some participants thought the EbD was the former – something of a stitch up. Despite the interviewee’s view that the preparation for the EbD was essential to the process, it is worth noting that the prior work required of a typical EbD is information gathering, not masterplanning (see Chapter Five). The extent of Krier’s preparatory work was far more than information gathering. Moreover, as already noted, it was not entirely consistent with the promoted intentions of the EbD (see section 6.3.2). Thus the understanding that many core team members had about their role in the process, fostered by claims that the EbD was to allow them to ‘collaborate in articulating a vision for the site’ (Prince’s Foundation 2005a:15) was compromised by Krier’s role as the masterplanner. But for Krier, his vision was guided by his expertise and theoretical thinking. There was no predetermination – he was simply doing his job.

The underlying theme that has emerged throughout this discussion, is the clash between the EbD philosophy of starting with all the necessary information (including local knowledge) in order to begin the process of design and conversely, a masterplanner who understood the role of public involvement and his job of masterplanning differently. Krier’s approach to public involvement was evident in his preference for working offsite. Moreover, it was evident in his interpretation of the work of the core team, which many participants found problematic. The antagonism arose as each identity – Krier on the one hand and the core team on the other – sought to assert their conflicting roles within the process that emerged from different significations for the role of participation.

The antagonism between the Foundation and Krier and the resultant charge of predetermination operated within the urbanist discourse, at the level of different subjectivities who articulated their identities within the process. A second antagonism emerged which was also related to the ideology of the Foundation, the Prince of Wales and Krier. However, this antagonism occurred at the discursive level whereby the nature of the ‘vision’ for the Growth Area (as an articulation of the urbanist discourse) was further challenged. The association with the urbanism of Poundbury and the known preferences of HRH the Prince of Wales for traditional architecture were instrumental in provoking an antagonism on the architectural form of the proposed development.

6.4.4 A Misunderstanding on Style?

Not long after the decision was made to move forward with the Growth Area (see section 6.2), it was publicly associated with Poundbury. Consequently, the proposal earned the nickname ‘Surfbury’ and ‘Kensington-on-Sea’ (Bond 2003a, 2003b). Moreover, key
players in the development process, such as elected representatives, council officers, the owners, and some working groups were encouraged by the Duchy and in some cases enabled to go and visit Poundbury. It was clearly used as an exemplar of a series of principles that were deemed to have worked elsewhere. The connection with Poundbury and its traditional architecture reveal two aspects of the antagonism on the perceived style of the Growth Area.

*Poundbury to Surfbury*

There was a great deal of concern expressed by interviewees about the reliance placed on Poundbury as a representation of the Growth Area development. For example, one local resident felt that the Growth Area designs were ‘excellent on paper’, but expressed reservations that it was ‘being perhaps, placed on Poundbury and I don’t think Poundbury is what would be needed in the growth area’ (Resident N6). Another showed some irritation: ‘where are these people coming from. ... I mean because Poundbury worked, they think they can pick it up and move it anywhere’ (Community Group N1). While a Council officer understood ‘Poundbury has been successful, a lot of authorities are copying it. Clearly we shouldn’t be copying, there should be local distinctiveness’ (Council Officer N1). A Councillor believed ‘Prince Charles ought to know better, ... you really shouldn’t be carving up our green fields just because he wants another ... Poundbury’ (Councillor N1). Others considered Poundbury was ‘too pristine’, ‘too twee’ (Resident N1); ‘too good to be true almost’ (Core Team N6) and lacked privacy: ‘if somebody sneezed, everybody else would know’ (Resident N1).

Conversely, others liked the ‘philosophy behind [Poundbury]’ (Resident N2) and thought it was ‘beautiful’ (Resident N3). Some, who expressed concern, also appreciated certain aspects: ‘the atmosphere was very calm, ... it’s a very nice, rather sedate sort of place and beautifully designed’ (Resident N6) The quietness and serenity of the place was affirmed by others (Council Officer N1; Core Team N6, N4). The range of views show that Poundbury was used by the Duchy, as a discussion point. Poundbury provided an image and point of reference for what the Duchy were proposing. Thus, Poundbury fixed meaning for the Duchy’s vision of the Growth Area and as such served as a nodal point within their articulations of urbanism. This was a strategic move, but not without consequence. Along with *The Pattern Book*, it was the source of antagonism over traditional and modern architecture.

Moreover, there is some irony within this antagonism. Some of the concerns about Poundbury cited above indicate a fear that the development will look like Poundbury.
However, those views revealed a misunderstanding of the urbanist principles that underpinned Poundbury’s development. A development in Newquay modelled on Poundbury’s principles would not look like Poundbury. As Porphyrios (1996:95) argues, for classicists (and Krier has been described as a classicist and takes the same position on this matter\(^\text{18}\)), the starting point is ‘not with aesthetics but with the strategies of urban design’. The reference point for design is the traditional city as a whole which underpins the urban form, not the look or architectural style. For Krier, the urban layout of blocks, the public realm and buildings is of primary importance (Krier 1998; Thompson-Fawcett 1998). In an interview with Salingaros (2001:no page), Krier argues ‘urban structure as a set of organisational principles is largely independent of style’. So it is quite possible to have a traditional urbanism that consists entirely of modern buildings. The perception that Poundbury would be transplanted suggests these principles were not made sufficiently clear to participants.

So in Krier’s view, the development of the Newquay masterplan precluded a question of architectural style in the first instance. Krier’s vision for the masterplan was a vision for the whole form of the development. The architectural aspects of the project would emerge via adherence to a local vernacular architecture, which was Krier’s preference ‘for the time being’, given a distrust of modernist architecture (Salingaros 2001:no page). The intention to adhere to a local vernacular in Newquay was signified by the publication of *The Pattern Book* which was made available for comment during the pre-EbD phase and the workshop, and presented as a study to facilitate understanding. Vernacular refers to the traditional or indigenous building types, materials and construction methods of the locale, rather than those adopted from elsewhere. As such it is much more than a look or a style. Thus existing housing and architecture within Newquay are not necessarily vernacular. So the irony lay in an evident fear and resistance to a Poundbury Esk development even though it would never eventuate because the Dorset vernacular evident in Poundbury is very different from a Cornish vernacular that might be adopted for Newquay.

However, the debate on architectural style, as it became (mistakenly) labelled, went far beyond a misplaced fear of strictly replicating Poundbury. The antagonism was pitched between those who believed there was a place for contemporary or modern architecture and

---

\(^{18}\) Krier prefers to call himself a traditionalist but has been described as a classicist amongst other terms (see Thompson-Fawcett 1998:172).
those who supported a local vernacular as the principle means of articulating local identity. The antagonism resulted in criticism of the Pattern Book.

**Debating the Pattern Book**

Several interviewees suggested *The Pattern Book* was very selective of architecture in Newquay, and that it did not reference any architecture built after about 1910 (Core Team N1; Council Officers N2, N5, N4; Community Group N1). A local resident considered that the Duchy was:

... looking at the wrong things. [At the EbD, the Duchy] said “we’ve been down Newquay and looked at the architecture and we’re going to try and get it the same”, but their architecture was not what we see the Newquay is (Resident N3).

This local resident saw bungalows and post WWII architecture as typical of Newquay (ibid). The differences in understanding between the urbanist discourse and local people on the concept of a local vernacular became clear. Local vernacular became imbricated with significations for *local identity*. However, within the discursive frame of traditional urbanism and architecture, local identity (emerging from adhering to a local vernacular) differed from how local residents viewed it. As noted in section 6.2.3, the intention to reflect local identity was articulated as a nodal point for the intentions of the EbD.

In an attempt to mitigate the level of conflict that arose at the EbD on this issue, the workshop timetable was adjusted to fit a specific session on the *Pattern Book* with tier A and B participants. For this session, as one interviewee described it, a Duchy representative ‘had channelled all the dissenters on the stylistic thing’ to this session (Design Team N1). Others also commented on this debate. A Duchy representative described it as:

... a very big debate in the middle of the week ... [where people asked] “is the Duchy going to take us down a retro traditional route or is it going to open its eyes to, you know the new world of design and materials”. That was quite a big conflict, [and] we’re still debating (Design Team N4).

Another interviewee recalled how the debate became very animated: ‘the Victorian pastiche and retrospective architecture got hammered, *absolutely hammered*’ (Landowner N1, emphasis original). Some interviewees recalled ‘heated exchanges’ (Council Officer N4) and vociferous debates between core team members and the design team on modern and traditional architecture (Working Group N2). Others indicated the source of debate concerned differences in the perception of how the development would reflect local identity. So where the Duchy suggested that adhering to a local vernacular architecture would ensure the local identity of Newquay was reflected, others in the core team perceived that such an approach would result in a ‘pastiche’ (Working Group N1), or ‘twee imitation Georgian
built’ development (Council Officer N5). This was perhaps reinforced by images presented at the final public meeting (see Figures 6.9 and 6.10). The lack of a resemblance to Newquay was noted by one interviewee:

The funny thing is they go on about using the local architecture, but when they actually come up with the plans that they come up with, they tend to come up with the same stuff which is rather alien to Cornwall. It’s very, it’s almost Georgian in its style, it’s not very grand but semi grand. It’s London, it’s big city stuff as opposed to small coastal town … its super architecture but it’s in the wrong place (Councillor N2).

Figure 6.9 – Town Square perspective presented in both the Summary Report and at the final public meeting (Source: Princes Foundation 2005a:48; 2004b)

Figure 6.10 – Architects impression of the central square, presented at the Final public meeting of the workshop week (Source: Prince’s Foundation 2004b)
Chapter 6 – The Newquay Case Study – Visions and Visionaries

The debate on local identity showed that many residents had a particular identification with Newquay that differed from the vernacular identified in the *Pattern Book*. A commonly held view was that local identity should be more in keeping with the way in which Newquay was being marketed to promote surfing, thus rejecting a vernacular derived from traditional building techniques, materials and features. For example, one design team member suggested ‘Newquay is very much a young person’s town. It’s a sort of surfing capital of Britain and so on’ and as such it should have ‘at least [some] quarters or houses which were of a much more contemporary styling’ (Design Team N3). Similarly a core team member argued that:

Neo-classical architecture, ... that’s not about Newquay. ... The whole point about Newquay is that it’s supposed to be the sort of surf capital of certainly Britain if not Europe ... It’s about a young vibrant modern place (Council Officer N4).

Certainly, Restormel was consistent in its view that there was a place for modern architecture in Newquay, and that sustainability should have been higher on the agenda than style (Council Officers N5, N4). Here, the local authority suggested that sustainability had to be at the forefront, in order that it met with the Council’s requirements for the development (ibid). Interestingly, the Duchy also claimed that sustainability ‘was at the heart of everything we do here’ (Design Team N4; see also Prince’s Foundation 2005a). However, the organisations differed on the issue of how to achieve that sustainability. The Council argued that there was far more scope for high sustainability credentials in contemporary architecture (employing a variety of building technologies) than traditionalist architecture regulated by codes (Council Officers N4, N5). This position was not shared by the Duchy, who argued that drawing on a local vernacular was inherently more sustainable (Design Team N4). Indeed, traditional architecture generally claims to meet high environmental sustainability standards, as was found in Poundbury (for example, Thompson-Fawcett and Bond 2003).

The specific reference to sustainability by Council officers was far more technologically oriented than the Duchy’s perspective. The Council’s view was evident in Restormel’s Local Plan, with a key focus on reducing energy consumption, carbon emissions and utilising renewable resources (for example, General Policies 8 and 10, Restormel Borough Council 2001). And in this regard an expert in sustainable building technology suggested that high sustainability credentials may be ‘incompatible architecturally’ with a traditional vernacular architecture which presents ‘real challenges’ for achieving the kind of sustainability targets Restormel were seeking (Design Team N3). This supposed
incompatibility was discussed in early working group meetings (for example, Minutes Environment and Ecology Working Group dated 30th September, 2004; Housing Working Group’s Technical Briefing Note, dated October 2004). In addition, it was the crux of the antagonism from the Council’s perspective – and given the influential role of the Council in the future of the project, of critical concern to the Duchy. From the end of the EbD to mid 2006 there were evident shifts in the Duchy’s emphasis on sustainability and a local vernacular. These shifts are explored further in section 6.6 which explores the post-EbD period (see section 6.6.1). The following concludes this section on the EbD event.

6.4.5 Visions and Visionaries

Section 6.4 has explored four key themes that emerged in the EbD workshop. Consistent with both the pre-EbD phase and concerns raised in Chapter Five on inclusivity, the EbD in Newquay prioritised expertise. In addition, crucial to the conception of inclusivity was a definition of those affected – for Newquay affected was narrowly construed, omitting those who might have a negative response to the project. As a result, those most negatively affected potentially became marginalised.

From exploring the issue of inclusivity, three key antagonisms were explored – all of which were imbricated with the nature of the key players and the urbanist discourse. The first antagonism involved the tension between Krier and senior Foundation staff, resulting in the privileged position of the masterplanner and a contestation over each party’s respective roles and skills within the EbD process. It was also the result of a fundamental difference in each party’s perspective on public involvement. The authority of the Prince was evident, as he ensured that the Foundation and the Duchy worked together and that Krier was masterplanner of the project (see sections 6.2.2 and 6.3.2). Yet the Prince’s commitment to ensuring EbDs enhance the democratic nature of a development project was undermined by Krier’s attitude to public involvement.

While the first antagonism occurred at the level of individual subjectivities (between Krier and the Foundation team) within the urbanist discursive formation, the second and third antagonisms occurred at the discursive level. The second antagonism – the challenge to the transparency of the process through a charge of predetermination – arose because of Krier’s authority, the spatial and temporal distance from the rest of the core team, his perspective on the role of the expert masterplanner and his lack of commitment to public participation. This and the third antagonism therefore arose at the discursive level. The third antagonism was a conflict between discourses. The discourse of traditional architecture was
contested in two ways. First, traditional architecture was resisted because it was perceived to be contrary to a vision of sustainability derived from a range of sustainable building technologies envisioned by council. Second, a local vernacular was resisted as an articulation of a physical local identity derived from historical architecture of the region rather than a contemporary image of its people. So, in the final antagonism there was a clear tension between the core team and the project proponent’s significations of ‘local identity’. What this section has revealed is the quite remarkable influence of the key characters involved and how tensions between them have permeated the nature of the participation within the process. The question to consider now is how participants interviewed perceived the process overall.

6.5 Post EbD – Perceptions

Although many interviewees saw value in the EbD process (see section 6.5.3 below), there was evidence of additional resistances. The following sub-section explores these resistances, while the subsequent section reviews the more positive perceptions of the EbD.

6.5.1 Additional Resistance – Viability?

A key criticism of the EbD process was that the designs delivered at the final public meeting were unrealistic and represented in part a wish-list. The masterplan included one third affordable housing; community facilities; extensive open space and a high quality public realm; a high standard of design; the use of local materials that would be prescribed by the Building Code; and the Trenckreek bypass – a requirement of the County Council to address traffic congestion – to be built in the early stages of development (Prince’s Foundation 2005a). One landowner suggested the masterplan was a wish-list that outweighed any benefit (Landowner pers. comm. 2005; Landowner N2) while another suggested:

You can’t have a road, a school, da, da, da Cornish materials, Cornish labour and … affordable housing, you’ve got to be realistic about this you know. If you insist on something that’s not realistic in terms of affordable percentages you’re going to finish up with nothing, because the developer will say “well, we are not going to

---

19 In the Public Inquiry for Restormel’s Local Plan and at the EbD, the County Council argued that a Trenckreek Bypass was a requisite for their approval of the Growth Area development. Trenckreek-Trevenson Road is narrow and creates several congestion points. For the County Council, main access points onto this road from the new development were to be avoided, and a new trunk road through the middle of the Growth Area was required to be completed in the first phase of any housing development (interview Council Officer N1, N2).
bother” and that is an issue that is still under, well not under debate, but still under negotiation (Landowner N1).

In addition, several local residents and stakeholders were sceptical that the development would go ahead. For example one stakeholder was under the impression that ‘somebody, ... has got to find six million pounds for the road infrastructure [the Trencreek Bypass] and nobody’s prepared to do that’ (Working Group N2) and that ‘it’s all very well being optimistic, ... [but] you’ve got to actually be realistic, ... and I don’t think that’s happening’ (ibid). She saw the question of who was going to pay as an ‘absolutely crucial issue’, and thought:

Hang on a minute, shouldn’t they have had this conversation before we started the [EbD week] because actually if it all hinges on the road going in and there is no money for the road then why did we bother? ... It just leaves you a bit cold really (ibid).

Others suggested a general scepticism regarding funding (Core Team N6; Resident N4; Community Group N1; Councillor N2), and that in Newquay ‘there are always these policies promoted and never enough money’ to follow them through (Core Team N6). One stakeholder noted that there was a general expectation that the open market housing in the development would pay for all the ‘additional’ features and benefits. He suggested the viability check did not happen early enough in the week so that:

Too far along [in the week] it was kind of like a wish-list, let’s write down everything we want for Christmas .... You need to make compromises. Yes you might want 50% affordable housing but you can’t have it because it doesn’t stack up. If you want houses that are architecturally fantastic, whilst you’ll no doubt hear from lots of people saying, “good design doesn’t have to cost anything”, perhaps it shouldn’t but it invariably does. ... you’ve got to pay for it somehow (Core Team N5).

Thus the scepticism expressed was, in part the result of experience within the locality of previous schemes realised. It was also a consequence of understanding the costs of what was proposed, and questioning how it might be achieved. The detailed economics were unlikely to have been discussed openly at the EbD (Urbanist 2). However, as several interviewees noted, the Duchy were financially very astute, which lent weight to a belief that the vision would be realised (Resident N6; Councillor N2; Core Team N3). Moreover, the Duchy had experience in Poundbury where social housing providers willingly bought into supplying high quality social housing (Thompson-Fawcett and Bond 2003).

The degrees of scepticism are difficult to interpret. A working group member (Working Group N1, cited above) indicated that a lack of realism marred the legitimacy of the whole process, whereas other interviewees were simply unsure whether the proposal
would eventuate. In questioning the legitimacy and the lack of funding for the road, there was a suggestion that the Duchy were pandering to participants to gain support. Certainly building aspirations, making people ‘greedy’ (Foundation 1) for what they can gain from a project is a strategy urbanists use in EbDs to encourage people to think outside the square (Foundation 1, 2; Urbanist 1). Nevertheless, if the resultant outcomes are unrealistic, there are significant implications for transparency and legitimacy of a process. Scepticism such as that expressed above would then be justified. The implications of this issue will emerge as the project unfolds over the next few years, and are therefore questions for future research. Despite these concerns and the significant charge of predetermination explored in the previous section (6.4.3), there was evidence of a variety of understandings about the value of the EbD.

6.5.2 Perceived Benefits of the EbD

Working group members in the core team thought the workshop was ‘excellent’ (Core Team N2); that people were ‘involved, interested, and exploring issues’ (Core Team N1); and many were ‘impressed by the array of expertise’ (Working Group N2); ‘impressed with the way people were nurtured along’ and considered there was ‘a good mixture … of organic development of the group[’s ideas] and leadership as well’ (Working Group N1). In addition they were impressed at the ‘professionalism’ of the Foundation team, as ‘they were always capable of either giving an answer or finding an answer’ (Core Team N2) and ‘they had what they needed to carry out the project’ (ibid). Similarly, the Foundation team were ‘invaluable’ because of their experience:

You need to have those people who have a high degree of confidence in their knowledge and ability to steer so they can really step in and be, to a degree, relatively forceful if they need to, to steer a group and you know, I think that was really good (Core Team N5).

The facilitation and structuring of the process was accepted by these interviewees as legitimate and valuable. Similarly, the necessity of the Foundation’s professionalism and expertise was recognised. Neither of these core team members were concerned that the outcomes were predetermined, although one acknowledged others’ concerns in this regard.

Interviewees also observed that all the issues ‘were well and truly gotten in to’ and there was some productive ‘cases of people crossing swords’ (Core Team N2) and debating issues (Landowner N1) because:

All the groups were being brought together and saying, “how does your plan superimpose on this plan” and then “where does it touch and where does it not?” And so you’re actually seeing all of these things and able to make decisions and so
that in the end the [master] planner came up, who knows how perfect it was, but in the end it came up with a lot of it [and] the rough edges knocked off (Core Team N2).

At least one owner felt that ‘the logic of having all the decision makers in one room at the same time is brilliant, absolutely brilliant’ and ‘all in all it is a bloody good system and it needs to be applauded and you can see how much time could be saved’ compared with ordinary planning processes (Landowner N1). Interestingly, this interviewee was very concerned outcomes were predetermined (see Table 6.4, section 6.4.3). However, he clearly still valued the process. Another interviewee recognised the value of having the relevant expertise in the room in discussing specific issues and viability. He stated:

You do need all that input ... I haven’t got a clue what it costs to lay a railway line or to build a railway station, not a clue. ... I think that’s the great thing, is that you’ve got lots of people there who could chip in and when you’re talking about viability, ... we could actually go to these people and say “we’re assuming that a railway station costs £100 000 is that right?” and they can [say] “no its 50 000 really” or “no it’s a half a million quid because there’s another [factor] involved” and that’s the benefit. You can do a lot because the expertise is there in one or two rooms and the way it was run I think was quite good and it was relatively informal. You were encouraged to go and talk to other groups and to ask some questions and pick their brains (Core Team N5).

The workshop allowed some core team participants to meet and establish new networks that provided access to ‘a range of people and [a] range of expertise and particularly, for the public sector organisations and individuals that under normal circumstances we probably wouldn’t have been able to talk to on a one to one basis’ (Working Group N2). Similarly, another interviewee was surprised:

I met so many people I’d never met before, ... so it was quite good for me too because I learnt a whole lot about the things that were going on that I didn’t know about before from being able to actually sit and talk to people that you’d never get near half the time’ (Core Team N2).

Arguably, such learning has the potential to create a basis for more holistic working within the area, at least on a temporary basis.

One design team member suggested ‘the real benefit ...[was] the extraordinary consensus that was achieved on an enormously complicated and ambitious project in a very short [time]’ (Design Team N1). Other interviewees concurred (Design Team N4; Core Team N3; Council Officer N5) suggesting ‘there’s a lot of support’ (Core Team N2). A landowner observed that while ‘not all [views] were taken on board’, at least people were ‘persuaded that they weren’t practical for very good reasons’ (Landowner N1, emphasis original).
The process of understanding why some suggestions were relevant or worked and others did not was important and the reasoning was deemed to be transparent. However, this view is inconsistent with the charge of predetermination claimed by the same interviewee (see Table 6.4; section 6.4.3). Another working group member noted the connection between transparency and predetermination. She suggested that ‘people get involved, they get embroiled in the process’ but then they were ‘disappointed because actually there’s no solution and there’s still no end in sight’ (Working Group N2). She agreed there was value, particularly in ‘a real feel good factor’, but believed that because outcomes were predetermined, there were ‘hidden agendas’. As a result, she suggested it was ‘on the surface and probably half way down quite transparent’ (ibid).

The simultaneous claims of predetermined outcomes and transparency of process suggests that on some issues there was transparency, while on others the perception was less positive. Nevertheless, the ‘feel good factor’ was evident in statements from those involved in the EbD week: ‘it was really quite tremendous to see how things started actually to change by virtue of having to meet the needs of others’ (Core Team N2); ‘it was fascinating, ... I very much enjoyed it, ... it was very, very stimulating’ (Design Team N3); and ‘it was very good, it was very interesting to be involved ... and look at the full wider picture’ (Core Team N5). In addition there was evidence of participants learning about the ‘multifaceted’ nature of such projects, and that there are ‘a lot of different perspectives to take into consideration’ (Working Group N2).

Local residents interviewed felt that the development would be ‘beautiful’, the meetings were ‘interesting’, and the process was ‘excellent’ (Resident N3), that ‘it was lovely to see the development being planned, that was taking into account all the different links and overlaps’ (Resident N2); and that ‘you could tell by the presentations that everyone was qualified in their own field which was rather good you know, I was impressed with it’ (Resident N6). For one local resident it stimulated ‘thinking’ about issues associated with planning and development and urban design for the first time (Resident N2), while another learned ‘that consultation exercises need not be dogmatic’ (Resident N6).

On the whole, the perceptions varied considerably. There were several positive aspects to the process. Interviewees noted they learned about planning issues, urbanism, local people, and other interests, and developed new networks with other participants. There was evidence of agonistic debate within workshop groups in the suggested ‘crossing of swords’. The value of expertise was also recognised. Overall, the merit and potential of the process as a ‘bloody good’ (Landowner N1) system was recognised. However, in light of the
perceptions that outcomes were predetermined, transparency was not as good as it could have been, although this was in part the result of the peculiar role of the masterplanner in this particular case rather than the with EbDs per se. The penultimate section of this chapter explores key events that moved towards implementation in the two years after the EbD.

6.6 Post EbD – Towards Implementation

At the conclusion of the EbD, there were two choices for implementing the masterplan within the planning system. It could either be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance under the existing Local Plan within the old planning system or it could be implemented under the new system. Under the latter, the masterplan would form a set of development documents as a part of the Newquay Action Framework, providing the Framework had been formally adopted. Implementation proceeded under the new system, although at the time of writing the documents had not been submitted to the Authority (pers. comm. Duchy of Cornwall representative 2006). The set or ‘family’ of documents (Design Team N1) were to include the Masterplan, the Pattern Book, the Building Code and a Sustainability Strategy (Design Team N1; Council Officers N4, N5; Design Team N4). The production of these documents involved several small workshops, which included local authority representatives, the masterplanner and a variety of consultants. The draft documents of both the Sustainability Strategy and the Building Code are revealing, and elucidate two themes already introduced earlier in this chapter – sustainability and the Duchy’s command and control of the project.

6.6.1 Sustainable Vernacular?

The Sustainability Strategy and the Building Code reinforced the increasing emphasis that the Duchy placed on sustainable development referred to in section 6.4.4. In mid-2005, the antagonism on vernacular architecture and modern architecture as expressions of local identity was still very much unresolved. At this time, a Council officer suggested that the Duchy was ‘moderating’ its views and the ‘emphasis on architecture [had been] modified to promote sustainability’ (Council Officer N4). Similarly, a Duchy representative recalled a meeting with ‘the boss’ (HRH the Prince of Wales) and Krier in 2005, in which they decided ‘to look at contemporary architecture, but it’s got to pass very high standards in terms of aesthetic tests’ (Design Team N4). Moreover, in 2005, there were suggestions that the Pattern Book which was presented to the EbD in 2004 as a ‘draft’ would be revisited by exploring:
A slightly looser vocabulary there in terms of its style, that will start to lead us to other kinds of buildings which we feel are relevant examples of, you know, hitting the sustainability targets and using regional materials perhaps, but sometimes in a more modern way (Design Team N1).

Similarly, a Duchy representative considered that the whole debate was very ‘constructive’ and:

A Pattern Book has to look at the urban typologies and architecture of the location and if you haven’t got really inspirational contemporary architecture to draw upon what do you do. [What] I’ve now concluded in my own mind is that the best thing to do is to go not just around Cornwall looking for good examples, you have to go world wide and you have to say this is a maritime location (Design Team N4).

In mid 2005 then, there was evidence of a shift in the Duchy’s adherence to a strictly traditional vernacular design, which anticipates an exploration into more modern types and styles in the expression of a vernacular that still relied on local materials and building techniques. It remains unclear whether or not further enquiry into good examples of modern architecture occurred. Nevertheless, the Pattern Book was not substantially revised\(^\text{20}\). However, the Building Code portrayed some images of modern buildings (Petter 2006). Despite the suggestion of modern building types, the Code continued to emphasise a local traditional vernacular:

At the heart of this whole development lies an aspiration to create an exemplary sustainable urban community. Vernacular architecture, using local, natural materials, put together in such a way as to respond to the local climatic conditions must by its very nature be sustainable: this code sets out, therefore, to build upon these established local traditions in such a way as to create buildings which reflect the distinctive aesthetic character of Cornish architecture and which meet environmental and sustainable standards significantly exceeding those presently required by central government (Petter 2006:4).

So while there was a suggestion of endorsing more ‘modern’ architecture, there is a shift back to supporting a traditional aesthetic. Indeed, this point was raised at the Building Code workshop, where a leading member of the development team indicated that explicit reference to ‘traditional’ or vernacular design should be avoided in favour of a reference to sustainability to mitigate the conflict (Observation Notes\(^\text{21}\); Building Code workshop minutes 2005, paragraph 8.01).

\(^{20}\) A final version of the Pattern Book received in mid 2006 was identical to the draft but for a page of images on sculpture and public art.

\(^{21}\) I was able to attend the Building Code Workshop held on 8th July 2005 in Poundbury, as a participant observer.
The intentional shift in the use of a signifier to articulate a concept in a different way (in this case to mitigate the conflict) marks the metonymic sliding of the signifier sustainable in place of the signifier traditional. The meanings for each signifier remain largely the same. However, the shift in terminology is a particularly strategic power play. Sustainable, as an empty signifier (see Chapter Three, section 3.4.4), serves to mask the antagonism between those who identify with the different discourses of urbanism and sustainable building technologies. In other words, sustainability is a term both discourses use to anchor and fix meaning, albeit differently. The implications for this play of power are discussed further in the following section. Through the Building Code, project proponents sought to marry sustainable building technologies with a vernacular architecture. It remains to be seen what will eventuate, and whether the use of local materials and an adherence to the Building Code produces an aesthetic that appears traditional as objects to a local vernacular fear. Nevertheless, the Building Code demonstrates the Duchy’s intention to maintain command and control of the project throughout its life.

6.6.2 Command and Control

The Duchy’s desire for command and control was introduced in sections 6.2.3 and 6.3. The Building Code re-affirmed the vision the Duchy had for their project, and the nature of the controls they intended to impose in order to achieve the desired aesthetic and environmental qualities. Throughout the EbD the Duchy maintained control – by ensuring the Foundation deferred to Krier as masterplanner (see section 6.4.2), by mitigating the conflict on vernacular architecture (as indicated above), and by managing differences between the landowners and taking the lead in the development (see section 6.2.2). In addition, the Duchy ensured, via the Building Code, that it maintained command and control of the development process in the future. The code is prescriptive, and all plans for the development will be assessed for ‘conformance’ with the Building Code by an architect appointed by the development proponents. The code prescribes the materials, techniques, building configurations, and specifications as to dimensions and proportions. It also provides a list of specific features and details that are prohibited. For example, items that are ‘specifically forbidden’ include:

... individual antennae and satellite dishes, bubble skylights, exterior waste pipes (except water down pipes), pre-fabricated accessory buildings, permanent plastic sunblinds/awnings, plastic commercial fascias and lettering, and internally illuminated signs, box signs, corporate signs etc. (Petter 2006:100).
There is no question that building codes are contentious, given their imposition on what is perceived as private property rights. What are the implications of such control to ensure that a vision is realised? What the combination of documents and the EbD process constitute is an attempt to realise the urbanist ideology shared by the Duchy, the Prince of Wales and Krier. This issue is discussed further in the next section.

6.7 Scattered Resistances, Dominant Players

This Chapter has presented an analysis of the Newquay EbD process. Two key themes emerge from the foregoing analysis. The first theme concerns the way in which the intentions for the EbD were signified in the media and then played out. Having found that the articulated intentions for the EbD were for a high degree of local engagement (see section 6.3.3), no distinction was made between the high levels of involvement of core team members and the low level of involvement of ter C residents (see section 6.3.4 and 6.4.1). Thus, the means to achieve inclusivity was primarily by representation, but the way in which representatives (as the right people) were selected was problematic and exclusive because of the prioritisation of expertise. The nodal points that refer to inclusivity employed in the media and in articulating the intentions for the EbD were drawn from similar nodal points within a participatory planning discourse (see Chapter Two). But when those significations became imbricated in the urbanist discourse (as manifest in Newquay) the meanings, as they were practiced, shifted.

The second theme involved the role of powerful elites and the contestation over meanings within and between the urbanist discourse on the role of public participation and the vision for the development (see sections 6.4.2, 6.4.3 and 6.4.4). The role of HRH the Prince of Wales in the Newquay project cast a complex web of political agents and power over the process (see sections 6.2.2 and 6.3.1). The power of the masterplanner was evident in his location off-site and in the claims that outcomes were predetermined (see section 6.4.3). The charge of predetermination can be seen as a resistance to the masterplanner’s authority. But it also reinforced the disjunction noted above, between the articulated intentions for the EbD and the conditions of possibility that the process provided for those intentions to be realised. By engaging a pre- eminent urbanist masterplanner like Krier and in particular, one who does not ascribe to participatory planning per se, the Prince and the Duchy showed a commitment to urbanist principles and a vision for the development over and above the commitment to an enhanced democracy. The articulation of local identity as
local vernacular, the command and control maintained by the Duchy, and the strategic rearticulation of ‘sustainability’ reinforces this interpretation.

The two themes outlined above elucidate the most dominant discourses in the process, presented in Figure 6.11. While the discourses are represented as shaded ovals, they are not concrete. Rather they are open to contestation and re-articulation (see Chapter Three). The schematic serves as a heuristic device to portray the nature of the dominant discourses, and their over-lapping character. The dominant discourses in the Newquay EbD were urbanism, participation, sustainability, and traditional architecture, while other discourses such as various articulations of a local Newquay identity were subsumed by the authority of the project proponents. Antagonisms are shown by the dark thick lines, where contestation arose between differently articulated discourses. The divided space of the core team is represented, with the Duchy and the Foundation staff passing between the sites. Traditional architecture and traditional urbanism are closely related discourses and dominate the core team, although there was tension between them.

Figure 6.11 – The interaction of dominant discourses in the Newquay EbD and primary points of conflict between them
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The overlapping and contested nature of the discourses suggests the political spaces of the EbD process operated predominantly under a logic of difference rather than one of equivalence. While antagonism did emerge, it generally arose on disparate issues. There was no single point of contestation, and no single dislocatory event on which an equivalential chain could be established (see Chapter Three). A differential logic is often indicative of sedimented discourses, which in turn tends to obscure a variety of tensions and conflicts resulting in scattered, micro-level resistances which never gain strength (Torfing 1999). This is precisely what was revealed in the Newquay case. For example, tension over the role of Krier and a concomitant charge of predetermination (see section 6.4.3); a resistance to the nature of the vision promoted (see section 6.4.4); and resistances after the EbD to the scale of the project through the formation of the Henver Road action group (see section 6.4.1). What this indicates is the dominance of one discourse, which encouraged others to both articulate their differences while simultaneously contesting others’ articulatory practices. Thus, in Newquay, the urbanist discourse as articulated by HRH the Prince of Wales, dominated the entire EbD process, which can be seen as a hegemonic project being enacted by several hegemonic agents – the Prince, Krier, and senior staff of the Prince’s Foundation and the Duchy.

The effect of the role of these hegemonic agents was that the influence of the sedimented authority, resources, status and extraordinary symbolism of the monarchy permeated the Newquay case. The very nature of the sedimented discourse of the British Royal family\(^ {22} \) provided the Duchy and the Foundation with a level of autonomy that legitimised their authority (Howarth 2000a:120). The role of the Prince and the Duchy as the principle developer (despite not owning all the land) was not questioned, it was ‘conventionalised’ and ‘decontested’ (Norval 1999:2; also see Freeden 1996). That is, the scope of political disputes were limited by the normalising and generalising effects given the simultaneously ordinary and extraordinary role of the Royal and by association, the Duchy (see section 6.2.3). For example, for some residents, the Duchy had a right to do what they

\(^ {22} \text{As discussed in Chapter Three, institutions (such as the Monarchy) are discursively constituted under Laclau and Mouffe’s theory. For Foucault and various other approaches to discourse analysis (for example, Fairclough 1992) a distinction is made between discursive and non-discursive structures (see Chapter Three note 8). Laclau and Mouffe (2001) argue that all meaningful social practices and action are discursively constituted, because they emerge from a specific set of differential relations. That includes institutions and the social practices that reproduce and maintain the meanings attributed to them. Where the meanings attributed to and constituted by those social practices are so entrenched as to be unquestionable and normalised, they are sedimented discourses.}
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wished with their land, despite the fact it would alter the outlook from their residence from predominantly rural to urban (see section 6.4.1). The Duchy’s activities as developers were also normalised. The meanings attributed to their activities were fixed, decontested because of the very nature of the organisation and the sedimented discourses of both the monarchy and private property rights.

The articulation of Krier’s masterplan sketch from 2002 (see section 6.4.3) can be interpreted in discourse theoretical terms as the institution of a myth for the vision of the Newquay Growth Area (see Chapter Three). The process of testing it through the EbD was a formalised process in which various demands were inscribed on the mythical vision initially articulated through Krier’s early masterplanning work. In the EbD, certain demands were incorporated, and rearticulated as new iterations of the masterplan, while others were dismissed depending on the nature of sedimented discourses and power relations in play. Essentially, the dominance of the urbanist discourse and the meanings fixed through its articulation in Newquay were instrumental in controlling the outcome of the various demands inscribed on the myth.

Decontestation or sedimentation of particular meanings worked in the Duchy and the Foundation’s favour in this regard, allowing the Duchy and the Foundation to dismiss certain resistances and incorporate others. For example, in response to objections about the scale of the project by the group of Henver Road residents (see section 6.4.1), the Foundation argued that the proposal was already allocated – the issue was no longer a relevant argument. That the Growth Area would be developed was given, sedimented in the local institutional planning arrangements. Similarly, when antagonistic objections to a proposal for a Mosque in the masterplan arose at the final public meeting, several interviewees dismissed the objections on grounds that objectors were narrow-minded, bigoted, nimby (not in my backyard) responses (Council Officers N2, N3; Design Team N1, N3; Residents N2, N3; Working Group N1), consistent with broader discourses on tolerance and multiculturalism.

23 The whole issue re-emerged in the middle of 2005, when the media – both national and local – seized on it with inflammatory headlines such as ‘Charles’s Mosque Meets a Resellion’ (Leppard 2005:1.3) and ‘We Don’t Want a Mosque Here’ (Wherry 2005). Letters to the Editor in local papers responded with headlines ‘Nothing short of bigotry’ (Cutter 2005) and ‘Ashamed to be a part of the Community’ (Allen 2005). At the same time an action group was purportedly established and a petition launched to prevent the mosque proposal from going ahead. It was during this media frenzy that field work was undertaken, and so the ‘mosque issue’ was on the radar of those interviewed. Interviewees revealed concern at the minority of vociferous objectors (Resident N2) and were surprised by the ‘parochial’ nature of some local residents (Community Group N1), the ‘racial or religious hatred’ that was evident (Councillor N2); and surprised by ‘the xenophobia of [some] local residents’ (Design Team N3).
While these discourses are not always adhered to in lived experience, the ideology behind them remains sedimented through significations of equity, morality and ideals of the good life.

In contrast, the antagonism over the traditionalism of the vision, revealed a resistance to the hegemonic articulations of the myth during the EbD. The ongoing debate after the EbD, revealed that incorporating sustainable building technologies into the development became a demand by Restormel, which was inscribed on the myth of a traditional development. Here, the demand was incorporated into the myth by the expansion of the discourse to encompass the concept of sustainability (see section 6.5). It was a strategic power play on the part of the Duchy, to facilitate the incorporation of both the discourse on sustainable building technologies and vernacular architecture into the mythical vision of the Newquay Growth Area. Sustainable, modern and traditional architecture were no longer counterposed. It therefore allowed objectors to the traditionalism of the myth (principally at this time Restormel officers) to believe that it would not be a traditional pastiche akin to Poundbury as was feared by many interviewees. So while the Duchy had the power and authority within the process to articulate its mythical vision and maintain command and control of the process, the governmentality of the local authority and its role as arbiters of the project within the planning system was also evident.

However, the dominance of the antagonism of traditional architecture and the power of the two players – the Duchy and Restormel – pushed other resistances to the margins. For example, the dominance of the sustainability argument (via the local authority who had the governmental power to persuade the Duchy) excluded the alternative argument against tradition such that it would not reflect the significations for local identity of Newquay as the surf capital of Britain (see section 6.4.4). Again the nature of the hegemonic desire to enact the vision articulated through the EbD process meant that certain particular concerns were marginalised.

Thus, the hegemonic project and vision articulated for Newquay is dominant, largely as a result of the character of the lead developer – the Duchy of Cornwall. While the urbanist discourse and the role of the Prince is similarly apparent in Whitefield, its dominance is weakened by the operation of a persistent antagonism and the governmentality of the agencies instituting urban regeneration policy. It is to Whitefield that the following Chapter turns.
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Limited symbols and notations reveal its full potential. In this scenario, we will explore how symbols and notations can be used to enhance understanding and facilitate communication. The key to unlocking the true potential of these symbols lies in their context and interpretation. By analyzing the symbols systematically, we can uncover deeper meanings and insights that are not immediately apparent. This approach allows us to see the bigger picture and make connections that might otherwise be missed.

Incorporating diverse perspectives and methodologies, we will explore the rich tapestry of cultural and technological influences that shape our understanding of symbolic representations. Through critical analysis and creative synthesis, we will seek to transcend the limitations of traditional methods and embrace new possibilities for innovation and collaboration.

As we delve deeper into the world of symbols and notations, we will encounter a myriad of challenges and opportunities. By fostering a culture of curiosity and collaboration, we can harness these elements to drive progress and foster a more interconnected and understanding society. In doing so, we will not only enhance our ability to communicate effectively but also pave the way for new frontiers of knowledge and understanding.
Chapter 7 – The Whitefield Case Study
From Deadlock to Regeneration?

7.1 Whitefield in Decline

Whitefield is a ward set within the industrial mill town of Nelson, in East Lancashire, in the north west of England (see Figure 7.1). Nelson, with a population of just under 30,000 (Lichfield and Partners 2004a), is situated in the Calder Valley amidst rolling hill country, to the west of Pendle Hill. Nelson is located between Colne and Burnley, adjacent to the M65 and the Leeds-Liverpool canal. While Colne and Burnley are medieval towns, Nelson is a new town, which grew rapidly after the canal opened in 1816 during the industrial revolution (Wray 2001). Over the span of thirty years, between 1860 and 1890, the population of Nelson increased from 3,500 to 33,000 (Lichfield and Partners 2004b) and it became one of the largest weaving and textile manufacturing centres in Lancashire (Pendle Borough Council 2005). However, like other industrial towns in the north of England, Nelson has suffered in the post-industrial period. To find an approach to regenerate the Whitefield ward in Nelson, an EbD facilitated by the Prince’s Foundation was held in November 2004.

Figure 7.1 – The location of Nelson (centre right) within Lancashire and in relation to surrounding urban centres (Source: author)

Before explaining the relevant historical context of Nelson and Whitefield in the remainder of this section, the contents of this Chapter are outlined. In a similar fashion to
the discussion of Newquay (Chapter Six), the significations and more particularly in this case, the nature of the antagonisms that arose in the course of the EbD process are explored. As a result, the constitution and interaction of the discourses that come together in the EbD are revealed, thereby exposing the power relationships that occur within the Whitefield EbD process. The Chapter follows the chronology of the EbD’s three phases, with each section picking up on themes that arose within the phase. Building on the historical context discussed below, section 7.2 details the events which led to a deadlock or stalemate arising between the Pendle Borough Council and local communities in 2003. The EbD was designed to break the deadlock and find a way to take the process of regenerating Whitefield forward. Sections 7.3 and 7.4 investigate the pre-EbD phase and the EbD event itself (respectively), while section 7.5 explains the implementation of the EbD plans as they have evolved between November 2004 and mid 2006.

The political and social climate in Whitefield prior to the EbD was complex. Therefore, it is useful to understand the historical context of Nelson which situates the events that led to the Prince’s Foundation’s involvement in Whitefield and the concomitant initiation of the EbD.

Whitefield is located in central Nelson beside the Canal (see Figure 7.2) and was developed in an early phase of Nelson’s growth. Whitefield is largely comprised of pre-1890, two up-two down Victorian mill workers’ terraces, built in Pennine sandstone and Welsh slate (see Figures 7.3 and 7.4). The Victorian terraces are interspersed with a variety of prominent buildings, such as St Mary’s Church, St Georges Priory, a Methodist church, the gothic style Spring Cottage (later known as The Groves Hotel), mill buildings, shops and Lomeshaye School.

In 1864, a Local Board was established in Nelson consisting of ratepayers and industrialists. The Board responded to the high demand for housing that resulted from rapid industrial growth by regulating, planning and imposing a variety of building standards which became instrumental in shaping the pre-1900 urban landscape1. One legacy of the Local

---

1 No single industrialist prevailed in Nelson in its early development (Pendle Borough Council 2005). In addition, a ‘room and power’ system developed which allowed small groups of entrepreneurs to buy land and build factories, which were in turn let to tenants. Thus more individuals ran businesses which spread the wealth more evenly. Given the absence of a major landowner/entrepreneur providing public health measures, there was a greater need for civic governance to ensure new workers continued to be attracted to work in Nelson (Lichfield and Partners 2004a). Hence the Local Board was established to fill this role.
Board’s regulation lies in Whitefield’s fine-grained urban fabric on a grid street pattern, with rear alleys between terrace rows. Combined with the quality of the terraced housing, Whitefield has consequently been recognised as having heritage value as the largest intact example of an industrial urban landscape (Wray 2001).

Figure 7.2 – The location of Whitefield within the urbanised area of Nelson (Source: author)
Figure 7.3 – Victorian terraces of Whitefield with St Mary’s church spire in the background (Source: author)

Figure 7.4 – Burlington Street in the south of Whitefield, with the canal perpendicular to the end of the street and Pendle Hill rising in the far distance (Source: author)
The dominance of manufacturing as the primary economic base in Nelson peaked in the 1940s and has since been in steady decline (www.visionofbritain.org.uk), a phenomenon experienced across the north of England, particularly for towns reliant on textile manufacturing. Concomitantly, the 1940s and 1950s saw migrants from India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh arrive to take up jobs in manufacturing. The migrants provided cheap labour, allowing mills to compete with developing markets abroad and fill a labour shortage locally (Amin 2002; Phillips 1998). The tendency for south Asian immigrants to live in close proximity to one another, maintaining close community networks and cultural practices was evident in Nelson (see Amin 2002; Phillips 1998, 2006; Rees, Phillips and Medway 1995). Several wards, including Whitefield, have significant proportions of British Asian residents. In 2003, 69% of Whitefield’s population (4200 people) were Asian or British Asian (Lichfield and Partners 2004a).

Signs of the effects of the downturn in the manufacturing sector in Nelson were marked. The population of Nelson was static in 2003, but particular wards including Whitefield experienced decline (Lichfield and Partners 2004a). In 2005, at the time research for the study was undertaken, the retail offerings in the town centre were limited, with a noticeable absence of common high street chain stores. Most significantly there was low demand in the housing market2. And less obvious but perhaps more telling, Whitefield was ranked as a significantly deprived area on the national deprivation indices3. The need to regenerate Whitefield was recognised by Pendle Borough Council (hereafter, the Council or Pendle) in the 1990s. The foregoing conditions form the immediate backdrop for the EbD. As one interviewee noted:

Whitefield is loaded up with just about everything you can think of on the political agenda in the UK at the moment. You know, it’s got race, it’s got issues of poverty, issues of poor quality housing and how you deal with it in the twenty first century, it’s got heritage, it’s got politics and the relative [question of how] you deal with successful households [and] individuals in an area where there are a lot of

---

2 Low demand in the housing market is an effect of three processes that occur simultaneously over time – housing types become obsolete, housing is over supplied, and neighbourhoods become unpopular (Cole and Nevin 2004). Low demand manifests itself through low and/or falling property prices; high private and public sector void rates; high turnover of population; a visibly high incidence of properties for sale or let (Lichfield and Partners 2004a).

3 Whitefield was ranked 39th most deprived ward on the 2000 Index of Multiple Deprivation, placing Whitefield amongst the worst 2% of wards in England and Wales (Lichfield and Partners 2004a:90). In the 2004 Indices of Deprivation, the two ‘output’ areas that make up Whitefield rank 1840th and 3779th most deprived of 32,482 output areas across England. Deprivation Indices index relative deprivation in a range of domains including health, educational attainments, work status, living conditions both internal and external and income.
unsuccessful households. It’s got absolutely everything you can think of (Design Team W3).

In order to understand the deadlock between local communities and the local authority that the EbD was intended to break, the following section explains a series of decisions and regeneration activities initiated by Pendle Borough Council from 1997. The reactions the regeneration activities precipitated from both Whitefield residents and local and national heritage groups is crucial to the complexity of the Whitefield case. The time period for the following section spans 1997 to 2003.

7.2 Dislocation – Compulsory Purchase Order and Stalemate

The local authority initiated a process for the regeneration of Whitefield by following Government legislation and guidance on undertaking a Neighbourhood Renewal Assessment and then declaring a Renewal Area\(^4\). The Assessment was undertaken between 1997 and 1998, and the Renewal Area was formally declared in early 2000 by the Labour led Council. Renewal Area status means that a local authority can acquire properties voluntarily or apply for a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) to demolish and rebuild or carry out improvement works. The Council sought to demolish and rebuild a significant area in central Whitefield by declaring three Clearance Areas in 2000 (labelled Phase One, Two and Three, see Figure 7.5). The Council initially pursued voluntary acquisition in Phase One, and then in November that year, indicated that properties in Phase One that had not been voluntarily sold to Council would be compulsorily purchased\(^5\).

\(^4\) In 1997, a Renewal Area could be declared by a local authority under s89 Housing Act 1985 providing the local living conditions were primarily of ‘housing accommodation that is unsatisfactory’ and the locality conformed with specific criteria set by the Secretary of State under s90. To determine the living conditions a Neighbourhood Renewal Assessment must be undertaken including proposals, costing and potential funding for the area’s renewal.

\(^5\) For Whitefield in 2000, the process of compulsory purchase of clearance area dwellings in a Renewal Area was provided for in the Housing Act 1985 and the Local Government and Housing Act 1989. A local authority must apply for a CPO to be confirmed by the secretary of state who will consider the case on its merits, and will only confirm an order if the objectives of the Renewal Area can not be achieved in any other way and that there is a compelling case in the public interest to make such an order. Where objections against the CPO are lodged, a local Public Inquiry is held. The Inspector hears evidence and presents a report to the Secretary of State that either recommends confirmation or recommends the Order not be confirmed.
The CPO was issued to remaining households in January 2001. After objections were lodged by local residents, heritage organisations and a local residents’ group, a local Public Inquiry was held in January 2002. Following the statutory process, the Inquiry Inspector issued a report of his findings with a recommendation that the Secretary of State revoke the Order in this case. However, the Secretary of State (then Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott) was unable to make a decision because of the emergence of the Government’s new Housing Market Renewal Initiative, and the establishment of the Housing Market Renewal
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Pathfinders⁶. There were indications that the housing market in Whitefield was undergoing low demand or even collapsing, and Nelson fell within the area of one of the newly instituted Pathfinders – Elevate East Lancashire (hereafter Elevate). As a result, the Secretary of State requested the Public Inquiry be reconvened to address three specific questions relating to the implications on the local housing market of clearance versus conservation led regeneration. The reconvened Public Inquiry was held in February and March 2003 and finally determined in September of that year, when the Secretary of State declined to confirm the Order.

As a result of the voluntary acquisitions which the Council had continued to pursue throughout the Public Inquiry process, it owned approximately 125-150 dwellings within the Phase One area (Asquith 2003; Core Team W3; Council Officer W2). From the time each dwelling was acquired and became empty (sometime between 2000 when the clearance areas were declared and 2003 when the public inquiry was determined), houses were boarded up and gradually fell into various states of disrepair, subject to vandalism. A handful of residents remained in their homes amongst the blighted dwellings. The following images (see Figures 7.6 and 7.7), taken in July 2005, show some of the worst affected areas around what is known as the Appleby Triangle. Given the level of opposition to the renewal proposal, the whole CPO process created a rupture between local residents who were in opposition to demolition, and the Council⁷.

---

⁶ The Housing Market Renewal initiative was launched to combat the high incidence of low demand housing (see note 3 above), said to be affecting 850,000 homes in England, predominantly in the north and in areas of concentrated deprivation (Cole and Nevin 2004). The Government established the Housing Market Renewal Fund and announced the establishment of nine Housing Market Renewal Pathfinders in 2002. The Pathfinders are located in areas with the most acute problems associated with low demand (ODPM 2003), and charged with working in partnership with Local Authorities and other agencies to develop strategic schemes for whole housing markets including ‘radical and sustained action to replace obsolete housing with modern sustainable accommodation through demolition and new building or refurbishment’ (ibid:24).

⁷ The Public Inquiry report (Asquith 2002) reveals that many residents felt Council were forcing them from their homes and breaking up established community networks. They claimed the compensation offered was inadequate to allow them to buy back into the housing market. There were claims that the Council with held compensation until objections to the CPO were withdrawn. Similar arguments were made in the media regarding a lack of compensation and claims of intimidation and racism (for example, Booker 2003; Clover 2004; Dukykhoff 2003; Mulheam 2002). In addition, media coverage (both local and national) quoted residents stating that the Council intentionally sought to displace their communities (for example, Carter 2002; Dukykhoff 2003; Mulheam 2002; Weaver 2004a). Many interviewees agreed Council rode roughshod over the local communities (Design Team W1; Core Team W6); that the decision to compulsorily purchase ‘was incredibly racist’ (Resident W1) and an attempt by Council to disperse the Asian population (Resident W1; Urbanist 2).
Figure 7.6 – Rear alley between Appleby and Portland Streets – washing line at end of terrace shows location of one of the two dwellings in the row still occupied (Source: author)

Figure 7.7 – Cobbled rear lane behind Macleod Street in the Appleby Triangle, showing boarded up terrace, sunken sewers and vandalised St George’s Priory in the background (top left). (Source: author)
An interviewee noted that the Public Inquiry process:

... was very confrontational, ... even the reconvened Inquiry got nasty, it did get nasty, very nasty ... we had the heritage and community section over here dug in a very deep trench and we had the local authority here dug in a very deep trench and [they] were lobbing grenades at one another all the time (Design Team W1).

Even after the Public Inquiry decision, the distrust of Council by many local residents was extreme (Foundation 1; Core Team W1; Core Team W2, W4, W6; Resident W1, W4), despite significant personnel turn-over of Council officers (including the Chief Executive of Regeneration, and several planning officers), elected representatives (from Labour to Liberal Democrats), and the success of the objectors to the Order.

Within the conceptual framework of discourse theory (see Chapter Three), the conflict can be read as a social antagonism across a political space divided by two frontiers – the heritage lobby as they became known, and the Council (who were joined by Elevate for the reconvened Public Inquiry). The Council’s act of issuing the CPO was a dislocation or crisis point for those subject to it, in that it threatened to displace Whitefield residents and jeopardized their identities as Whitefield residents. The Whitefield Conservation Action Group (Action Group hereafter) was formed in reaction to the dislocation or crisis. In addition, a range of different heritage groups came forward arguing for the heritage value of Whitefield. The heritage organisations and the Action Group joined forces (as the heritage lobby) and positioned themselves in opposition to the Council. The heritage lobby argued with one voice against the Compulsory Purchase on both heritage grounds and that it would have significant adverse effects on the Whitefield community (Asquith 2002; Core Team W5, W6; Councillor W1). That is, in the terminology of discourse theory, the combined heritage groups and the local residents’ Action Group can be interpreted as having formed an antagonistic frontier and assumed shared meanings to defend Whitefield housing against Council’s proposal (see Chapter Three, section 3.3.3). The antagonism was very much an us and them battle that divided and polarised the political space operating predominantly on a logic of equivalence (Howarth 2001a; Laclau and Mouffe 2001; Torfing 1999; see Chapter Three).

The Public Inquiry outcome forced the Council to recapitulate on its former approach to regeneration. The significant changes in officer personnel and the elected representatives added to Pendle Council’s uncertainty in the months following the Public Inquiry decision (Council Officers W1, W2, W4). Concomitantly, Council was under increasing pressure to work in collaboration with a maze of agencies now acting out regeneration roles as potential funding partners. For example, English Partnerships had become involved, as the
Government’s regeneration organisation, by ‘purchasing’ most of the dwellings the Council had acquired voluntarily in the Phase One Clearance Area prior to and during the Public Inquiry (Core Team W2, W3). It thereby established a legal interest in Whitefield and provided funding to the Council (Core Team W3). English Heritage, a quasi governmental organisation charged with protecting and researching England’s historic environment (see www.english-heritage.org.uk), were central to the heritage case in the Public Inquiry and remained involved in an advisory role and to monitor events following the failed Compulsory Purchase (Core Team W5). Elevate, the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder, had taken on a key role as funding partner following the outcome to the second Public Inquiry and the initiation of the Housing Market Renewal programme (Audit Commission 2004). The increasing involvement of outside agencies reduced the power Council had to make decisions in isolation and forced them to act more collaboratively. Consequently, in discursive terms, the Council had to rearticulate its practices, its methods of operation and its signification for the regeneration of Whitefield. Nevertheless it maintained the governmental authority to shape the local environment.

The governmentality of the Council was recognised by local residents and heritage groups as they clung to the diminishing power they achieved in the Inquiry process by over-emphasising the protective value of the Secretary of State’s ruling. For example, a member of the Action Group stated ‘there can not be any demolition in Whitefield. That is what the Secretary of State said’ (Core Team W6, emphasis original). A local resident (Resident W3) and a regeneration expert also stressed the protective value of the decision:

John Prescott has said in his decision notice that “you cannot knock anything down”. He said it in black and white, it’s in the decision notice, “you will not demolish any houses in Whitefield” (Design Team W1, emphasis original).

The constantly articulated belief in the force of the Secretary of State’s decision in protecting their various Whitefield identities belied a new fear that emerged in light of the Government’s Housing Market Renewal programme and the continual media attention that focused on demolition proposals instituted in various Pathfinder areas in the north of England8 (Core Team W5, W6; Design Team W1). In fact, the decision notice (dated 18th

8 In the wake of the announcement of the Housing Market Renewal programme and its proposed endorsement of demolition and renewal as an approach to address low demand housing, reports in the media criticised the programme for being ‘forced migration’ and ‘social engineering akin to the ‘Highland clearances’ or slum clearances in the East End of London (Clover 2004); that it amounted to ‘social cleansing’ (Bunyan 2006); and that it was overly focused on demolition (see Carter and Faisal al Yafai 2003; Sykes 2005; Weaver 2004b, 2005; Willis 2005a, 2005b).
September 2003) reflected grounds for this fear. It not only avoided any declaration in absolute terms that protected the houses in Whitefield against any clearance, but it clearly left room for the implementation of the Housing Market Renewal programme. For example the Public Inquiry decision notice (2003) stated:

... until there has been a full assessment of the implications of low demand within the wider area and a strategy to deal with this it would be premature to sanction the Council’s proposed approach in this particular instance (paragraph 12).

Furthermore, it reiterated that:

... without prejudice to any other initiatives that might be made to tackle housing problems in the East Lancashire Pathfinder area ... in this instance Council has not made a compelling case in the public interest why these properties should be compulsorily acquired. ... [I]n advance of a developed strategy for the wider area the Secretary of State accepts that there is a case for protecting the Order properties by virtue of their contribution in heritage and townscape terms (paragraph 20).

As will be seen below, the Council and Elevate were clear that there was no blanket ban on demolition in Whitefield as a result of the decision letter. But both organisations understood that any proposal to demolish dwellings would be highly sensitive and subject to a great deal of scrutiny (Council Officers W1, W2). However, Elevate clearly added a new layer of complexity to the regeneration of Whitefield, as the exploration of the EbD will show.

Once the Public Inquiry was determined in favour of the heritage lobby, there was in essence a stalemate. The effect of the Secretary of State’s decision on the discursive formations involved in the antagonism was profound and had implications for the EbD process itself. The governmental power of the local authority to issue a CPO at the outset was hugely significant in its potential to displace local residents and dislocate their place based identities. However, through the Public Inquiry process, the heritage lobby were empowered to alter that eventuality, arguably as a result of the apparent unification of local residents and heritage groups. The recommendation by the Planning Inspector and the determination by the Secretary of State, John Prescott, disempowered the Council in two ways. First, the decision undermined the Council’s authority and their identity as an authority endowed with governmental power to shape the local environment according to their expert judgements. Second, the very person ultimately responsible for the Public Inquiry outcome (then Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott) was also instrumental in the initiation of the Housing Market Renewal programme, which was highly controversial and portrayed in the media as endorsing demolition as an approach to regeneration. The irony of this position enhanced the victory of the heritage lobby and deepened the defeat of Council.
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But the victory was precarious. Although the outcome of the Public Inquiry diminished the immediate threat of demolition, the Housing Market Renewal programme, and the heritage lobby’s distrust of Pendle Council meant that a great deal of uncertainty remained and the antagonism was still entrenched (Design Team W1; Core Team W6; see also Prince’s Foundation 2005b). It was in this context that an offer by the Prince’s Foundation to run an EbD was taken up by the Council and Elevate.

7.3 Phase One - Lead-in to the EbD workshop

The EbD was proffered as a means to facilitate productive debate between the heritage lobby and Council (Design Team W3; Council Officers W1, W2) so that the urgently needed regeneration programme for Whitefield could begin (Prince’s Foundation 2005b; Council Officers W1, W2; Design Team W1). The heritage lobby saw the Foundation’s role as an ‘honest broker’ or an ‘independent facilitator of a new approach to regeneration’ (Asquith 2003; www.fightforourhomes.com). Whitefield was the first EbD in Britain that was run for a neighbourhood regeneration project. It was jointly funded by Pendle Borough Council, Elevate, English Partnerships and English Heritage (Core Team W1, W2, W3).

So how did the Foundation come to offer to run an EbD for Whitefield? Generally, the Prince’s Foundation becomes involved in projects in three different ways – the Foundation is sought out by various organisations as a consultant; the Foundation becomes involved via their education programme, or it is engaged by patronage. It was the latter route that resulted in the Foundation’s involvement in Whitefield, whereby a request came ‘from the public into Clarence House and to the Prince of Wales, and he [said to the Foundation “you] absolutely must get involved in this’” (Design Team W1, emphasis original). But the initial request was not to the Prince’s Foundation to run an EbD. Rather, it was for help in the provision of supporting evidence at the Public Inquiry of the Whitefield CPO. The request was passed on to the Prince of Wales’ charity, Regeneration Through Heritage9 – a trust dedicated to promoting the re-use of heritage industrial buildings in a way that provides wider local benefits. As a result of the request for help, Regeneration Through Heritage provided expert evidence at the Public Inquiry in support of the case put forward by English Heritage as part of the heritage lobby. Staff from the Prince’s Foundation were involved from the time of the

9 Regeneration Through Heritage is a registered charity, set up in 1996 by the Prince of Wales. In 2005, Regeneration through Heritage and the Phoenix Trust (also a heritage organisation established by the Prince of Wales in 1997) became unified under The Prince’s Regeneration Trust (see www.princes-regeneration.org).
reconvened Public Inquiry in early 2003, and in particular after its determination later that year (Design Team W1). An interviewee proposed that:

The Foundation undoubtedly initiated [the EbD] but it was to do with one of those sort of rather difficult to read exchanges between the Foundation and the English Heritage and the Prince (Design Team W3).

Similarly, another member of the design team suggested that:

When the Prince sees something going on, wherever he is, that he feels passionately about, then wherever he is, he genuinely wants to try and sort it out ... [and often] he gets the Foundation to go and work with people (Urbanist 2).

It is unclear exactly when the EbD was first raised as a possible solution for Whitefield’s stalemate. There is an indication that it was suggested in mediation between key parties including the Foundation, prior to the second public inquiry (www.fightforourhomes.com). However, it became more certain ‘not long after ... we got the decision letter back’ in September 2003 (Core Team W6). In addition, at this time, the Prince of Wales visited Whitefield. So while the initial request for assistance came from members of the heritage lobby, the ongoing involvement of the Foundation seems more likely to have been the result of a directive from the Prince of Wales himself.

The EbD followed the format outlined in Chapter Five. Baseline information was gathered, key stakeholders were identified, letters were sent to every household in the Whitefield ward, Foundation staff visited the site, meetings were held with agency representatives who had a part to play in the process (Design Team W1), and the local newspapers reported on details of the EbD both three weeks and one week prior to the workshop week. However, no pre-workshops were undertaken and the main activities of the pre-EbD phase occurred in the 6-8 weeks prior to the EbD week – considerably shorter than the four to six months recommended by EbD and charrette practitioners (see Chapter Five).

Yet, officers at Pendle Borough Council suggested that the EbD had been agreed to in principle in early 2004 (Council Officers W1, W2). Why then, did the bulk of the work for the lead-in phase occur in such a short period? In the 13 month period between the Public Inquiry decision letter and the EbD event, there were indications of resistance both by Council and by Elevate to the Foundation’s involvement. The following two sub-sections explore these antagonisms and possible reasons for the short pre EbD phase.

---

10 The Prince visited Whitefield to look at an exhibition of children’s Islamic art at St Mary’s Church and visit a terrace house in Whitefield renovated by the Heritage Trust for the North West. Several members of the
7.3.1 Pendle Borough Council and the Foundation

The relationship between the Council and the Foundation was complex. Three distinct elements contributed to tensions between the Foundation and the local authority prior to the EbD event. The first involved a debate about the scope of the project. The second concerned claims that the Council were unwilling clients. And the third involved the Council’s dissatisfaction with the timeframe of the lead-in phase.

Town Centre Debate

About one month prior to the EbD a heated debate between the Council and the Foundation arose as to whether the town centre would be included for consideration in the EbD (Design Team W1; Council Officer W1). Prior to the debate the Foundation came into the discussions with a fairly holistic understanding of the role of the town centre in Whitefield, and indeed within Nelson. This position was entirely consistent with an urbanist focus on how towns work. A representative from the Foundation recalled this story:

I had always maintained that the EbD necessarily had to include the town centre, that you couldn’t consider Whitefield in splendid isolation to the main economic heart of the entire community because the town centre is … the beating heart that will either make or break this community. And that was originally agreed to. Originally until we got up against doing the EbD about three or four weeks before the Enquiry by Design, when the local authority turned around and said we don’t recall saying it was going to include the town centre. … and we were prevented from including the town centre in the EbD [by both Pendle and Elevate] … they created a lot of fuss about that whole thing (Design Team W1)

A belief in the necessity of including the town centre was shared by others in the design team (Design Team W1, W4; Urbanist 2). In addition, a member of the Action Group suggested ‘the residents wanted an Enquiry by Design for the town centre because half of the town centre is in Whitefield … well no good doing us up and having a failing town centre’ (Core Team W6). For this resident, it was again a symptom of Council’s obstructive and we know best attitude – she stated ‘would our Council have it, no they bloody would not … the thing is nobody listens to you’ (ibid). Conversely, Council officers suggested that to include the town centre would be too big (Council Officers W1, W4). For example, an officer argued:

We just felt that there w[ere] so many issues and that the area had such a historic background in terms of people who had been living in sort of very poor conditions.
for such a long time and are uncertain whether their houses were going to be demolished or not, that we really felt that concentration really needed to be put on that area. ... I think that was the right decision in the end (Council Officer W2).

In addition, Elevate’s mandate precluded consideration of anything but housing market restructuring (Core Team W1). Therefore, the revitalisation of the town centre fell outside their remit, and although the funding was split between different parties, the inclusion of the town centre may have made the justification for Elevate to part fund the EbD questionable. Yet the Council needed to have Elevate on board in order to access much needed funding for future regeneration – a point that will be reconsidered shortly. So the town centre debate signified the emerging agenda with which Elevate entered the EbD process and the way in which Pendle Council was imbricated within that agenda because of its need for funding. In addition, the debate signified the Council’s resistance to the Foundation’s involvement in Whitefield as they both sought to determine the scope of the project. In particular, the claim that the Council lacked political will towards the EbD lends credence to this interpretation.

**Council’s Lack of Political Will**

According to several members of the Foundation’s design team, the Council were ‘reluctant joiners’ (Design Team W3) or ‘unwilling clients’ (Senior Foundation member pers. comm. 2005; ) and lacked political good will in the project (Design Team W1; Councillor W1; Urbanist 2). But, as suggested above (section 7.2), in the period immediately after the outcome of the Public Inquiry, the local authority faced uncertainty on several fronts. Rather than simply being ‘unwilling clients’ the Council were in a difficult position. Two factors came into play.

First, the Prince’s Foundation was imbricated with the heritage lobby because of its role in the Public Inquiry (Asquith 2003; Design Team W1). A design team member explained that the Foundation’s involvement in the Public Inquiry ‘kind of won us the label [of] the Foundation as being part of the heritage lobby who were viewed very negatively and very sceptically by everyone’ (Design Team W1). However, the label was justifiable beyond the Public Inquiry. The Foundation was symbolised by its relationship with HRH the Prince of Wales and concomitantly, an adherence to and promotion of specific urban form and heritage principles. Several Foundation representatives suggested the Foundation was ‘not a consultancy, it’s an educational charity’ (Core Team W1). Others made similar claims (Foundation 1; Urbanist 1), adding that the Foundation comes with a:

... set of design principles, ... we don’t bow down to what the person who is paying us wants us to do you know. We come with a set of values as the Prince’s
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Foundation and [whoever engages us] takes on those values, well – or is open to explore those values during the EbD (Foundation 1).

The Foundation was open about its position, as evidenced in a promotion piece in the local newspaper prior to the EbD quoting a Foundation staff member:

We come in with no preconceived ideas apart from the fact that at the Prince’s Foundation we don’t believe in destroying things that have a contribution to make to what is sustainable (Dewhurst 2004:2).

Thus, the Council’s reticence in accepting the Foundation’s offer is understandable. The Foundation entered the EbD with an agenda which fitted one side of the already well established antagonism, despite their claim to be an honest broker or independent facilitator.

In effect, the Council was not only acknowledging that they needed help to break the deadlock, but because the Foundation were allied to the heritage lobby, Council were engaging the enemy’s help – enemy here referring to the constituted other situated at the opposite pole of the antagonistic frontier (see Chapters Two and Three; Laclau and Mouffe 2001; Mouffe 1995, 1999; Torfing 1999).

The second factor that contributed to the Council’s situation and the perception that it was an unwilling client, related to the identity of the Foundation. As with the Newquay case, the nature of the Foundation as an organisation attached to the Monarchy was evident. For example, a Council officer suggested the EbD was ‘an offer you couldn’t refuse from the Prince of Wales … you don’t turn down an offer like that’ (Council Officer W1). Although, it was an offer, the event cost £90-100,000 (Core Team W1, W3; Council Officer W1; Urbanist 2). So although the Foundation was not a consultancy, it charged as though it were.

Moreover, the offer came directly from the Prince according to this interviewee, not the Foundation – the Prince and the Foundation were conflated. As with Newquay, the sedimented authority and paternalistic power of the monarchy within British society was evident (Billig 1992).

Further indications of the Foundation’s elite position were revealed by the advantages and disadvantages its involvement was perceived to carry. Similar to the Duchy’s involvement in the Newquay case (see Chapter Six), a Council officer in Whitefield stated:

It’s got two sides to that coin. First of all I think its very powerful that you’ve got a figurehead like the Prince of Wales who will come along and say as Princes of Wales do every now and then, “something must be done” … that’s great … Prince of Wales, Prince’s Foundation, that you can say, “this is the organisation that’s involved here”, immediately people sit up and say, “oh well I must get involved in this” or “I must take it seriously” … so I think it helped unlock, open a few doors … but the down side I think is that you do get [(sighs)] um you do also throw it open to
the argument that “well, who are these do gooders coming along and thinking they could solve our problems in five days and then go away” (Council Officer W1).

While this officer stressed that he did not hold that view himself, there were others who saw the Foundation’s role as problematic. A Council officer suggested that the Foundation team were a ‘bit too southern in some respects’ (Council Officer W5), while a design team member suggested a typical response at hearing of the involvement of the Foundation in any project was “‘Oh my God you’re not adopting that are you’” (Design Team W3).

The town centre debate provides a further indication of the uniqueness of the Foundation as not a consultancy, and their concomitant power to establish their own brief. A representative from the Foundation revealed:

I was trying to hold out, using the Foundation’s potential withdrawal from the process if the town centre wasn’t included. Because I didn’t think it was a sustainable Enquiry by Design if we were simply just made to look at the small component of [Whitefield] (Design Team W1).

There was clearly a belief in the power of the Foundation’s offering as a means of persuasion or even manipulation.

Ironically though, the Foundation representative also felt that because of the high profile nature of the case, not to go ahead with the EbD would have ‘been more problematic for the future of the area’ (Design Team W1). The Foundation felt they ‘kind of had to do it’ (ibid) even though they had to compromise on their own principles – something it was suggested that the Foundation would not ordinarily do (Urbanist 1). For example, a Foundation member stated ‘we wouldn’t do a halfhearted one anyway there is no reason for us to’ (Foundation 2).

Arguably, the Foundation could not realistically have made the decision to forego the EbD without serious repercussions. Given that the Foundation became involved by patronage, there would presumably have to be very good reasons to go against HRH the Prince of Wales’ wishes. Moreover, during and after the Public Inquiry, local residents had established their allegiance with both the Prince and Foundation staff, alongside a belief that the EbD would solve Whitefield’s problems (Core Team W6), a point discussed shortly. Thus, there is some complexity to the way the Foundation was perceived, the way in which it took on its role as not a consultancy, offered its services, was difficult to refuse, and charged for consultancy work. And yet, in undertaking the project, the Foundation compromised its own principles by not being able to include the town centre.

Within this context, it is not surprising Pendle Council did not embrace the Foundation’s involvement. Moreover, underlying the tension was the Council’s residual
belief that Whitefield was not the Saltaire of the northwest\(^{11}\) and that the heritage value was overstated (Council Officers W1, W2, W5). Nevertheless, the Foundation’s performance of the lead-in period did little to facilitate a greater level of commitment from Pendle.

**Short Lead-in – Poor performance?**

Several interviewees commented on some misgivings just prior to the EbD workshop. According to one Council officer there were a ‘number of reservations in the run up to the event’ (Council Officer W1) and indeed ‘no firm quotation’ for the cost very close to the ‘fixed dates’ for the EbD (ibid). He stated:

> We struggled ... we were actually trying to find out quite late in the process, well what is actually going to be involved here, who is going to be involved, what form is this going to take and so on. The Prince’s Foundation obviously knew themselves but they weren’t communicating it to us early enough and effectively enough (ibid).

Similarly, this view from Elevate, who jointly funded the EbD:

> [The Foundation] were very, very slow putting forward a formal document in terms of what it was they were going to do. Very, very slow and drove everyone at Pendle [Borough Council] to distraction and us ... they were very slow at costing it as well, ... so we were expected to sign up to something with an open cheque book really (Core Team W1).

As a consequence of the short pre-EbD phase, no pre-workshops were undertaken (Foundation 1; Design Team W1; Urbanist 1). Several interviewees also noted that the preparation of technical information was poor (Council Officer W5; Core Team W5). One interviewee who was instrumental in co-ordinating a range of agency stakeholders’ attendance was unhappy at the short notice and expectation of the Foundation:

> I think there was a perception from [the Foundation’s] team that this is really important we need you there, it is only five days we need you there for every session. It is just not realistic as we told them quite clearly, you know “you are not going to get that. If you can get them there for the beginning and the end you will be lucky” ... we only had about one months notice and these people have commitments, you know, they are managing services they are booked in for several months ahead and to just commit them for five days was impossible (Council Officer W6).

However, the reason for the short lead-in remained unclear. When asked, a Foundation staff member suggested there was ‘just lack of time basically’ (Foundation 1) but not expand to give a reason. One Foundation representative suggested the town centre debate was the

---

\(^{11}\) Saltaire is an industrial village in west Yorkshire in the north of Britain, built between 1850 and 1870 by philanthropist, Sir Titus Salt, specifically for the workers of his large textile mill. Saltaire was designated as a World Heritage site by UNESCO in 2001 (see http://www.saltairevillage.info/).
primary reason for the short lead in (Design Team W1). Yet this was inconsistent with the reported emergence of the conflict (four weeks prior as noted by interviewees cited above). If negotiations on whether to include the town centre or not caused a delay in initiating the pre-EbD phase then one might expect it to have erupted some four months prior to the EbD rather than four weeks. The more likely explanation is that there was some internal problem within the Foundation at the time, as suggested by several interviewees from outside the Foundation. For example, one interviewee involved in the core team suggested:

It was quite a short lead in and I remember, I think the Prince’s Foundation had some trouble because they had lost a member of staff or something, so I don’t think they had as much time as they wanted to prepare for it (Core Team W3).

Similarly a member of the design team stated ‘somebody didn’t perform’ which meant that the lead facilitator was ultimately ‘dumped with it’ when ‘he wouldn’t normally have done [it] ... because it wasn’t well enough prepared’ (Design Team W3). Somebody underperforming may explain the lack of timely information reported by both Elevate and Pendle. Similarly, a Council officer recalled, ‘I know that they did have some sort of big row about [the lack of timely information] at the Prince’s Foundation, I’m told, allegedly’ (Council Officer W1). Nevertheless, whatever did occur had an impact on the quality of the product in the pre-EbD phase. In addition to the tensions between the Foundation and Council, the Housing Market Renewal discourse added a further layer of complexity – the antagonism between Elevate and the Foundation is the subject of the next section.

7.3.2 Elevate and the Foundation

In the 13 month period between the Public Inquiry decision and the EbD, there was evidence that the urbanist discourse (through the Foundation) and the Housing Market Renewal discourse (through Elevate) were in competition. As indicated above, Elevate’s funding is bound by strict criteria to ensure that it meets the goal of restructuring the housing market. Thus, whatever path the Council chose, in order to secure much needed funding, it had to fit with Elevate’s criteria, processes and housing market focus. Of particular relevance at this time, was the need for Elevate to put in place an Area Development Framework for its intervention areas in the region prior to commencing any projects (Core

---

12 The Area Development Framework is a comprehensive series of studies used as the basis for drafting both a town-wide strategy of action, and individual projects and plans for specific Priority Action Areas in order to achieve Elevate’s goals (see Lichfield and Partners 2004c). Nelson’s Area Development Framework was commissioned by Pendle Borough Council, English Partnerships, English Heritage and Elevate in December 2003 and completed by a team of consultants led by Nathanial Lichfield and Partners in December 2004.
Team W1). Nelson had become one such intervention area, within which several Priority Action Areas were identified for targeted funding and specific programmes administered by Elevate and Pendle Borough Council in partnership. Whitefield was one of the Priority Action Areas in Nelson and was seen as a necessary first target for action when Elevate was inaugurated (ibid).

When the Area Development Framework was commissioned, the possibility of holding the EbD was already on the table. Thus both the Development Framework process (over 11 months) and discussions about the possible role of the EbD were underway simultaneously. According to a representative from the Foundation, it was the commissioning of the Area Development Framework that galvanised them into lobbying and finalising the details for the EbD because of concerns that the Framework was going to be focused on fulfilling Elevate’s demolition quota in order to gain funding. He recalled:

I recognised very quickly that if we were going to have an [Area Development Framework] that was going to last 11 months and was going to be coming from an angle of demolition we very quickly had to have an Enquiry by Design to thwart that coming about for Whitefield (Design Team W1).

Despite the sense of urgency to counter the demolition focus of the Area Development Framework, the Foundation were slow to finalise the EbD, as noted above. In fact, it seems more likely that the production of the draft Area Development Framework in the middle of 2004 was the trigger that galvanised action, which fits with the timing of several scoping meetings with other partners held in mid 2004 (Core Team W2, W3). Moreover, there was a suggestion that the brief for the Area Development Framework was not consistent with the final report: ‘I cannot see how that brief produced that piece of work … [which] was still predicated on achieving a thousand demolitions in one way shape or form … across Nelson’ (Design Team W1).

There was no initial concern that the brief for the Area Development Framework would involve demolition in Whitefield particularly given the protection the Public Inquiry decision was deemed to have provided (see section 7.2). Therefore, it is not surprising that when the draft document proposed almost 100 demolitions as a minimum intervention option

---

13 At the Housing Market Renewal programme’s inception, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister set specific performance outputs, two of which include homes demolished and homes acquired for Pathfinder purposes. As a result, each pathfinder established indicative targets of outputs for each year of funding in their Prospectus. The outputs include a specified number of demolitions per area, which through the approval of the prospectus by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, were endorsed as performance indicators (Cole and Nevin 2004; Elevate East Lancashire 2004).
for Whitefield (Lichfield and Partners 2004d:140), the Foundation and heritage lobby were alarmed. A member of the Whitefield Conservation Action Group recalled a meeting with Council staff to preview the options of the Draft Area Development Framework:

The first [option] was for a hundred [and] two demolitions, the second was for two hundred and forty seven, these are all approximate now because, it’s about it, the third was 350, the fourth was for 460 odd! All in the same bloody area that was targeted the first time round and we won at the two inquiries. So in other words it was the bloody area that Prescott said ‘don’t touch’. Right? ... But the fifth option was a doozy. The fifth option was, if we didn’t choose one of the above four options, they’d all walk away from Whitefield and leave us here with it and there’d be no money, no funding, nothing. And I turned around and I said, “wait a minute, that’s blackmail ...”. And he said, “no no no, wait a minute”. I said, “no never mind waiting a minute, it’s blackmail. If we don’t choose demolition, you’re gonna walk away from us anyway. Right?” He said, “no no”. I said, “you’re gonna walk away from us and leave us here in a mess, boarded up, seeing as it was your folk that did it in first place, Council”. And he says, “no no, right enough we’d have a duty of care to er to to keep the area going”. I says, “yeah, not, not er putting down weed killer for the weeds, not collecting the bloody rubbish, bloody folk break into the bloody houses and the people still living here. Oh yeah. And we have to live with boarded up bloody doors? That you boarded up and all this.” So I laid into him. ... He gets to the [public] presentation which was the following week. ... and they’d taken away the fifth option which was the blackmail option right. ... So everybody voted, not to [do] nothing. We said, “no, we’re not having it”. Ah well saying everybody, there was those that thought they had to pick an option. Right. You had to pick an option. And I was thinking “no you don’t”. You just turn around and say “no, we’ll wait for the EbD. We’ll wait for the EbD, we’ll wait for the EbD. We’ll wait for the EbD”. That’s how they managed to get it going when they did. Because I thought bloody hell, if this EbD doesn’t come for another 12 months we’re in deep doodoo (Core Team W6).

The first thing to note about this extract is the sense of antagonism between the Conservation Action Group and Council. In addition, the fear that the Area Development Framework and Elevate (with Council) remained predisposed to demolition despite the Public Inquiry outcome was evident. And finally, as a result of this fear and the antagonism, the EbD was framed as the saviour, as the way forward that would remove the threat of demolition. Therefore, even before the EbD date was fixed, there were high expectations that it would solve all Whitefield’s problems. In addition, the EbD, because it was being facilitated by the Foundation, represented a force with which to combat the demolition hungry tendencies of the relatively new threat that Elevate posed.

7.3.3 Antagonism, Equivalence and Complexity

The foregoing analysis illustrates that the negotiation for the EbD must have been extremely difficult. The antagonism and the logic of equivalence were still firmly in
operation in the period prior to the EbD. Figure 7.8 shows the discursive formations on both sides of the antagonism in the pre-EbD political space.

![Figure 7.8 - The pre-EbD political space showing the logic of equivalence and two antagonistic frontiers that resulted from the original dislocation posed by the CPO in 2000](image)

Within this space, the heritage lobby comprised identities including the Foundation, English Heritage, various heritage groups, the Action Group and local residents articulated three main discourses – urbanist, industrial heritage and a local community discourse articulating a set of meanings associated with living and being homeowners in Whitefield. On the other side of the antagonism, the pro-demolition identities included Pendle Council and the recently formed Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder, Elevate, articulating a variety of urban policy discourses, including sustainable communities, urban regeneration and housing market renewal. The dislocation of the CPO in 2001 divided the political space. Each side of the antagonism signified Whitefield in a different way. For Council, Whitefield was failing as a place, with obsolete housing in market failure, high levels of deprivation, an imbalance of Asian and white Lancastrian residents, a poor reputation, a place where people
did not want to live and work – an unsustainable community. For the heritage lobby on the other hand, Whitefield was a unique remnant of industrial heritage with value, a cohesive and integrated community, a place where people wanted to live, and which, in urbanistic terms, had a great deal of potential to become socially and environmentally sustainable.

The governmental power of the Council to pursue its preferred approach to regeneration was interrupted by the power the heritage lobby gained through successfully opposing the CPO. However, the position the heritage lobby gained was threatened by the new governmental power in Elevate, which concomitantly put Council in a very difficult situation – caught between two opposing mandates from the same Government department. In other words, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister refused to confirm the CPO which was the very type of regeneration proposal the Housing Market Renewal programme was mandated to implement. In addition, Pendle had to find a way through a paralysing conflict which included a number of high profile organisations. The force of the Housing Market Renewal discourse was evident, as the Council were bound to the potential sources of funding, a point recognised by a core team member who suggested Elevate and their associated agenda were ‘all joined up’ (Core Team W6):

Pendle Council will not relinquish that funding because we’re desperate for it. We’ve had no funding for a couple of decades now. But at the end of the day they can’t just let that money walk away from them (ibid).

Thus the fear of demolition, now via the Housing Market Renewal programme remained very real, particularly given that Pendle Council had to address housing market, social and economic problems across the whole borough in accordance with urban policy prescribed and funded by central Government.

To compound the situation, the Foundation’s role, signified in relation to the heritage lobby, was perceived as an intervention by the Council. Moreover, the urbanist discourse sought to dominate in articulating the scope for the EbD, so that it would include the town centre. The Housing Market Renewal discourse, despite being a recent initiative was well defined, and its meanings firmly fixed in alignment with the demolition side. Already, the community was signified as homogeneously opposed to demolition. Within that context, the EbD was set up with very high expectations to address Whitefield’s problems. Therefore, the situation in which the EbD was undertaken was extremely complex and multi-layered. Its purpose was not just to find a solution for Whitefield. Rather, it incorporated the broader agendas of a raft of different players, and as a result was no easy task for the Prince’s Foundation, particularly given its poor performance in the short lead-in period.
7.4 EbD workshop

The five day EbD was held at the Palentine Hall in Norfolk Street, on the north west side of the canal, ten minutes walk from the town centre. The workshop ran from Monday 22nd to Friday 26th November 2004. The tiers of stakeholders involved are listed in Table 7.1 and the timetable for the week is provided in Table 7.2. In a departure from the typical half day of ‘technical briefings’ and testament to the complexity of the context and the range of agencies involved, the whole of day one was dedicated to a broad range of stakeholders presenting their positions (Prince’s Foundation 2005b).

Table 7.1 – The composition of tiers of participants in the Whitefield EbD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Team</th>
<th>Foundation urban designers, regeneration specialists, architects and traffic engineer. Consultants engaged by the Foundation including quantity surveyors, costing consultants, sustainability consultants, heritage consultants.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier A – Core Team</td>
<td>Pendle Borough Council officers in regeneration, planning, and employment/community; Lancashire County Council officers in transport; representatives from Elevate, English Partnerships, North West Development Agency, and British Waterways; heritage groups including English Heritage, Heritage Trust for the North West, and the Whitefield Conservation Action Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier B</td>
<td>Pendle Borough Council and Lancashire County Council officers in education, housing, community safety, community development, planning, and the environment; Local and County elected representatives; heritage groups including the Ancient Monuments Society and the Council for British Archaeology; housing associations; Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE); local youth centres, Asian groups including Ithaad and Faisalabad Welfare Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier C</td>
<td>The residents of Whitefield and the general public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first day culminated in a public meeting in the evening, the first contact the broader public had with the Foundation given there were no ‘pre-workshops’. At the first public meeting, a presentation on the nature of the EbD and the urban design characteristics of Whitefield was followed by an open forum in which the audience was asked to comment on the ‘good’ and ‘bad’ things about Whitefield and their vision for the future of Whitefield. These were documented for use during the week. A site tour was held on day two, followed by design sessions which adhered to the typical design, critique, review, design cycle (see Chapter Five). The mid-charrette review was held for all tier B stakeholders on Wednesday evening and the event culminated with the final presentation on Friday evening.
Several themes arose through the analysis of the EbD week and are explored below. The first concerned a new antagonism that emerged between a group of young Asian men and the Foundation (section 7.4.1). The emergence of this antagonism raised questions of inclusivity and representation, thus the issue of inclusivity is considered in section 7.4.2. Several themes are then explored in section 7.4.3, in relation to the ‘old’ antagonism, between the Council and Elevate on one hand, and the heritage lobby on the other. Finally, section 7.4.4 concludes the investigation of the EbD workshop phase by articulating the nature of the discourses and power relations therein.

### 7.4.1 New Antagonism

At the public meeting on the first night, a group of Asian young men expressed a view about the future of Whitefield that signified aspects of their lived experience in England. As such their perspective drew several different discourses into the EbD process. In addition, the antagonism revealed problems with the EbD process itself. There were approximately a dozen men in the group (Core Team W1; Design Team W3; Urbanist 2) aged between 18 and 30 (Foundation 1; Core Team W1; Resident W2).

Several members of the core team were surprised and concerned by the antagonism and the vehemence with which the Asian young men expressed themselves (Agency W1; Core Team W1, W4; Council Officers W1, W2; Foundation 1; Urbanist 2). For example, a member of the design team recalled an ‘eruption’ (Design Team W3), while another
indicated the lead facilitator ‘got a bit of a torrid time’ from the group asserting their views in the open forum of the meeting (Design Team W1).

A member of the group of Asian young men stated that, rather than more terraced houses, they wanted ‘better housing, detached, semi-detached housing with parking space and the rest of it’, ‘nice’, ‘modern’ housing (Resident W2). A Council officer interpreted the group’s arguments suggesting they wanted ‘new houses and better and more exciting things to do, … [and did not] want to repeat the way of life of [their] parents’ (Council Officer W1). Similarly, a Foundation representative recalled:

[The Asian young men argued] “We don’t give a monkey’s for regeneration you know, as far as we’re concerned [Whitefield is] a symbol of deprivation. You know, our mates think we’re a laughing stock because we live in Whitefield, you know, a much publicised poor place, full of poor people. Well you know actually we’re not. We’re not poor but we’re stigmatised with this badge”. They said “well the only reason we live here is because there is nowhere else for us to go. There is nothing else for us to buy. There are no new buildings, no new properties in Nelson. If we want to buy a new place a modern house we’ve got to move out. We don’t really necessarily want to move out because our families are here. We’ve got no choices. There are no choices for us”. And which, I thought was a very valid point (Design Team W1).

The argument presented by the group of Asian young men revealed their difficult and paradoxical situation which has been evident elsewhere in Britain. On the one hand, to live their identity as Asian Muslim, they sought to live in close proximity to their parents and extended families:

Asian families like to stick together. It’s not a matter of the housing being so bleeding good [in Whitefield] that they want to live there. It’s just a matter of being close to your parents (Resident W2).

So, having left home to study, a younger generation of British Asians were drawn back to the communities in which they were brought up, even though those areas, through a variety of factors, were often in decline and held few employment opportunities for them (see Amin 2002; Bowes, Dar and Sim 2002; Kundnani 2001; Phillips 1998, 2006; Ramamurthy 2006). On the other hand, the young Asian men in Whitefield clearly had white middleclass aspirations for a detached or semi-detached dwelling in the suburbs with a space to park their cars (Resident W2; Design Team W1). As one interviewee noted, they argued that their ‘needs and aspirations are no different to [their] white counterparts’ (Core Team W1); while another noted the Asian young men aspired to becoming ‘western as they can conceivably be’ (Urbanist 2). Similarly, a Foundation member suggested:

We’ve got a youth culture there, who simply aspired to owning a volume build box, no character, ok that was their aspiration because that represented the modern …
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that’s their perception of wealth and also of getting up in the world, of getting up the ladder (Design Team W1).

Their aspiration was to become what was represented as ‘other’, which signified the ultimate in being British (Phillips 2006; Robinson 2005), and yet precluded them because they could not achieve the aspiration while simultaneously living their Muslim Asian identities (close to their families) in Whitefield. Most significantly, the heritage conservation arguments that sought to protect the terraced housing signified a barrier to reconciling the Asian young men’s aspirations with living their identity.

Thus, as noted by one interviewee, an ‘assimilationist’ discourse was implicit (Urbanist 2). Corroborating this view, one of the Asian young men argued that the area was perceived as an ‘Asian area’ and that conserving the terraces by laterally converting two or three dwellings into one without changing the external form, as proposed in the EbD, would not regenerate Whitefield (Resident W2). He suggested there was a need to think ‘radically’, to look to the ‘future’, and ‘to think about what kind of people ... we want living in this area’ (ibid). For this young man, the bigger question was:

Where do you want to go from here? ... You do two [terraced houses] in ones, three in ones, this is always going to be an Asian Area... English people aren’t interested in two in ones, three in ones, young professionals aren’t interested in two in ones, three in ones, they are going to move out... (Resident W2).

For the young Asian men in the group, Whitefield’s problem was understood in terms of its Asian label. This understanding fits discourses of isolation and self-segregation in urban areas of north England where ethnic clustering is seen by Government as the ‘signs of failure, particularly on the part of minorities, to integrate socially, culturally, and economically’ (Phillips 2006:28; see also Amin 2002; Imrie and Raco 2003a; Levitas 2000, 2005; Rose 2000). Moreover, one member of the group of Asian young men specifically referred New Labour’s ‘community cohesion agenda’14, which in his view, could not be achieved when ‘Asian areas’ were perceived as ‘no go areas by the white community’ (Resident W2). An integral part of the urban policy agenda in England is to create places where people want to live and work and where a diversity of people live together in strong cohesive communities (ODPM 2003). So for the Asian young men, Whitefield needed to

14 Under New Labour, cohesion, or more explicitly addressing ‘social exclusion’ is a significant component of a raft of urban policy initiatives in which the Government sought to solve the persistent problems in urban areas and the widening gap between the living conditions of the wealthiest and the poorest neighbourhoods. Several commentators on New Labour policy have noted an underlying communitarian doctrine in which ‘individual
develop so that it was attractive to young professionals and white middleclass individuals and families to live and work. This is similar to policy responses in the wake of riots between Asian and white youths in Burnley, Oldham and Bradford in 2001. Segregation between groups was identified by policy makers as the cause of the riots (Amin 2002; Kundnani 2001; Phillips 2006). The policy response was to encourage ‘greater ethnic mixing’ (Amin 2002:963).

However, the Public Inquiry on the CPO in Whitefield found that there was no evidence of an isolated self-segregated community, but rather, one where Lancastrians and Asians were cohesive and integrated (Asquith 2002). Moreover, as both Phillips (2006) and Amin (2002) note, an assimilationist policy response does little to understand the initial reasons for Asian clustering, and in particular the institutional and direct racism to which many Asian groups were subjected. Consequently, the argument for assimilation ‘makes too much of the demons of segregation’ in an overly reductive way (Amin 2002:963). What is important to note though, is the complexity of the situation, and the way in which a marginalised group of young Asian men sought to fix the meaning of their identity in relation to being both Asian and British, neither of which were comfortably reconciled within the discourses that were present in the Whitefield EbD and in British urban policy generally. In addition there was a marked intergenerational difference between the younger and older generations of Asian men in Whitefield. Here, as noted by an interviewee, the younger resisted becoming like their parents whom they saw as failing to integrate into English life (Urbanist 2; see also Amin 2002; Kundnani 2001; Ramamurthy 2006).

The young Asian men asserted their own Asian-Britishness at the EbD – a forum which provided an opportunity for them to express the precariousness of their situation outside the hierarchy of their community (Urbanist 2; Resident W2). Consistent with addressing conflict in EbDs, the Foundation responded to the antagonism by encouraging the group to explain their argument. Generally, EbD facilitators seek to encourage particularly vocal people or those with conflictual views to voice their position, ‘to get it all out of their system’ (Foundation 1). So as one Foundation representative indicated ‘people can say “oh this person’s a trouble maker”, “great, ok, get them along, give them a microphone, just let
them have [their say]” … it’s like blood letting isn’t it’ (Foundation 2). Another Foundation representative suggested such individuals should be included at the workshop:

[There] might be some really outspoken individuals who are critical to have at the Enquiry by Design because they are going to undermine you every step of the way (Urbanist 1).

The use of the words ‘troublemaker’ and ‘undermine’ are interesting here, and will be revisited in section 7.4.2. While one of the key members of the group of young Asian men indicated that they were ‘on a course somewhere else [that week and] couldn’t go’ to the workshop during the week days (Resident W2), others made use of the ‘open door’ policy, and in groups, ‘dropped in’ on the workshop sessions in an often ‘mob like’ fashion (Urbanist 2). The group requested an additional closed meeting with the lead facilitator, because:

In this community you [have] got to be quite careful what you say and where you say it, because it can have repercussions. Ah, so I suggested we have a closed meeting and [the facilitator] agreed to that which was good (Resident W2).

Clearly, the public meeting was not a comfortable forum for them to express their views openly. The closed meeting was a fairly heated and passionate affair, held in the design studio on the Thursday evening of the workshop. A member of the design team recalled that it was hard not to notice the antagonism involved:

Most of us were doing other things but you couldn’t ignore it and it went on, that meeting with about seven or eight, I guess maybe a dozen people went on for probably about three hours (Design Team W3).

Another design team member noted the young men were ‘very angry’ and yet he recognised the legitimacy of their anger (Urbanist 2). However, he suggested the issues that they raised were far greater than anything the EbD itself could address (ibid). As a result, the meeting failed to achieve any kind of resolution, and a group member was still angry when interviewed eight months after the EbD in 2005. He recalled being ‘really pissed off’ after the meeting, and believed the Foundation were pushing their own agenda:

Prince Charles has his own views on architecture and the rest of it, you know [what] I mean. They came from, they were very sympathetic to the heritage way, … and whatever we came up with in that meeting was not going to be taken on board (Resident W2).

A Foundation representative admitted that the group were excluded from the EbD process, and that it was a failing of the Whitefield EbD (Urbanist 2). He noted with some concern, that the Foundation had in effect, excluded the already marginalised. The representative claimed that had they had more time in the lead-in period to identify and work with the group, the antagonism may have been resolved (ibid). However, the complexity of
the young Asian men’s situation suggested their sense of marginalisation was general, rather than specific to the EbD. For example, a member of the group stated that the local authority:

Want to keep us in these areas. There’s even a perception of that, they want to keep us in these kind of areas so they can, the system can say right that’s where they are, we can keep an eye on it we can control it ... I mean how serious are they about integrating and community cohesion (Resident W2).

Interestingly, while the Foundation recognised the concerns of the group of young Asian men, they attempted to meet the group’s aspirations in the masterplan by incorporating loft apartments and one bedroomed flats overlooking the canal in the sincere belief that the young men would ‘go for that ... something that represents modernism, that represents life choices, lifestyle choices’ (Design Team W1). The designs presented in the EbD report were similar to recent trendy concepts of urban living – described by some commentators as an ‘urban idyll’ typical of a café culture and inner city living (Hoskins and Tallon 2004). However, the young men were not convinced. Rather, they saw it as not being heard. For example a group representative stated ‘to be honest after the closed meeting our views were just basically sidelined and totally ignored on the Friday’ (Resident W2). However, a member of the design team recalled that he tried to explain to the young men the impossibility of meeting their aspirations for detached and semi detached housing in Whitefield:

Well ok, if you want to do that, then you’ll have to go and buy the house on the edge of town because no society in England is going to allow you to demolish heritage housing in the middle of town. [You are just] not going to get that to happen (Urbanist 2).

What in fact they aspired to was something that was not going to be deliverable in Whitefield given the prominence at this time of the urbanist discourse, the heritage discourse and the associated identities involved – HRH the Prince of Wales in particular. Clearly, the situation was complex. Would, as the Foundation representative suggested, a lead-in period more typical of a best practice EbD have improved the group of Asian young men’s perception of being included? Given the complexity of their marginalised position and the vehemence of their argument, it may not have. But what is evident from the foregoing, is that the weakness in the pre-EbD phase had significant repercussions for the inclusivity of the process which is considered below.
7.4.2 Inclusivity

Several themes emerged in relation to inclusivity, which are discussed below. These include consensus, representation, how local voices were heard, and an exploration of why a high expectation of inclusivity was held by many interviewees and not realised.

Consensus

There were mixed views as to whether a consensus was achieved by the end of the EbD week. Most of those interviewed recognised that true consensus was rarely possible, but rather understood that consensus was at most, a general agreement amongst those involved. Given the mixed views and obvious dissent, claims to consensus revealed whose agreement was considered important or significant in the process. As noted in Chapter Two, following Mouffe (1999), any claim to consensus creates a division between those who agree and those who do not.

Table 7.3 shows the range of views regarding consensus. Where it was thought that consensus was partial, the most commonly recognised dissenting view was perceived to emanate from the group of young Asian men discussed in the previous section. A Foundation representative suggested ‘the community’ endorsed the masterplan (Design Team W1; final quote, Table 7.3). A similar statement is made in the Summary Report (Prince’s Foundation 2005b). The very act of making a claim to consensus defined community as those who agreed with the masterplan. Thus dissenters were excluded – that is, specifically the group of young Asian men. Again, the community was defined as homogeneously pro heritage. Moreover, most of those who indicated there was no consensus or that it was at most partial were also critical of the level of community involvement through the EbD week (discussed in the following two sub-sections).

A Foundation representative explicitly recognised the argument presented by the Asian young men as valid while simultaneously suggesting that ‘quite a few of them were mischief making’ (Design Team W1). This contributed to their exclusion. Section 7.4.1 noted that a core method of addressing conflict in the EbD process was to ensure those with contentious views were enabled to participate. However, of concern is the use of phrases such as ‘mischief making’ (Design Team W1), and a reference to individuals with conflicting views as ‘trouble makers’ (Foundation 2) who constantly ‘undermine’ (Urbanist 1) the facilitation team. These three different statements made by three different Foundation staff members implies a therapeutic and paternalistic approach to conflict resolution, whereby pacification
is the goal rather than a more meaningful and lasting resolution. Such labels undermine the stated intention to allow spaces to create understanding, so that even where aspirations are not met, an understanding of why it is not met are made clear and accepted (Urbanist 1, 2).

Table 7.3 – Range of perceptions on the degree of consensus reached

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Tier C</td>
<td>[...] at the final presentation] the people who were residents ... there were more against it than for it (Resident W2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant to Foundation Team</td>
<td>Design B</td>
<td>... there was still an element of conflict [at the final public meeting] (Design Team W3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency representative</td>
<td>Tier B</td>
<td>[At the final] public meeting there were still a lot of really divergent views particularly from ... the Asian young men (agency W1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency representative</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
<td>[Before the EbD] people had become quite polarised in their views. I think if I am honest I would say people still have very fixed views (Core Team W5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council officer</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
<td>There’s never been an agreement reached about the cost of repairing but there was a consensus reached at the end, this is the standard we have to reach and this is the cost (Council Officer W5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency representative</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
<td>[After Friday’s public meeting] everyone seemingly went off happy that we’d reached a consensus … we’d come up with this plan that was going to work, very little demolition that’s what the community wanted. Ther I stood in the room with these guys [the Asian young men who] …said to me “we’ve just been sold a complete” what’d they call it, I can’t remember exactly what the expression was actually ... but you know “this is a nonsense” (Core Team W1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant to Foundation Team</td>
<td>Design A</td>
<td>…we finally managed to come to something that generally most people were happy with (Council Officer W2); [there was a] broad consensus (ibid).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus among stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency representative</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
<td>[The masterplan] reflected all these individual groups that had been working stuff up (Core Team W3); [There was] an awful lot of buy in at the end of the week (ibid).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council officer</td>
<td>Tier B</td>
<td>[Conflicting views] had been refined, sanitized, dealt with through the workshop process and that what was being presented [on Friday evening] were a generally agreed set of proposals and views at the end of the process (Council Officer W5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency representative</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
<td>…a compromise and that is what I think we achieved at the end of the week (Core Team W2); [we shared] a common understanding … [and developed] a framework which was acceptable to all parties (ibid).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council officer</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
<td>A general agreement [was achieved through the week] (Council Officer W3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
<td>... a good compromise was reached [during the week] (Councillor W1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitefield Conservation Action Group</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
<td>... we agreed in principle [by the end of the week] (Core Team W6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanist</td>
<td>Design A</td>
<td>All things taken into account, [the] EbD did come up with a consensus bearing all that [political and cultural complexity] in mind, a remarkable consensus [Urbanist 2].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation representative</td>
<td>Design A</td>
<td>[At the final meeting, the masterplan was] endorsed by the community] (Design Team W1); All the organisations, the government agencies, English Heritage, [English Partnerships] even the local authority and Elevate were saying this is really good, this is really good’ (ibid).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, as mischief makers who disagreed with the final outcome, the group of Asian young men fell outside the community (of consensus) and as a result their view was given less significance than others. For the most part the consensus, such as it was, was achieved between Tier A and to some extent Tier B of the EbD attendees, rather than the residents themselves (see Table 7.3). A claim to community endorsement overstated the inclusivity of the process, since ‘the community’ as signified here, excluded any Whitefield resident who was not at the EbD and anyone who was in dissent. Inclusivity was a perceived failing of the process, and relied on representation on the core team and a number of mechanisms for community voices to be heard. It is to these topics that the following three sub-sections turn.

**Representation**

Typical of EbDs, the wider community were not directly involved in the workshop, except in the public meetings. However, the Whitefield community were represented on the core team by three local residents: a middle aged white female liberal democrat Councillor, a senior Asian man (a Labour Councillor prior to the proposals for renewal), and a middle aged white woman resident. All three were involved in the Whitefield Conservation Action Group, and had varying degrees of commitment to the idea of conserving Whitefield’s heritage (Core Team W6, W7; Councillor W1). All were involved in articulating their opposition to the demolition of Whitefield dwellings in the Public Inquiry. They all felt strongly that their community was cohesive, close knit and that any demolition was unjust (ibid).

The bias apparent in the community representation was noted by the group of Asian young men (see section 7.4.1), one of whom claimed ‘the true [community] representation was not there’ at the EbD (Resident W2). Rather it was the ‘selected few who were invited’ as representatives (ibid). Moreover, the representatives ‘had their own interests, they weren’t community interests they were personal interests’ (ibid). So although having three community representatives on the core team follows the typical EbD format, the representation was not as good as it might have been. And although, as noted above, the Foundation went out of its way to try and include the Asian young men in the process (albeit toward the end of the week) the group continued to feel marginalised. While the Foundation claimed that the brevity of the lead-in period and the lack of pre-workshops was the principle reason for the group’s exclusion (Urbanist 2), there was evidence of the existence of voices in favour of demolition in both the Public Inquiry (Asquith 2002) and the Area Development
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Framework (Lichfield and Partners 2004e)\(^{15}\). Foundation staff indicated they had this material available to them prior to the EbD (Design Team W1). That the Foundation still failed to identify the ‘pro-demolition’ voice prior to the EbD and provide them with a means of representation on the core team is perplexing. It raises a question: was the omission of the pro-demolition view in the community representation on the core team the result of oversight and poor performance or bias on the part of the Foundation for viewpoints sympathetic to their own cause? There is no direct evidence of the latter in this case.

Nevertheless, it is difficult to understand how, in the presence of information to the contrary and a stated commitment to inclusivity, the group of Asian young men and their position were overlooked by the Foundation team regardless of the short lead in. While this does not suggest an intentional omission, it is possible that the dominance of both the heritage and urbanist discourses in Whitefield at the time meant that alternative views remained on the margins. Such an omission may be symptomatic of a subconscious desire for the Foundation to maintain an adherence to their agenda in the absence of conflicting views, as was suggested in the Newquay case in relation to a lack of community representation.

The concerns expressed regarding a lack of inclusivity of local viewpoints did not extend to stakeholders or Tier B participants. As Table 7.1 shows (section 7.4), there was some breadth to the range of stakeholders represented in both the core team and tier B, including local community groups. Moreover, a full day of stakeholder briefings on day one and the attendance of some 80 tier B representatives indicated that a large number of agencies and organisations were involved. Indeed, this became a source of criticism when compared to the level of local community involvement. One Council officer noted that ‘in terms of involving the stakeholders it was good, but a lot of those people were sort of around the table already’ (Council Officer W2). Others suggested it was agency heavy or agency led (Council Officer W5; Core Team W5). So despite the concern expressed by an interviewee that the Foundation had an unrealistic expectation and provided insufficient time to organise stakeholders’ attendance (see section 7.3.1), it appears this was either not

\(^{15}\) In the Public Inquiry, three individuals appeared expressing their support for demolition. Two supporters suggested there was widespread endorsement of the clearance in Whitefield, with one submitter indicating that many supporters had been silenced by a vociferous minority against demolition. One submitter provided a petition with 146 signatories supporting the clearance proposals. In addition, from the Area Development Framework consultation, which was extensive, there were several indications of mixed support for some demolition and some conservation in Whitefield.
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founded or did not present a problem. Indeed, it was the lack of local community engagement that was seen to be problematic by several interviewees.

Local Voices – Public Meetings

The lack of pre-workshops meant that the two public meetings provided the primary means for locals to express their views and for the core team to gain ‘local intelligence’ (Urbanist 1; see Chapter Five). So what was the format and atmosphere of those public meetings? Again the format was typical of EbD public presentations with a powerpoint slide show, followed by an opportunity for questions in an open forum. In addition, as noted above (see section 7.4.1), the atmosphere was antagonistic with the group of Asian young men dominating the question time.

The general view amongst interviewees was that both public meetings were well attended, with more residents at the final meeting (Council Officer W2; Core Team W1, W2, W7). A range of views indicated that the atmosphere on Monday evening was pensive, expectant but also suspicious (Council Officers W2, W6; Core Team W4). However, there were criticisms of the nature of the public meetings given the context. First, there were indications that the presentation in Monday’s public meeting was overly long, given the timetabled length of thirty five minutes. One agency representative referred to its length and suggested ‘people were starting to lose a bit of interest and that, I think that breeds [the idea] … “I’ve got to react” and they react in a way that isn’t perhaps fully considered’ (Core Team W4). Similarly, an agency representative recalled Monday’s meeting, where the presenter:

... spent the first hour and half talking to the audience in a not particularly user friendly way ... the slides he put up were appalling in terms of ... the language that was used. It wasn’t the language of the man and woman on the street. It was very much, I don’t know how you would define it but it was kind of professional language. Now again, to give him some credit he didn’t actually use word for word ... what was on the slides, he did try and translate into something that people might be able to understand who weren’t a planner, an engineer and all the rest of it but nevertheless... most of it went, I am quite convinced, over you know, the audience’s head[s] (Core Team W1).

A resident also suggested that in relation to the presentations at both public meetings, ‘Joe Public who [is] not used to be participating in this process and kind, it would go over their head’ (Core Team W7). In addition, in an area in which 60% of the population are of South Asian origin, for many of the older generation residents of Whitefield, English was not their first language. Not only was the language used in the presentation not very accessible, but translators were not available at the public meetings. As a result, it seems unlikely that
local residents with poor English would have attended the meeting, or if they did, they may have had difficulty in understanding the nature of the presentations.

Similarly, the way in which the Foundation accessed local information may have presented a barrier to participation. As noted above, at the public meeting, the audience was asked to indicate what they liked about Whitefield, what they disliked and what they saw for its future. The official timetable indicated that this component of the meeting was to be managed by small group discussions. However, that did not eventuate even though it is commonly recognised as a more inclusive approach. One interviewee argued:

I think the opportunity was lost because there was sufficient professionals there as part of [the Foundation] team to have actually broken the group up into small groups to allow discussions but what [the facilitator] did then was open the discussion up and [he said] “right put your hand up ... I want you to think about one good thing about Whitefield, one bad thing about Whitefield. And raise your hand and we’ll scribble stuff down”. Well I don’t think that suits most people. It’s too, too intimidating for most people unless you’re used to speaking and you know, fair do, quite a few people spoke but ... I actually thought that was what we were going to do, that we’d all break off into little groups and then feed back and all the rest of it. It would have been far more meaningful (Core Team W1).

So not only did the views presented as the aspirations for Whitefield depend on who was at that meeting, it also depended on who was willing and able to stand up in front of a room full of people and make a statement about Whitefield with microphone in hand. Asian Muslim women, in particular, are unlikely to take up such an opportunity and indeed there were very few Asian women at the public meeting (Core Team W1). An Action Group member involved in the EbD affirms that Asian ‘male folks go [to meetings], fathers and brothers etcetera’ and so women tend to have limited experience and capacity to participate in such forums (Core Team W7). He recognised the difficulty, but also the necessity for women to be involved and to take up the opportunity to participate:

... because they [are] gonna live here, ;their younger children going to live here, so they know what they want for the toddlers and Johnnies and Abduls and etc so they ... want to describe how the house should be, where the kitchen’s are, so this is a process at a basic level where there [should be] an opportunity for them ... to get them involved (ibid)

Similarly an agency representative was critical of the Foundation for not specifically finding a way to include Asian women:

There are women’s spaces, women’s groups and the rest of it ... the Prince’s Foundation was warned about these issues and were asked to actually make sure that in the same way that the consultants for the Area Development Framework had gone out and done outreach work, that they would do something to address that. That didn’t happen (Core Team W1).
Again it was the pre-EbD phase in which that kind of outreach work would have been undertaken (see Chapter Five). A Foundation representative indicated a full six month lead-in period would have been required for a project like Whitefield that was such a ‘political cocktail’ or a ‘hot package’ (Urbanist 2). Furthermore, he indicated that in the six month period, specific work could have been undertaken with Asian women, as well as identifying and working with conflictual perspectives, such as the Asian young men. Thus the weak front-end of the process had repercussions throughout the EbD. Nevertheless, there were alternative means for community voices to be heard.

Local Voices – Alternative Means

There were two alternative approaches adopted for hearing community voices at the EbD. As one design team member suggested:

If you’re up against a very tight timeframe and if you have to produce a product, then if you don’t have a lot of background information and if you don’t have able advocates and if you aren’t able to break down, some of those problems [about] people articulating what they believe in front of others then I think you get a very you get a very limited, a very limited and um rather monochrome response (Design Team W3).

The design team member suggested that ‘walking about with people from the local community and going into houses and talking to them’ (ibid) on site was one way they sought to counteract this tendency. Certainly, this aspect of the process was seen as a strength by several core team members (Council Officer W2; Core Team W2, W3; Design Team W4). However, the connection to local residents outside the core team was channelled through the core team representatives who were, as noted earlier, all members of the Whitefield Conservation Action Group. Thus the existing bias in community representation on the core team may have been perpetuated.

The second feature that may have served to counteract a monochrome response was the open door policy. However, the policy seemed to remain unacknowledged, and arguably intentionally so. One agency representative stated ‘we didn’t have an open, well it was an open door policy but I don’t think it was as widely pushed as, perhaps, as far as it could have done’ (Core Team W5). Similarly another agency representative who was particularly critical of the level of public involvement, indicated it was not widely utilised or accepted as such: ‘don’t get me wrong I think all the actual sessions were actually open to the public but the truly public session itself was the Monday evening’ (Core Team W1). Her criticism of the public involvement in the EbD was testament to her belief that rather than an open door policy, the EbD did not have a closed door policy. This view was confirmed by Foundation
representatives who argued that to provide members of the public with open access to the design sessions throughout is not productive (Foundation 1, 2; Urbanist 1, 2):

... not just because it prevents people actually working, but every time someone comes in you know they have to be met and they have to be taken around and shown and spoken to and its very hard to resource if you've got people coming in all [the time] and people get a negative impression of what's going on (Foundation 2).

The 'idea is that it is [a] very open and transparent process’ (Foundation 1) but ‘that doesn't mean that it's open to everyone all the time’ (Foundation 2). So while there was a desire for an open and transparent process, open access for local residents or tier C groups to the EbD workshop was not necessarily encouraged. This effectively meant that those likely, in the context of Whitefield, to make use of the unpublicised open door approach were those either with a direct connection to a member of tier A or those who felt so strongly about an issue that they simply had to speak out, as was the case with the Asian young men (see section 7.4.1). But they felt they had to ‘bulldoze’ (Resident W2) their way into being heard and considered even then that their views ‘were basically ignored’ (ibid).

So while the above presents the format of the EbD as fairly typical, there were clearly issues associated with the inclusivity of the process in terms of recognised principles for participatory planning (see Chapter Two) and EbD best practice (see Chapter Five). And yet, there was further evidence of an unrealised expectation that opportunities for public involvement at the EbD would be greater than those that eventuated.

Unrealised expectations?

Many interviewees expressed an expectation that the local communities would be more involved than they were. Interviewees were asked what the weaknesses of the process were. Table 7.4 provides a range of views, revealing perceptions that the EbD was biased toward a few articulate individuals from local communities and that locals were only superficially engaged in the process. These interviewees were generally disappointed with the opportunities given to local people to be involved and expected a greater level of inclusivity for local residents. The fact that locals had only one real opportunity to be involved, by way of the first public meeting was noted by many as an inadequate means of community engagement.
Table 7.4 – Perceptions expressed by interviewees on the community involvement of the Whitefield EbD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Council officer        | Tier B | It was their one time for the people to say this is what local people want … but it felt like it was driven by certain articulate people within the community and could be then given the face of this is what the local community wants (Council Officer W6).  
If you want to marry the quick with the inclusive there should have been much more use of something called an outreach workers group (ibid). |
| Council officer        | Tier B | I think we felt that maybe the community involvement perhaps wasn’t all it might have been (Council Officer W3).  
The usual suspects always turn up … you’re not really reaching new people kind of grass roots ordinary resident as it were (ibid). |
| Council officer        | Tier A | [Many residents who came to the public meetings] said was, you know, “this process is supposed to be about involving the community in the process, but actually you’ve only called us in at the beginning and at the end and a few people got called in at the middle and one or two people were involved locally”. A lot of people said “actually this isn’t that valid as an engagement, as an exercised in engagement of the community” (Council Officer W1). |
| Council officer        | Tier A | In terms of engaging the community maybe it wasn’t so good. Not as good as we’d probably hoped … I think we kind of missed a stage really in terms of actually engaging the people that live in that area … yeah it would have been better if they could have been more involved mid point stage or something along those lines (Council Officer W2). |
| Council officer        | Tier A | I think there were people who felt they were excluded (Council Officer W3).  
The usual suspects always turn up … you’re not really reaching new people kind of grass roots ordinary resident as it were (ibid). |
| Council officer        | Tier A | I think if got the community involved, in my view, superficially (Council Officer W4).  
I had an issue with was how much involvement the community had (ibid). |
| Agency representative  | Tier A | The other thing that would have helped in the EbD process is actually … to have more community representation … [community representatives] were far outweighed by Council representation and the professionals’ (Core Team W5). |
| Agency representative  | Tier B | It would have been good to get more community members there and I think when I went to the very last the public meeting there were still a lot of really divergent views, you know, particularly from … some of the Asian young men who were there, they weren’t happy at all I don’t think with the consultation … which sort of calls to mind have those people been engaged throughout the EbD (Agency W1). |
| Agency representative  | Tier A | I thought it was going to have much more of the community involved in the whole process … so that came as a bit of a surprise (Core Team W4).  
I think that if anything it was something that Enquiry by Design process needs to address to make it more rigorous … I felt that they [community] weren’t entirely shaping what was happening all the way through (ibid). |
| Agency representative  | Tier A | It was the community engagement side that I was particularly concerned with and the one that brassed me off, because it had always been sold to us that its kind of added value’s about the way in which it engaged communities. Well it didn’t as far as I’m concerned quite frankly (Core Team W1). |
| Action Group/resident   | Tier A | The meetings that set off the Enquiry by Design and the end meeting, a lot of people were there. But actually on the five days working there weren’t many people there (Core Team W7); |
| Resident                | Tier C | [Consultation with Council is] a waste of time [Resident W4]. ... Same happened again [with the EbD, Council says] “right tell us what you want we’ll look into it” (ibid).  
[Consultation is] keep asking us when they do it [consultation] “what do you want, what do you want” and then it’s not we want it’s what they want (ibid). |
| Resident                | Tier C | [Consultation was] a farce to be honest, it was a selective few who were invited. The grass roots people who work in [Whitefield] ... weren’t involved’ (Resident W2).  
To be honest it did seem like a stitch up (ibid).  
The EbD involved] self-appointed community re[resentative]s (ibid). |
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The basis of the raised expectations is unclear. There was newspaper coverage of the EbD in Nelson on two main dates in which articles in local papers detailed the process. One month prior, readers were told ‘residents will have [their] say at Inquiry (sic)’ and be ‘invited to give their views’ on the future of Whitefield (Nelson Leader 2004:4). One week prior to the event, readers were informed that ‘representatives of the residents, Pendle Council, heritage groups, designers and regeneration experts will get together to put ideas on paper for ways in which to breathe new life back into Whitefield’ and that ‘everyone involved will be able to put forward their ideas and listen to those of other people’ (Dewhurst 2004:2). Moreover, a Foundation representative was quoted as saying ‘everyone has an equal voice and gets involved. It doesn’t necessarily mean everyone gets what they want, but they understand each other. It is a win-win situation’ (ibid). The article indicated that the public could be involved at the beginning of the week and at the end of the process in the two public meetings (ibid). So media coverage of Whitefield, although less prolific, was far more realistic and explicit about the actual opportunities given for locals to be involved than the coverage of the Newquay EbD (see Chapter Six). But despite this more realistic promotion of the EbD, there remained an expectation that the process would be more ‘participatory’ for community members.

The way in which several interviewees suggested potential improvements to the process emphasises the character of these expectations. One Asian interviewee who identified as having been a ‘community activist’ in the past, suggested ‘you have to have a bank of knowledge’ in order to participate meaningfully in such an exercise (Core Team W7). Furthermore, he stated that:

Affluent area[s] only where middle class people were and fashion lived, and they participated, you could say they have a bank of knowledge already to be able to do that. In a run down area or an area such as Whitefield, I think to make that process inclusive you have to start from behind, you have to go work it and … bring them up (ibid).

He argued that ‘to bring them’ up might require a ‘community worker working with [them] for six months or a year’ (ibid). For this interviewee, there is an explicit emphasis on the need for a certain capacity to enable effective participation and what is required when that capacity is lacking. Encouragement to participate does not automatically generate the capacity to participate – capacity is required prior to participation of this nature.

Other interviewees suggested having the ‘community there all the way through to look at the issues that are involved’ would have been advantageous (Council Officer W4). An agency representative proposed ‘that running the event over a longer time’ (Core Team W4)
might make the process more inclusive, while another indicated that there was a need for much greater grass roots engagement and specific outreach work to access hard to reach groups (Council Officer W6). A heritage group member argued for a parallel event in which they could:

... run the process in tandem ... [with] a community panel, community workshops looking at things and ... [simultaneously] the professionals panel if you like actually evolving those and making them into something that was deliverable (Core Team W5).

These suggested improvements to the EbD process for a case as complex as Whitefield are revealing in that they expose a perception of an inherent flaw in the process in its ability to engage and include participants. One argument given for the EbD’s inability to engage was that the context was too complex. The concern expressed by Council officers was that the EbD process promised more than it could deliver and it was overly focused on the physical environment. The comments in Table 7.5 reveal a range of views in this regard.

Table 7.5 – Interviewees’ perceptions of the limitations of the EbD process for addressing the complexity of issues in Whitefield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council officer</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>I’m not certain that [the EbD process] looked in-depth enough at the underlying issues behind why the area was in the state it was in. ... I’m not so certain whether it is the answer to Whitefield because I don’t, my personal view is, that there’s a lot more social issues involved in regenerating an area over and above simply doing the physical or cosmetic work, whatever you want to call it (Council Officer W4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council officer</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>It was difficult to deal with the more social and health issues because it was very much around kind of how, very physical, how a place works, how it functions (Council Officer W2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council officer</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>I think the idea that you can resolve all the incredibly complicated issues to heritage and conservation and new development and community issues and race issues and so on, that you can resolve all those in five days over a drawing board with felt tip pens I think is erroneous and misleading. I think actually there are much bigger issues that are not ever going to be solved in a five day process. It is just incredibly complex. The reasons why Whitefield has become like it is are complicated and not easily summarized just like that... Actually it is a much more complicated situation than that (Council Officer W1). You know the idea that you can parachute in some very nice people and they’re going to solve all of our problems for us (ibid). There has got to be an acknowledgement that eh five days is only five days and if we can turn this around in five years we’ll have done well (ibid).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant to the Foundation</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>[EbDs] get badged up as a way of dealing with something. Actually they probably are more appropriate to some things more than others. I think personally that they are ... less good at dealing with things where there are more underlying problems than the simple physical regeneration. ... where there is a predominance in other problems I think they become much more difficult... you could take the example of Whitefield where I think the issues are much much much bigger ... I think Whitefield is a bigger problem than the EbD can tackle but I mean it then rather depends on what you expect EbD’s to do (Design Team W3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The EbD’s focus on physical aspects of Whitefield and its inability to deal with social issues is emphasised in these comments. Given that the process is urban design based, this is perhaps inevitable. However, it does suggest that for regeneration projects, where the social issues of a place are complex, the physical focus of an EbD constrains the potential to address social and economic issues. There is a case to be made here for adapting the EbD to enhance and broaden the level of involvement for local residents in cases like Whitefield. But as noted in the last quote in Table 7.5, any suggested adaptation does depend on what you expect the EbD to accomplish – that is, should the EbD be addressing social issues, or is it strictly an urban design tool?

A Foundation representative recognised the EbD’s limitations. For example, one interviewee recalled the final public meeting when a Foundation representative acknowledged that the masterplan ‘wasn’t going to be a panacea to all problems, it was going to be the starting block’ for Whitefield’s regeneration (Council Officer W4). Similarly, another interviewee stated that:

If you see the EbD as one part of that [wider regeneration] process, and I think you know, [those] at the Prince’s Foundation acknowledge that. I think if you see the EbD as part of that process then that’s great. If you see it as the process then no, it’s not great (Council Officer W1, emphasis original).

So while this Council officer believed the Foundation understood the limitations of the process, he suggested that their acknowledgement of such was not sufficiently evident and did not permeate their practice. He stated that the delivery was problematic, and the notion of the Foundation team ‘parachuting’ in like ‘do gooders’ (ibid) may have been exacerbated by the weak pre EbD phase (see section 7.3). Yet it was not just the Council officer who was disappointed in the EbD and what it actually delivered. As indicated above, many stakeholders expected it to do more and have a much greater community and social focus. The question is why?

Reasons for High Expectations

There are a number of possible reasons for the unrealised expectations. As noted above, the lack of pre-workshops meant that the purpose and nature of an EbD was not explained to the local community until a week prior to the event. Then, notification came via local newspapers and a letter, rather than directly by way of a meeting or workshop. Expectations may have been more in line with actual EbD practice had full explanations occurred in a public meeting within a pre-workshop. A second reason lies in the way the process was promoted. For example, one interviewee suggested the EbD was ‘sold’ to her
agency (a joint funder of the event) on the basis of the public involvement it would achieve (Core Team W1). Given the Council’s resistance to both the EbD and the Foundation’s intervention, exaggerating the public involvement and social benefits of an EbD may have been one strategy adopted by the Foundation to try to gain the Council’s commitment to the EbD. The way that rhetoric was used in relation to the EbD in the *Summary Report* is consistent with this argument. Where it details the preferred delivery mechanism it infers the EbD masterplan was a community led vision. The report stated that the:

... need following the determination of a community led vision is to ensure community led implementation. The community cannot be excluded again from the rejuvenation and renaissance of their social, economic and environmental well-being (Prince’s Foundation 2005b:6.4).

That the EbD was community led overstates the situation. As already noted, the way in which community was signified (in relation to consensus and as homogeneously pro heritage) was problematic. One public meeting prior to the development of the masterplan did not equate to a community led process for many interviewees. For the Foundation, the representation and stakeholder involvement on the core team was deemed sufficient to describe the creation of the masterplan as community led.

The third reason for unrealised expectations lies in the promotion and description of the three tiers of involvement. The tiered approach specifies that landowners were included in the core team (Prince’s Foundation 2005a). For Whitefield, the landowners within the study area of the EbD (see Figure 7.5) were a large number of local residents as owner occupiers. Whitefield property owners were relegated to tier C. As in the Newquay case, the term landowner was signified as those with developable land. So in the case of Whitefield, Pendle Borough Council, English Partnerships, and the heritage organisation that owned Lomeshaye Bridge Mill and St Mary’s Church were landowners for the purposes of Core team membership. However, local home owners were not. Again the effect of development proposals on minor landowners was not given significance. There was no adaptation of the standard form of an EbD to take account of the potentially greater or at least different impact of a regeneration project on home owners in contrast with the impact of a greenfield project.

Fourth, the purpose of the EbD and the antagonistic context may have contributed to high expectations. The intention to break the deadlock (Council Officer W1) and find a solution to the stalemate (Dewhurst 2004:2) suggested as much an emphasis on social and political aspects for conflict resolution as on a physical improvement of the environment and housing. Moreover, as already noted, in the context of the antagonism, the EbD became
symbolised as the solution or saviour of Whitefield’s problems (see section 7.3). Thus the expectations of what the EbD could achieve were high at the outset.

Finally, interview data reported in the foregoing analysis revealed an expectation that the EbD would empower local residents, build capacity and engage them. The concept of empowering and enabling local communities to take responsibility and ownership of the regeneration processes in their neighbourhoods has been a part of urban policy rhetoric for some time (see Imrie and Raco 2003a). The presence of such discursive articulations may explain why it was expected in Whitefield. However, there appears to be no space in the EbD for capacity building at the level of the community which might have been required in the Whitefield context given the complexity of the case and the nature of the local community. The Foundation’s focus for capacity building was directed towards those implementing the regeneration programme. For example, through EbDs and working with local authorities and agencies like Elevate, a design team member stated:

It’s almost [like] we’re empowering [local authorities] to take control over their own destiny, ... they delegate responsibility left, right and centre to high street consultancies because they either don’t want to take responsibility or they don’t have the in-house skill ... the majority do have the in-house skill but they are just so pressurised with bureaucracy that they don’t know how to use it ... and that’s where the Foundation comes in and helps to give them a different perspective ... [then] we are heading deeply into our education principles of building capacity in the region and getting people to think differently about [urban restructuring] (Design Team W1).

Thus, the decision-makers, funders and agency representatives who would be instrumental in implementing the urbanist scheme were those targeted for capacity building and whose engagement was deemed important. So like Newquay, there is some primacy given to tiers A and B at the expense of local knowledge, a point considered further in Chapter Eight.

**Flawed Application or Flawed Process?**

A key question in terms of the inclusivity of the Whitefield EbD is whether the failings identified above and the unrealised expectations were the result of the weak pre-EbD phase or the result of a flaw in the process. This is a difficult question. The Foundation recognised the weaknesses and attributed them to poor preparation. Of course hindsight provides a nuanced perspective. Had pre-workshops been undertaken, would they have addressed the barriers and representation issues raised in the foregoing analysis? An additional public meeting for tier C participants prior to the event may have moderated their expectations. It may also have allowed the core team to become familiar with the Asian young men’s
position prior to the workshop. However, unless the format of the public meeting was altered, outreach work undertaken to facilitate the participation of Muslim women, and translators provided, the same barriers would have prevailed. In the absence of a similar case with which to compare performance, it remains unclear whether the weaknesses in inclusivity are attributable to poor performance or an inherent flaw in the process. Nevertheless, the way in which community was signified and concomitantly, representatives selected raises questions as to how these terms are problematised in the urbanist discourse. These points are revisited in Chapter Eight. In the meantime, the following section returns to a significant component of that complexity which was the relationship between Pendle Borough Council and Elevate on the one hand and the Foundation and heritage lobby on the other. That ‘old’ antagonism was still very much entrenched at the beginning of the EbD week, and permeated the process, as the following sub-section shows.

### 7.4.3 Old Antagonism

There were three key themes that emerged in relation to the ‘old antagonism’. The first concerned a subtle shift in the antagonism between the pro and anti demolition groups from an entrenched polarised conflict operating on a logic of equivalence (see section 7.3), to a less confrontational tension between different groups. So while the logic of equivalence was very much apparent at the beginning of the week, there was evidence that the chain of identities on both sides expanded, and consequently, asserted their own positions, which in turn resulted in the antagonism being less confrontational and polarised (see Chapter Three). Concomitantly, at the EbD workshop, the urbanist discourse became more dominant. However, as the urbanist discourse became more dominant tensions between the Foundation and Elevate also remained evident, albeit to a lesser degree. This comprises the second theme of this sub-section. Finally, the dominance of the urbanist discourse resulted in a challenge from some members of the core team that the outcomes in the masterplan were predetermined.

### Equivalence to Difference

Several interviewees agreed that the EbD for Whitefield achieved its intention of moving the debate beyond the impasse of the Public Inquiry. For example, a Council officer stated:

> We unlocked the deadlock, we got people talking to each other, we got the thing moved forward on a rational basis and we had an end result out of it in terms of the EbD report which … we could all look to for future work (Council Officer W1).
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Even those who strongly criticised certain aspects of the process felt that it could not be faulted in terms of the work that was done and the way it ‘pull[s] together these experts and they are all in one room together and they are all talking together’ (Core Team W1). In particular, the mechanisms within the design sessions were considered to be valuable as a means of resolving conflict. For example, a Council officer suggested the design sessions were ‘a good way of getting everybody around the table hearing everybody’s different views, ... [and] working with a team of professionals’ (Council Officer W2). Similarly, an agency representative suggested that having all the different stakeholders:

... working so closely together and exchanging ideas and getting an in depth understanding of the concerns, but then accepting what was needed for the perception of the area to change was a very good way of, I suppose, reaching a compromise (Core Team W2).

These statements suggest that the workshop space involved characteristics of collaborative or deliberative discussions (see Chapter Two). It illustrates how participants who had been entrenched in the two opposing poles of the prior antagonism were beginning to be open to other ideas.

In addition, the different heritage groups were beginning to rearticulate their own identities and the range of differences in the meanings they attributed to the heritage of Whitefield were starting to emerge. One local resident noted that ‘there’s some very, very strong heritage people, who want the look of the houses changed relatively little ... others are not quite so strict’ and were willing to alter back streets to create open space and small gardens, ‘but to the conservationists that’s a real bone of contention’ (Councillor W1). Similarly, a Council officer noted the range of positions that came together in the EbD: from ‘heritage purism’ to a mix of conservation and demolition through to the view that the housing type was ‘obsolete’ and should be entirely demolished (Council Officer W1). He suggested that ‘we weren’t ever going to get a solution if both sides of the argument just stood to their guns and would not move’ and as a direct result of the EbD there ‘has [now] been a compromise somewhere along the line’ (ibid). Others noted that while there ‘was polarisation’ at the start of the week, it had started to ‘dissolve a little’ toward the end (Core Team W4). Others agreed that the conflict had been resolved to some extent (Core Team W2; Agency W1; Foundation 1).

For the most part the equivalential positions of the CPO antagonism and the period leading up the EbD had shifted toward more differential relationships between different players and positions. Despite the shift, a residue of conflict remained between Elevate and the Council on the one hand, and the urbanist discourse on the other.
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The Council, Elevate and the Foundation

The Council sought to regenerate Whitefield into a sustainable community in accordance with the Government’s urban policy agenda (see ODPM 2003), by making it into a place where ‘people will choose to go and live … in which they will get modern and decent standards of housing’ (Council Officer W1). As noted in section 7.3, Pendle Borough Council was in a difficult position going into the EbD workshop. Moreover, their discomfort was evident to other core team members. For example, an agency representative recalled that the Council were ‘committed’ but ‘a bit bruised’ from the failed compulsory purchase (Core Team W4). Similarly, a Foundation representative thought that:

The local authority put a lot of effort actually into the Enquiry by Design, they tried very hard to be positive in it, in times when things did get frustrating for them during the EbD, but they did try very hard from an officer perspective to genuinely feed into the process, they did try to get as much out of it as they could (Design Team W1).

Despite the effort on the part of the Council, another Foundation representative recalled that ‘there was a lot of antagonism towards us [from some Council officers and] … the pathfinder as well’ (Urbanist 2). Furthermore, he suggested that throughout the process, the Council was continually defensive and very difficult to work with (ibid). From the Council’s perspective however (as noted in section 7.3), there was a sense that the Foundation were intervening, ‘parachuting in’ like ‘do gooders’ (Council Officer W1).

It is evident that one Foundation representative was aware that the Council felt this way, and that the Prince of Wales’ involvement was potentially problematic. He suggested that when the Foundation works with people at the request of the Prince, ‘sometimes it’s better than others’ (Urbanist 2). So while the Council felt that the Foundation and the Prince of Wales intervened, the Prince of Wales sought to provide assistance for the local communities that were seen to be in need. Irrespective of the fee the Foundation charged for their work, they were enacting the Prince’s beneficent intention, to actively care and do good by the communities of Whitefield (see Silk 1998; Smith 1998; 2000).

Others in the design team provided further evidence of ongoing tension between Elevate and the Foundation. For example, one team member indicated Elevate was ‘completely myopic’ and ‘obsessed with achieving a net reduction in housing numbers, absolutely obsessed’ (Design Team W1, emphasis original). He added that it was ‘extremely disappointing’ and demonstrated ‘that they were hell bent on demolition numbers, despite the fact that the language, the spin, is not about demolition’ (ibid). This design team member was negative about the whole Housing Market Renewal policy:

228
This is only one step away from implementing the same housing policy as that of Robert Mugabi, the only difference between the HMR policy in this country and Robert Mugabi’s is that at least we’re waiting till we rehouse people before we knock the houses down (ibid).

Another design team member was similarly critical of Elevate, suggesting ‘they were awful … dreadful’ and that:

The only thing we could try and do with them was to persuade them, because they obviously, you know, were like rabbits caught in the headlights. … they desperately need[ed] to get it right … they knew they would get more kudos [from Government] if they could sweep [the terraces] away and put [in] lots of nice noddy houses … whereas our argument to them was okay, well you know, here we’ve got something where on the face of it there are x number of households. If we do all the things that the community want, which is to help them to do some [lateral conversions], some clearance, some new build. Well we did an analysis that showed that we got less houses with higher values on the site. And so that is restructuring the housing market. But they weren’t terribly convinced or able to engage with it (Design Team W3).

However, an Elevate representative was similarly dissatisfied with parts of the process and the Foundation’s role, particularly in regard to inclusivity (see section 7.3.2). The tone of her criticisms against aspects of the EbD process was similar to those statements made by design team members against Elevate (Core Team W1). While there was no explicit disapproval of the concept of lateral conversions and conservation rather than demolition, disapproval was implicit in the interview. She reiterated twice that the masterplan involved ‘minimum demolition, that’s what the community wanted’ – the quick justification for ‘minimum demolition’ lay in the community’s wishes, rather than that it was the most appropriate solution. She also described some of the proposals in the masterplan as ‘exciting’, but omitted the idea of lateral conversions in her list: ‘A marina on the canal and opportunities you know to really develop it. Mixed use in the mill etcetera, etcetera’ (ibid). Thus, while she accepted the direction the EbD had taken, disapproval of certain features of the masterplan was implicit and remained connected to Elevate’s original position in the antagonism. So for Elevate, the chain of equivalence expanded, but only slightly.

The data above reveal further indications that the chain of equivalence was expanding – differential positions were articulated. Rather than the condensed pro or anti demolition views being expressed and perceived in the EbD (although clearly that was still evident to some extent), the Housing Market Renewal pathfinder was articulating its agenda to restructure the housing market, while the Council was articulating its position in making Whitefield a place where people want to live and work, providing choices and regenerating the area in line with the sustainable communities agenda. Nevertheless, the basis for the
alignment of the two positions is also evident. In articulating two aspects of the Government’s urban policy agenda there was overlap in the two positions, as one Council officer notes, ‘the [Housing Market Renewal] thing does kind of overlap very strongly with what we are trying to achieve’ in Pendle (Council Officer W1). So while the chain of signification was expanding, there was still a strong link between the local authority and Elevate. Yet at a discursive level, further complications lie in the overlaps between the urbanist agenda and the sustainable communities urban policy (see Chapter Five; Foundation 1, 2; Urbanist 2). While those two discourses overlap in a variety of significations for ‘sustainable community’, the urbanist discourse lies in opposition to the Housing Market Renewal discourse. The Housing Market Renewal discourse understands terraced housing as obsolete, and as causing the failure of towns and communities in parts of the north of England. Whereas, the urbanist discourse signifies terraced housing in Whitefield as an opportunity to create good sustainable urbanism. It was this articulation of the sustainability of Whitefield that was dominant at the EbD.

The Urbanist Discourse

Throughout the EbD workshop, it was evident that the urbanist discourse was dominant. A handful of interviewees noted that there was a degree of pre-determination in the outcomes. For example, one local resident involved in the core team stated ‘to some degree I felt that the Prince’s Foundation team had made their minds up as to what was required’ (Councillor W1). This view was fundamentally connected to the feeling of being heard – ‘it took some persuading to put [the residents’] views across’ (ibid). Furthermore she stated she was:

... eventually listened to but it was very difficult to get my point across ... in other words the residents’ views and understandings of the situation was not accepted, it was a hard fight, like I say, if you were a wall flower you were not going to be heard (ibid).

As indicated above, this perception of the process was shared by a member of the group of Asian young men (Resident W2; see section 7.4.1). Two agency representatives similarly sensed a degree of pre-determination in the outcomes. One stated ‘I have no doubt that there was a steer toward conservation but clearly that was why the Prince’s Foundation were involved’ (Council Officer W4). A County Council officer argued that:

The agenda was set before the week and issues that [my colleagues] raised that were new were listened to but never picked up. The agenda that was set was quite adamant, it was set with quite strong views. This needs to happen. ... the agenda was set and the agenda was set out at the end and nothing changed in between, the
agenda was taken forward. That was their view. It was felt it was a fait accompli (Council Officer W6).

These groups did not feel that what they said in the EbD workshop sessions was influential. This was particularly the case for Lancashire County Council and was indicative of a slight antagonism between the County Council and Foundation. Two County Council officers suggested that the Foundation did not ‘listen to the constraints’ (Council Officer W5) and that the proposal raised unrealistic expectations about what it was possible to achieve (Council Officer W6). One example involved the Foundation’s proposal to open up the traffic system to make it more permeable and connected. However, a County officer was concerned that the Foundation ‘didn’t have … a knowledge of local issues and some of the background to the particular issues in Lancashire and some of the County’s policies on things like traffic calming and casualty reduction and so on’ (Council Officer W5).

One member of the core team was particularly concerned that if care was not taken in balancing different knowledges then managing the process could be very difficult (Design Team W3). He suggested that the professionals needed to be open, listen, and learn from local knowledge. In particular, the interpretation and presentation of information required care given that:

When presentations are made [to the public] they tend to be drawn up by the professionals and if the professionals aren’t open and don’t hear and don’t have time to learn, then I think you get all sorts of things coming through that really aren’t participatory. And my, I suppose my underlying worry is that a lot of the people who are involved in EbDs haven’t spent much time exploring what user participation means in design in particular, and they aren’t very sensitive towards it. And you know [they] have all the signs of wanting to do what people want, but then also what you get is, and one of the things that I believe fundamentally is that you do have to put forward physical proposals to prompt reactions … but you do have to push the bounds a little because if you don’t actually suggest that there are other ways of doing things, then people only have the one frame of reference. But if you [do] that in such a way that you are actually just peddling a few, a variety of your favourite designs I think that there are real problems (Design Team W3).

There are several important points to note from this extract. First, the role and significance of local knowledge is crucial to ensuring that the process is inclusive and addresses the power imbalance between expert and lay people. Yet, as shown in section 7.4.2, given the context in Whitefield, the means for achieving local knowledge was not extensive.

The second point is that the interviewee expressed concern that often, there was a lack of sensitivity and knowledge about just what user participation means. The reference to user participation links to a discourse of community architecture, prominent in the 1970s and 80s in which end users of the built environment participated in its design (for example, Scott and
Chapter 7 – The Whitefield Case Study – From Deadlock to Regeneration

Jenks 1986; Sneddon and Theobald 1987; Towers 1995). Furthermore, the design team member suggested that a much more ‘pernicious’ result of this kind of insensitivity to participation arises where beliefs and value systems held by experts come into play and dominate over local beliefs and values (Design Team W3). The interviewee implied this occurred in relation to the specific housing needs of Asian residents, but he was unwilling to elaborate. However, a similar characteristic was noted by other core team members in regard to an architect engaged by the Foundation, ‘who listened least’, particularly in regard to Asian housing needs (Councillor W1). Council officers also suggested that ‘there were one or two people that the Foundation brought along that were a bit off the wall’ (Council Officer W1) and ‘there were others that if we were running one again ... we’d ask [the Foundation] not to bring particularly on the architectural side’ (Council Officer W2) – sentiments reflected in further comments by another Council Officer (Council Officer W3).

The third point in relation to the extract above, is that without taking account of the particularity of the locale and its inhabitants, there is a risk that the process becomes an opportunity to ‘peddle’ design favourites. In the case where there is a strong ideology guiding design principles, this risk is heightened, and may lead to the charge that outcomes are predetermined. There is a case to be made in relation to the first and third points that arise from the design team members’ comments about local and expert knowledge – to reiterate those points: a lack of sensitivity to and experience of user participation principles and peddling favourite designs. These points will be taken up in Chapter Eight as both cases revealed issues with inclusivity of local knowledge and perceptions of predetermination. In the meantime, the following section concludes the discussion of the EbD workshop phase for Whitefield.

7.4.4 Towards Regeneration?

The EbD workshop provided a political space in which antagonism operating on a logic of equivalence developed into a more differential logic. The shared pro- or anti-demolition positions of different identities and subject positions on each side of the antagonistic frontier, that formed as a result of the Compulsory Purchase dislocation expanded to articulate a range of different interests and agendas. Figure 7.9 reveals the different discourses that came into play in the EbD political space. The Prince’s Foundation had initiated a central role for itself as the facilitator and organiser of the space – instrumental in how information and views were interpreted and incorporated into the masterplan. This role set it apart from the heritage lobby, thus enabling it to re-articulate
itself as a neutral body, albeit one that continued to be signified by many players as aligned with the heritage lobby. Distinctions between heritage groups marked the difference between a proposal for conservation led regeneration which accepted there might be some demolition or changes to the urban fabric while more purist groups pursued a vision of Whitefield as part of Britain’s industrial heritage that should be saved in its entirety. Funding bodies and agencies articulated their own agendas, and did so in relation to their own mandates and accountability requirements. Similarly, Pendle Borough Council articulated its goal (in line with the Government’s urban policy on sustainable communities) for Whitefield to become a place where people choose to live and work. The group of Asian young men articulated their position, drawing on assimilationist/integrationist discourses and an emerging and uncertain discourse that identified their precarious position as first generation British Asian. The group’s marginalised involvement in the EbD is marked by the dashed line. Similarly, for local residents, articulating a weak discourse of a Whitefield community were marginally involved in the EbD political space.

![Figure 7.9 – The interaction of discourses and key identities within the Whitefield EbD](image-url)
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The EbD exposed two further themes that had implications for claims to its inclusivity. First, the emergence of the antagonism with the group of Asian young men contested the articulation of the community as homogeneously anti-demolition. It alluded to the power of the Foundation in defining who is included and excluded by articulating who was representative of the community and by making claims to consensus. The power play was significant, in that it persisted even after the emergence of the antagonism. If the exclusion of the Asian young men was solely a result of poor performance of the pre-EbD phase, there should have been an evident shift in the articulation of community after the antagonism became apparent. This was not forthcoming, which may suggest that the Foundation were blind to the effect of their bias towards heritage, even though they were open about the existence of the bias.

The second point is the disjuncture between the expected level of involvement and that which occurred. Here a discourse of public participation emerged from several stakeholders in which inclusivity was defined in terms of not only providing an opportunity to be involved (via the public meetings) but of ensuring that the opportunities were appropriate to the context. The issue becomes one of capacity and appropriate methods for the locality (see Chapter Two). However, for the urbanist discourse and the Foundation, they sought to build the capacity of the ‘experts’ rather than the locals. From the locals, the Foundation sought local knowledge. Despite these two weaknesses, the EbD did allow the antagonism to be transformed into more agonistic relations, and thereby ‘break the deadlock’ as intended. Yet, there was evidence the transformation was vulnerable in the post EbD phase as positions once more tended towards antagonism.

7.5 Post-EbD

The Whitefield EbD Summary Report (Prince’s Foundation 2005b), written by a Foundation representative, outlines a delivery mechanism that proposed the establishment of a partnership body that would make decisions on the implementation of the masterplan and Whitefield’s regeneration. However, it was not until November 2005 that the partnership was formally launched. The apparent lull aggravated the already vulnerable relationship between the Foundation and the Council, which had improved during the EbD. This section explores the progress towards implementation that occurred between the EbD in November 2004 and the middle of 2006, focusing on the relationships between the key players in the EbD.
Figure 7.10 – The masterplan for Whitefield, as shown in the final public meeting and in the EbD Summary Report (Source: Prince’s Foundation 2005b)

Table 7.6 – Summary of the proposals contained within the masterplan and the Summary Report (Prince’s Foundation 2005b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Site</td>
<td>A mixed use creative quarter&lt;br&gt;Five workshop/light industrial units&lt;br&gt;Live-work units (cross-section across two terraces, backyard separating work and home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront area</td>
<td>Open and redevelop canal corridor&lt;br&gt;New moorings&lt;br&gt;Housing fronting canal&lt;br&gt;Potential for café/bar and retail mixed uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>Open street network to enhance connectivity to original historic form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block layouts and housing refurbishments (whole of study area)</td>
<td>Maintain blocks&lt;br&gt;Reconfigure backstreets for garden/open space and car parking&lt;br&gt;Rebuild back walls, relay cobbles&lt;br&gt;Improve infrastructure including water supply and drainage&lt;br&gt;Exterior and interior modernisation and repair maintaining exterior form and appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Market Restructuring (whole of study area)</td>
<td>82 new build 2 bedroom apartments&lt;br&gt;158 2 bedroom refurbishments&lt;br&gt;262 3 bedroom refurbishments&lt;br&gt;226 4/5/6 bedroom conversion&lt;br&gt;Total of 886 units with a net loss of 222 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public open space</td>
<td>3 new squares and open and landscape Groves Hotel grounds&lt;br&gt;Improved public realm including Canal corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Leisure facilities</td>
<td>New Community Resource Centre, including Women’s centre, youth centre, senior citizens centre, and nursery with children’s play area.&lt;br&gt;New cricket nets, improve sports playing fields, and children’s play areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use and retail on Every street</td>
<td>Specialised Asian shopping precinct along Every Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To situate the discussion, Figure 7.10 presents the masterplan and Table 7.6 outlines the core elements of the proposals. The masterplan shows that the detailed proposals were primarily for the original clearance areas. In particular, proposals focus on Phase I, the Peninsula Site which contains two disused mills – Lomeshaye Bridge Mill and Whitefield Mill – and surrounding terraces. The report provided little more detail of the proposals than that contained within Table 7.6. However, it does outline costings of the proposals as an initial feasibility statement. In addition it discusses a length but with little specificity a proposed delivery vehicle. This delivery vehicle and the months preceding its inauguration are the focus of the following two sections. Data relating to the relationships between Council and the Foundation provide further evidence of the shifting nature of both the power plays and the discourses that frame them. Two themes emerged in this period. The first theme reveals how the tension between the Foundation and the Council became polarised again after the EbD. The second theme focuses on how the delivery vehicle was established and suggests a subsequent shift back toward a logic of difference once the specific vehicle for collaboration had been established.

7.5.1 The Foundation and Pendle Borough Council

Two inter-related features of the relationship between Council and the Foundation were indicative of ongoing tension. First, the Council expressed concern at the quality of the report and supplementary material. Second, and relatedly, there was a disjuncture between how each organisation viewed the process of implementation and the necessary steps to progress the masterplan. These two points are explored below.

The Summary Report and the Masterplan

After the EbD workshop the Council remained dissatisfied at the Foundation’s performance. In the post EbD period their concerns arose on two levels. The first source of dissatisfaction lay in the Foundation’s follow-up to the EbD. For example, an officer stated ‘one of my quibbles with the Prince’s Foundation is that we’ve not had very much in terms of electronic version[s]’ (Council Officer Wl). Furthermore, he revealed ‘we’ve not been very happy with the follow up services because it has been very hard to get information subsequently’ (ibid). The Summary Report was released to Council four months after the event, which was considered ‘a long time’ by one agency representative (Core Team W1). Moreover, the report was a fairly unpolished document, with typing errors, signs of partial
editing, overly small plan reproductions often with an illegible legend or none at all, and lacked clarity in some sections. Of the report, one Council officer commented, that it was:

... quite simplistic. And it’s not a detailed action plan as such, more of an aspirational plan. I am trying not to use the words a wish-list, but its more than that and there is some good solid stuff in it. But there is a heck of a lot of work to be done to, between that and making it a reality, turning it into a sort of programme of action and putting the funding together to secure all that (Council Officer W1).

From this quote it is evident that the Council identified the role of both the masterplan and the Summary Report as instruments from which to begin to explore what might be possible for Whitefield in the future, including whether that vision was feasible and if so, how it could be implemented. The Foundation also recognised that:

The Enquiry by Design produces a particular product, so we don’t go back and sanitise that product, it’s with the intention that you move forward into a further phase of developing that plan and evolving those individual propositions (Design Team W1).

However, the distinction here lies in the Council’s use of the term ‘aspiration’ and the Foundation’s use of ‘individual propositions’ in ‘that plan’. So the Foundation understood the masterplan as a blueprint for action, the vision that must be enacted and the Summary Report was a ‘Framework Plan’ with which to implement the vision (Design Team W1). In contrast, the Council viewed the masterplan as a guide from which to move forward with regenerating Whitefield. This disjuncture between the Foundation’s and the Council’s respective views on implementation is explored further below.

Articulating the Next Steps

The tension between the Council and the Foundation emerged again in each organisation’s articulations for the next steps of the process. Interestingly, a Foundation representative was aware of the disjuncture between the Council’s and the Foundation’s conceptions of how the implementation phase should proceed. He suggested that he:

... very often [got] the impression that [local authorities] don’t understand what they’ve got at the end of [the EbD] because they’ve got this plan, they’ve got this report, and if we’re not there to lead them they revert back to type (Design Team W1).

However, the failing, according to the Foundation, was based on a lack of understanding and capacity by Council to implement the vision, rather than any problem with the documentation provided to the Council at the conclusion of the EbD. For example, the Council was accused of:

... making executive unilateral decisions to commission consultants to do work based on the EbD framework plan [which] I think is very dangerous, because [the
local authority] don’t understand what the framework plan really is, they don’t understand how to deliver within the market forces so we need to have this mechanism in place quickly (ibid).

Thus, the Foundation considered that its ongoing involvement was essential to maintain the momentum of the EbD and to ensure the masterplan was implemented faithfully (ibid; Foundation 1). But the statement above also illustrates that the Foundation was critical of Council’s ability to implement the masterplan as envisioned. In addition, the unique nature of the Foundation and its confidence in the value of the services they offer is also evident.

The relationship between the Foundation and the Council in this phase of the process mirrored the pre-EbD phase, where Council resisted the Foundation’s intervention. For example, given the Foundation’s poor performance of the pre-EbD phase and the inadequate production of follow-up material (Council Officers W1, W2; see section 7.3), it is not wholly surprising that the Council was unwilling to engage the Foundation to implement the proposals. In the private sector, an organisation with a high level of dissatisfaction at a consultant’s performance would be unlikely to negotiate a further contract. Moreover, the not a consultant role of the Foundation (see section 7.3.1) and their desire to remain involved for the good of Whitefield creates some ambiguity. It seems that the Foundation could charge consultant’s prices – because the seniority of their staff means costs were high (Design Team W1) – but they were exempt from performing to the same standard that might be expected of a consultancy.

The Foundation’s remit ended once the report and supplementary information was provided. The establishment of a Steering Group and the subsequent decision-making that occurred prior to the formal establishment of the Whitefield Regeneration Partnership excluded the Foundation. This exclusion was considered to be a weakness of the EbD process and was something the Foundation was seeking to address for the future (Design Team W1, Foundation 1). A design team member acknowledged that it was very difficult given that ‘EbDs aren’t cheap’ and to go on engaging the Foundation as a consultant begins to add up (Design Team W1). Nevertheless, an improvement in the supplementary material and the quality and detail of the Summary Report may have been sufficient to enable the local authority to implement the masterplan effectively.

The Foundation was very critical of the steps the Council took in the period up to the inauguration of the Partnership – that is from December 2004 to December 2005. The nature of the criticisms revealed both the patronising approach of the Foundation toward Pendle
Council and the nature of the two different approaches each organisation had for taking implementation forward. A Foundation representative stated:

[The Council are] not following it through in the way that [they should], they think they are following it through, they really do think that they are following it through the way that they should be. They don’t, they can’t see that they have reverted back to the default setting straight away by giving it to consultants (Design Team W1).

The Foundation representative suggested that the next step was to hold ‘a series of workshops’ to put ‘planning mechanisms’ or a ‘planning framework’ in place, by way of ‘supplementary planning guidance’ or a ‘development code’ (ibid). Then, ‘a clear vision [is] enshrined within the planning process that cannot be watered down by anyone’ (ibid). The Foundation sought to control the final built form through the use of planning instruments and codes. They emphasised the importance of ensuring the development was implemented as envisioned and not ‘watered down’. The question of funding could be addressed later: ‘you don’t necessarily have to have any funding, you know, you can tap into funding’ (ibid).

In contrast, the Council and funding agencies were particularly concerned that what was proposed in the masterplan was feasible and that funding ought to be secured along with an actionable and detailed delivery plan prior to any development controls being put in place. The Council had endorsed the masterplan in principle (Core Team W1), ‘subject to, obviously, more detailed work going on around [the feasibility of] specific things’ (Council Officer W2). Key decisions that were undertaken in the period and subsequently by the Council and funding agencies are outlined in Table 7.7. First, the Steering Group was established, which then commissioned a feasibility study by consultants to explore the actual costs of proposals within the masterplan. Several smaller projects followed, including the conversion of a terrace by Registered Social Landlords, Adactus, and the initial discussions concerning an urban design competition for the original Phase I Clearance Area. This approach is consistent with the idea that for Council, the masterplan and Summary Report were a guide to future action, not a blueprint. Table 7.7 shows that contrary to perceptions of several interviewees and the Foundation (see section 7.5.2), the Steering Group were both committed to and acting on the masterplan proposals. However, for Pendle, ensuring feasibility and securing funding was a priority.

Furthermore, the Council’s concern about funding and feasibility is evident in regard to the costings of the proposal as presented at the EbD and in the Report. For example, the Report costed (conservatively) the proposals at over £114 million, when the total levels of funding available from the various agencies involved amounted to £20-25 million (Prince’s Foundation 2005b:6.3). A Council officer noted ‘the costs were absolutely phenomenal’
which might have different implications if ‘we were kind of a city centre somewhere’ but would be very difficult to raise for Whitefield (Council Officer W2). Moreover, it was the Steering Group that was instrumental in commissioning the feasibility study. For such funding organisations, feasibility studies and a more specific delivery action plan than that provided in the EbD Report may have been a requirement to justify spending and maintain accountability.

Table 7.7 – Timeline of events and proposals as they emerged in the period between the EbD in November 2004 and June 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event/Proposal</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>EbD Summary Report released</td>
<td>Written by Foundation staff. Published on the Council’s website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 2005</td>
<td>Steering Group established</td>
<td>Comprised of Pendle Borough Council, English Partnerships, Elevate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Heritage, the Commission for Architecture and the Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment (CABE), and the Housing Corporation (Council Officer W1;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core Team W5, W2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 2005</td>
<td>Extension of the St Mary’s Conservation Area</td>
<td>The Public Inquiry and the EbD argued that the existing Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>area was too small and tokenistic. It was proposed that it should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>include the whole of the study area as shown in Figure 7.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 2005</td>
<td>Feasibility Study Commissioned</td>
<td>Completed late 2005. Commissioned by English Partnerships and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Group to explore the feasibility of the proposals in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>masterplan (Council Officer W1, W2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 2005</td>
<td>Adactus project initiated</td>
<td>Discussions underway between the Council and the development arm of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adactus housing (a registered social landlord) to convert a terrace on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every Street (in original Phase I Clearance Area) to provide an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplar in lateral conversions for social housing. Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 2005</td>
<td>Phase I Competition initiated</td>
<td>A competition was held by CABE in conjunction with the Steering group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to design a regeneration project for the Phase I Clearance area that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>complied with criteria established in the EbD, and to encourage private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sector investment to develop the area as an exemplar in regeneration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The competition was announced in December 2005, a shortlist selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in January 2006, and a winner announced in April 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Whitefield Regeneration Partnership established</td>
<td>Comprised of 15 seats including an independent chair, Lord Shutt of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greeland, three Pendle Borough Councillors, two private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>representatives, two Whitefield community representatives, and one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>representative each from Elevate, a Registered Social Landlord, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>heritage sector, the Northwest Development Agency, English Partnerships,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Prince’s Foundation and the Whitefield Community Forum. In addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Partnership has advisors that include Pendle Borough Council and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lancashire County Council officers, English Heritage and CABE who are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>invited to meetings but are not entitled to vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Whitefield Community Forum established</td>
<td>A community forum for Whitefield to keep residents informed of progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>on the regeneration of Whitefield and to provide an information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>channel for residents to give their views and raise concerns. The Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>holds monthly meetings open to all residents. It also has a chair and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a committee with representation on the Whitefield Regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership. The Forum has Council officer support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2006</td>
<td>Civitas workshop</td>
<td>Peninsula site workshop run by the Prince’s Foundation. Purpose to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>revisit the EbD masterplan proposals for the peninsula site, test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>viability and develop further ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The tension outlined above between the Foundation and Pendle Council, was caused by two different understandings of the role of the *Summary Report* and the masterplan in the delivery process, and an ongoing mutual resistance between the two organisations. Council continued to resist the Foundation’s involvement in Whitefield. Conversely, the Foundation continued to express doubt on the Council’s capacity to implement the masterplan. However, there was nothing in the *Summary Report* that specified that the next steps for action were to embed the masterplan in the planning system, rather than to assess the feasibility and available funding for progressing proposals. Rather, the Report outlined a delivery framework in fairly general terms, which was eventually installed by way of the Whitefield Regeneration Partnership – the subject of the following section.

7.5.2 *The Delivery Mechanism*

The delivery vehicle proposed at the EbD involved establishing a partnership body – ‘a Charitable Foundation or trust with board membership drawn from the project partners, the business network and community representation’ and led by an independent chair (Prince’s Foundation 2005b: 6.4). In mid 2005, a Foundation representative displayed his concern at Council’s apparent reticence in establishing the partnership. He claimed that the method of delivery was agreed to by:

... all those who participated in the Enquiry by Design, all of them endorsed the [delivery] framework, all of them endorsed the delivery vehicle, and even the Council endorsed the delivery vehicle. But they failed to deliver on it (Design Team W1).

The Foundation representative believed, that in order to maintain the momentum of the EbD, ‘we have got to get this thing up and running now, it should’ve been done, should’ve been up and running now’ – a view shared by another core team member from a heritage organisation (Core Team W5). Yet the Council was more equivocal about the delivery vehicle proposed. The EbD report recorded their position, stating the Council sought ‘to retain elements of control over the redevelopment and to avoid a duplication of resources with the creation of any new delivery structure’ (Prince’s Foundation 2005b:6.2.3). In July 2005, a Council officer reiterated this position, stating that they were establishing the Whitefield Regeneration Partnership in which various groups will:

... be represented including the community, including the heritage lobby, including the funders, public agencies and so on, and we will establish that as a partnership body where the Council will be the accountable body, we’ll handle the cash. And that body will be the one that has ownership of the final delivery plan when it’s devised and that body will be the one that decides on what happens where and so on (Council Officer W1).
The key distinction between Council’s approach and the Foundation’s lay in the appointment of an independent chair. Council were clear in mid 2005 that:

[The Partnership] won’t be entirely independent. I mean one of the things I think the Prince’s Foundation wanted to see was a completely independent regeneration body there. You know, I’ll be frank. We didn’t want that because we would see that as competing with Pendle Borough Council for funding and we think it is absolutely vital that if we [do our job which] is to bring about the strategic regeneration of the whole of the Borough of Pendle and the whole of the town of Nelson and not just one bit of it, so the last thing we want is a Whitefield body you know competing with us (Council Officer W1).

Rather than establish the partnership immediately as per the Foundation’s preference, it evolved from the Steering Group over the space of a year. Several decisions were taken by the Steering Group on projects and the commissioning of work in that period (see Table 7.7). So through the Steering Group, the Council were operating collaboratively with other agencies including funding bodies, English Heritage, CABE and the Housing Corporation. A great deal was put in place in that year in which Council and funding agencies maintained control, thus allowing the Council, Elevate and English Partnerships to set up the direction that the Partnership would follow before relinquishing its authority to a more independent body.

However, during this period, there was still uncertainty expressed by other agency representatives and local residents. For example, several local residents were concerned at the apparent lack of action, claiming Council were ‘dragging their legs (Core Team W7) and that ‘something should be happening’ (Resident W4). An older couple interviewed suggested ‘we might be shoving up daisies by the time anything happens’ (Resident W3). So while the Council were working on implementation, they were not communicating it to local residents, which was a further bone of contention from the Foundation. Similarly, a heritage body representative expressed concern at the ‘tightrope balancing act’ that was evident as to:

... which way is it going to fall, you know, are the Council going to go for something completely detached which will only happen if the funding agencies say we want our money, this is how it is going to have to be. Nobody’s been prepared to push the boat out that far so the way it is leaning at the moment is ah Pendle Council want to go down evolving the Steering Group into a delivery agency so basically they’re saying, we’ll produce an action plan which will evolve from the EbD process and that action plan will then be devolved [to a delivery agency] (Core Team W5).

Interestingly, the delivery mechanism that was finally established in November 2005, a full year after the EbD, did involve an independent chair and a Foundation representative. The overall purpose of the Partnership was to ‘bring together the public, private, voluntary
and community sectors to work for a community and heritage led regeneration of the Whitefield area to provide it with a long term sustainable future’ (Whitefield Regeneration Partnership 2006). The following month, December 2005, the Whitefield Community Forum was established, which served to link the Council and the Regeneration Partnership with residents of Whitefield (Whitefield Community Forum 2006). So although it took some time to establish, the final delivery mechanism was similar to that proposed in the EbD.

7.5.3 Vulnerable Truce?

The Foundation’s negativity about the Council’s ability and intention to deliver the masterplan revealed two characteristics of the post-EbD period. First, it revealed the enduring nature of the prior antagonism, in which the Foundation was involved as a part of the heritage lobby. The reconciliation that developed in the EbD workshop was vulnerable and consequently, reverted to polarised positions as soon as each party failed to perform as expected. Second, the two discourses of urban regeneration and urbanism interacted uneasily. Two very different ways of operating were evident. The use of codes and a regulatory framework to ensure the built form adheres to the urbanist vision is a fundamental part of realising the urban design principles of the urbanist discourse on the ground. However, funding agencies tend to be confined by policy and regulatory frameworks to ensure accountability in the way that they allocate and spend money. In order to receive that funding the Council was, to some extent, string fixed to those frameworks.

Overall throughout the period up to the formalisation of the Whitefield Regeneration Partnership, there was a re-emergence of the antagonism between the Council and the Foundation. Figure 7.11 shows how the political space was once again divided. As one Council officer noted, at the EbD there was ‘movement on both sides’ however eight months later he was ‘a little sceptical about that still’ (Council Officer W1). Similarly, another agency representative suggested ‘I would say people still [in mid 2005] have quite polarised views’ (Core Team W5). He also suggested that in getting:

... around the table [to] actually talk to people then you can start to understand where they’re coming from and try to find a route that will satisfy everyone and it’s not always going to be possible but I think there was and still is to a certain degree a lack of understanding of where the different parties are coming from (ibid).

Despite the antagonism and that the Foundation doubted the Council’s capacity to progress the masterplan, the Steering Group achieved a significant amount in the two years after the EbD workshop (see Table 7.7). Moreover, unlike the pre-EbD phase, the antagonism did not divide the political space entirely – differential positions were still
articulated. However, because of the insular operation of the Steering Group and the precariousness of the agonistic relations established at the EbD, the two poles begin to emerge once more. A key distinction however, is that the Council and Elevate endorsed the EbD masterplan which was guided by the idea of conservation led regeneration. Thus the discourse of conservation led regeneration dominated the political space. For the most part, the funding bodies remain on one side of the divide. However, English Heritage, an identity firmly associated with the heritage lobby, maintained a position on the Steering Group as a potential funder, and thus sits astride the division.

Figure 7.11 – The interaction of discourses and key identities in the period immediately after the EbD workshop showing the re-emergence (albeit weakened) of the original antagonism

The sense of antagonism shifts again once the Whitefield Regeneration Partnership is established, as depicted in Figure 7.12. Local residents became involved via the Community Forum and representation on the Partnership. Similarly, the Prince’s Foundation found a way to become a part of the future of Whitefield by establishing a business interest in the Peninsula site and by gaining representation on the Partnership. The differential relations prevail once more as the formal structure allows each identity to articulate its vision and agenda. Moreover, heritage led regeneration dominates the entire political space, as a
discourse that anchors both the Partnership and the Community Forum. Clearly, this is only the beginning of Whitefield’s story. It remains a question for future research to see how well the Forum and the Partnership allow for agonistic relations to prevail and the effect of the power relations in operation within that agonistic space.

Figure 7.12 – The post-EbD political space after the Whitefield Regeneration Partnership and the Community Forum were established.

7.6 Shifting Antagonisms – Equivalence and Difference

The story of the Whitefield EbD, as far as it is told here, involved several shifts between logics of equivalence and difference. The final section of this chapter draws together implications of the operation of the discourses, by drawing specifically on the discourse theoretical concepts of hegemony, myth and imaginary. The dominance of the urbanist discourse in Whitefield was less conspicuous because of the equivalential nature of the antagonism (section 7.2). Consequently, the urbanist project was articulated through the hegemonising practices of the heritage lobby. Through the public inquiry process, heritage led regeneration became the mythical vision of the future of Whitefield whereby the dislocation and crisis that resulted from the CPO was sutured or repaired. The myth expanded with further demands inscribed on it through the ongoing antagonism. The EbD was proffered as one such demand, and consequently became a constituent part of the myth
as it was posed to solve the stalemate. Consequently, it was marked with high expectations of providing the solution to Whitefield’s problems (see Chapter Seven, section 7.3.2). At the end of the EbD week, the claim to consensus and the use of various articulatory techniques (artistic drawings, design, powerpoint presentations, images of good urbanism, oratory skills, etc.) universalised the myth of heritage led regeneration so that it became a collective horizon of meaning – an imaginary for how Whitefield would be in the future. However, immediately after the EbD workshop, the power base shifted from the heritage lobby to the governmental and to some extent, sedimented authority of the Council working in conjunction with funding agencies in the Steering Group (see section 7.5). Although committed to heritage led regeneration and therefore the collective imaginary created in the EbD, the Steering Group operated in isolation, diminishing the power the heritage lobby had maintained in the EbD and prior to it in the Public Inquiry process. The strength of the prior antagonism generated distrust, such that identities from the heritage lobby resisted the Council’s sedimented authority to institute a delivery mechanism. The interplay of resistance and governmental authority rendered the imaginary of heritage led regeneration vulnerable. However, once the Whitefield Regeneration Partnership was instituted the imaginary gained strength, providing certainty for the future direction of the regeneration of Whitefield.

Therefore, the hegemonic project in Whitefield was led, not by the urbanist discourse but via the heritage discourse, of which the urbanist hegemonic agents (the Prince of Wales and the Foundation) were a constituent part. Whereas, in Newquay, the Foundation and the Prince had a legitimate means of involvement through the development of Duchy land, in Whitefield, it was through the heritage lobby and the status of the Prince as an ‘agent of change’ (Design Team W3), the authority ascribed to the monarchy, its paternalism and beneficence, that the Prince and the Foundation sought their legitimate involvement. The extraordinary and sedimented nature of the British Royal discourse was evident (see section 7.3). While the Council resisted the Foundation’s involvement, they could not refuse it, and indeed implied it was acceptable as something ‘Princes of Wales do every now and then’ (see Chapter Seven, section 7.3.1). The role and status of the Prince in Whitefield was crucial to the Foundation’s involvement in the first instance and to its incorporation into the heritage lobby. Moreover, the Foundation’s involvement in the heritage lobby enabled them to articulate their urbanist discourse in a new context and thus to expand the signification associated with their urbanist project beyond greenfield sites to include regeneration and heritage projects.
Yet the dominance of the heritage lobby still operated in such a way as to exclude certain groups – the group of Asian young men in particular. Because of the strength the heritage lobby had gained through its equivalential development, meanings within the Whitefield political space were condensed, such that all subject positions articulated in the space were identified with either pro demolition or pro heritage. That is, the Council and Elevate on the pro-demolition frontier and the heritage groups and ‘community’ on the anti-demolition frontier. Therefore, any groups outside of the division, not interpellated into either frontier were outside of the political arena. As a result, the Asian young men were excluded from having their vision for Whitefield incorporated into the EbD masterplan.

However, this analysis misses a crucial point. The agency of the Foundation, and the dominance of the urbanist discourse during the EbD event would suggest that the Foundation had a role in the group’s exclusion. Arguably a commitment to an inclusive process should have identified them as a group (section 7.4.1). Yet, the Foundation claimed that the group’s omission was due to the weak front end of the process – and so was the result of poor performance rather than external or structural factors. Despite the nature and strength of the antagonism, and an understanding that it structured the social and political context in Whitefield in a particular way, the fact that the Foundation defined community as that aligned with the heritage lobby raises a concern. At the time when the exclusionary path was taken, the Foundation and the urbanist discourse were dominant, and despite extensive experience in working with communities, they failed to understand the implications of such a narrow construction of community. Nevertheless, the EbD for Whitefield revealed the potential for a deliberative arena to facilitate moving beyond a paralysing antagonism. Thus these points concerning the inclusivity of the process and its evident potential are taken up in Chapter Eight, where the research question asking what are the implications of the power relations for communicative participation is addressed.
Chapter 8
Effective Participation?

8.1 Introduction
The last two chapters have explored the details of the Enquiry by Design processes for Whitefield and Newquay and identified the key discourses and power relations revealed within each process – thereby addressing research questions one and two. In both cases, the urbanist discourse was dominant but less conspicuous in Whitefield. This chapter brings the cases together in order to discuss the findings, and to understand the implications of the power relations revealed in the previous two chapters. Therefore, it focuses on research question three which asked: what are the implications for effective participation of the operation of the power relations that arose in each case? To address this question, section 8.2 evaluates the EbDs in light of the urbanist discourse’s own articulations of its principles and in terms of the communicative ethic established in Chapter Two. Section 8.3 then turns to the issue of equality of access by problematising representation. Maintaining the theme of inclusivity, section 8.4 problematises community as a consequence of how the term was articulated in the EbDs. Subsequently, agonism and antagonism are discussed in section 8.5, before section 8.6 draws out the broad implications of the study at a variety of levels by way of conclusion.

8.2 Effective Participation?
In order to address the question of whether effective communicative participation was evident in the two EbD cases, this section evaluates each EbD in terms of the urbanist intentions established in Chapter Five and in relation to the Communicative Ethic developed in Chapter Two. The following two sub-sections discuss these topics, while the third sub-section draws together the implications of such an analysis.

8.2.1 Urbanist Participation
Both Newquay and Whitefield inevitably involved variations to the ‘typical’ EbD format – consequences of the very different nature of the two projects (greenfield and regeneration), the particularities of the localities, and the key agents involved. In each case a dominant feature stood out in this regard. For Newquay, it was the involvement of Krier, while for Whitefield, the weak pre-EbD phase and the antagonistic political context left their mark on the process as a whole. Overall, though, the core principles of the EbD as
articulated within the urbanist discourse were broadly adhered to. Table 8.1 presents the extent to which each EbD adhered to the guiding principles for process and outcome that were established in Chapter Five for urbanist participatory processes.

Table 8.1 – Synthesis of both cases assessed against broad urbanist principles established in Chapter Five.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Principles for an EbD</th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Whitefield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborative, interactive, multidisciplinary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inclusive of those who 'should be there', 'interested' or 'affected' parties (Foundation 1.2; Urbanist 2)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expert and local knowledge are integrated (Lennertz 2003)</td>
<td>Within core team. Limited in tier C</td>
<td>Within core team. Limited in tier C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design and drawing as tools for communication</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feedback loops by way of design-review-design cycle</td>
<td>Within core team and at mid charrette review with tier B. Limited in tier C</td>
<td>Within core team and at mid charrette review with tier B. Limited in tier C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tensions diffused</td>
<td>Within core team. Limited in tier C</td>
<td>Within core team. Limited in tier C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Underpinned by appropriate technical information</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guided by urbanist principles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transparent</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Partially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carefully facilitated and structured</td>
<td>Problematic with Krier offsite</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes of an EbD</th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Whitefield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 'Well resolved win-win solutions' (Prince's Foundation 2000:21)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared understandings, build consensus (Design Team W1; Urbanist 1,2)</td>
<td>Within the core team Partial in tier C</td>
<td>Within the core team Partial in tier C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create a feasible, holistic masterplan (Urbanist 2); a 'buildable' plan, not a vision or a wish-list (Lennertz 2003)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Product is 'fully endorsed' (Design Team W1; Urbanist 1) and engenders ownership of the outcomes (Foundation 1.2)</td>
<td>Within core team</td>
<td>Within core team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educative (Design Team W1; Urbanist 2) and empowering (Urbanist 2)</td>
<td>Educative within core team partial in Tier C</td>
<td>Educative within core team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides appropriate implementation documents (<a href="http://www.nationalcharretteinstitute.org">www.nationalcharretteinstitute.org</a>)</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effects of the two distinguishing features of the EbDs noted above are apparent in Table 8.1. For Whitefield technical information and inclusivity were problematic, both of which were implicated by the weak pre-EbD phase (see Chapter Seven, section 7.3). Similarly, the effects of the mechanism used for Krier’s involvement off-site permeated the Newquay process by weakening its transparency (see Chapter Six, section 6.4.2). The
second point to note is that many of the criteria were met for the core team, but not for tiers B or C. A similar pattern is evident in terms of the outcomes of the EbDs. Both EbDs were educative, engendered ownership of the outcomes and built consensus. However, these characteristics were confined to the core team. The feasibility and resolution of the outcomes will not be known until further progress is made on implementing the masterplan – thus these are questions for future research. Feasibility was questioned in both processes, and consequently, the masterplans were perceived as wish-lists to some extent. In addition, both cases were criticised for the loss of momentum associated with the lull that followed in the period immediately after the EbD (see Chapter Six, section 6.6; Chapter Seven, section 7.5).

So while neither process would be considered exemplars of EbD practice by the Foundation they were fairly typical of EbD practice. Certainly, Newquay was deemed better in urbanist terms than Whitefield by Foundation representatives – a view consistent with the findings presented in Table 8.1. The remainder of this sub-section draws out three points from this evaluation that have implications for participatory practice. The first point concerns how core team participants are selected and the implications of such selection. The second point, relatedly, explores the implications of the different opportunities each tier of participants in the EbD is provided with for participating. Finally, the discussion moves to questions of power by exploring the specific techniques of articulation utilised in the EbD workshop and their effect.

*The Right People*

In both cases, the phrase ‘the right people’ was used to determine who should be on the core team. The right people were loosely defined as stakeholders with decision-making authority or specific expertise, and those affected by the proposal. While stakeholders were relatively easy to specify, the identification of those affected by the proposal was less clear. In particular, the scope of the effect was not specified. The Newquay case suggested that the right people for inclusion in the core team were those with expertise or those positively affected – privileging a certain type of rationality, and marginalising emotional responses and conflict. This is consistent with statements made by an influential (and often controversial) new urbanist, who argues that citizen participants in a charrette should be those ‘who know what they are talking about’ and are ‘voices characterised by intelligence and reasonableness’ (Duany 2003:12.6-12.7). In addition, he advises charrette organisers: ‘do not let anybody disrespect the planners or the [urbanist] principles of town planning...
When disrespectful opponents smell weakness, they will attack like a pack and they will not stop' (ibid: 12.7). A tendency toward the avoidance of conflict or conflictual individuals in community representation or participation processes has been noted in other research (for example Collins 1997; Connelly and Richardson 2004; Maginn 2004). The approach adopted in the current study takes conflict, or antagonism as an indicator of the existence of power plays. As such, the avoidance of conflict or negativity as criteria for inclusion becomes a process of neutralising, or avoiding particular types of power relations in the EbD workshop – those that may constrain, inhibit, or paralyse the process of design. Thus, in the EbD, the process of design is prioritised, a point reconsidered in sub-section 8.2.3.

In the Whitefield case, the lack of a clear definition of the scope of who was affected was evident in a different way. The context of a regeneration case arguably results in a greater effect on a greater number of individuals than a greenfield project. However, there was no adaptation to the typical format of the EbD process to account for the broader effect of the proposals on local residents – in fact the weak pre-EbD phase in Whitefield provided less scope for involving local residents than the Newquay case. Indeed in light of good practice principles articulated within literature on participation (see Chapter Two), the antagonistic context and complexity of the Whitefield case suggests that a more participatory approach involving a significant component of capacity building and a deeper interaction with local residents may have been more appropriate (see Jackson 2001; Sandercock 2000; Wild and Marshall 1999). Nevertheless, the deliberative and interactive sphere of the workshop week was successful in creating a space in which the primary antagonism was resolved to some extent in Whitefield (see section 8.5).

The Privilege of the Core Team

The general success of the core team in both cases according to criteria in Table 8.1 raises the second point under consideration – that the EbD process as a whole encompasses different types of public involvement. For the core team, involvement in the EbD is participatory, yet for tier C it is more consultatory. Consequently, it is difficult to situate the EbD process within specific types or levels of participation as they are specified in the most commonly adopted typologies of public involvement (see Chapter Two, Arnstein 1969; Jackson 2001; Wilcox 1994; Wild and Marshall 1999). While this may not be of significance, the conflation of the core team’s high level of participation with tier C’s consultatory role is more problematic. By signifying the work of the core team and the workshop as the whole EbD, the participatory nature of the process is overstated, potentially
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raising unrealistic expectations, (as occurred in Whitefield). Generalised appeals to the EbDs potential benefits (as they relate to the core team) are not realisable for tiers B and C. The exclusive nature of core team membership (by invitation only) and the prioritisation of expertise and professional knowledge are obscured by conflating the distinctions between the different levels of involvement of each tier. The use of rhetorical claims about what the EbD can achieve, such as those used in media promotions of the Newquay case, contribute to this tendency to overstate the capability of an EbD.

Articulatory Techniques – Power

The use of rhetorical claims pertains to the third implication of EbD practice – the articulatory character of the EbD within the urbanist hegemonic project. The EbD is an articulatory practice that constitutes and is constitutive of discursive meanings at the local level. Within the EbD a variety of factors and techniques are employed for this task, some of which were discussed in Chapter Five, and others which became evident in the presentation of the cases:

• the use of impressive graphic presentations and oratory;
• rhetorical appeals to concepts of community, sustainability, inclusivity;
• strong facilitation, careful structuring of the process, setting the agenda, and allocating individuals to specific tiers of participants;
• the use of normative principles which can be represented in built examples through imagery;
• urbanist expertise and principles;
• drawing, urban design and artists impressions; and
• the elitism of celebrity hegemonic agents such as HRH the Prince of Wales, Krier and the Foundation.

While these general techniques were utilised in both cases, and are typical of EbDs and charrettes, the particularities of each project, locale, political space, and hegemonic agents involved were both internal and external to the urbanist project and served to shape its manifestations. The effects of these techniques are that they shape the way in which the process is perceived in a variety of different ways and the particular shaping effects are context dependent and variable within the locality. For example, the Duchy were symbolised as representing quality in Newquay, while simultaneously, their elitism and vision as presented through the built form of Poundbury was resisted. Similarly in Whitefield, the elitism of the Foundation was resisted by the Council and Elevate. Moreover, in both cases the adherence to urbanist principles as an articulatory technique
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marred the transparency of each process. This was especially the case in Newquay with the separation of Krier’s role from the core team, and in the work conducted prior to the EbD process – both factors led to challenges that outcomes were pre-determined.

The effects of the use of articulatory techniques are not necessarily negative. For example, the deliberative, carefully facilitated and structured spaces in the EbD workshops were found to be beneficial. Similarly, the presentations, level of expertise and use of urban design skills were advantageous. Nevertheless, it is important to note that how the techniques are framed and the assumptions that underpin them, are acts of power with consequences. As such, they shape how concepts are constructed, presented, and normalised within the process. The evaluation of the cases in light of the communicative ethic identifies several further implications of these constructions.

8.2.2 Communicative Tendencies?

The evaluation against the Communicative Ethic, developed through the review of literature in Chapter Two, is presented in Table 8.2. It shows a different picture to that of the previous sub-section. The weaknesses in the cases relating to inclusivity and representation are very clear. Thus there is a marked discrepancy between the urbanist discourse’s standard for inclusivity and that of the Communicative Ethic as a consequence of the operation of the two different discourses. To investigate this issue further, representation as the central means of establishing inclusivity is discussed in section 8.3.

In terms of equality within the process, the problematic transparency of Krier’s role in Newquay and the concomitant charge of predetermination were more evident. In addition, a trace of predetermination was perceived in Whitefield, suggesting a challenge to the dominance of the urbanist principles that were manifest through the use of various articulatory techniques such as urban design, expertise, graphic imagery, and drawing (see section 8.2.1). Moreover, in Newquay the prioritisation of technical knowledge (see Chapter Six, section 6.3.4 and 6.4.1), and the role of Krier as a hegemonic agent contributed to questions of transparency and legitimacy. While there was no explicit evidence suggesting an acknowledgement of different knowledges and capacities, the prioritisation of expertise raises questions in this regard for Newquay. In Whitefield, although the core team discussed the specific housing needs of the Asian communities, the public meeting did not accommodate those with poor English, or address the fact that the forum was unsuitable for many Muslim women. Again there is a discrepancy between the achievement of criteria for
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the core team versus other tiers of participants, a distinction rarely acknowledged by proponents of the urbanist discourse in their articulations about the benefits of the process.

Table 8.2 – Evaluation of the EbD cases against the Ethic for Communicative Participation established in Chapter Two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions for Communicative Participation</th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Whitefield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Equal opportunity of access; that is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inclusive</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equal opportunity within process:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Open, honest, transparent and legitimate</td>
<td>Transparency problematic</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Recognition and accommodation of different capacities and knowledges</td>
<td>No explicit recognition Expert/technical knowledge prioritised</td>
<td>Recognised but poorly accommodated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agonistic space</td>
<td>In core team</td>
<td>In core team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognition and awareness of inherent power plays through:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- critical listening,</td>
<td>Awareness of Duchy's privilege</td>
<td>Some recognition of difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- careful interpretation and facilitation</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Some evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problematic</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes of Communicative Participation</th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Whitefield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Shared understandings</td>
<td>Within core team</td>
<td>Within core team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social learning</td>
<td>Within core team</td>
<td>Partial in tier C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engenders sense of ownership of outcomes</td>
<td>Within core team</td>
<td>Within core team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agonistic space was created within the core team in both processes, but antagonism was evident in the final public meeting at Newquay and permeated the Whitefield process. Moreover, in Whitefield, there was evidence of antagonism being 'tamed' to agonism (Mouffe 2000). This issue, its potential for a more deliberative planning praxis, and several associated questions for further research are discussed in section 8.5.

Finally, the outcomes of the EbD processes met communicative criteria in the core team. Shared understandings were established in both cases concerning the future of the project. Social learning was evident in the core team in Newquay and to a lesser extent in Whitefield. And a sense of ownership of the outcomes were achieved in both processes but again, was confined to the core team. There is, therefore, much potential in the character of the deliberations within the core team of the workshop phase for effective communicative participation. However, these benefits are marred by the questions raised regarding the inclusivity of the process. These issues are discussed further in sections 8.3 and 8.4. Before
moving on to those sections, a note about the employment of two evaluative frames (urbanist and communicative participation) is required.

8.2.3 Two Discourses – Two Objectives?

It has become clear that there are differences in the principal objectives of the discourse on communicative planning and those of the urbanist discourse as it is manifest in the United Kingdom and in the two cases studied here (see Chapter Two and Five). As noted in Chapter Two, an overarching theme of communicative planning lies in a commitment to the value of public involvement in urban planning and governance decision-making. Values include several characteristics shared with the urbanist discourse such as gaining local knowledge to inform decision-making, engendering ownership of the outcomes, and ensuring a more efficient implementation process as a result of that collective ownership of the process.

However, there are a variety of additional objectives in the communicative participation discourse directed towards achieving social justice, democracy and empowerment. An explicit recognition of the plurality and multiplicity of urban spaces and places means a central goal of public involvement is to acknowledge the resultant complexity and continue to work with communities to plan for better futures (for example, Cameron and Grant-Smith 2005; Forester 1989, 1999a; Healey 1997; Sandercock 1998, 2000, 2003; Umemoto 2001). There is a transformative goal, in which it is claimed effective participation engenders an understanding of difference that in turn, enhances tolerance and encourages more cohesive and inclusive ways of living together. In addition, the transformative potential empowers individuals and builds capacity by encouraging a sense of self worth and responsibility for their urban spaces, as well as providing opportunities for learning about how urban governance and planning systems operate. The overall intention of a communicative planning praxis is to recognise that involvement in the decisions that affect one’s life is a democratic right. Participation serves as an end in itself, with a variety of beneficial social outcomes.

In contrast, participation in urbanist processes is a means to an end – that end lies in creating a broadly endorsed masterplan that will facilitate the project’s passage through the planning system and enable an urbanist vision to be built. Participation serves to engage stakeholders with influence, decision making power, and those who are significantly affected, around the table. The purpose of community representation lies in gaining local knowledge. Similarly, while the public meetings offer an opportunity for the general public
to provide input (albeit, carefully structured and limited), the meetings are primarily to inform the public about the EbD process, who is involved, how it will operate and crucially what principles will underpin the outcomes. Therefore, the overarching purpose of urbanist participation lies in gaining a wide range of different (instrumental) knowledges to inform the masterplan, to ensure ownership of the masterplan for expediency through the planning process, to educate about how urbanism and communities work, and to build the capacity of local authorities (that is, policy makers) and built environment professionals (see Chapters Five and Seven, section 7.4.2). Thus the primary goal of participation is instrumental to ensuring urbanist projects are built.

The synthesis of both EbDs through the different lenses of urbanism and communicative participation reveals the more structural discrepancies in the processes. Reliance on criteria from within the urbanist discourse provides no clear way of understanding whether a flaw that is highlighted is the result of poor performance or an inherent difficulty with the nature of the process and the meanings constituted within it. The meanings underpinning practices can more easily be revealed through a lens looking in on a discourse from outside and problematising the meanings articulated. The evaluations reveal that the level of inclusivity that is deemed good differs in each discourse. Having exposed the discrepancies by employing the two lenses to the EbD practices, it is now possible to employ discursive techniques to investigate why a weak conception of inclusivity appears to be inherent to the urbanist discourse – this is explored in the following three sections. This is important, given that inclusivity is a fundamental constituent of effective participation and is an effect of power – governing decisions as to who is included in or excluded from the process, and who is empowered and who is disempowered within the process.

Before turning to these themes, there are two points to note in regard to questions of equality of access and equality within the process. First, because of the tiered structure of participants and their differential status within the process, it is more useful to speak of inclusivity in relation to the tiers rather than in terms of access to and equality within as it was discussed in Chapter Two (see section 2.3.2). Second, and related, data generated to reveal the nature of interaction within the workshop was reliant on interviewees recollections of the event some eight months prior. A shorter gap between process and interviews, complemented by a more ethnographic approach including participant observation and a longer time spent in the field would have provided more in depth data with which to address questions of equality within the EbD process. Nevertheless, at a structural level, the meanings attributed to key concepts of representation, community and consensus provide...
several indicators of the nature of inclusivity. Thus the following sections tease out the implications of the way in which representation and community were articulated, and draws out implications for the inclusivity of participatory processes.

8.3 Equality of Access – Problematising Representation

Representation is crucial to the EbD process. It is the principal mechanism for managing core team numbers and balancing the need to produce certain outputs with inclusivity within a short timeframe. Thus representation is central to maintaining the deliberative nature of the workshop and addressing the issue of economy (Dryzek 2001; see Chapter Two). Representation versus direct participation is carefully structured through the tiers of participants. The core team membership relies on the participation of individuals directly affected and with an influence in decision making as well as the representation of specific organisations with key roles and the community. Tier B is made up, primarily of representatives, while tier C comprise direct participants. Nevertheless, beyond recognising the need to balance inclusivity and the production of a masterplan, representation was not problematised by the organisers of the EbDs who were instrumental in determining who, how and in what way representation occurred.

Problematising representation requires a return to how political theorists treat the subject as discussed in Chapter Two. Following Young (2000) and Pitkin (1967), it was suggested in Chapter Two that although representation takes many forms there are several elements said to constitute effective representation. These are the authority to represent, accountability to the represented, coherence between the interests of the represented and the way in which the independent agent represents them, and an ongoing mutual relationship or connection. So the question is, how well did representation in the EbDs meet this formula. The nature of the tiered structure of participants resulted in different types of representation – formal and de facto – each is discussed below.

8.3.1 Formal Representation

Within the core team and for Tier B, representation of organisations and agencies tended to be very formalised, authorised, transparent and legitimated. Tier B representatives typically acted on behalf of their employer, representing the organisation’s position by making a presentation at the stakeholder briefing sessions on Day One of the EbD, ensuring coherence between the outcomes as they emerged at the mid-charrette review and their agency’s stance. The representatives were authorised to act, make decisions and provide
input in line with the agency’s position. Moreover, they were accountable to the organisation for the statements made. There was a formalised relationship between the represented (organisation) and the representative (tier B participant).

A similar level of formality was evident for core team members representing agencies and organisations that had tended to have a clearly defined stake in the process. With that, higher levels of authority and accountability were evident. The higher the authority and accountability, the more strongly the represented’s position was articulated by the representative. For example, in Whitefield, the agenda of the Housing Market Renewal pathfinder, Elevate, was clearly stated through its focus on housing numbers and restructuring the housing market (see Chapter Seven, section 7.4.3). Elevate’s funding criteria and performance targets were closely related to the necessity for restructuring the housing market. Similarly, in Newquay, the antagonism between Restormel Borough Council and the Duchy on the perceived incompatibility between traditional architecture and high sustainability building technologies arose as a result of the need for Restormel to adhere to their Local Plan and emerging Government Policy (see Chapter Six, section 6.4.4). Restormel’s accountability lay in the potential for any decisions taken on the Newquay Growth Area to be subject to scrutiny at a Public Inquiry. These representatives had the legitimate authority of their organisations to be involved in the process, they were accountable to their organisations, and maintained ongoing communication and mutual relationships with the represented. Their actions were transparent and understood by both the represented and the representative and the organisers of the EbD.

The important point is that although the level of accountability and authority was variable, there was a strong connection – a mutual relationship – between the representative who was substantively acting for the represented (Pitkin 1967; Young 2000). In contrast, community representation on the core team was de facto in Whitefield and overstated in Newquay.

8.3.2 De Facto Community Representation

The core team membership typically involved community representatives – based on the understanding that community members will be affected by the proposal (see Chapter Five). As will be seen, the very concept of community makes achieving community representation difficult (see section 8.4). In Newquay, community representation was limited to a Gusti Veor resident (see Chapter Six, section 6.4.1) who was authorised to act for other residents of the hamlet, maintain communication with them, and as such be
accountable to them. So the Gusti Veor community were well represented. However, the hamlet comprised less than a dozen households, most of whom knew each other and shared similar concerns regarding the development of the Growth Area. The effect of the development on those residents was significant and obvious. Yet, for other communities of Newquay both the potential effect of the development and appropriate representation are not so easily identifiable. Nevertheless, the impact of the proposals on some of those residents may have been as significant as those in Gusti Veor. As noted above, the extent to which different residents were affected such that they are then constituted as ‘the right people’ for involvement in tier B or the core team was not made explicit.

A second point to note in relation to the absence of broader community representation in Newquay lies in the conflation of terms such as representation, participation, and inclusivity. For example, in Newquay there appeared to be an assumption that the high numbers of local people involved in the working groups and tier B were sufficient to make the process more inclusive. Yet the fact that the group membership was biased toward expertise, and the task of the groups was to gather information for the EbD, suggests that participation was not based on community representation. Their roles were more akin to the formal representation of tier B participants discussed above. Their presence as community members, living and working in Newquay does not equate to community representation, as they were not authorised, accountable nor had a mutual ongoing relationship with the represented (Young 2000). A participatory process cannot be said to be inclusive just because a lot of participants are involved. Rather, inclusivity requires that the full diversity of interests, opinions and perspectives are accounted for (Young 1999, 2000; see Chapter Two).

Whitefield community representation was more problematic, despite the relatively more straightforward identification of who might be affected by the proposals. The community representatives selected by the Foundation were all members of the Whitefield Conservation Action Group. As a result, the representation was, in effect, not that of the ‘community’ but rather of the Action Group. While the Action Group may have authorised the representatives to act as such, Whitefield residents outside that group did not. Moreover, there was no direct connection or relationship between the representatives and residents outside the Action Group, other than the fact of living and being politically active in Whitefield.

Yet the representation of the Action Group on the core team was referred to by the Foundation as generically ‘including the community’ (Prince’s Foundation 2005b; Design
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Team W1). The community representatives in Whitefield were standing for or substitutes for residents or the community (as conceived by the Foundation) in a de facto way (Young 2000). The conflation of the community with the Action Group’s representatives on the core team shows how little the notion of representation was problematised by EbD organisers. There was little that suggested how community representatives were to represent the community, or of how they should be selected. It was assumed that residents’ participation on the core team was community representation. Consequently, there was little transparency as there was no vehicle for accountability. Yet, in the EbD process, reliance is placed on community representation as the means to gain local knowledge. If representation is partial, then so too is the local knowledge gleaned from it.

Nevertheless, there were indications that certain interviewees understood the issues of representation. For example, one Foundation representative recognised the need to ask who people were speaking for (Urbanist 2). And in relation to the proposed delivery mechanism in Whitefield, a Foundation member argued that community representation was more favourable than elected Council representation because party politics tend to dominate; whereas ‘a community representative is there to represent the community at [the] local level about real local issues’ (Design Team W1). Interestingly, in relation to the formally instituted bodies of a delivery structure, he recognised the importance of a nexus between the represented and the representative through maintaining ‘direct contact’ which would enable ‘working in harmony [and] collaborating on key issues’ (ibid). Despite these clear statements, the concept of representation as a relationship did not permeate the EbD practices. So despite evidence of knowledge to the contrary, the interviewees (both involved in the Whitefield case and both with the power to initiate a different form of representation) maintained the status quo of de facto representation. While there may be a myriad of practical reasons for such an omission, the fact that two Foundation representatives independently revealed a more astute understanding of the issues than was enacted, suggests that the ideology of the discourse came into play. In other words, even the knowledge of an event, process, ambiguity or problem does not necessarily change behaviour in relation to it because of the way in which meanings within the discourse legitimise certain actions (Norval 1999; Torfing 1999).

There are two characteristics of the urbanist discourse, as manifest in the EbD cases studied, that contribute significantly to why a relational conception of community representation failed to be enacted, despite recognition of its value. First, the overall purpose of public involvement in the EbD (that is, to gain local knowledge) meant that community
involvement was not prioritised. The second reason for the poor representation in the EbDs lies with the way in which community was articulated. This was exemplified in the Whitefield case, where community was understood to be primarily anti demolition and pro-heritage as reflected in community representatives who were all associated with the Whitefield Conservation Action Group. The construction of community in Whitefield was reinforced by the claim to consensus for a heritage led approach to regeneration (Chapter Seven, see section 7.4.2).

Clearly, in order to identify appropriate community representatives, an operable definition of community is required. Both issues – community representation and the claim to consensus – excluded certain community members from participating within the core team, and disempowered them within the EbD process as a whole. As such, how community was signified in the EbDs emerged as problematic and imbricated with inclusivity. Consequently, the following section turns to the question of defining community, necessarily drawing on a new body of literature on community to explain the issue and draw out the implications.

8.4 Inclusivity – Problematising Community

There are three reasons why the articulation of community has become important in the current study. First, as noted above, the poor community representation in the cases was in part due to a problematic conceptualisation of community. Second, the way community was articulated in Whitefield in relation to the claim to consensus symbolises a bigger issue – that is, community was signified as a homogeneous, unified ideal entity in agreement even in the face of the dissenting young Asian men. And third, this unified, positive conception of community is evident in urbanist literature and urban policy discourses, but is at odds with contemporary literature and research on community. Thus the question for this section is: how was community signified in the cases and what are the implications of this signification? To address this question, the following turns to contemporary literature on community.

The concept of community has been much debated and scrutinised. Levitas (2000:188) observes that community is ‘deeply ambiguous, being simultaneously utopian and ideological’. Panelli and Welch (2005:1594) summarise the range of difficulties with the concept which is evident through:

Continuing confusion resulting from the wide range of community types identified; frustration at the apparent dislocation between the need for community and the general inability to define the term; uncertainty about the motivation of those
seeking to create or construct community, and an associated lack of trust in the process; and suspicion that community is a euphemism, but for what?

Despite these difficulties community continues to be seized upon as positive, unifying, cohesive image of the good life (Gilchrist and Taylor 1997). As such it conflates difference and the complex, heterogeneous, multiple identities, values, and meanings constructed in and through a diversity of social relations. The very act of defining a community involves drawing boundaries around those inside and those outside, which begs the question of who has the power to define community in any given context (Levitas 2000:188). Despite this acknowledgement of the double edged nature of community, and its problematic articulation, it has become central to both British urban policy (Imrie and Raco 2003b) and to the urbanist discourse (Duany et al. 2000; Katz 1994a; Talen 2000b, 2001; Grant 2006). Crucially, then, both urban policy and the urbanist discourse frame how community is signified in EbDs.

The Prince’s Foundation articulates the urbanist discourse in its principles, which seeks to ‘create communities’ through the ‘carefully facilitated, early involvement of the local community’ (www.princes-foundation.org; see Appendix B). Similarly, seminal works of the New Urbanism show their intention to build communities that are diverse and heterogeneous (Duany et al. 2000; Katz 1994a; also see www.cnu.org). However, there is a concomitant assumption of unity, cohesion and the inherent desirability of community (ibid). Community as a difficult, contested and sometimes negative notion has not often been problematised by urbanists (although see B:ain 2005; Talen 2000b, 2001). Several academics have criticised the New Urbanism for its lack of specificity in appeals to community, its mythical representation of community and its lack of acknowledgement of the embodied nature of community as a diverse set of human relationships (for example, Day 2003; Grant 2006; Harvey 1997; Lehrer and Milgrom 1996; McCann 1995).

Similarly, as indicated above, urban policy under Britain’s New Labour government takes ‘community’ as central to its rhetoric (Amin 2002; Imrie and Raco 2003b; Levitas 2000; 2005; Rose 2000). Community under the urban policy discourse is signified as ‘communities of unity’ (Panelli and Welch 2005:1594) and:

... a natural and desirable social formation, based on the diminution of difference and conflict, and the inculcation of shared values. These values construct ‘community’ as something that ought to be based on culturally homogeneous social relationships (Imrie and Raco 2003b:8).

In urban policy, community is articulated primarily as place based, and variously as ‘an object of policy (in other words, a thing to be worked on), a policy instrument (that is, the means by which policies become devised and activated), or a thing to be created (an end in
itself’ (ibid:6, emphasis original). Community then becomes crucial to implementing policies and programmes. As such, the articulation of community in urban policy is a form of governmental power which shapes the way in which society is envisioned (Huxley 2002; Ploger 2001, 2004). So how was community articulated in Newquay and Whitefield? More importantly, what are the implications of these significations for the inclusivity of EbDs? Both cases revealed evidence of all four constructions of community – that is, a unified homogeneous entity, an object, an instrument, and a mythical thing to be created.

In Newquay, a variety of different terms were used by the Duchy, the Foundation and in the media to refer to tier C – ‘local people’, ‘the public’, ‘the local community’, ‘local needs’ (see section 6.3.2) – all of which inferred an unproblematic homogeneous unity, with an obvious singular identity. In addition, the EbD was assumed to be inclusive of that unspecified, but ultimately determinable group. At the same time, Newquay was considered to be the object of the proposed urban transformation – something to be worked on and fixed. The Summary Report for the Newquay EbD patronised the town’s growth, claiming it had expanded like a ‘suburban octopus’ with ‘tumours’ that constrained its connectivity (Prince’s Foundation 2005a:17). The proposed development would allow Newquay to ‘mature’, suggesting it was somehow immature (ibid). In addition, Newquay was ‘polarised’, overly dependent on tourism, incapable of providing itself with a variety of adequate well paying jobs or affordable housing, and needed to diversify to be sustainable for future generations (ibid:9). The use of organic metaphors provide an animated image – imbricating the communities of Newquay in the articulation of the town’s inadequacy. The proposed development of the Newquay Growth Area would provide those aspects to the broader Newquay community that were lacking, to make it ‘a more sustainable community’ (ibid:16). The latter claim is to building a community, based on the mythical image embedded in the masterplan and representations developed through the EbD process. Finally, in Newquay, community was constituted with an instrumental purpose in the EbD process. The prioritisation of expert knowledge and the privilege given to potential end users showed how a particular construction of community was valued and thereby included to the extent that it could contribute knowledge in implementing the vision, and through its embodied role (as end-users and experts) in the articulation of the project (see Chapter Six, section 6.4.1).

Whitefield differed in that the specificity of community was established through both external discourses and the antagonistic process of the Public Inquiry. As noted in Chapter Seven, the Foundation initially perceived the Whitefield community as a homogeneous
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group opposed to demolition (see section 7.3.3). The success of the heritage lobby, over the period from the time of the Compulsory Purchase Order in 2001, to after the EbD when a heritage led approach to regeneration was accepted and universalised, meant that the heritage lobby dominated the political space in Whitefield. The dominance of this position obscured or marginalised alternative views or possibilities for regenerating Whitefield, and in the process, defined the ‘community’ in hegemonic heritage terms.

So the antagonistic context resulted in the dominance of a particular viewpoint within the Whitefield political space, which in turn signified a strong community, unified and cohesive in their position (Dalby and Mackenzie 1997; Rodriguez 1999; Wilson et al 2004). In the EbD workshop, the Foundation had the authority and power to define the community through representation. In signifying the community as those in favour of heritage led regeneration (intentionally or unintentionally), those in favour of an alternative approach were excluded. Because of the Foundation’s part in the heritage lobby, the idea that community as they conceived it might be substantively fractured, threatened their urbanist project.

Nevertheless, in Whitefield, the influence of the urban policy discourse on the way community was constituted was also evident. The regeneration proposals, even prior to the public inquiry, were seen as capable of ‘fixing’ the community. Whitefield was seen to be ‘failing’ as a place and as a community, and regeneration was intended to ensure it became a place that people chose to live and work (Council officer W1; see Chapter Seven, section 7.4.3). Similarly, the lack of integration and cohesion of the Asian population in Whitefield within Nelson was seen as unsustainable and a constraint on the success of regeneration:

... if the town is to truly thrive and regenerate it must address the issues of community cohesion and racial integration throughout all strands of the community, such as in schools, housing and leisure (Prince’s Foundation 2005b).

In addition, an objective of regenerating Whitefield was to invest in the area to make it attractive to a diversity of people (Council officer W1, W2; design team W1) – ultimately seeking to change the nature of the existing communities.

Thus, both Newquay and Whitefield were constituted as communities of unity and the instrument through which to implement a policy or programme that would fix the problems apparently inherent to it. Concomitantly, both projects sought to build new communities. What are the implications of these constructions for the EbDs and inclusivity? In both cases community was largely constructed as disembodied and abstract, devoid of conflict. Consequently, community was simultaneously conceived of as apolitical and yet imbricated
with political power of policy makers and those instrumental in operationalising urban transformations (Rose 2000).

There are three key implications, not exclusive to the operation of EbDs. First, and as noted in the previous section, a narrow and instrumental signification of community results in representation that is similarly partial and is likely to prioritise the dominant group. Conflictual and othered interests become marginalised in the very determination of community. Second, a disembodied conception of community that arises from both the instrumentalisation and objectification of its material status fails to take account of the embodied nature of community as systems of relationships, heterogeneous, diverse and often conflictual. Consequently, claims that a proposal will have a significant effect on individuals based on emotional or passionate reasons become marginalised. An instrumental rationality is privileged over emotion, and alternative means of expression (Young 1996). Third, a unified conception of community means that consensus is deemed possible and desirable – that different positions can be superseded to reach some unified common good (Mouffe 1999; Young 1996). As noted in Chapter Two, and evident in the conflict with the group of Asian young men in Whitefield, any claim to community consensus excludes those in dissent, and again avoids conflict. As suggested earlier (see section 8.2), conflict or contestation over meanings is an indicator of power plays. A disembodied and unified conception of community neutralises or brackets both conflict and power relations (Mouffe 1995, 2000), by minimising the opportunity to contest meanings and allowing dominant discourses (and groups/identities) to be maintained. So the articulation of community is itself an act of power.

Without problematising community as fractured, conflictual, difficult to define and heterogeneous; any kind of community representation will be partial and reproduce existing inequalities in society. Similarly, in the absence of alternative constructions of the concepts of community and representation, a strong version of inclusivity is unlikely to emerge in EbD projects. The unified idealised notion of community is akin to the ideal of an uncoerced power neutral public sphere that underpins Habermas’ ideal speech and early versions of communicative planning theory (see Chapter Two). Therefore, the study illustrates the complexity, contingency and inherently power riddled reality of participatory practice and the difficulty of attributing to it a simplified power neutral ideal. The foregoing chapters thus confirm the arguments by critics of communicative planning theory that it is insufficiently sensitive to the realities of power (for example, Flyvbjerg 1998a, 2002; Hillier 2002; Huxley 2000; McGuirk 2001; Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger 1998). As evident in
both cases, participatory planning is suffused with fluid, dynamic, criss-crossing power relations, and resultant antagonisms. Rather than assuming away politics, conflict and power, the current study has sought to engage with them, and provided an alternative conceptual lens with which to question how power operates and to what effect. While the discussions so far have focused on the more negative, constraining effects of power, the following turns to the positive potential of the creation of agonistic spaces in the design studios of both cases.

8.5 Agonism and Antagonism

The foregoing discussion lends weight to the premise that by starting from an acknowledgement of the inherently antagonistic nature of the political sphere (which includes participatory planning) power relationships potentially become more visible (Mouffe 2000). Moreover, research undertaken from this perspective may render the effects of hegemonic power plays that usually make unquestionable meanings open to question and contestation. The cases illustrate how antagonism, as the contestation of meaning which in turn marks the limits of discourse, is an indicator of power relations (see Chapter Three). However, the question asked in Chapter One remains, when do power relations matter (Forester 1999b). To address this question, Mouffe’s theorisation on agonism as a different and more productive form of antagonism (see Chapter Two) is valuable.

It was evident that agonistic debate in the core team of both Whitefield and Newquay was generally positively perceived by interviewees. For example, discussion was characterised as the ‘crossing of swords’ (Core Team N2), in which a range of different views were put forth and debated (see Chapter Six, section 6.5.2; Chapter Seven, section 7.4.3). The form of agonistic debate here is akin to communicative argumentation. The positive perceptions of such argumentation by interviewees support emerging arguments by planning theorists on the concept of agonism and its merits (Gunder 2003; Hillier 2002, 2003; Ploger 2004). However, the analysis of the cases illustrated several instances of conflict and antagonism. For the purposes of Chapters Six and Seven, the identification of antagonism was to elucidate the nature of discourses and related power relations through employing the conceptual tools of Laclau and Mouffe’s (2001) work. As such, the distinction between agonistic conflict and antagonistic conflict (after Mouffe) was not made. Thus the question now is how agonistic were those conflicts? Moreover, how is antagonism (as a potentially harmful power play) and agonism (as productive democratic politics)
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distinguished? The following section turns to issues of how conflict is read such that it is understood as agonistic.

8.5.1 On Reading Conflict

While agonism can be seen as a way of reading conflict, there are substantive qualities required for its emergence. Theorists have posited several characteristics required of individuals in agonistic contestation:

- individuals in agonistic contestation are adversaries rather than enemies – that is, there is mutual understanding between opponents who are each regarded as legitimate in posing arguments and have a right to defend them (Connolly 1998; Foucault 1983; Hillier 2002; Mouffe 2000);
- adversaries share the same ethico-political commitment to democratic principles of liberty and equality (ibid); and
- mutual respect and reciprocity is given to the other and the other’s right to disagree or maintain a different (legitimate) position is recognised, even while that position is resisted (Connolly 1998).

However, applying such characterisations to practice is less straightforward and raises some questions. The nature of the conflicts varied both within the cases and between them. Characterising some tensions as agonistic was easier than others. For example, the conflict between the Foundation and Krier in Newquay (see section 6.4.2) was agonistic, given the mutual respect and understanding of each identity’s position. In contrast, also in Newquay, the conflict between Henver Road residents and the Foundation at the final public meeting (and subsequent to it) can be read as antagonistic – the Foundation did not believe the residents had the right to claim that there should be no development because it had already been determined through the Local Plan process (Urbanist 1). As such, the objectors’ claims were not recognised as legitimate. Conflict between the core team and the masterplanner (regarding predetermined outcomes) arose within the carefully facilitated forum of the EbD, through which argumentation was legitimated. So although the core team resisted the hegemonic articulations of the masterplanner and the Duchy’s vision, their position and right to argue was legitimate, respected, and acknowledged. As such, the conflict was agonistic. Finally, for Newquay, determining the extent of agonism in the debate on architectural style is more difficult. The Duchy considered the nature of the debate on traditional architecture as productive, positive (Design Team N4) and as such it can be considered agonistic from the Duchy’s perspective. However, whether the objectors to traditional architecture considered the debate similarly agonistic is less clear. It seems doubtful that they deemed the Duchy
enemies in Mouffe’s (2000) terms or that they believed the Duchy was not entitled to argue its position. As such it is likely to have been of a more agonistic character.

Nevertheless, this issue raises a question regarding the balance of power between opponents and on how conflict is read by different sides of contestation. In the traditional architecture debate the Duchy carried the balance of power in the relationship and the conflict was read positively. The conflict with the Asian young men in Whitefield provides further elucidation. Although the young men were excluded from the process and felt that their concerns were not taken on board by the Foundation team, their position was understood by design team members and their right to assert it was for the most part respected (see Chapter Seven, section 7.4.1). A space was provided in which both parties could make their cases. Yet, while the design team members acknowledged the group’s views, the nature and strength of the hegemonic myth that represented a heritage led vision for Whitefield did not allow for the Asian young men’s demands to be incorporated. And although the Asian young men resisted the hegemonic vision, it is not clear that they respected the Foundation’s right to articulate and defend it. Consequently, the conflict was read differently by the different players – as productive and agonistic by the dominant player in the conflict and conversely, as antagonism by the resisting players. What does this difference in reading conflict and the relative power of each reader mean, particularly in relation to claims that the core objective in creating a democratic planning praxis is to tame antagonism into agonism (Hillier 2002; Mouffe 2000)?

Does agonism also require the ability to read antagonism as potentially positive and productive? The fact that the Asian young men developed an ongoing relationship with the local authority as a consequence of their presence in the EbD process was a positive outcome of the antagonism (Council Officer W2; Resident W2; Council Officer W1 pers. comm. 2006). The ongoing engagement may have provided the appropriate conditions for a more agonistic relationship to develop between Peadle Council and the group of young men. However, the Asian young men’s engagement at the EbD could have been better, a point the organisers of the EbD made themselves (Urbanist 2; Foundation 1). A further point to note is the disparate levels of power between the two parties. The old antagonism in Whitefield between the heritage lobby and the Council provides a further example with which to illustrate this issue.

Agonism was evident in the EbD core team in Whitefield between a large number of agency representatives, embued with the governmental power of their organisations and associated policy agendas. In addition, there was (for the most part) a respect for the
necessity to argue that perspective. Is there, then, a link between the degree of power and authority an individual carries and their capacity to read antagonism as potentially productive, thereby transforming it into agonism? Is a more powerful position an indicator of capacity to accept the adversarial and productive character of conflict? If authority is a determining factor in the ability to renegotiate antagonism into agonism, is there a question of empowerment for those less powerful? Certainly, the latter point relates closely to debates on deliberative democracy (see Chapter Two), where it is argued that a certain capacity is required to enable participation in deliberative politics. In a parallel fashion, even in an agonistic space, there will always be those structurally less empowered to contest meanings and discourses, particularly those sedimented or embedded in a hegemonic imaginary. Those less empowered to contest meanings and discourses may be imbricated in the governmentality of local governance in which conflict is deemed negative and debilitating and society is represented as mythically unified and homogeneous (Foucault 1978; Gunder 2003; Ploger 2004). Consequently, without the ability to read the potentially productive space as agonistic, possible responses are constrained and are more likely to be negative or involve compliance with a hegemonic discourse. The potential to contest and articulate an alternative argument is inhibited. Thus the ability to read antagonism as potentially positive, productive, inherent and necessary for political engagement is a precondition for an agonistic politics.

8.5.2 Agonistic Democracy?

The argument for the establishment of an agonistic space lies in the potential to create a more plural politics which does not deny the existence of power relations within that space. For Mouffe (2000), an agonistic pluralism explicitly acknowledges the ineradicability of antagonism and therefore of power. As such the aim of a democratic politics is to foster spaces in which power relations are more consistent with the ethico-political goals of democracy. The deliberative arena established amongst the core team of the EbD workshop came close to resembling such a space. In particular, the antagonistic conflict in Whitefield was transformed into agonism, illustrating the potential of interactive workshop style processes capable of fostering that transformation. Moreover, because antagonism was already embedded in the political sphere, its existence was not denied. The whole purpose of the EbD process was to create a productive space from which to ‘tame’ the antagonism (Mouffe 2000). For the most part, the EbD in Whitefield was successful in achieving this goal. This supports Mouffe’s (1999, 2000) and Hillier’s (2002, 2003) claims that the starting
point for research and practice must be a recognition of the inherent ineradicability of conflict and power in order to produce a more productive space for decision-making.

However, there is one last point to make. Discussion in the previous section suggests that the way in which representation, community and inclusivity were discursively framed, led to the avoidance of certain known conflictual views in the constitution of the EbD core teams. So while the EbD goes part way to achieving an agonistic space which provided positive benefits to core team members, it brackets out contestations by distancing them from the main decision-making arena in the core team and removing them to tier B or C. In addition, by hiding behind the instrumental rationality of technical knowledge, expertise and design, it plays to the governmentality of planning practice (Gunder 2003; Huxley 2002; Ploger 2001, 2004).

In Chapter One, planning theorist John Forester (1999b) was cited, posing the question, what power relations matter (section 1.3)? The current study suggests the answer is: those that perpetuate existing inequalities in society; those that silence the ability of individuals to contest dominant meanings when they differ from their own; and those (governmental powers) that shape the way in which society is imagined such that it forecloses on the very possibility of developing spaces in which different (other) meanings, positions and identities can be articulated. Reading conflict as agonism or antagonism provides a heuristic device by which the identification of how power relations matter is facilitated. So to conclude, the current study has elucidated a number of levels at which participation and power can be re-articulated to promote an agonistic planning praxis.

8.6 Rethinking Participation, Urbanism and Power

In Chapter One, urbanist participation through charrettes and EbDs was likened to Albrecht’s (2002) new type of planning that demonstrates an enhanced form of democracy and fosters spaces in which to voice diversity and difference. The case studies illustrate the difficulty of achieving that goal within the format of EbDs. Nevertheless, even though the EbDs in Newquay and Whitefield were imbricated by elite and complex power plays, they provide the grounds for some general comments at a variety of different levels – at the level of urbanist practice, at the level of participatory processes, and at the level of researching and rethinking power.
8.6.1 Urbanism, Participation and Power

The core question for this chapter is what are the implications of the power relations that were in operation in the EbDs for effective communicative participation. This question underpins the thesis which has focused on how a commitment to democratic processes can be reconciled in the face of a strong professional ideology. The answer depends on how participation is articulated within the professional discourse. For the urbanist Enquiry by Design process, the cases studied exposed a weak commitment to democracy, thus confirming Beauregard’s (2002) and Grant’s (2006) arguments. This was manifest in two principal ways. First, a strong participative democracy was secondary to the hegemonic visions instituted by project proponents in each case. As such the EbD was instrumental, a means to an end, for ensuring that the vision was realised. These observations raise a question about the articulated purpose of the EbD – it might better be framed as an urban design tool rather than as a means to participatory, or community led planning. In addition, the contexts in which it is employed should be carefully assessed. The complexity of the Whitefield case – antagonism, issues of race, culture, class, deprivation, and the built environment – revealed that the EbDs physical and instrumental focus may not be well suited to addressing such complexity, unless it is employed in conjunction with a series of other tools and mechanisms. Thus the results support Sarkissian et al.’s (1997) claims that urbanist charrette style processes are better suited to more straightforward physical development proposals and counter McGlynn and Murrain’s (1994) argument to the contrary.

Second, the way in which agents in the EbD cases appealed to positively framed concepts of community, inclusivity, and consensus belie an adherence to ideals of unity in a world riddled with complexity and disunity. Such appeals to unity are not confined to the urbanist discourse. The current study has shown how ideals of unity bracket or avoid power relations which are inherent to and constitutive of participatory processes. As such power relations and conflict are pushed to the margins, excluding those potentially already marginalised by pre-existing inequalities.

So while the hegemonic character of each project affected the extent to which the cases were inclusive and participatory, the framing effect of broader discourses also came into play. Nevertheless, there are several strategies at a practical level that could be adopted should a commitment to a stronger democracy be desired by EbD proponents:
An explicit recognition of the levels of involvement for participants in each tier and the different benefits that accrue at each level would allow for a more transparent articulation of the EbDs potential and therefore avoid rhetorical overstatements as to its capacity for public participation.

Avoiding rhetorical appeals to contested concepts of unity such as community and consensus, while concomitantly recognising the multiplicity, heterogeneity and embodied character of social relations in local places, will facilitate more inclusive practices.

Problematising the difficulty in achieving good community representation on the core team may initiate improved practices. Recognition of the desirability of formalised mutual relationships between the represented and representative will contribute to inclusivity and avoid de facto partial representation.

An acknowledgement and recognition of the role of expertise in the process will enhance transparency and aid in addressing the bias against local knowledge.

Recognition of the inherently antagonistic character of social spaces will facilitate a productive and real engagement with conflict and power.

In spite of the weaknesses pertaining to inclusivity, the strengths of the EbD processes revealed potential for moving beyond ideals of unity and toward an enhanced agonistic democracy. In this respect there are a number of implications that can be drawn for participatory processes generally.

8.6.2 Rethinking Participation and Power

The cases in this study have illustrated the messy, complex, shifting and contextual character of power in participatory processes. Normative principles are an important heuristic aid in improving processes and pointing toward weaknesses or issues that need to be addressed in practice, as has been demonstrated in the current study. Nevertheless, the use of normative principles must not mask the historicity and contingency of power in each different individual case. Moreover, a set of normative principles should not be reduced to universals or regarded in isolation from the discursive structures that inform them. Power and participation cannot be simplified to a tidy package of pragmatic answers that apply to any practical context. There is a need to think differently about power, conflict and participation.

This study has illustrated the value in understanding power and conflict as imbricated in one another and crucially, as inherent in social relations. By starting from such a position, power is already in operation, and its effects are already present – the effects of power cannot be mitigated or bracketed out of participatory processes, for that itself is an act of power that masks its own effects. At best, the distinction between positive power effects and
negative power effects can be identified (Forester 1999a, 1999b). Only then, can the negative effects of power be potentially transformed such that they are positive or at least benign.

There is no single answer as to how the negative effects of power can be transformed, as the effects will be determined by the context within which they are played out. However, there are two criteria that will facilitate rethinking power. First, there must be a willingness to engage (in practice, research and theory) with conflict and power. Second, there must be an interrogation of appeals to any ideals of unity or collectivity. At the heart of the current research is a critical orientation to ‘all forms of “we speak” [which] always involves asking what differences or conflicts of interest or experience are suborned within the assertion of collectivity’ (Levitas 2000:192). Although ‘we speak’ is integral and historically embedded in planning practice in concepts such as the common good, public interest, and consensus, a critical stance toward its effects is essential if the question ‘what power matters?’ is to be held in focus by researchers and reflective practitioners.

Understanding the way in which different meanings are framed and are contextually contingent is crucial to a critical stance that engages with and interrogates forms of ‘we speak’. The Foucauldian question (see Chapter One) ‘what is this reason that we use?’ (Foucault 1984:249) is significant. Strong professional ideologies will continue to emerge in the face of increasing global environmental and social crises, as different groups and movements are established to counter hegemonic projects that are perceived to be responsible for the dislocatory effects of vexing contemporary issues. Popularised movements such as the New Urbanism and traditional urbanism will continue their quests to hegemonise local spaces with the imaginaries of their discourses. The challenge is to recognise the potential effects of such hegemonic projects and to create spaces in which the hegemonic forces are open to contestation. The current study has illustrated that by scrutinising the principles, reasoning, articulatory practices, and character of the discourses that lie behind such movements, the effects of their operation can become more apparent. So while the power of different knowledges cannot be reconciled per se, they can be made visible. Only then, can spaces be created in which different knowledges are open to contestation and an enhanced agonistic democracy has the potential to emerge.

8.6.3 Final Reflections

The current study has involved a detailed analysis of two urbanist participatory processes. As such, the study provides a baseline of empirical data for future work on two
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fronts. First, it can be used as a comparative to investigate like cases of EbDs and charrettes. As such, it contributes to rectifying the sparseness of empirical studies on urbanist participation. Second, the urban transformations under study in the foregoing chapters are in their infancy. The implications of many of the power relations involved in the analysis here will not be fully understood until each project unfolds. Thus, the study forms the basis from which these two urban transformations can be traced into the future. Both have intrinsic value in their own right, and potentially contribute to broader debates on urban change. Newquay provides an interesting and valuable comparison to studies of Poundbury and other urbanist greenfield projects in the United Kingdom and elsewhere. The study of Whitefield establishes an initial record of how and to what effect urbanist principles can be applied to a regeneration project, thereby contributing to broader debates on regeneration.

The current research illustrates how the combination of an explicit critical stance which infers normative principles as an ethical standard and a discourse theory approach can tease out the meanings, discourses, antagonisms, and consequent power relations in a political social space. The theoretical frame employed facilitated a structural analysis of meanings and power at the micro level of local politics in the EbD process. Drawing on poststructuralism, political theory and philosophy provided a rich conceptual terrain capable of extending and rewarding planning theory with alternative ways of researching and understanding power. While a small number of planning theorists are exploring this terrain (for example, Gunder 2003; Hillier 2002, 2003; Ploger 2004) few, if any, have employed discourse theory derived from Laclau and Mouffe’s (2001) work. However, the approach also provokes further questions. Section 8.5 discussed the potential of an agonistic planning practice and asked several questions that provides extensive scope for a future research agenda on an agonistic democratic politics for planning. The core question for such an agenda is what are the conditions of possibility for an agonistic planning praxis?

There are two further points to make about a discourse theory approach. First, it is clear from the present study that discourse theory privileges the moment of antagonism. The analysis in this study has revealed the value in using tensions and antagonisms to identify the limits of discourse and the resultant meanings articulated in the political space. However, the Newquay case revealed the operation of a number of sedimented discourses. A theoretical question for discourse theorists then, is what is the effect of privileging the antagonistic when sedimented discourses may have equally powerful and potentially problematic effects that are silenced and marginalised by the very operation of the sedimented discourses? Thus, an expansion of the conceptual framework to incorporate a
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means of exploring the nature of sedimented discourses in the absence of antagonism is required. The second point related to the more structural level of analysis inherent in a discourse theory perspective, is that it does not provide an easy route to analysing the way in which power at the discursive level affects the constitution of identities and political subjectivities. Several discourse theorists are beginning to theorise at this level, by drawing heavily on Lacanian psychoanalysis (see Glynos 1999; Howarth and Glynos 2007; Stavrakakis 2005). A limitation of the current study lay in the constraints experienced in accessing data from individuals in the communities of both cases, and (as noted in section 8.2) for analysing the interactive character of the workshops. Thus the current study would be complemented by a further programme of research that offered a lens into the identities and subjectivities of each case, and would facilitate understanding questions of empowerment or disempowerment and how interests are articulated within the deliberative spaces of the EbDs.

The present research must be understood as an articulatory practice in and of itself – governed by conventions, norms and practices – and embedded in power relations. The research has involved a series of decisions, some easy and others more difficult, which resulted in the foreclosure of certain possibilities while simultaneously providing opportunities in other directions. The very decision to follow a discourse theory approach is an ethical decision, one based on a broad acceptance of the underlying principles of a radical democracy, a commitment to exposing the sedimented power relations which produce and reproduce inequalities within our societies. As such it is undertaken within a particular discursive frame, not just within the requirements of a doctoral thesis, but from a series of perspectives about the nature of research and the social. In Chapter Four, the critical stance adopted for the present research was explained, and as such lies open to contestation, debate and future dialogue.

At the outset of this thesis, the fundamental problematic of democratic decision-making was introduced – that is, the tension between the universal and the particular, collectivities and individuals, the local and the global. The question is: how can decisions that are taken in the public sphere that are intended to affect a universalised public be equitable when those decisions have a variable impact at the local level on particular individuals (see Chapter One). The issue is one central to contemporary democratic theory. For example, Laclau (2001:4) states that:
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The ambiguity of democracy can be formulated in the following terms: it requires unity, but it is only thinkable through diversity. If either of these two incompatible dimensions prevails beyond a certain point, democracy becomes impossible.

Collective decision making and the premise of a just and equal society depends on various formulations of democracy – of power to the people – where, by some means, the people have an influence on decisions that affect them. For participatory planning practice and research, a path in recognition of the two extremes is necessary in order to balance the need to decide for the collectivity against the potentially exclusionary effects of power imbricated in so deciding. The current research has demonstrated the value in understanding power such that every act is first and foremost one embedded in power relations. The challenge of an agonistic democratic planning praxis is to make those power relations open to contestation, recognise exclusionary negative effects and transform them into productive agonistic debate.
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Letters and unpublished material

Letter from Duchy of Cornwall sent to residents of streets neighbouring the Growth Area, dated 12th May 2004.


Letter from the Princes Foundation to all listed in Duchy of Cornwall’s database gathered at the Newquay Enquiry by Design Briefing Session, dated 15th July, 2004

Minutes of Building Code Workshop, held 8th July 2005 in Poundbury.


Newquay Growth Area – Enquiry by Design Briefing Session Agenda for Local Authorities, South West Regional Development Agency, and Others, prepared by Duchy of Cornwall and Prince’s Foundation.

Newquay Growth Area – Enquiry by Design Briefing Session Agenda for Architects and Builders, prepared by Duchy of Cornwall and Prince’s Foundation.

Newquay Growth Area – Enquiry by Design Briefing Session Agenda for Potential Users/Occupiers, prepared by Duchy of Cornwall and Prince’s Foundation.

Newquay Growth Area – Enquiry by Design Briefing Session Agenda for Landowners, prepared by Duchy of Cornwall and Prince’s Foundation.
Newquay Growth Area – Enquiry by Design Briefing Session Agenda for Registered Social Landlords, prepared by Duchy of Cornwall and Prince’s Foundation.

Newquay Growth Area – Enquiry by Design timetable prepared by the Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment.

Newquay Growth Area Enquiry by Design Briefing Session Programme, held 2nd and 3rd June, 2004 by the Duchy of Cornwall and the Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment.


Observation Notes of Building Code Workshop, held 8th July 2005 in Poundbury.

Websites

www.charretteinstitute.org/charrette.html
www.cnu.org
www.communities.gov.uk
www.cornwall.gov.uk
www.duchyofcornwall.org.uk
www/english-heritage.org.uk
www.fightforourhomes.com
www.nationalcharretteinstitute.org
www.planningportal.gov.uk
www.princeofwales.gov.uk/speechesandarticles/
www.princes-foundation.org
www.princes-regeneration.org
www.SouthWestRDA.org.uk
www.visionofbritain.org.uk
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Sample Interview Schedules
Appendix A

Interview Schedule
Land owner – Newquay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Background, role in Newquay
- Role in relation to the Newquay project
- History of interest in Newquay project
- Chapel Town Partnership – history, relations, role, operational mechanisms
- Briefing Session – purpose, involvement, roles, perceptions
- Working groups – purpose, involvement, roles, perceptions
- Nature of the workshop – purpose, involvement, perceptions, working relationships between different parties, interaction, communication, conflict, tension,
- Interactions and relationships with and between other parties involved – landowners, organisers, design team members, Council, residents
- Changes in relationships over the course of the whole process
- Influence in the process – before, during and after
- Value – benefits, disbenefits, what did you get out of it, what did others get out of it
- Learning
- Surprises
- Agreement, disagreement, consensus, dissensus, conflict
- Inclusivity
- Interaction of professional/expertise and lay knowledges
- Drawing, urban design, and facilitation
- General perceptions – locals, other stakeholders, landowners,
- Post EbD and next steps
- Other comments.
- Other contacts
Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Schedule</th>
<th>Council Officer – Newquay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Background and role for Council
- Role in Newquay project – individual and Councils
- Council collaboration with Chapel Town Partnership – history, relations, role, operational mechanisms
- Briefing Session – purpose, involvement, roles, perceptions
- Working groups – purpose, involvement, roles, perceptions
- Nature of the workshop – purpose, involvement, perceptions, working relationships between different parties, interaction, communication, conflict, tension,
- Interactions and relationships with and between other parties involved – landowners, organisers, design team members, Council, residents, etc
- Changes in relationships over the course of the process
- Influence in the process – before, during and after
- Value – benefits, disbenefits, what did you get out of it, what did others get out of it, related to other experience of participatory planning/public involvement
- What should have been different
- Learning
- Surprises
- Agreement, disagreement, consensus, dissensus, conflict
- Inclusivity
- Community involvement
- Interaction of professional/expertise and lay knowledges
- Drawing, urban design, and facilitation
- Planning issues, Council’s position, perceptions of masterplan
- Post EbD and next steps
- General perceptions – Council, locals, other stakeholders, landowners,
- Other comments, other contacts
- Background documents
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Interview Schedule
Whitefield Design Team – urbanist
Name ________________ Date ______ Time ______ Location ______

General re EbDs

• Role, background
• Experience in/with EbDs
• Background of EbD process, relationship with charrette
• Perceptions of charrettes/EbD in local government, fit within planning system
• Inclusivity
• Balance required outputs and inclusivity
• Role of urbanist principles
• Skills or qualities required of EbD facilitator, design team etc.
• Learning

Whitefield

• Role in Whitefield, history of involvement
• Purpose of the process
• Pre-EbD phase – purpose, involvement, roles, perceptions
• Nature of the workshop – purpose, involvement, perceptions, working relationships between different parties, interaction, communication, conflict, tension,
• Interactions and relationships with and between other parties involved – landowners, organisers, design team members, Council, residents, etc
• Changes in relationships over the course of the process
• Value – benefits, disbenefits, what did you get out of it, what did others get out of it
• Learning
• What should have been different
• Surprises
• Agreement, disagreement, consensus, dissensus, conflict
• Inclusivity
• Community involvement
• Interaction of professional/expertise and lay knowledges
Appendix A

- Drawing, urban design, and facilitation
- Post EbD and next steps
- General perceptions – Council, locals, other stakeholders, landowners,
- Compare Whitefield EbD with other EbDs / charrettes
- Other comments
- Background documents, literature
- Other contacts
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Interview Schedule
Whitefield resident – core team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Background, role in Whitefield
- Role in relation Whitefield EbD
- History of interest in project
- Whitefield Conservation Action Group – formation, purpose, operating mechanisms, relations within and with other stakeholders, future
- Pre-EbD phase – purpose, involvement, roles, perceptions
- Nature of the workshop – purpose, involvement, perceptions, working relationships between different parties, interaction, communication, conflict, tension, key issues
- Interactions and relationships with and between other parties involved – landowners, organisers, design team members, Council, agencies, residents
- Changes in relationships over the course of the whole process
- Influence in the process – before, during and after
- Value – benefits, disbenefits, what did you get out of it, what did others get out of it, for Whitefield
- Learning
- Surprises
- Agreement, disagreement, consensus, dissensus, conflict
- Inclusivity
- Interaction of professional/expertise and lay knowledges
- Drawing, urban design, and facilitation
- General perceptions – locals, other stakeholders, landowners,
- Post EbD and next steps
- Other comments.
- Other contacts
APPENDIX B

Urban design principles of the Prince’s Foundation for the Built Environment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Encourages</th>
<th>Discourages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td>Design that respects the complex character of a place and takes into consideration its history, geology, transportation links and its natural landscape.</td>
<td>Individual character and a sense of belonging to a place</td>
<td>Soulless, anonymous development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Space</strong></td>
<td>A recognition that the design of public areas including 'street furniture', signage, and lighting, is as important as the design of private spaces, and should be designed as part of an harmonious whole.</td>
<td>Harmonious and legible public areas.</td>
<td>Visual intrusion and clutter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permeability</strong></td>
<td>Urban design in which blocks of buildings are fully permeated by an interconnected street network.</td>
<td>Ease of access and a greater spread of traffic movement.</td>
<td>Inefficient movement and an oppressive sense of impenetrability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hierarchy</strong></td>
<td>A clear and legible ordering system which recognises a hierarchy between types of buildings or roads and their individual parts in relation to the whole.</td>
<td>An understanding of the relative significance of parts of a building or town and easy navigation within each.</td>
<td>Confusion and over reliance on signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Longevity</strong></td>
<td>Design that creates streets and buildings that will cope with a variety of uses during their lifetime.</td>
<td>Design solutions based on examples that have adapted well to change.</td>
<td>Buildings and places that are very specific to current need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>Design that creates a valuable asset in economic, social and environmental terms.</td>
<td>Long term investment in buildings, towns and cities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale</strong></td>
<td>Towns and buildings which, whatever their size, relate to human proportions.</td>
<td>A relationship between people and their built environment.</td>
<td>A feeling of being overwhelmed and alienated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harmony</strong></td>
<td>Design that sounds its own 'note' and yet blends with the local and natural environment.</td>
<td>Buildings and towns whose various parts work together and respect the value of the whole.</td>
<td>A confused and oppressive built environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enclosure</strong></td>
<td>Design which establishes a clear distinction between town and country, public and private space, thus encouraging appropriate activities within each.</td>
<td>Safe environments and the full and appropriate use of available space.</td>
<td>Wasteland and degraded no-go areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials</strong></td>
<td>Design that uses materials that are, wherever possible, indigenous, have a natural harmony with the landscape, and which are selected with care to ensure they improve with age and weathering.</td>
<td>Buildings that have a natural resonance with their environment and that can be easily repaired.</td>
<td>Long distance transport of materials, buildings with short life spans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decoration</strong></td>
<td>Design whose decoration not only enhances the quality and beauty of a building but helps engender emotional value and personal and cultural relevance.</td>
<td>Visual identity and interest, as well as fine craftsmanship.</td>
<td>Functional anonymity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Craftsmanship</strong></td>
<td>The care and attention with which a building is made rewards both the maker and the user and makes them likely to last and be valued by future generations.</td>
<td>Longevity, the inspiration of generations of potential practitioners of building crafts as an art form.</td>
<td>Quick-fix solutions and low-grade buildings that rely on assembly only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>The carefully facilitated, early involvement of the local community in order to create places which have a civilizing influence, which meet people's needs, desires and aspirations, and engender civic pride.</td>
<td>A proactive, holistic approach to planning.</td>
<td>A reactive piecemeal approach to planning and a compromised result.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* www.Princes-Foundation.org
APPENDIX C

Timetable for the Newquay Briefing Session or Pre-Workshop
June 2004
### Appendix C

#### Day One: Wednesday 2nd June, 2004 – Full day introductory workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Welcome and background to the project (Duchy representative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1130</td>
<td>Explanation of the EbD process (Foundation representative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Site visit &amp; tour (Growth Area; Newquay; St Columb Minor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430</td>
<td>Follow up plenary session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Day One: Evening – Public Open Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Arrival and refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Welcome and background to project (Duchy representative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Growth Area Strategy (Restormel representative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>The Pattern Book – the language of Newquay (architect – consultant to the Duchy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Introduction to EbD and expectations from evening (Foundation representative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Opportunity for public input, comments and suggestions (small facilitated group discussions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Day Two: Thursday 3rd June, 2004

Technical briefing sessions with Duchy and the Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0900</td>
<td>Session One: Local Authority, South West Regional Development Agency(^1) and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Session Two: Potential Users/Occupiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>Session Three: Landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Session Four: Registered Social Landlords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Session Five: Architects, Builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) The South West Regional Development Agency is a quasi Governmental body at the regional level, charged with ensuring and promoting sustainable economic development for the whole of the South West region in England (see www.SouthWestRDA.org.uk).
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APPENDIX D

Summary of the Newquay Working Groups
Agendas and Composition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>1. Existing and future car parking needs</td>
<td>6 Council officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Existing and future public transport needs, outline strategies</td>
<td>1 Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Outline strategies for integrating Newquay and Growth Area via transport links</td>
<td>4 core team (incl transport consultants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Investigate opportunities for maximising pedestrian and cycle links within and between Growth Area and town centre</td>
<td>2 rail network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Understand impact of Growth Area on existing roads and congestion hotspots</td>
<td>2 charity organisation on sustainable travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Chapel Town Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1. Agree which Registered Social Landlords could deliver the affordable housing quota</td>
<td>6 registered social landlords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Investigate who builds affordable housing when pepper-potted (developer or Landlord)</td>
<td>3 house builders/ developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Define % affordable housing for site</td>
<td>3 Council officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Explore national examples of affordable housing</td>
<td>2 Councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Establish key worker housing requirements with local authority</td>
<td>3 Chapel Town Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Investigate mechanisms for sustainable affordability</td>
<td>1 care provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Investigate grant funding loopholes and avoidance measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Draft and assess funding requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1. Investigate future education requirements for Newquay</td>
<td>8 Council officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Investigate funding opportunities</td>
<td>6 local school representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Understand Local Education Authority Strategy</td>
<td>2 regional Diocese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Draft footprint schemes for Nursery and Primary Schools within Growth Area</td>
<td>2 regional agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Explore life long learning, and potential for shared use facilities</td>
<td>1 Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Investigate adult education provision</td>
<td>1 Gusti Veor resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Investigate key worker housing requirements for education</td>
<td>1 voluntary sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Report on applicability of national agenda for redevelopment of secondary schools</td>
<td>1 Chapel Town Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and employment</td>
<td>1. Explore ways to encourage year round employment</td>
<td>6 Council officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Investigate how to attract industry/employers to relocate in Growth Area</td>
<td>4 local economic development voluntary groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Report on opportunities for incubator units</td>
<td>2 Chapel Town Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Understand local wages/employment needs</td>
<td>1 public sector regional agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Understand impact of new development on Newquay</td>
<td>1 Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Investigate connections and implications for Growth Area within Newquay Action Framework</td>
<td>1 employment agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and collaborate with Surf-Capital Steering Group.</td>
<td>1 private sector business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1. Explore integrated health provision, understand needs and footprint requirements</td>
<td>6 public sector healthcare provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Viability of relocation of Newquay Cottage hospital to Growth Area</td>
<td>3 Council officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Requirements for health key worker housing</td>
<td>3 Chapel Town Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Opportunities for spiritual health/welfare provision in Growth Area</td>
<td>3 religious groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Investigate potential for collaboration of Foundation with Local Health Authority in looking for new hospital premises</td>
<td>2 voluntary sector care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 private sector health providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 core team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 care provider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

| Environment and Ecology | 1. Appoint expert to explore flooding issues  
2. Understand issues re barn owls and bats  
3. Define preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment required for EbD week  
4. Investigate recycling of waste and water  
5. Comment on Pattern Book and investigate use of sustainable materials and housing | 9 Council officers  
6 charity organisations  
4 core team (incl consultants)  
4 Chapel Town Partnership  
1 public/private partnership  
2 private sector  
2 regional agencies  
1 Councillor |

(Source: Prince’s Foundation 2004a; 2005a)
APPENDIX E

Timetable for the Newquay EbD workshop
### Appendix E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>0915 – 0930</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Tier A, B Working Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0930 – 1300</td>
<td>Stakeholder briefings/presentations</td>
<td>Tier A, B Working Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1400 – 1600</td>
<td>Site tour</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1600 – 1700</td>
<td>Technical workshop</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1700 – 1800</td>
<td>Report back on key issues and group discussion</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>0915 – 1300</td>
<td>Testing the Structure</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitated groups on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community services, housing &amp; mixed uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Movement and transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Urban structure and urban transect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1400 –</td>
<td>Design team and Masterplanning team design sessions</td>
<td>Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>0915 – 1000</td>
<td>Design team briefing for the day</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 – 1300</td>
<td>Strategic development of key concepts / action for implementation plans</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1400 - 1700</td>
<td>Production of information and presentation for evening mid-charrette review</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1700 - 1730</td>
<td>Arrival of masterplanner and contributors</td>
<td>Tier A, B, working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1730 – 2000</td>
<td>Mid-Charrette Review with masterplanner</td>
<td>Tier A, B, working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>0930 - 1000</td>
<td>Core team briefing for the day</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 – 1200</td>
<td>Testing the structure and strategic development of key concepts / action for implementation plans</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1200 – 1300</td>
<td>Review and organisation for final presentations and production of information</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1400 – late</td>
<td>Design sessions masterplanning team and design team</td>
<td>Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>0930 – 1000</td>
<td>Core team briefing for the day and final presentation</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 – 1400</td>
<td>Design and preparation for final presentation (information production, photographing work, &amp; powerpoint images created for presentation)</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1400 – 1500</td>
<td>Finalisation of design for final presentation</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1500 –</td>
<td>Design cut-off time</td>
<td>Tier A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1900 – 2100</td>
<td>Presentation production and preparation</td>
<td>Design Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final presentation to all participants and general public</td>
<td>Tier A, B, C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>