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The question "What is the central core matter of the discipline Economics?", is one which has been a familiar route into the subject for many undergraduates, and there are traditionally many answers each aimed at marginally expanding perception as to the nature of this central core matter. Setting the details of this particular debate to one side, certainly most economists would agree that economics has largely concerned itself with the study of resource allocation. The questions posed by the great economists from Adam Smith to Milton Friedman have been concerned with providing an explanation, and indeed sometimes a prescription, as to how resources are allocated.

Many practitioners and writers over the last fifteen years have tended to re-emphasise the role of prices, profits and markets and the general importance of the private-enterprise system in providing answers to our economic problems and, although many of their models may be regarded as abstract and artificial, they are presented to us as being relevant to the problems of the real world.

Alongside this concern with the nature of the private enterprise system, has existed a lower-key body of thought concerned with non-market resource allocation which has perhaps lacked the
theoretical and intellectual glamour of the more traditional economics. Here the traditional cast of buyers and sellers moving towards an equilibrium via the motives of profit maximisation and optimising a utility function, have been replaced by a study of organisation and decision making where bounded rationality, behavioural theory, patterns of decision making and theories of the distribution of power are the central ingredients.

Non market resource allocation is not confined to the public sector, for such writers as J K Galbraith (1) have emphasised the similarity of problem definition and search for solution that faces both governments and multi-national corporations. The firm and the public authority have much in common with respect to their resource allocation problems.

This study is concerned with resource allocation within the public sector. As such our context is not the rational, goal-seeking, optimising organisation beloved of scientific management, but rather a view of organisations that sees them as aggregates of individuals, each of whom seeks to protect and advance his or her own interest, where collective goals are ambiguous and difficult to identify, where management structures reflect past and present distributions of power and where the right to make decisions is a power granted by higher authority or obtained as a result of the struggle of individuals and groups to protect or develop their own prerogatives. The neutral, disinterested public servant seeking
the public interest through the faithful implementation of the policy of his political masters, has little place in this literature. Public decisions are considered to be based on limited information, taken by individuals of varied computational ability, facing unclear and unaccepted goals, who seek a satisfactory performance of their task in the light of their own aspirations. In such a scenario, conflict and uncertainty are two key variables and whichever individual possesses the information, knowledge and skill to ease or resolve them may acquire a prescribed place in the pattern of decision making.

We must also, on a wider scale, make some consideration of the role of the state in society and the needs it responds to, and the underlying determinants of policy.

This study is concerned with some of the special features associated with public sector resource allocation, in particular where such resource allocation requires inputs from both central and local government. The particular focus of the study is the processes whereby resources were allocated for the planned expansion of the town of Northampton from 1965 to 1985.
A consciousness that such matters were worthy of investigation struck the author as a consequence of his own participation in the process of expanding Northampton. Holding the following position provided a base for securing access to information, opinion and views relevant to the activity.

1973-1976 - Northampton Borough Councillor
Deputy Leader Majority Party 1975/76
Chairman of Finance Sub Committee 1974/76
Deputy Chairman of Policy/Resources Committee 1975/76
Member of Town Expansion Committee 1974/76

1979-1987 - Northampton Borough Councillor
Deputy Leader Minority Party
Member of Policy Committee
Member of Housing Committee
Member of Employment & Economic Dev. Committee

1980-1985 - Board Member of Northampton Development Corporation

A considerable portion of this study is therefore founded on observer participation although it is supplemented with in depth interviews with other participants, official minutes and documents, officer memoranda and correspondence. Such an empirical approach
has its disadvantages to the extent that conclusions, such as they are, must be tentative and a basis for further research. Nevertheless, the distilled view of practitioners has some value for, at the end of the day, academic research must contribute positively to the real world and its problems. In the words of P Saunders (1986) we must seek to

"get a grip on the messy stuff of political reality" (2).

The South East Study published in 1963 stimulated central government to respond to the problems of increasing population and congestion in South East England. The response took the form of identifying key areas within one hundred miles of London that were appropriate for taking overspill population away from the capital. From this policy emerged the designation of Milton Keynes as a new town and the decision to expand Northampton and Peterborough. For separate reasons of urban planning and economic growth, Warrington, Telford and Central Lancs. were also designated as new towns. These six towns, collectively known as the Mark III new towns, were formally established under the 1965 New Town Act.

For the the Mark III new towns, such planned growth involved the creation of homes, jobs and public services on a substantial scale and in turn required agencies of central government, local government, statutory undertakers and private enterprise to collaborate closely in this major task of social engineering.
This case study of Northampton identifies a number of unique administrative arrangements between central and local government, associated with Northampton's expansion, and seeks to advance the proposition that the Northampton experience was such as to suggest that such administrative arrangements are worthy of further application in other circumstances where similar town expansion activities are being undertaken.

Towns provide certain vital social and economic functions and their definition, locale and growth is largely the purview of the economic geographer. The natural growth of towns is largely explained in terms of these changing industrial, technological and social functions and there exists a considerable literature devoted to particular causes of natural growth, from the works of W Christaller (1933) (2) on central place theory to those of more modern analysts, such as B T Robson (1973) (3), concerned with the statistical analysis of travel to work patterns. The key feature of the natural growth of towns is that it is demand led, urban settlement patterns responding to social and economic requirements.

This study has as its context the planned growth of towns, a situation where central government seeks to interfere with those factors which are producing a natural urban settlement pattern. Such a supply led urban development process involves the allocation of resources and the creation of physical assets and services in anticipation of demand. Pari passu with the generation of these
physical assets and services, the planning authority must undertake administrative activity concerned to generate the necessary demand for them. The main instruments of demand generation are marketing and promotional programmes and the interference with market prices through subsidies, etc. Supply led town expansion has not been an unqualified success in the United Kingdom. The provision of physical assets and services, high powered marketing and substantial market interference do not inevitably create social and industrial communities.

In this study we are primarily concerned with the impact of the special partnership arrangements initially established in 1965 between the Ministry of Housing and Local Government and Northampton County Borough for all those activities concerned with town expansion.

Planned town expansion of the size experienced by Northampton 1965 to 1985 requires central government initiation and central government resources. It also involves a considerable element of central government direction and control. It is a process that begins with the designation of an area of land that will be developed and development is sustained through the provision of financial resources. The pace and direction of town expansion is a function of two elements, the totality of financial resources made
available by central government and the ease with which the agents of town expansion can convert that finance into physical assets and services which are taken up by householders and firms.

It is the contention of this study that unique "partnership" arrangements, established to affect the expansion of Northampton 1965 to 1985, operated in such a fashion that they are worthy of extension to other areas of central government policy in the 1990's, particularly the regeneration of our inner cities.

We must, therefore, commence our study with a closer look at the partners who were to be concerned with the expansion of Northampton.
   Andre Deutsch

(2) P Saunders (1986) Reflections on the dual politics
   thesis: the argument, its origins and
   its critics.

   in M Goldsmith and S Villadsen Urban
   Political Theory and the Management
   of Fiscal Stress. P12.

(3) W Christaller (1933) Central Places in Southern Germany
   English translation, C W Baskin
   (1966). Eaglewood Cliffs, New
   Jersey, USA

   Methuen & Co, London
Chapter 2

THE PARTNERS AND PARTNERSHIP

Northampton

Northampton is about 67 miles North West of London. It is adjacent to the M1 motorway and is on a loop of the main railway line from London to Manchester. Its main asset as an industrial and commercial centre is its central geographical location and the ease of its North-South communications.

As early as 1932 Northampton was seeking to attract new industry by stressing its geographical location. The town council at that time employed the slogan "Wonderfully placed at the crossroads of England", and, if one can speak of a three-part transport history, namely canals, railways and roads, then the central advantages of Northampton are physically evident in the Grand Union Canal, the main line from London to Manchester and the M1 motorway all passing within a few miles of the town. (Fig 1,2). Not only central location, but also ease of communication with the rest of the country is Northampton's strong card.
map of the English Canal System.
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The original name for Northampton was Hamtune, meaning home town to the invading but homesick Anglo-Saxons settling on the banks of the River Nene (1). Although initially a small Romano-British settlement and first referred to in writing in 914 (300 population under the Saxon King Edward the Elder), the earliest major reference to Northampton occurs in the Domesday Book when the prefix North was added to distinguish it from Southhamtune.

Northampton was an important centre in the Middle Ages; a favourite town of King John, it had been granted its charter in 1190 by his brother, Richard. In the thirteenth century, it was one of the six most prosperous towns in England and third in size after London and Norwich, enjoying at this time a large religious settlement and occasional visits from parliament. The town, however, was unable to sustain this pre-eminence during the 14th and 15 centuries, and entered upon a period of relative stagnation and decline.

At the beginning of the 17th century, Northampton was still a walled town dominated by its castle. Town life was focussed on the market square and the radial road pattern has remained to the present day. The 17th century was, however, one of great change in the town. Northampton became a stronghold of Puritanism and the citizens backed Cromwell in the Civil War, providing footwear for the New Model Army. Charles II on his accession to the throne ordered that the town should suffer sleighting which involved the demolition of the town walls and the castle. Then the dreadful fire of 1675 destroyed
the greater part of the town and rebuilding began almost immediately. The new Northampton was described by Daniel Defoe as the "handsomest and best town in all this part of England". (2)

By the early 18th century Northampton had become primarily a shoe making town, but trade remained small until the opening of the Grand Union Canal in 1815. In the fifteen years following, the town almost doubled its population to 15,000. This specialisation to a degree resulted in the town being bypassed by the Industrial Revolution. The mechanisation of boot and shoe manufacture had proceeded only very slowly, and factory as opposed to domestic based production only really developed in the mid 19th century. As a result Northampton is still characterised by the many small factories scattered over the town. The existence of a considerable number of independent craftsmen in part explains the non-conformist and liberal traditions of the town at this period when it was regularly returning the atheist Bradlaugh to the House of Commons despite his continuing expulsions.

The main growth of Northampton took place after the building of the railway in 1845 and toward the end of the 19th century the population had reached 61,000 and the town had achieved County Borough status. Throughout the major part of the 20th century it has remained a quiet, unspectacular market town for the County of Northamptonshire. It was the largest urban area in Britain that was not bombed during the second world war. During the 1950s and early
1960s it enjoyed the level of prosperity associated with Midland England but there was a growing concern about the nature of its industrial and commercial base.

The eventual expansion of Northampton was to some extent inevitable following the opening of the Northampton section of the M1 motorway in 1958. Located in the centre of England and at the hub of a new national communications network, the town was unlikely to remain a small market centre serving its county hinterland. Its development possibilities were soon recognised by the Town and Country Planning Association which in 1961 suggested that Northampton was a possible candidate for expansion. (3). Such a suggestion reappeared in the South East Study 1963, which had been commissioned by a Conservative government to look at the problem of population growth in the South East of England. The authors of the study had been briefed on the need for another generation of new and expanded towns and the suggestion had been eagerly taken up in their recommendations. These were largely accepted by the government and enshrined in a White Paper. (4). The White Paper accepted the need to decant population from London and identified six possible towns which would be considered as possible recipient authorities. These were Ashford, Ipswich, Northampton, Peterborough, Stanstead and Swindon.
Thus Northampton was scheduled to be one of a number of medium-sized towns which were to be expanded under the New Towns Act 1965. With this particular national policy central government sought to enjoy the advantages to be accrued from the expansion of existing towns rather than greenfield site new towns. The advantages were identified as increased speed of development in the early years, substantial rehabilitation and redevelopment possibilities in the existing town, immediately available central area facilities, established employment possibilities for the incoming population. In addition there was heightened central government awareness of 'new town blues'.

"A new town with all its physical planning advantages can lack the atmosphere that comes from a place having what might be called 'depth in time'." (5).

In the early 1960s it was clear that Northampton possessed many of the necessary attributes for developing an expanded, coherent and satisfied community. Already a national motorway system was developing to link every major city in England, and Northampton's central position gave its industry ready access to markets in every part of the country, to ports on the South and East coast and to all major manufacturing and administration centres. Situated close to the main rail line from London to Manchester, Northampton had an established character and maturity with a wide choice of employment and residential facilities. It enjoyed a successful shopping
centre, green and broad parks, some exceptional churches and sports venues for County Cricket, the Football League and one of the leading Rugby Football clubs.

In local government terms, Northampton had been a County Borough from 1888 and therefore responsible for all the local government services within the area - education, housing, planning, etc - and on 1 April 1965 enjoyed County Borough boundaries which encompassed some 125,000 people. In its pre 1974 state, the Borough Council was made up of both Councillors and Aldermen; the Councillors were elected for three years, one-third retiring every year, and the Aldermen were elected by the Council for six years, one-third retiring every two years. In the late 1950s-early 1960s, there existed a very delicate balance between the Labour and Conservative groups on the Council, and annual elections constantly threatened the current political majority. In 1964, the year prior to designation, Northampton experienced a most bitter election dispute around the "pepperpot election".

"... the voter who went to a St George Ward polling station in the May 1964 elections looked at three names on the ballot and promptly put a cross against the Liberal candidate. Then came a change of mind; the cross was marked out by a squiggle, and a fresh cross made for the Labour candidate. It was an action which was to have repercussions far outside Northampton. During the subsequent count, the paper with two crosses was disallowed by the Returning Officer, despite protests by Mr
Richard Gregson (Labour) that it was a valid vote for him. After two recounts, it was found that Conservative and Labour had dead-heated and lots were drawn to decide who would take the seat. The method chosen was almost bizzarre: two pepper pots, one black, one white. Into one went the name of the Labour candidate and into the other the Conservative. The pots were put into the Town Clerk's pocket and the draw made by the Returning Officer. It was a victory for the Conservative, Mr Pearson - by a sneeze.

Not only did Mr Pearson retain his seat, the Conservatives kept control of the Council by 25 to 23, the parties later became evenly matched when Labour claimed an extra aldermanic seat.

The last, however, had not been heard of the Pepperpot Election. Labour persisted with their protest about the spoilt ballot paper and drew up an election petition. On July 24th an election court was duly convened in Northampton. Presiding over it was Mr Commissioner Bristow. He heard arguments about the paper, looked at it through a magnifying glass, and decided: "its a good vote for Labour". Exit Pearson, enter Gregson. The fact that Mr Gregson was now the duly elected representative for St George Ward gave Labour a 25 to 23 majority on the Council." (6).
Thus the Labour-controlled Council in existence at the time designation was announced on 3rd February 1965 was one that owed its position to the Election Court Commissioner. In addition, the normal annual elections that were due in May 1965 had been postponed to November 1965 because of a ward boundary dispute associated with the overall extension of the County Borough boundary. After two inquiries set up by the new Labour Home Secretary, Sir Frank Soskice, votes of censure in the House of Commons survived by eight votes, the largely conservative plan was accepted. Local political power at this time was a very unstable commodity.

Amidst this heady political excitement the business of the County Borough had to be continued, routinised decision making had to proceed. There was a need for a political consensus, a certain stability in local political life, especially with the prospect of town expansion and a development corporation on the horizon. Key politicians on both sides of the political divide recognised this situation and began cautiously to construct a political consensus around the need to provide for town expansion. The leading personalities in this movement were R Dilleigh and Carol Trusler for Labour and J Corrin, J Lewis and D Walmsley for the Conservatives. With considerable difficulty, they were able to lead their respective party groups towards a consensus on town expansion.
The Ministry of Housing and Local Government

The machinery provided by the New town Acts has been used for a variety of purposes. It has been used to spearhead economic regeneration, to improve living conditions in areas such as coalfields, but its major role has been to take "overspill" of both people and industry from the conurbations.

In securing these objectives, it has also been possible to provide new and improved standards of development and to experiment with new ideas and, in particular, it currently provides an additional option for inner city renewal.

The initial steps required to establish a new town in 1965, however, were:

1. Once central government had established its general policy on new towns as positive, it had to indicate its preference for particular sub-regions, areas, or even individual towns.

2. At this point, there was a dialogue between central and local government as to the general locality of the proposed new development, but its precise area was kept open. The Minister could at this point invite professional advice from other sources.
3. Following these consultations, the Minister could make a draft
designation order for the area of the new or expanded town.
At this point, the proposals had a fair degree of precision.

4. Following the publication of the draft designation order there
was inevitably a public inquiry undertaken by an inspector
appointed by the Ministry. All views were heard and the
Inspector made a report to the Minister including recom-
mendations.

5. In the light of the Inspector's report the Minister could
amend, abandon or confirm his draft designation order.

The establishment of a designated area was the fundamental part of
the town expansion process for it constituted the key to future
progress.

"From this act of designation flow all the statutory powers -
the right to buy land compulsorily, the freezing of land
values, the use of Exchequer money and the many other
processes involved in building a new town." (7).

The designation order settled the issue of the land that would be
subject to physical development. For the original new towns it was
stated that it was the intention to acquire all land within the
designated area and originally there was an obligation upon
development corporations to purchase all land offered to them within
seven years. Land could be acquired by consent or through compulsorily purchase, although the latter required the Minister's approval.

Following designation three main issues confronted the Minister: the development corporation, the master plan, and finance.

Under the New Towns Act 1946, the main engine of new town development was a development corporation. This was the organisation which was to be given the responsibility for developing the land within the designated area.

"The new town corporation comes into being by an order of the Minister, under his seal of office, constituting the corporation for the purpose of developing land specified in a particular designated area, giving it a name and setting out its constitution - a chairman, a deputy chairman and not more than seven other members. The minister's order does not at that stage appoint the members: it merely creates the corporation as a legal entity able to enter into contracts, hold the title to land, take decisions and carry out the many other functions and legal processes necessary in the course of building a town." (8).

The development corporations were responsible to the Minister and were subject to his direction. Formal directives were, in fact, very rare but the corporations were subject to a steady stream of
guidance and instructions, and each corporation required ministry approval of its capital and revenue budgets. The amount of freedom enjoyed by the corporations was even more circumscribed in that every major item of expenditure and every development proposal required the approval of the Ministry and, through them, the Treasury. Nevertheless, once having secured Ministry approval the emphasis was upon action and performance. Ministry approval, for example, of a development proposal automatically provided planning permission and the necessary finance.

Besides establishing a development corporation the Minister became concerned with the Master Plan. It was the Master Plan that provided the detail of physical development. It established road networks, housing patterns, retail and recreational areas and the time scale of development. Master Plans have been produced by the Ministry itself, by private consultants, and by development corporations. It is both a highly technical and a highly human activity. It requires professional skills in geography, town planning, transportation, demography, together with a capacity to envisage future life-styles.

"There are no stereotyped set of rules for Master Plans. Each new town has its own problems and each planner has his own individual approach. His ideas are subject to the closest scrutiny and he has plenty of opportunities to explain them. He must carry with him the development corporation, the local
authorities and the statutory undertakers, he must give the
general public the chance of criticising or objecting, and he
must satisfy the Minister at a public inquiry." (9).

Although the most important document in the new town process, the
Master Plan is not a statutory requirement. It has no legal
significance but has been developed as an administrative necessity.
For all this, it remains as the clearest statement of what the new
town aspires to be.

The public financing of a new town is largely based on the concept
that everything will be paid for out of development value.
Development corporations are financed through Treasury loans which
it uses to fund both revenue and capital expenditure. All advances
are at the rate of interest in force at the time the money is
borrowed and are repayable over 60 years by equal half-yearly
installments. Not unlike many family mortgages, early payments are
largely interest with small elements of capital, this proportion
changing over the years. At the end of its life the development
corporation is expected to be receiving revenues from rents and
leases that will allow it to repay all that has been borrowed.
There is another major source of finance which does not have to be
repaid and does not involve funding out of development gain. This
is the important area of housing subsidies which operate through the
development corporation's separate housing revenue account.
Other public bodies clearly make a major contribution to new town development. Statutory Undertakers, Health Authorities, have had to finance their contributions, sometimes with additional central government finance. Private capital is also a major feature of new town development. This is especially the case with housing, office and industrial development and retailing. Over the history of new towns the importance of private capital has steadily increased.

The department of state responsible for the implementation of the New Towns policy was thus the Ministry of Housing and Local Government. In October 1964 its Permanent Secretary was Dame Evelyn Sharp who enjoyed a considerable reputation for effectiveness and determination, and who had worked under Lewis Silkin, the Labour Party protagonist of the New Towns programme. The new Minister was Richard Crossman who, previous to the October 1964 General Election, was Labour's Shadow Spokesman on Higher Education. To have this new responsibility was something of a surprise. (10).

The new Minister inherited the South East Study and the White Paper CMND 2308 South East England, whereby the previous Conservative government had accepted its key recommendations. As the party of planning and the party responsible for the New Towns Act 1946, it is not surprising that Crossman was to recommit his party and government to the New Towns Programme. That Northampton was to form part of this programme was basically confirmed by the Northampton, Bedford and North Bucks Study. This study, (11), undertaken by Hugh Wilson, Chief Architect and Planning Officer, Cumbernauld New Town,
and Lewis Womersley, City Architect of Sheffield, was to endorse the ring of new towns in a radius of approximately 65 miles around London.

On February 3rd 1965, Richard Crossman announced a policy for dealing with London overspill population through the establishment of a series of new towns of which Northampton was one.

"At 3.30 there came my second major statement of my career as Minister: this was about London overspill and the use of new towns to deal with it. I announced the new town at Bletchley. And also another kind of New Town which consists of doubling the population of a town by the device of setting up a New Town Commission to work with the County Borough authorities - we are to start with three famous boroughs, Northampton, Peterborough and Ipswich." (12).

Ipswich was subsequently to reject the idea of town expansion, and Warrington, as a County Borough, was to be added to the list. But of the three County Boroughs involved, Northampton was the only Borough whose boundaries were to fall completely within the designated area and, indeed, after 1974, was to enjoy boundaries coterminous with the designated area.
Partnership

It is the contention of this study that the expansion of Northampton was undertaken by a distinctive form of government, a partnership between central and local government which possessed institutional form and specific functions. The word "partnership" tends to be a popular one and, as it possesses acceptable moral undertones, it is frequently applied to mask the reality of relationships. Whilst it is also often used in a manner which implies an equality of powers and responsibilities, the major feature associated with it is the idea of sharing. Partnership is about sharing. It may be sharing risk or powers or functions. The Northampton partnership involved a sharing of powers and functions between central and local government. There is no presumption that this was an equal partnership; its exact balance was a function of two elements - partnership breadth and partnership depth.

Partnership breadth involves the identification of those activities that the partners agree will be subject to the partnership arrangements. In the Northampton experience, where partnership was concerned with the expansion of a town, a considerable number of activities were potentially available for inclusion within the partnership. These included:
a) The legal and parliamentary process of designation.
b) Developing a Master Plan
c) Resource acquisition and assembly.
d) Resource use .. Infrastructure development.

Road Construction
House Construction.
Shops/Office Construction.
Factory Construction.
The development of Parks & Open Spaces.
The attraction and placement of new population.
The provision of Education and Community facilities.
The development of Sport and Leisure facilities.
Housing Management.
The marketing and sale of assets.

This list is by no means comprehensive, but it indicates the range of activities that could go into any partnership arrangement associated with town expansion. The partnership between central government (The Ministry of Housing and Local Government) and Northampton County Borough Council had to involve a resolving as to which of these activities were to be within the scope of the partnership and which would each partner reserve for their own
direction and control. The clarification of this issue was of major importance in the eyes of, in particular, the Development Corporation.

"But partnership involves more than a platitudinous declaration of intent. It requires a clear understanding between the parties as to their role and functions." (12)

Thus partnership in Northampton involved each partner positively identifying activities for which he was publicly responsible and accountable, and voluntarily making them part of a partnership arrangement. In fact all of the above list were included in the partnership arrangements in some form or other.

Partnership depth is a rather more complex area in that once an activity has been identified as being within the framework of partnership, it becomes necessary to determine more carefully the component parts of that activity and to ascertain the role of each partner with respect to each component part.

For example, in the field of housing construction, the activity can be broken down into two general areas, the provision of publicly owned housing for rent and the provision of plots for sale to private builders. The generation of publicly owned housing for rent was an activity very familiar to a housing authority like a County Borough and thus this was an activity where the partnership arrangements could be quite significant in their depth; on the other hand, the preparation, marketing and sale of private plots of
land to both builders and members of the public was one in which the County Borough had little experience and partnership arrangements were quite limited.

For each identified partnership activity the partners establish a division of labour, a form of contract, in the key areas associated with the activity. These areas will normally include information, resources, operations control and policy formulation. When one of the partners considers that they have an activity which they wish to make subject to the partnership, then they accept that they will be placed in a situation involving some surrendering of authority to its partner. The major landmarks of such a surrendering process would be:

Partner A (Original source of authority)

a) Total authority and control with Partner A answering questions.
b) Sharing information.
c) Granting favours.
d) Offering financial resources.
e) Granting executive and operational control.
f) Joint policy formulation.
g) Retaining a veto on specified matters.
h) Total authority and control with partner B.

Partner B (No original authority)
Thus an activity may be included within the breadth of the partnership but the depth may be limited to sharing information with the other partner. On the other hand the depth may be such that all aspects of the activity are granted to the partner, the other confining his involvement to the right to veto certain facets of the activity. In some cases the division of an activity between partners will be on a geographic rather than a functional basis. In the activity of building houses for rent, the agreement involved such a geographic division. House building by the Borough Council was confined to the pre-1974 area, the Development Corporation confined its activities to the new areas. The management of the housing stock, so created, was undertaken entirely by the borough Council.

On its establishment the Northampton Development Corporation largely assumed the central government role in the partnership. Although on occasion the Borough Council would emphasise that partnership had been originally struck directly with the Ministry of Housing and Local Government. Thus in the designated areas, housing management policy formulation and the provision of resources was determined by the Development Corporation, but operations control was in the hand of the Borough Council who accepted the obligation of information provision to the Development Corporation.
Thus the partnership relationship between Northampton Borough Council and Northampton Development Corporation is explained in terms of a number of identified activities - partnership breadth - and a series of agreements - partnership depth.

In outline such arrangements were:-

a) The master plan drawn up by consultants Wilson and Womersley was a joint plan of both the Ministry and the County Borough.

b) An "Agreed Memorandum" was negotiated and signed by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry, Dame Evelyn Sharp, and the leader of the County Borough, Mr R Dilleigh.

This document provided:-

(i) Defined representation of the County Borough on the Development Corporation.

(ii) A veto for the County Borough Council on appointments to the Board of the Northampton Development Corporation.

(iii) A defined sphere of influence whereby expansion within the existing County Borough boundary, in particular the central area, was to be the
responsibility of the County Borough and expansion in the new areas was to be the responsibility of the Development Corporation.

c) To avoid unnecessary duplication, a scheme of shared officers was established.

(i) The Chief Executive of the County Borough Council (after 1973 the Borough Solicitor) was appointed the Chief Legal Officer of the Northampton Development Corporation.

(ii) The County Borough Engineer was appointed Chief Engineer to the Northampton Development Corporation.

(iii) The County Borough Housing Manager was appointed the Housing Manager of the Northampton Development Corporation.

Thus all the Legal, Engineering and Housing functions of Northampton Development Corporation were administered by Chief Officers of the County Borough.

d) Certain functions of the Northampton Development Corporation were undertaken on an agency basis by the County Borough namely, Engineering, Legal and Housing
functions. Thus the County Borough implemented these activities of expansion for the whole of the expansion area.

In addition the Development Corporation's Chief Estate Officer administered lettings for industrial, commercial and office sites in the central area on behalf of the County Borough and the Borough Treasurer administered all routine financial activities for the Development Corporation.

e) Regular joint meetings were established between the County Borough Council and its Chief Officers and the Development Corporation and its Chief Officers, with the Chairmanship rotating, formal agenda and minutes.

f) Private development in the new expansion areas was not controlled by the Development Corporation under Section 6(2) 1965 New Town Act, but handed over to the County Borough Planning Committee, which thus exercised this function throughout the whole of the expansion area.

These partnership arrangements were unprecedented and have not been repeated.

A careful examination of the annual reports of the New Town Development Corporations reveals that in its early years Peterborough also espoused partnership but all references ceased very early in its life; whereas with Northampton it was a regular heading for all annual reports.
The establishment of the partnership could be interpreted as a generous recognition by central government of the particular sensitivities of an ancient County Borough faced with considerable upheaval as a result of central government policies or, alternatively, it could be regarded as an attempt to defuse inevitable conflict by incorporating as one of the town expansion team the major potential local protagonist. Distinguishing motives is always difficult but, given that the government of the time were not prepared to impose town expansion, then some form of agreement or modus vivendi was inevitable.

Over the twenty years of town expansion the pattern of partnership was to change. The political complexion of central government was to alter, the structure of local government was to be reformed and there were major redirections of central government policy ultimately leading to the demise of the new town programme. All these factors produced changes in the partnership relationship, establishing a new political context for decision making on town expansion. In large measure, the history of town expansion in Northampton is understood through the history of the partnership relationship.
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Chapter 3

THE THEORETICAL CONTEXT

This study, concerned as it is with a particular feature of central-local government relations, cannot ignore certain fundamental questions associated with the nature of local politics and the wider role of the state. Although essentially an empirical study conducted at the micro level, nevertheless we require a conceptual framework or at least an understanding of the possible options available as frameworks.

Marxist writers have done much to stimulate discussion on such issues, in particular N Poulantzas (1969, 1973) (1), and M Castells (1976, 1977) (2). Poulantzas identified the state as essentially an instrument of the capitalist classes which was required to perform the dual role of safeguarding the interests of monopoly capital and maintaining a quiescent working class through the provision of institutionalised reform strategies. Manuel Castells particularly developed this view in the context of urban issues and the French working class/student movements of the 1960s. Urban studies and the analysis of local politics had been provided with a strong and distinctive conceptual framework.

"In recent years the study of local politics has been transformed by the emergence of what has come to be called Urban Studies." (3).
A particularly important feature of this concern with urban studies was the identification of the concept "collective consumption". Here was a recognition that, besides that consumption an individual organised and provided for himself, there existed a host of goods and services that were organised and provided by the state on a collective basis. Such provision is particularly significant and concentrated in urban areas. The content of collective consumption would include roads, schools, law and order, but above all, housing.

"housing is the most significant element of consumption in the urban system". (4)

The central debate of urban studies and local politics has therefore centred around this issue of collective consumption and its interrelationships with the state and society. P Dunleavy (1980) (5) in particular, sees the collective consumption concept as providing a theoretical basis for political studies that virtually can supplant both observer participation and empirical studies.

"The pervasive practitioner orientation which exerts a debilitating influence on work in the field." (6).

"Understanding decision making and state intervention in collective consumption processes requires an explicit attempt to analyse urban policy change which is quite different in kind from the 'policy insights' sometimes claimed for institutional approaches." (7).

The classification and categorisation of theories associated with this debate vary but in general there appear to be three approaches. (P Saunders 1981) (8).
The first of these normally considered is pluralism. (R A Dahl 1956 1958) (9), (N W Polsby 1980) (10). This is a view of society and government which emphasises that power is dispersed to many localities - there is no one dominant group class or institution. In some instances the view suggests that power is evenly spread amongst individuals as in the example of elections; policies and decisions that emerge reflect a majority or consensus view.

"The pluralist view ... is optimistic and consensual and indicates a policy that is supposedly open, responsive and representative. Conflict occurs between competing interests and is resolved through cooperation, concession and compromise. Participation is widespread and power dispersed. Business is one of a number of interests pursuing its objectives but reacting to pressures exerted by other interests such as consumers, labour and environmentalists. Pluralist accounts are devoted to studies of visible decision making". (11).

"Political pluralism sees society as a compound of competing groups and interests, and accepts or recommends that the administrative system should mirror these social demands." (12).

Pluralism sees representative institutions and interest groups actively operating in a balanced fashion to secure equality of individual interest, representation and consideration. Besides stressing openness, the dispersal of power and the emergence of consensus, pluralism concentrates analysis upon the actual workings of institutions and the role of participants. As such, it enjoys an apparent concern with reality and an ability to encompass the uncertainty, ambiguity and mistakes associated with human behaviour.

Pluralism enjoys many critics, some of whom find it an unacceptable explanation of reality, other who find it theoretically inadequate. The major attack on pluralism concentrates on its claim to secure equal significance for individuals.
"For those who gain - whose voices are heard and whose interests are routinely taken into account - the liberal pluralist model of urban politics advanced by Dahl and others is clearly appropriate. But for those who lose, those who cannot make their demands heard and whose interests are routinely ignored or overruled the right to a soapbox represents little more than a right to whistle in the wind." (13).

A particular critique is advanced by those that advocate the second general body of thinking, namely, elitist views. These stress that pluralism cannot counter the problem of the non-decision where issues are simply kept off the political agenda and that such issue manipulation is evidence of dominant groups within society, groups whose position is either mirrored by the institutions of government or who, in some fashion, secure control of the institutions of government.

"Power is concentrated among elites who possess the resources and information to secure these objectives. This power is exercised on decisions through privileged access to the formal and informal processes of a political system, with inbuilt biases in favour of elite interests. Elites also engage in strategies of non-decision making which involve the suppression of issues and the non-participation of groups affected by them." (14).

Elitism remains in the Weberian tradition of being linked to social processes "the general logic of industrial, technological and social development" rather than economic determinism, but comes in a variety of forms. The essence of elitism is that some groups in society have power resources that are not available to others. Where elitists disagree is on the nature of the groups that come to dominate the society and the organisational institutions of the state. R Milliband (1969 1977) (15), sees the bourgeoisie as the dominant group whilst J Rex and J Moore (1967) (16), and R Pahl (1975) (19), see the state dominated and controlled by managers.
within the state apparatus, a reflection of J Galbraith's (1967) (18) technocrats. P Saunders (1979) (19) describes this as instrumentalism and managerialism although he emphasises the domination of the former and the autonomy of the latter. Both forms of elitism, instrumentalism and managerialism, reflect ideas developed by corporatist writers.

J Simmie (1981) (20) stresses the organisational basis of society and that the marxist horizontal social framework needs to be supplemented with a recognition of the vertical division within society.

"large and complex organisations tend to segregate production and society on the vertical axis of social divisions" (21)

"In terms of observable social action, therefore, vertical functioning groupings such as production units, trade unions or political parties appear to form the most important divisional boundaries in advanced industrial societies as opposed to those of social class". (22).

"Vertical functional divisions in modern industrial societies are more significant than horizontal divisions between social classes.... Marxist theories follow a class analysis while corporatist theories are based on functional and organisational divisions in society." (23).

Given such a social matrix and given industrial commercialisation, declining profitability, the growth of technology and international competition, the role of the state is both growing and changing. In particular

"the institution has interests of its own which are distinct from other contending organisations in society." (24)
J Winkler (1976,1977) discusses Corporatism as

"An economic system in which the state directs and controls predominantly privately owned business." (27).

Winkler is in fact primarily concerned with the extension of state control over private business but there exists a clear parallel with a self-sustaining interest group controlling the organs of the state. A Blowers (1984) also sees the similarity

"The concept of corporatism implies institutionalised arrangements which provide particular interests with privilege of access to decision making. Such arrangements are exclusive and usually removed from public scrutiny ..... At a local level the bargaining between business and local government officials may be regarded as evidence of corporatism". (28).

Again, P C Schmitter (1979) (29) develops concepts of corporatism and pluralism around the number of interests, degree of representation, hierarchy and license.

"Corporatism can be defined as a system of interest representation in which the constituent units organised into a limited number of singular, compulsory, non-competitive hierarchically ordered and functionally differentiated categories, recognised or licensed (if not created) by the state and granted a deliberate representational monopoly within their respective categories in exchange for observing certain controls on their selection of leaders and articulation of demands and supports." (30).
Against this, a pluralistic system is one with an unlimited number of interests, competitively representational, lacking order and hierarchy and license from the state.

In relating corporatism to its social context PL Schmitter appears to place himself as a structuralist.

"Corporatisation of interest representation is related to certain basic imperatives or needs of capitalism to reproduce the conditions for its existence and continually to accumulate further resources." (31).

However, R Flynn (1983) draws attention to elements of contention amongst corporatists

"there is even greater disagreement about the general validity of corporatism ... A major division of opinion exists between those who regard corporatism as a distinctly new or alternative economic and political system (Winkler 1976) and those who merely view it as an extension of capitalism (L Pavitch 1980)." (32)

Like pluralism, elitism is founded in empiricism. It is very much concerned with local case studies and the roles of individuals and groups though it tends to neglect the wider theoretical context.

"Pluralist politics are important as a safeguard, a safety valve, from time to time exposing issues and overturning the process of non-decision making by which issues remain hidden ....

Elitism suggests exclusiveness, the ability of the powerful to dominate the agenda of decision making, the denial of other less privileged interests. Both elitism and pluralism emphasise the importance of actions and focus on the locality as the key focus of influence and decision making." (33).

In some senses, corporatism as a form of elitism seeks to relate itself more carefully to theory and wider social movement.
Structuralists are essentially marxist, and emphasise the fusion of economic and political power. Society, including its political institutions, reflects the underlying economic relationships of a capitalist system. Class conflict is the fundamental consequence of these economic relationships, and thus the role of the state becomes one directed towards sustaining and supporting the domination of capital. (N Poulantas 1969 1973) (M Castells 1976) (Althusser 1969). (34).

"The structuralist perspective stresses the superior power of business, the predominance of economic factors, an ability to exploit circumstances and the relevance of regional and national influence on local decision making. It argues that the support of the central authorities and the compliance of local bureaucracies demonstrate the state apparatus functioning to support productive capital." (35).

Thus local government as part of the apparatus of state is included in this support activity. There is a necessary structural relationship between local government and the dominant economic class interests of a capitalist society. Thus the key functions of local government are viewed as aspects of collective consumption having this one objective. An activity such as road development is regarded as the provision of essential commercial infrastructure; housing is the maintenance of human labour units; education is investment in human capital; the police sustain the capitalist social order, and social services support surplus population. The purpose of collective consumption is to reproduce labour power for capital. The structuralist approach is founded in economic determinism, it is theoretical, comprehensive in explanation and mechanistic. It is concerned with outcomes rather than actors; it provides an explanation rather than taking on the struggle of
analysing the complexities of human behaviour. For all that, marxist structuralism is a powerful intellectual tool which even its strongest critics would concede has stimulated fresh thoughts and perspectives about human society.

Faced with a threefold explanation of the framework of local policies, various writers (P Saunders 1979, 1981) (A Blowers 1984) have come to acknowledge the significance and merit of each of the approaches, and yet remained conscious of their limitations.

"Pluralist theories are particularly strong in the analysis of the active phase of conflict, and there is some evidence to support the idea of widespread participation, responsiveness and the role of actors. The neo-elitist critique is to an extent complementary, with its emphasis on the prior phase of non-decision making when issues are prevented in various ways from emerging for public debate and decision. The elitist stress on inequalities of power between competing groups contrasts with the pluralist thesis, and offers certain parallels with the structuralist focus on the domination of powerful interests; but structuralism takes the analysis further with its emphasis on the class nature of interests, the stress on underlying economic forces and its denial of the importance of individual action to the outcome of conflict." (36).

"No single body of theory and no one paradigm can be expected to provide all the answers to the questions .... and that a degree of theoretical pluralism and epistemological tolerance is essential." (37).

P Saunders (1979, 1981) seeks to reconcile and integrate the theoretical frameworks through the concept of collective consumption. The management and organisation of collective consumption is regarded as the central function of the state, but collective consumption is regarded as having two constituent elements - social investment and social consumption. There exists a duality within collective consumption. R Flynn (1983), discussing P Saunders et al, states:
"...social consumption and social investment functions and policies are located at different levels of the state, and are correlated with distinctive political interests and types of political participation. Thus social investment (eg: state provision of physical infrastructure and roads) is so important for capital accumulation that it is the subject of political mediation in which large capital, central state and organised labour (or 'corporate') interests predominate, and is based in non-local institutions removed from popular pressure. On the other hand, social consumption (eg: public rented housing, education, health, welfare services) tends to be decentralised and is the focus for local pluralistic (or competitive) politics and especially working class demands." (38).

Thus the dual state theory proposed by P Saunders seems to suggest that local politics, concerned as it is with social consumption, exhibits pluralistic features tempered with inputs from elitist local groups and bureaucrats. Central government, concerned as it is with social investment, constitutes the battleground for elitist clashes as the component parts of capitalism direct the state apparatus to sustain the fundamental capitalist order.

"Thus it may be suggested that the reasons why the state (viewed as a whole) appears both to act in the long term interests of capital and to respond to the demand of other groups in the population is that social investment policies are typically developed at national level in close consultation with capitalist interests within corporate state agencies, while social consumption policies are relatively responsive to local popular pressures exerted on and through representative state agencies." (39).

He accepts that the bifurcation he proposes is an idealised state, and recognises that the division of function suggested is not a reflection of reality; nevertheless, the dual state thesis is offered to us as an all-embracing context for the study of local politics.
In the face of this dual theory of the state, R Flynn (1981) (40) seeks to re-emphasise the importance of empirical studies.

"Theoretically 'why' questions seem to have taken precedence over 'how' questions in recent explanations of the state's role in urban policy ... the way in which policy is created and managed, especially by state professionals or bureaucrats is itself very important if we wish to understand in detail the dynamics of policy making ..." (41).

He also has doubts about the class basis of state activity and indeed about the homogeneity and single consciousness of the state.

"Most writers now acknowledge that the state is not merely an instrument for dominant class interest, and that it is neither homogenous nor integrated...

...The position adopted here is that we cannot simply assume a priori that the state is able to operate as a unified or efficient guarantor of the general interests of capital accumulation, or that class interests are totally determinant of or directly reflected in policy outputs." (42).

Flynn clearly prefers a context for political studies that stresses the complexity, variety and ambiguity of human behaviour.

"Capitalist demands and interests are neither uniform nor continuous. The relative balance between fraction of capital, types of industry and stages of economic growth and decline will all obviously affect the demands made on the local state. Demands will vary in nature and degree and will probably be expressed in different ways in different areas. Furthermore, the political composition and structure of local authorities may not entirely coincide with, or consistently reflect, discrete interests and this will affect the way in which councils acknowledge, or respond to, particular pressures. (43).

"At all levels of the state, political struggles, bureaucratic and professional divisions, and financial and legal restraints set limits on the state's ability to respond to demands and pressure and implement policies whether they ultimately serve capitalist interests or not." (44).
Ultimately, Flynn questions the social investment-social consumption divide and the duality of political process.

"Thus the thesis of bifurcation of functions, interests and politics is problematic because types of policy cannot be unambiguously assigned to either production or consumption and because at different levels of the state the nature of political representation is mixed and variable." (45).

Given that pluralist/elitist theories concentrate on empirical studies whilst structuralists emphasise theoretical concepts, A Blowers (1984) (46) tries a different approach to their reconciliation when examining the politics of the environment in Bedford. Through a process of conceptual desaggregation he seeks to align the issues in conflict, alongside the political process contrasted with administrative expertise, the local-national dichotomy and the impact of time and space as a means of illustrating how pluralist, elitist and structuralist concepts can expand understanding of local politics. At first sight, it would appear that the Blowers' model is a partial one concerned as it is with a single issue in the County of Bedfordshire. Nevertheless, such was the scope and duration of the issue that we may, in fact extend important aspects of his mediating concepts to the analysis of routine political life.

The dual state theory of P Saunders 1981 (47) also provides an interesting framework within which to study the partnership relationships established at Northampton. The development of a new town involves both aspects of collective consumption in a significant way. There is massive social investment into new roads, public utilities and industrial estates, together with equally large
housing, education and social support programmes associated with social consumption. Broadly speaking, P Saunders (1981) identifies the former with structuralist and elitist influences and the latter with neo-elitist and pluralist influences. The Northampton partnership arrangements could be viewed as an attempt to reconcile such influences given the comprehensive nature of the development task to be performed. In a Saunders' scenario, Northampton would appear to be a melting pot into which pluralist, elitist and structuralist elements would be cast, and indeed one would expect the partnership arrangements that were established to take account of the social investment-social consumption dichotomy and to reflect the associated theoretical influences.

What is common to both A Blowers (1984) and P Saunders (1981) is the recognition that a route to extending our understanding of the role of the state in society may be obtained through a consideration of central-local relationships.

We must now outline the framework of central-local relationships within which we may consider the special Northampton partnership arrangement.
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Chapter 4

CENTRAL/LOCAL GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

The 1980's have witnessed a considerable amount of activity and debate centred upon central/local government relations in the United Kingdom. This has been largely a by-product of central government's determination to reduce the level of global public expenditure, which it has regarded as a necessary prerequisite to reduce taxation and initiate economic regeneration.

To secure tighter control over public expenditure has, therefore, led central government to seek tighter control of local authority expenditure and indeed the local authorities themselves. New legislation such as the Local Government Planning and Land Act 1980, the Local Government Finance Act 1982, the Rates Act 1984, and the 1986 Local Government Act, have emerged from Parliament with considerable consequences for local government.

Perhaps the most significant result of this legislation has been the abolition of the Metropolitan County authorities and the placing of their functions with the Metropolitan Boroughs and ad hoc authorities. However, a number of other measures have been of almost equal impact upon all local authorities, in particular there have taken place significant developments in the
composition and application of the Rate Support Grant. In global terms the proportion of local authority expenditure that has been met by the Rate Support Grant has fallen from 60% in 1978/79 to 46.4% in 1986/87. (1)

In addition to this fairly drastic reduction, the nature of the Rate Support Grant calculation has also been restructured as to financially penalise those authorities which, by central government criteria, are high spending authorities.

The year 1985 witnessed considerable debate between central government and Liverpool City Council and by 1986/87 there were twelve rate capped authorities: Camden, Greenwich, Hackney, Haringay, Islington, Lambeth, Lewisham, Liverpool, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Southwark, Basildon and Thamesmead.

In addition to the application of new legislation the existing powers of central government have been more stringently applied, particularly to capital spending controls, over-borrowing and the use by local authorities of their capital receipts.

Such events emphasise the divide between central and local government and encourage the concept of a shifting frontier, a line between central and local government that moves one way and then the other. Much academic enquiry has focused upon this
approach to central/local government relations, in particular concentrating upon functional allocations and financial controls. D E Regan (1982) (2) and J Greenwood and D Wilson (1984) (3) have devised models emphasising the dominance of central government whilst others, in particular those involved with the two Maud reports, view central and local government as both possessing a democratic legitimacy and where systems should be devised which create an acceptable balance between their respective claims. Maude (1967, 1969) (4).

Whilst such an approach has its merits, it considerably simplifies the nature of central/local government relationships to an extent where key features of those relationships are seriously obscured.

Other writers (R A W Rhodes 1981) (5), (Richardson and Jordan 1979) (6), have developed explanatory models that reject this frontier view. They emphasise the complexity, intricacy and reciprocity of relationships, their ambiguity and often overlapping nature. They recognise the significance of political and professional inputs and stress the multiplicity of points of contact, the variety of channels of communication and the importance of less structured and informal contacts. They also emphasise the role played by such intermediary quangos as Whitley
Councils, local authority trade unions and the local authority associations which sit beside and between central and local government.

In addition to such factors, that undermine the frontier view of central/local government relationships, is the fact that the participants themselves are not necessarily homogeneous bodies. Central government itself has recognised this fact.

"..for most practical purposes the concept central government is -- an abstraction which conceals reality. Central government is in fact a federation of separate departments with their own ministers and their own policies. (7)

"..central government departments in making and implementing policies, still act for the most purposes in isolation from each other and conduct their relationships with local authorities accordingly. (8)

Further, Rhodes (1981) does not regard central government as all-knowing and all-seeing.

"Central government is not all powerful. Dependence on grant does not necessarily mean a decline in local discretion. The existence of controls does not mean either that they are used or, when they are used, that they are effective." (9)

Again there is some support for this view even from organs of central government.
"Central government knowledge about what is happening at local level can best be described as patchy." (10)

"In general it seems undeniable that central government needs more and better information about local authority activities." (11)

"Communication between central and local government is less good than it should be." (12)

Local authorities themselves are very varied, both in function and discretion. Their activities are not a reflection of their constitutional and legal status alone, but are more closely related to the totality of their individual relationships with central government, quangos and each other.

Formal relationships are supplemented by professional and political links of both officers and political representatives. The presentation of central/local government conflict as a head-on clash between two homogeneous parties, each defending its own clearly defined block of power, greatly distorts reality. E O Laumann, F U Pappi (1976) (13) have investigated

"the myriad networks of relations linking a collectivity's members to one another." (14)

J K Friend, J M Power and C J Yewlett (1974) (15) in their studies of Droitwich have emphasised the importance of this network of relationships which intermesh the activities of
central government, quangos and local authorities. In terms of planning they suggest that the successful identification and utilisation of such networks is the crucial element ensuring effectiveness.

"The practical influence of public planning depends on the disposition among agencies of skills and resources relevant to the selective activation of inter agency networks." (16)

RAW Rhodes (1981) develops this concept of intergovernmental networks to a level where it constitutes the key reference point for the understanding of the whole of central/local government relations. He is also anxious to broaden the debate on central/local government beyond the traditional preoccupation with central/local government controls. He would rather that studies of central government relations would look at the totality of relationships.

"The starting point for studies of central/local relations can no longer be central controls. In future, the starting point must be the complexity of interactions and the constraints imposed thereby on both levels of government." (17)

and again

"....the study of central/local relations in Britain cannot be limited to the links between central departments and local authorities. The complexity of the institutional environment must be recognised and analysis extended to include all public sector organisations." (18)
Given this approach, the study of central/local government relationships allows cognisance of potential contributions from a wide range of disciplines, sociology, politics and organisational studies.

"Both the sociologists who have explored inter-organisational linkages and the political scientists who explore inter-governmental relations have produced models or theories capable of illuminating the interactions between government units." (19)

Inter-government networks are thus an interesting starting point for the study of central/local government relations and such networks come in several varieties. There are those that may be described as issue networks where the number of participants is great, where there exists a limited degree of independence and where parties are less integrated. Networks may be territorially based or professionally based, examples of the latter may be found within the National Health Service and Water Authorities. The most significant of networks for policy making, however, tend to be those based upon functional areas of government such as education, fire, etc.

Policy networks become more significant policy communities where there is established:-
a) Stability of relationships.
b) Continuity of restricted memberships.
c) Vertical inter-dependence based on shared service delivery responsibilities.
d) Insulation from other networks.
e) Insulation from the general public. (20)

Richardson and Jorday (1979) have particularly explored the policy community idea:-

"Policy making is fragmented into sub systems, and that the main boundaries are between sub systems rather than between the component units of the sub system. There is a breaking down of conceptual distinctions between government agencies and pressure groups." (21)

"The policy making map is in reality a series of vertical compartments or segments - each segment inhabited by a different set of organised groups and generally impenetrable by unrecognised groups or by the general public." (22)

They in particular see the growth of policy communities as evidence of a strong corporatist element in central/local government relations. The policy community is thus offered to us as a structure within which much policy formulation takes place, with all the various processes of negotiation, consultation, secrecy and conflict avoidance.
The policy community concept has the flavour of reality in its explanation of much of the policy-making process. In particular it places stability and the resolution of conflict at the heart of the activity. The policy community through the blurring of identities, the sharing of service delivery functions and the usage of common professional skills, generates a commonality of interests, activities and experiences which predisposes participants to utilise negotiating and bargaining skills to maintain the community through the resolution of conflict.

Jordan (1981) argues the reality of this process:—

"the notion of disaggregated power, extended links, a developing complexity in policy-making reflects reality." (23)

A view, in part, sustained by central government.

"No arrangements, however ingenious, could ever completely eliminate all differences of view between central and local government. In short, the possibility of disagreement is built into the system." (24)

J K Friend Power and Yewlett (1974) have identified the important connection between networks of relationships and resource use.

"Disposition of organisational resources does not determine the formation of decision networks, but is an important restraining or enabling influence." (25)
For R A W Rhodes (1981) the essence of network and policy community relationships is power dependence. Rather than power, he chooses to emphasise dependence as his central concept, dependence that may be one way, but is more likely to be mutual in nature. Resource need is in turn the basis of the power-dependence relationship.

"..the availability, distribution and substitutability of resources underpin the power-dependence relationships between organisations." (26)

Organisational decision makers, the dominant coalition, find that their decisions are constrained by other organisations with which they have a power-dependence relationship. They are thus in the business of resource exchange, within known rules of the game. Local discretion exists to the extent that participants control resources, the nature of the agreed rules and the shared values of organisations, the product of political, professional and social factors.

Rhodes (1985) brings power-dependence and interorganisation networks together in his explanation of policy communities.

"A policy community can be seen as a network of resource dependent organisations separated from other communities by a break in the structure of dependencies." (27)
Thus central-local government relations when expressed through policy communities involve a game-like activity where the actors of central and local government apply strategies in the disposition of their resources to secure maximum influence over policy outlines without surrendering their independence.

In establishing this framework of explanation, Rhodes (1985) identifies certain key features of policy communities.

1. "The issue scope of policy communities is limited to ordinary issues." There needs to be an element of consensus over policy values within the community. Where central government initiates a policy perhaps based on an extreme political point of view, the policy community will break up.

2. "Relationships within policy communities are asymmetrical" - Central government is much more than "primus inter pares" within any policy community. Through coercion and resource control it determines the agenda of issues, the rules of consultation and enjoys a much wider choice of strategies. In many circumstances it may suit central government's purpose to allow the illusion of equality or partnership, but it is an illusion.

3. Policy communities are constituted and manipulated by central departments.

4. Policy content is a major influence on relationships within policy communities.

5. The policy process varies considerably between policy communities.

6. Relationships between policy communities are important.

7. Integration within policy communities can be generated by ideological corporatism which very often involves an active role by the professions.
8. The structure of resource dependence not only distinguishes between policy communities, but also provides an explanation of patterns of behaviour within policy communities. (28)

Ideas of power dependence and the features of a policy community constitute a valuable cluster of ideas for application to our case study of Northampton, especially as they stress the search for stability through consultation, negotiation, bargaining and conflict avoidance, seeing them as the prime activities of any policy community. These processes involve a pattern of social behaviour where other forces become involved, where original identities may become blurred, and where professional and territorial allegiances may intrude to undermine the dominance of central government within the policy community.

"...it is increasingly difficult to differentiate groups, agencies and departments. Boundaries are unclear; 'government' and 'governed' is difficult to maintain as a distinction." J J Richardson, A G Jordan (1979) (29)

Heclo and Wildawsky (1976) (30) have directed attention to the notions of kinship and culture that encourage individuals to cooperate, strike bargains and work together and in so doing engender a loyalty to the organisation/policy community. Their basic theme is that there exists a working cohesion between those individual politicians and senior officials based on personal
relationships not unlike family kinship and reinforced by the common standards of their own culture. Public sector decision makers are to be regarded as a type of separate family.

"...we are talking about people united by coherent patterns of practice, the shared experiences that facilitate learning... coherence among British political administrators is expressed through exclusiveness... governing public money is a private affair." (31)

"Men of common kinship know they can continually bargain and fight for what they want from each other, not in a once and for all massacre, but in the market place exchange of an agreed culture; day after day, year after year." (32)

P Dunleavy (1980) has also explored this issue

"Furthermore, the interpenetration of central departments and local authorities by the same occupational community may tend effectively to integrate nominally separate tiers of government over and above the formal and political balance of power between them." (33)

In such a bargaining process central government coercion may well become a somewhat rusty deterrent. This kinship at the centre of decision making is maintained through a culture based on the four concepts of community, mutual trust, common calculation and political climate.

"The structure of government community sets the basic outline for distinguishing insiders from outsiders. Mutual trust is a pervasive bond expressing an awareness of how to deal with members of one's own group and, by extension,
strangers. Common calculations help political administrators deal with a complex world but separate them from the layman. "Political climate often gathers force outside government but blows this way and that largely through insiders' concentration on their own reactions and assessments." H. Heclo, A. Wildawsky (1974) (34)

The kinship and culture of local government may be different from that existing within Whitehall, but the influences identified by Heclo and Wildavsky of community, mutual trust, calculation and political climate, remain a useful framework for the analysis of the policy community culture that determines its own brand of kinship.

In terms of community, H Heclo and A Wildawsky (1974) stress that at Westminster, governments, and in particular individual Ministers, change with considerable frequency. In Whitehall, the range and depth of decision-making is enormous and Ministers of the Crown have to be selective in determining the areas of decision-making with which they wish to be concerned. A considerable amount of decision-making is left to civil servants who build up a familiarity with the issues and personalities of the policy community. Thus the party political element, the fundamental basis of central government coercion, may be subject to regular change. This is much less the case with local government, where a political party may hold a majority position on a council for twenty or thirty years, and where the committee
chairman may as a result similarly hold office for a considerable length of time. Local councillors have a smaller range of functions to understand and, through the committee system, acquire an experience in the minutiae of administration as well as policy formulation. Within a policy community the balance of expertise and knowledge is shared between central government administrators, and local councillors and officials with the powerful political element of central government possessing a certain instability. Ministers of the Crown are less likely to be part of the policy community. Within a policy community there are often powerful bonds between central government civil servants and local government officers. Such elements as a common professional background, the exercise of common administrative practices, the holding of the common values of the administrator, standards of dress, are all factors which stress a consciousness of community.

Besides community, H Heclo and A Wildawsky (1974) (35) stress the importance of mutual confidence and trust. Within the administrators of central government and officers of local government mutual trust develops as a consequence of having to establish effective working relationships with counterparts and colleagues which will stand the test of time. Individual officers create in their daily activities a number of favours and obligations which generates and is in turn based on mutual
confidence. An important example of this is the giving and receiving of up-to-date information. Civil servants and local government officers are all involved in the regular activity of information sharing on ministerial decisions, acts of other authorities and political gossip. This act of giving and receiving establishes a pattern of information sharing which is based on mutual trust.

P H Levin (1976) (36) also identifies community generating factors but goes a marginal step further and identifies factors which encourage the performers within a policy community to gravitate towards agreed strategies.

He stresses the importance of "commitment". As individuals make choices and precipitate events in consequence of their public position, they become identified with and build up commitments to those choices and events, and where an organisation is concerned with linked choices over a period of time, commitment is generated not only for the choices and events but also the organisation. Over time a mutual support and loyalty develops between the individuals concerned which relates not only to their performance as decision makers but also results in their supporting and defending the organisation with respect to its relations with other organisations and the public at large. this commitment facilitates decision making in that a stock of agreed
past decisions encourages mutual trust, confidence and support amongst the individuals concerned. It engenders a predisposition to act as a single group rather than a set of individuals.

P H Levin (1976) stresses that the formation of such commitment emerges from the fact that ...

"A person who takes a decision forms the expectation, implicit if not explicit, that he will suffer a psychological or socio-psychological penalty of some kind if he goes back on it". (37)

The penalties suffered are of three types ...

"Three kinds of penalty may be distinguished - damage to self-esteem, damage to present image and damage to relations with others. Damage to self-esteem will occur when what a person regards as his preserve ... is infringed by others ... Damage to relationships with others occurs when, for example, other people lose confidence in one or feel under a weaker obligation to one". (38)

Members of a policy community, having taken decisions, collectively run the risk of these penalties and this constitutes the basis for growing community consciousness.

P H Levin (1976) not only identifies the penalties that engender "commitment", but also outlines particular circumstances which create the possibility of penalty. These are:-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Espousal</td>
<td>Where decision makers have publicly expressed a preference for a course of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>The activation of obligation</td>
<td>Where decision makers have gone through statutory or informal consultations with other affected parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>The expiry of opportunity</td>
<td>Where decision makers have chosen not to meet a particular deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Undertakings</td>
<td>Where decision makers have given promises or made bargains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Public declarations</td>
<td>Where decision makers have publicly stated a policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Investment in projects</td>
<td>Where decision makers have already invested resources in a programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Multiple clearance</td>
<td>Where decision makers have sought particular professional and technical information from those with the relevant expertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h) The limited Where decision makers have considered in study detail one of a series of options.

i) The single proposed statutory Where decision makers have established a procedure and terms of reference for arriving at a decision.

j) Direct action Where decision makers have already taken decisions which precipitate choice.

k) The hidden link Where decision makers have already taken decisions which unknowingly precipitate a choice.

P H Levin's (1976) ideas concerning the growth of commitment can be applied in part to policy communities. The significance of penalties, however, is strongly bound up with the public nature of decisions and it must be said that in policy communities this public nature of decisions is not always present.

Nevertheless, "commitment" as a basis for community remains an important idea.

The importance of community is also recognised by J K Friend, J M Power and C J Hewlett (1974) (39), in their studies of Droitwich.
"In these circumstances we sometimes found it necessary to look on various actors from central government departments as themselves forming a part of the local policy system, rather than simply as an external source of recognised policy guidelines". (40)

Calculation, the technical processes by which decisions are made, also constitutes a binding element in the policy community. The commonality of technical/administrative practice eases communication and creates a common consciousness.

The political climate also makes a contribution to establishing a community consciousness as major political changes, especially those concerned with the economy and public-expenditure, have an impact upon players from both the local and central governmental elements of the policy community. The backcloth against which they both operate will generate similar problems and a similarity of search for solutions.

Thus there are elements at work that emphasise the boundary around the policy community to the expense of both the central and local government dimensions. There are also a variety of formal institutional arrangements which provide an opportunity for the enhancement of policy community consciousness. For example, the new town's policy community enjoys opportunities to strengthen itself through the new town's Committee of the Association of District Councils, Whitley Council meetings and
Chairman's and Chief Officers' meetings. These are all occasions when the chief actors in the policy community meet and reinforce their common consciousness.

We have stated that studies of central-local relations are valuable as a means of adding to our understanding of the role of the state. In particular in this study we are concerned with the special partnership arrangements established between the Ministry of Housing and Local Government and Northampton-County Borough for securing the successful expansion of the town.

We have particularly identified such concepts as a policy community, power dependence, culture and commitment as those that will feature strongly in our analysis. Such concepts have much to say about relationships between participants. Before proceeding to a more detailed study of the history of partnership and town expansion, however, we must now examine the more proactive processes of policy formation and decision-making because this is the human behaviour which ultimately determined the nature of town expansion.
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Policy formulation undertaken within the context of planning, as is the case with the new towns programme, is very much concerned with such ideas as goals, aims, objectives or some similar term.

The goals of organisations have been the subject of considerable literature - E Gross (1969) (1), A Etzioni (1960) (2), D Silverman (1970) (3) - and a goal based analysis often creates difficulties. P Georgiou (1973) (4). However, from this literature a simplistic but robust view of goals is to suggest that the goals held by the participants within an organisation come from both the external environment and from a process of self-generation and negotiation reflecting own needs or those of clients. Goals may vary from specific quantitative targets over time to general vague statements of intent. Goals may change, are often temporary, and are both the product and the substance of political processes.

The goals of a central government department or local authority may determine what other organisations they would wish to interact with to form a policy community. The social, economic and demographic goals of central government have been responsible
for the whole of the new town programme and have led to central government establishing relationships to facilitate these goals with local authority associations, the new towns themselves, and organisations like NALGO. The goals of Northampton County Borough ultimately involved it in recognising its own need for expansion and agreeing to embrace it as desirable. Many organisations and individuals other than central-local government possessed goals which interested them in the expansion of Northampton. For some of these, town expansion represented profitable opportunity. Insurance Companies and Pension Funds are constantly seeking secure and profitable long term investments. To secure the confidence of such institutions and for them to put private money into the expansion of Northampton was highly desirable from the expansion authorities point of view. It maintained development values and thus enhanced the financial basis of, for example, the development corporation.

Town expansion not only provides direct profitable opportunity but also involves the public authorities in the purchase of considerable goods and services. Certain key suppliers were to become very considerably enmeshed into the town expansion process. This was particularly the case with a number of major house-building companies and private developers, whom the partners saw as being essential to the provision of good housing for the new inhabitants of the expansion areas.
Water, Gas and Electricity services are fundamental to the town expansion process and decisions in these areas have to be made at the very beginning of the development process. At this level, the Regional Water Authority and the Gas and Electricity Boards become something more than just suppliers. They become a part of the planning process. The extent to which the statutory undertakers become part of the town expansion network is seen in the fact that the Borough Council became the Agent for the Anglian Water Authority and carried out all its functions on its behalf in the designated area.

Whilst the vast majority of public services for the expanding town were to be provided by statutory undertakers or the expansion authorities, there were a number outside their direct control and for which they had no financial provision. The most important of these was the Health Services. The development of hospital, family practitioner and nursing services was a matter for the regional and District Health Authorities, and the town expansion programme required them to make provision for the health needs of the expansion areas. These authorities, therefore, were brought inevitably into the network of relationships associated with town expansion.
Sir Gordon Roberts, Chairman of the Regional Health Authority, was appointed to the Board of the Northampton Development Corporation and additional special central government finances were made available to Health Authorities which were associated with the Mark III new towns.

The pursuit of goals can thus be the basis for the establishment of a policy community such as that associated with the expansion of Northampton which includes central and local government as major elements but also includes other organisations from the public and private sector. It is perhaps also important to realise that policy communities can also break up as a result of goal changes. For example, when certain local goals become non-negotiable for local politicians and local government administrators. In such circumstances, the central government may be forced to fall back upon the use of coercive powers. Such has been the case with the rate capped local authorities in 1987.

It is very significant when seeking to make some judgement about the role of the state to ask such questions as - In the exercise of its power by state organisations, whose goals are being pursued or facilitated and whose goals are ignored or off the agenda? Such questions are in part answered through a careful analysis of the policies through which town expansion was implemented. Such policy implementation involves the central decision makers in a process of negotiation bargaining and, above
all, exchange. J D Thompson (1967) (5), R M Emerson (1962) (6) and M Crozier and J C Thoenig (1967) (7) are authors who have identified this process of goal satisfaction through exchange. R A W Rhodes (1981) (8) sees exchange being determined through the activation of power-dependence relationships. An organisation is dependent on another to the extent that, through exchange, it obtains the resources it requires to secure its goals. The providing organisation, in consequence, has power over the receiving organisation. The above authors are keen to stress the concept of dependence rather than power in that dependence allows more clearly for reciprocity and thus explains that ...

"An organisation can be both dependent upon another organisation and have power over that organisation." (9)

The reciprocal nature of the concept of dependence is very applicable in adding to our understanding of the nature of relationships found within a policy community. R A W Rhodes (1981) is anxious to clarify the basis of power dependence and he does not restrict it to resources. Clearly resources are a fundamental part of the exchange equation and resource need is a major element in power dependence. Nevertheless, resources are not the whole story.

"It is possible to distinguish between power as resources, power as rule-governed interactions, and power as the mobilisation of bias." (10)
Power that results from the command of scarce resources is at first sight clear enough, but it is subject to complications for it is reinforced by the network of obligations and favours that result from its exercise. Such obligation, loyalty and support may be built around such activities as delegation and decision sharing.

Exercising power is a dynamic and integrative activity and subject to many unforeseen problems and difficulties such as missed deadlines, incorrect information and delay. These problems interfere with the smooth progression of an activity and may be referred to as "noise". It may be possible to ignore some "noise" or it may be dealt with through marginal adjustments in the pace and nature of events, but "noise" may be of sufficient significance to deny resource exchange or prevent events taking place and thus require a fresh network of choices, events and resources to secure completion of an activity. Thus "noise" hinders implementation, and the capacity to cope with or eliminate "noise" is a characteristic which will place power with an individual for it implies an understanding of the existing power relationships within the organisation and a capacity to get things done. As pointed out by M Crozier (1964) (11) whoever can reduce uncertainty possesses authority in the eyes of other decision makers.
Another important area associated with the exercise of power is that of coping with negative feedback. Feedback is a product of the environment, external to the organisation and may be from clients, supporting groups, suppliers or the media. Feedback may reinforce the need for an activity and encourage and motivate resource exchange by those that are a party to it. Negative feedback, that places the activity or the organisation in doubt and which generates threats to the organisation and its members, and resource exchange, constitutes a serious problem. A capacity to cope with and limit negative feedback, ie: to cover up mistakes, minimise adverse comments, prevent investigation and neutralise criticism, is a skill that also moves an individual towards key choice-making areas.

The other facet of power is that which originates in rule governed interaction. Here it is the application of rules that creates the facility to exercise power.

For many decisions power is ascribed to an individual or group in job descriptions, standing orders, prescribed procedures, handbooks and constitutions. It may be legitimised by an external controlling agency or by custom and practice. For example, we may consider patterns of power within a local authority. Through legislation and statutory instrument, central government has laid down structures and functional relationships, such as full time officials and part time elected representatives, and
ranges of functions for particular local authorities. This constitutes essentially an explanation as to "who has the power to make what choices". Within this general framework a local authority makes its own dispositions with respect to the allocation of power. Often this is associated with the Annual General meeting when the Leader of the Council is appointed, committees are established and the extent of delegation to officers is determined.

Within a policy community formal rules may so allocate power. In addition it must be stressed that rule prescribed power may in fact not originate from the rules themselves but how others perceive them. Within a policy community a member of Parliament may enjoy no control of resources, have no prescribed power based on rules, but may exercise considerable power as a result of how other members of the policy community perceive the rules that govern the community.

The third element of Rhodes' view of power dependence is power as the mobilisation of bias. Basing his ideas on the works of S Clegg (1975) (12), A Fox (1973) (13) and R Warren et al (1974) (14), he stresses that the socialisation process creates a consensus around resource distribution and the rules of relationships which may clearly bias power in terms of one of the participants within the policy community. Thus power can be based upon a capacity to create this bias within the system. An
interesting reflection of this concept may be in the officer-elected member relationship. The socialisation and training of local government officers may be so strong in its emphasis upon the democratic legitimacy enjoyed by local government councillors that, despite the resources position and the rules associated with any particular interaction, the elected representative enjoys considerable power purely as a result of the biased perception of his position.

The mobilisation of bias is seen in the creation of areas of non-issues where there is agreed to be no need for decision. The ability to generate such a no-go area for decision making to institutionalise thoughts, structures and values, may in its underpinning of the status quo place considerable power in the hands of one participant in any policy community.

The exchange of real resources, information, legitimacy, loyalty, etc, is the very substance of policy making. It is structured by individual and organisational goals.

The goals of the participants and the structure of power dependence constitute elements which not only define the members of the policy community but also form the context for the taking of decisions.
The individuals that make up a policy community bring individual personalities, perceptions, aspirations, values and goals to their activities within the policy community. Their behaviour, however, is not only a product of individual motivation but is further influenced by organisational and group identities, references, and loyalties.

The existence of goals and the need for exchange has been identified as the raw material of policy formulation. Goal differences and policy differences lead to the fundamental behaviour of decision-making.

Decision making is an aspect of human behaviour that has been subject to much consideration. P M Jackson (1982) has indicated the central issues.

"Decision making and choice lie at the heart of much of the discussion of human behaviour. How are decisions made: what influences the choices made by individuals; what performance criteria are to be used when judging between good and bad decisions?" (15)

The major polarity in decision making models revolves around unbounded and bounded rationality. Unbounded rationality is particularly associated with neo-classical economics and schools of scientific management. Unbounded rationality views individuals and organisations as goal directed and seeking the most efficient way to achieve these goals from the various
competing alternatives. Decision making is about deliberate choice. Neo-classical economics placed decision making within the straight jacket of a search for equilibrium. Economic man was clear of objective, rational and concerned with maximising self interest. This rationality of the decision making process has retained a healthy grip on academic writers. A Elbing (1970) (16) has developed a sequential structure that breaks the decision making process into five stages:-

1. Disequilibrium - recognition of a problem situation.

2. Diagnosis - developing assumptions about the underlying causes of the problem.

3. Definition - specific statements of the problem are diagnosed.


5. Doing - the implementation of the selection in stage 4. (17)

Elbing (1970) further develops a hierarchy of decision making based on the extent to which decisions are programmable. He identifies routine decision making which is very programmable, decisions involving risk which are less programmable and
decisions involving uncertainty which are not programmable, and this hierarchy of decision making relates to the assignment of tasks within an organisation. P F Drucker (1967) (18) has developed a similar approach but classified such decisions as generic and unique.

A L Delbecq (1967) (19) identifies three types of decisions...

- **Routine Decisions.** The organisation or group agrees upon the desired goals, and technologies exist to achieve the goal.

- **Creative Decisions.** The organisation has an agreed method of dealing with the problem, but lacks knowledge or a strategy.

- **Negotiated Decisions.** The organisation experiences a clash of values in facing these decisions. (20)

W.J Gore (1962) (21) labelled decisions as routine, adaptive or innovative. M Crozier (1964) (22) has emphasised uncertainty and irrationality in decision making.

"Power relationships and discretion in human interaction cannot be suppressed with rationalisation." (23)
PM Jackson (1982) has reviewed the critical literature of decision making models based on unbounded rationality. He concludes...

"If we are to understand the behaviour of economic decision makers, and if we are to account for the emergence of specific forms of economic organisation and institutional structure, then the highly restricted model of unbounded rational economic man must give way to one that incorporates the features of a reality in which information is incomplete, time is racing, decisions are urgent, and the future is uncertain and often unknowable - in other words, a world in which there is both surprise and disappointment when plans are not realised." (24)

Theories of decision making founded on unbounded rationality are not wrong in that within an equilibrium paradigm they produce answers, but in the study of human behaviour, bounded rationality constitutes the starting point. Theories of decision making founded on bounded rationality start from a perspective that life is complex, uncertain and ambiguous. Individuals and groups have changing values and are subject to the influences of others in a world where information is both incomplete and has a price.

The decision making process within the Northampton policy community involved collective decisions made by individuals and the central features of this activity were...
a) How were the issues to be decided identified?

b) What were the procedures that produced decisions?

C E Lindblom (1968) (25) has suggested that the answers to such questions are arrived at from a "play of power". P M Jackson (1982) also emphasises the political process.

"The internal politics of decision making has also been stressed. Decisions do not necessarily emerge from reflection, but are instead the result of argument and conflict within and between organisations, partly over who shall do what and who should be a net beneficiary, and partly because of differing perspectives about problems and the means to deal with them." (26)

J March and J Olsen et al (1976) (27) consider that such is the complexity of this power play that problems and solutions do not have separate identities but are themselves matched, taken up and discarded throughout the process. Not only are the issues of question and answer irretrievably entwined but H Simon (1965) (28) and C Lindblom (1968) (29) attack the distinction of means and ends. For C Lindblom the variety of individual ends precludes any identification of means and the means-ends issues are but a dimension of the decision making power play. Lindblom is concerned to develop an incrementalist approach to decision making. He sees decision making as a series of attacks on a problem, each attack making only incremental changes in the status quo. Adjustments are made to ends and means in the form
of compromises and redefinitions of the problem. Everyone involved in this process is both proactive and reactive, evaluating how these small changes affect their position or the end they desire. For Lindblom this form of decision making has three features:-

"I. The play of power is a process of co-operation among specialists.

II. The play of power is not a substitute for policy analysis, simply resolving those issues left unsettled by analysis. Instead policy analysis is incorporated as an instrument or weapon into the play of power, changing the character of analysis as a result.

III. The play of power proceeds for the most part according to rule; it is game like." (30)"

In such a model co-operation on the issues "What is the problem?, how is it to be resolved?", is obtained through a rule constrained play of power around policy analysis. Central to this play of power is dialogue and persuasion.

"Policy analysis is used by one policy maker to find a way in which a policy he desires can serve the values of another policy maker to whom the persuasion is directed." (17)

Each participant uses the analysis of policy to identify values which make his point of view acceptable to others. Pari passu with this is the exercise of power within a framework of rules. Certain elements of power may be applied in order to obtain a particular decision. Such elements are:-
a) The acceptance of authority.

b) Patronage, favours and disfavours.

The acceptance of an individual's authority as a basis for complying with his wishes may be based on one or many of an individual's attributes; his position such as chairman or party leader, his length of service, his past record. In addition, individuals have the capacity to grant favours and patronage or to grant disfavours. These explicitly or mainly implicitly are part of the maelstrom of decision making.

C. Lindblom (1968) stresses that such a system produces incremental decision making, that major and fundamental decisions are incompatible with the play of power process as he describes it.

"In short an established and stable play of power is an applecart that a) would be upset by drastic and sweeping changes in policy and b) has to be upset in order to achieve such policy changes." (32)

A. Ezioni (1967) whilst accepting much of the incrementalist view of decision making, thinks that it pays insufficient attention to certain key fundamental decisions. He argues that there are certain basic decisions that emerge as a result of unforeseen and unexpected events and, although relatively few in number, must be incorporated into any incrementalist model of decision making.
"..the number and role of fundamental decisions are significantly greater than the incrementalists state...while incremental decisions greatly outnumber fundamental ones, the latter's significance for social decision making is not commensurate with their number; it is thus a mistake to regulate non-incremental decisions to the category of exceptions. Moreover, it is often the fundamental decisions which set the context for the numerous incremental ones. Although fundamental decisions are frequently prepared by incremental ones in order that the final decision will initiate a less abrupt change, these decisions may still be considered fundamental." A Ezioni (1967) (33)

Thus Ezioni advocated what he described as a mixed scanning model of decision making, where the play of power mechanism operated at two levels, the incremental and the fundamental.

The incrementalist view of decision making has also come under some criticism from R E Goodwin (1982) (34) who considers the various hybrids of incrementalism and whilst conceding their descriptive success has grave doubts about incrementalism as a prescription for policy makers.

"Incrementalism.... is an undeniable success in purely descriptive terms. Most policy making surely does progress incrementally. But advocates of incrementalism Lindblom, Wildawsky & Co., want to claim more than descriptive success. For them, incrementalism is not only inevitable in practice, but also desirable in practice." R E Goodwin (1982) (35)

Goodwin stresses that incrementalism is a rejection of "theory" as a basis for decision making and that incrementalists consider analytical problem solving inadequate, through the poverty of our social theories, and that decision making is best viewed as a
study of social interaction. Goodwin's attack on incrementalism centres around the fact that some theory is necessary, random marginal change has no value. Even the incrementalist decision maker must know what counts as an incrementalist intervention, must be able to know whether or not it is safe to intervene.

"..logic alone requires incrementalists to use some sort of theory. Without any theory there can be no interpretation of the results of incremental interventions." Goodwin (1982) (36)

The sleeper and threshold effects are offered as examples where the incrementalism of small changes is inadequate.

"Burning coal and oil produces increases of atmospheric CO2 which, in the long run, threatens to change the global climate; but in the short term this effort may be masked by ocean absorption." Goodwin (1982) (37)

"Threshold effects mislead incrementalists by showing up suddenly. Incremental changes in inputs may produce incremental changes in outputs until the threshold is crossed at which point the change in output is markedly non-incremental." Goodwin (1982) (38)

Human behaviour is both social interaction and intellectual cognition. The value of incrementalism is to be found in its exposing of human frailty. Decision making is often made in both ignorance, uncertainty and above all against a backcloth of doubt. These are conditions which predispose decision makers to small incremental changes where the outcome is unknown and small decisions can be resolved in such a fashion; but large issues do
intrude upon decision makers. Sometimes the consequences of their own actions, but often the result of the actions of others. Such large issues are often not capable of solution through incrementalism, a path through the trees must be chosen without any opportunity of retracing one's steps. The size of such an issue concentrates the need for the right decision and in these circumstances individuals utilise all their resources, including those of intellectual analysis. Such analysis may be drawn into the power play of decision making but in such circumstances theory rather than incrementalism becomes the determining factor.

Any theory of decision making must recognise the significance of incrementalism and the play of power, but also take heed of the force of intellectual analysis and its resulting theories as to how the system works. Given that the activity of decision making is a play of power involving both incrementalism and theory, participants in this activity are not entirely without guidelines for imposing some form of order upon what they do. J K Friend and W M Jessop (1969) (39) and J K Friend et al (1974) (40) have considered how individuals structure their decision making.

"Whether consciously or otherwise, every decision maker behaves in accordance with a complex set of social and cultural influences which may themselves be in a state of continuing flux. Such influences combine to shape both the relations between decision makers and also the problems that concern them; further they will affect their perceptions of these relations and problematic situations in which they find themselves, decision makers inevitably make all kinds of distinctions, classifications and other judgements which relate to this social and cultural context. In particular,
they must relate themselves in some way to a structure of authority, which will provide them with a map of the distribution of relevant spheres of responsibility and competence, and will provide at least some guidance towards accepted modes of procedure." (41)

The construction of such a map is a key feature in public sector decision making. Participating individuals will form three sets of perceptions.

a) Perceptions about the operating environment.

b) Perceptions as to policy guidelines.

c) Perceptions as to relationships with other policy communities.

These constitute the touch stones, part of the end-means debate taken by the individual into the play of power. They generate much of the verbal raw material of decision making debate in such phrases as:
"We need more information about this issue."

"My party will not accept this decision."

"We require ministerial approval of this initiative."

Most of the commentators on decision making stress the importance of the processes of negotiating and bargaining and how they facilitate the emergence of a coherence and pattern, a coalescence of many individual views into an agreed strategy.

This negotiating and bargaining, the play of power, is one where each participant seeks to make full use of his power dependence quotient.

"...there is a set of interdependent actors or partisans; they operate within a certain social and institutional environment; they share some goals but differ on others; they have an issue or set of issues on which they must negotiate; none has hierarchal control over the others; they have varying political resources; they use these resources in certain strategies and tactics: they arrive at certain outcomes; and these outcomes have consequences for themselves; for other groups in the society, and for the system itself." (42)

This view of the bargaining-negotiating process not only throws light on the interactions between individuals but stresses the social and institutional environment within which the bargaining activity takes place. In seeking to align this approach to that of central-local relations in the United Kingdom, one may add to
the social and institutional environment the current political debate. Policy community participants not only operate within social and institutional restraints but are significantly affected by the consequences of day to day political life such as major switches in government policy, the rise and fall of ministers.

Within a policy community such as the Northampton partnership there are certain regularised almost automatic conflict resolving processes that fairly quickly produce clusters of agreed individuals. Foremost amongst these is that of political party loyalty. Many of the key issues within policy communities become coalesced around political party loyalties where an individual's view is determined by his party. Such party decisions are in turn the product of conflict resolving activities within the party which may be based upon a strong party leadership which enjoys instinctive rank and file support or a more formalised decision making process based on voting mechanisms. This is not the place to analyse political party decision making: however, it is important to underline its key role in producing strategies and policies. Whilst we are here stressing pluralist type activities eg, reconciliation of many different interests, such a mechanism can operate within an elitist scenario. For example, in P Saunders terms, a managerialist one would be that of institutional loyalty. Where the political party reference produces no obvious or stated position, institutional loyalty is
often a basis for generating an agreed posture amongst
collections of individuals. Certainly the needs of the Borough
or the County or the department constitute strong forces for
establishing agreement amongst members of those organisations.
Other reference points for group loyalties would include
professional loyalties, service loyalties, loyalties based on
common backgrounds, group cultures and class. These may all play
their part in resolving many individual points of view into one
or two group policies.

For most policy communities, therefore, there exist these
routinised conflict resolving mechanisms which provide standard
ready reckoner reference points for individual policy community
participants. On any particular issue an individual may
proactively seek to secure the support of others by appeals to a
particular loyalty reference point or react to such appeals.
This bargaining for support will encompass many individual
motives and relationships, and will take place against a
backcloth of historical exchanges of support, but from it emerges
a number of group views on a particular issue.

Thus from the myriad of individual views there exists a
routinised mechanisms which merge them into a more limited number
of group views. An adjunct of this process is that whilst the
number of viewpoints has been reduced, the strength with which they are held will be increased as will the difficulty of their reconciliation.

We have reached the situation where in any particular policy community there will be a number of possible policy responses to an issue supported by groupings of participants. Which groups or cluster of groups is successful in securing its policy option is a function of power dependence within the policy community. Through bargaining-negotiation over resources, the interpretation and application of rules and the mobilisation of bias, a particular policy option will be applied to secure a goal. From this process emerges a dominant coalition which, for a period of time on most issues, will determine which policy option will be applied. This dominant coalition and its composition will indicate for whom the powers of the state are being utilised.

We have thus set ourselves the task of examining any dominant coalition, patterns of decision making, policy formulation and goal attainment associated with the town expansion programme in Northampton 1965 to 1985. In this examination we will pay particular attention to the role of the special partnership arrangements between the Ministry of Housing and Local Government and Northampton County Borough that were established from the outset of the programme.
From this we will seek to identify institutional and process arrangements that may have relevance to similar expansion and renewal programmes, in particular those associated with inner city renewal. Finally, we shall seek to contribute to the wider debate on such issues as collective consumption, the pluralist-corporatist debate, and the role of the state.
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On February 3rd 1965, Richard Crossman, Minister for Housing and Local Government, announced that Ipswich, Peterborough and Northampton had been selected for major expansion schemes under New Town legislation. This came as a total surprise to Northampton County Borough, none of whose officers or elected members had any idea that such an announcement was to be made. Given the recent political excitement in Northampton, there was a substantial need for a clear local political consensus if such a major piece of social engineering was to be undertaken.

A key figure in the establishment of this consensus was to be Mr R Dilleigh. Although not the official leader of the controlling Labour group, (the official leader was 74 year old Walter Lewis), Dilleigh was in practice the intellectual and political driving force of the Northampton Labour Party.

Alderman Dilleigh and his local party group had to make up their minds about two questions.

a) Was the expansion of Northampton acceptable?

b) If acceptable, what should be the machinery of the expansion process?
Whilst the first question became a matter of fierce local debate, ultimately at the public level, the second was largely the concern of a relatively few local politicians and County Borough Council officials. It was known, however, that the new government would be introducing fresh legislation on the new towns in the near future and it was hoped that Northampton's circumstances would be covered by this legislation.

The decision to accept the expansion of Northampton was not arrived at easily. The Labour group had a majority of two on the County Borough Council and certain of its members were against expansion. The attitude of the minority Conservative opposition was also vital, as expansion, if it was to be successful, required continuity and bi-partisan support. The central government recognised that part of the price of this support was the framework of the machinery of expansion. Their initial acceptance of the special need for some particular partnership arrangements went some way towards winning this local political support. (2)

Almost immediately following the announcement of expansion, the County Borough Council accepted the principle of the proposal, although in fact the full council was never given the opportunity of voting on the proposition. The basis of this speedy acceptance varied from one individual councillor to another, but the range of explanations included:
1. Expansion was inevitable and could not be stopped. This view was largely a result of the sub-regional study on Northampton, Bedford and North Bucks, which had indicated the advantages of another new town near to Milton Keynes in the South East-Midlands. (3). The prospects for the future prosperity of Northampton were bleak should such another new town be developed.

2. The need for new employment, given the decline in the traditional boot and shoe and leather industries.

3. Expansion would provide new commercial opportunities.

4. The traditional political support of a Labour controlled local authority for the schemes of a Labour Government.

5. The County Borough Council were intending to develop the central area of the town anyway.

6. The central government promise of special partnership arrangements.
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This last point carried some weight especially amongst the majority Labour group as Alderman Dilleigh claimed special political ties with the Minister, Richard Crossman, which he suggested could be activated to secure powerful local involvement in any machinery to expand the County Borough. (4)

Creating this machinery for expansion was identified as a crucial activity and involved a series of meetings between representatives of central and local government. It is important to emphasise that these meetings took place three years before the establishment of the Development Corporation, and it is clear, therefore, that the initiation and development of partnership was an exercise between the County Borough Council and the Central Government.

In this matter of new town machinery Crossman was to be much influenced by his predecessor, Sir Keith Joseph, and it was to him and Dame Evelyn Sharp that Crossman accredited the idea of partnership. (5). Nevertheless, Crossman became a powerful advocate of partnership in his own right.

"I am making sure right from the beginning that the relationship between corporation and local authority should be one not of domination but of full equal partnership." (6)
The Ministry initiated discussions by requesting the comments of the County Borough on expansion, and itself raised the issue of machinery.

For the purpose of negotiating on behalf of Northampton County Borough, the Finance and General Purposes Committee established an ad hoc committee of four members, two Conservatives and two Labour. Its full membership was:

Chairman of Finance and G.P. ........... R. Dilleigh
(Labour)

Deputy Chairman of Finance and G.P. ... D. Walmsley (Con)

Chairman of Planning ..................... C Trusler (Labour)

Deputy Chairman of Planning ............. D Dolman (Con) (7)

This committee had two meetings with G R Coles, Deputy Secretary Ministry of Housing and Local Government, and three meetings with Dame Evelyn Sharpe, the Permanent Secretary. At two of these meetings Richard Crossman, the Minister, was present and at one of them Neil McDermot, the Minister of State. The first of these meetings took place on Monday, 8th March, 1965, in the Guildhall,
Northampton, and the central issue before this meeting was the nature of the administrative machinery that was to be used to secure expansion.

This series of meetings between Northampton County Borough and the Ministry took place against a backcloth of significant legislative change. The new government was in the process of amending and consolidating new town legislation which was to take the form of the 1965 New Towns Act. It was not a politically controversial piece of legislation, but it was clear that the government had fairly defined views on the various dimensions involved with the New Towns programme, and this Act was to establish the legal framework for the New Town movement throughout the 1960's and 1970's. The parties to the discussions considered four possible frameworks for expansion.

1. Joint Borough/Ministry machinery.

2. The County Borough as the agent of expansion.
3. The traditional Development Corporation.

4. A Development Corporation with a defined role.

The first option was rejected as being too radical, especially as other new towns were being established. For whilst the Ministry was prepared to meet Northampton's particular problems, such a constitutional innovation was in these circumstances too significant a precedent. Northampton's representatives were equally adamant that the traditional development corporation was completely unacceptable. Previous new town developments had been bedevilled by virtual open warfare between the Development Corporation and the local authorities. For example, in nearby Corby there had been considerable antagonism and bitterness. There was also the point that Northampton was a County Borough, a powerful all-purpose authority, very different from the Rural District Councils with whom development corporations were normally concerned.

The County Borough Council was attracted by the idea that it should be the major developmental agency, that the Council should set up its own department headed by an executive committee of local councillors to control and supervise all facets of town expansion. This committee was to have full delegated powers over all aspects of expansion, requiring the approval of the full Council only for its annual budget. A "Corporation Department" would also be established which would have significant
independence, possessing its own Chief Officer who would be responsible to the executive committee. Expansion would be financed through a combination of loans, at favourable rates of interest, and grants from central government. If central government was to insist on the establishment of a development corporation, then its role was to be restricted to the compulsory acquisition of land, which it was to hand over to the County Borough Council for development.

Such proposals were not acceptable to Dame Evelyn Sharpe. (8) There were three main objections to the County Borough proposals. Firstly, central government had to enjoy some of the development gains which would result from expansion and under the County Borough scheme it might be many years before that began to happen. Secondly, there was always the possibility that local political change would upset any arrangements, of an exclusively local nature, that might be established, and thirdly, there were doubts concerning the capacity of a local authority to build at the rate required for the envisaged expansion. However, whilst the Ministry could not accept the proposals of a County Borough-based machinery for expansion, it did accept that the traditional development corporation was an equally inappropriate vehicle. Therefore, what was required was expansion by a development corporation that had a clearly defined relationship with its local authority and where there were, built into the arrangements, procedures that guaranteed that the job would be done yet would preserve local interests. A genuine partnership
had to be established which would generate real co-operation. On this basis the two parties agreed that the machinery for expanding Northampton would involve the 1965 New Towns Act plus the "Agreed Memorandum." (9). Northampton would fall under the same legislation as all the other third generation new towns (Peterborough, Milton Keynes etc.) but special provisions would be made for Northampton's circumstances and these would be clearly identified in the key document the "Agreed Memorandum." Thus what emerged from the negotiations was a basis for partnership with clearly allocated functions that, in practice, largely met the needs of both the central and local governments for twenty years; and the local authority had, to a significant degree, established a stability in the social rules of expansion.

In essence, expansion was to be largely funded by central government. This involved monitoring and control procedures which were to be applied by central government, and civil servants of the Ministry of Housing and Local Government (Department of the Environment) and the Treasury. There was established a statutory body, the Development Corporation, composed of local government representatives and ministerial appointments, which possessed carefully defined functions vis-à-vis the local authority. There was to be officer sharing and local management via agency agreements, together with defined exclusive geographic areas of activity.
Functional specialisation, officer sharing and common membership were factors that precipitated the need for information sharing and the erection of a working network. Essentially, the information inputs of the local authorities and the Development Corporation had to be pooled and shared in order to develop the town expansion programme, and it was necessary to establish structures and working practices which would routinise information exchange.

Certain features of partnership created an information system that was characteristic of one, rather than two or three, organisations. These included:

i) Local authority membership of the Development Corporation Board.

ii) Shared officers.

iii) Shared accommodation and technical facilities such as libraries.

iv) Agency arrangements.

v) Routinised meetings of Board members and local authority representatives at all levels.
Constructing an open information system, one that made it almost impossible for partners to keep secrets, contributed greatly to the development of mutual trust and support that was essential for an integrated expansion programme.

A most unusual and distinctive feature of the partnership that was established at Northampton was the existence of the document that enshrined the key consequences of the negotiations between central and local government. This was the "Agreed Memorandum."

The existence of such a document was unique within the New Town Movement and has never been repeated. No other new town has ever entered into this sort of agreement with the central government. It is a rare example of local-central government relationships emerging from a negotiation between the two parties.

"This document, dated 10th May, was unique in the annals of New Town Planning". (10)

The "Agreed Memorandum" dealt with a number of key issues. Amongst the most significant was that of the membership of the Development Corporation when it was established. This constituted a key issue for the County Borough Council, as membership of the board had been the source of much local friction in the experience of other development corporations.
"As the former Manager of Stevenage (A C Duff) has put it...

...relations between the New Town Corporation and the Urban District (or Borough) Council are likely to require careful handling, even granted that there is goodwill on both sides, and unfortunately goodwill has been the exception rather than the rule. The councillors are aware that the members of the corporation devote less of their time to the business of the new town than do the councillors; that the members are paid but the councillors are not; that the members are for the most part 'strangers from London', while the councillors are all local residents; and that the members are nominated by a minister while the councillors are elected by the ratepayers. The councillors would be rather more than human if they did not on occasion feel some measure of both resentment and envy." (11)

Under the new legislation (New Towns Act 1965 Schedule 2 (i))

"in appointing members of the corporation the minister shall have regard to the desirability of securing the services of one or more persons resident in or having special knowledge of the locality in which the new town will be situated."

Paragraph 12 of the "Agreed Memorandum" deals with membership of the Board.

"It will be clear that the Corporation and the County Borough Council will have to work in closest harmony... when using new town machinery to expand an existing County Borough, the Minister would think it appropriate that the personnel of the Corporation should be agreed between himself and the County Borough.

This paragraph committed the Minister to go far beyond the normal consultation processes. He had to secure the agreement of the County Borough to his membership proposals. Effectively this gave the County Borough the power of a veto over all appointments to the Board. Experience has proven that this is no nominal
power as it has been used on at least two occasions. Also on this issue of membership the "Agreed Memorandum" indicated the possibility of four County Borough members....

"The County Borough Council has particularly asked for four representatives, and the only reason that the department cannot agree to this is that there is a statutory limitation of nine on the total number."

Membership was to be a continual problem, but at the time the County Borough thought it vital to obtain four seats so that a political balance could be maintained of two Labour and two Conservative members (12). This would reflect the initial harmony of the Finance and General Purposes ad hoc committee and sustain the cross party support for the town expansion process.

The "Agreed Memorandum" not only dealt with membership of the Development Corporation but also considered the question of function. In particular it was concerned with planning and the area to be designated.

"At the preliminary informal consultation with representatives of the County Borough Council, they were inclined to think that the existing town should be included in the designated area....the expansion would be much better done as an integrated part of a Greater Northampton if the whole of the town, old and new, were so included". (Para.5)

"Accepting that the existing town should be included in the designated area together with the new land, it would be understood that the Corporation would not exercise their acquisition or development powers in the town except at the request of or in agreement with the County Borough Council. Meanwhile if the County Borough Council wanted to do some building in the new area, no difficulty should arise over that". (Para.7)
From these paragraphs zones of development were established; the existing town for the County Borough Council and the new areas for the Development Corporation. The County Borough was encouraged to take advantage of the resources available to the Development Corporation, in particular for the development of the existing town, and, if it so wished, it could undertake development in the new areas. Clearly the rights and prerogatives of the County Borough Council were to be preserved in its own backyard.

Paragraphs 8 to 11 which were concerned with planning matters were to take this protection for the County Borough a step further.

"Initiative in planning the whole of the town (new as well as old) should be with the County Borough Council working in consultation with the Development Corporation. For this purpose it is suggested that the consultant commissioned to advise on the area for expansion should at the outset be commissioned also to prepare the plan for the whole of the enlarged town. This should be done jointly by the Minister (acting on behalf of the future Development Corporation) and the County Borough Council. (Para. 8)

"...When the Corporation is appointed they would take on the consultant jointly with the County Borough Council and the 'single mind' would continue. Instead of a master plan put forward from the Corporation (the usual practice in new towns) the plan would come forward from the County Borough Council supported by the Corporation. (Para. 9)

"Once the Corporation is in being, they would develop within the framework of the County Borough Council's plan. Under Section 3 (1) of the New Town Act, Development Corporations are required to submit their proposals to the Minister....such approval constitutes a deemed planning permission. It would be right, however, when expanding an existing County Borough that the Corporation should always put their proposals first to the County Borough Council in the manner of a normal planning applicant; in the event of
the County Borough Council having any objection thereto, the Minister will hold informal discussions with the parties to resolve the matter". (Para.10)

"Where the new town machinery is being used to expand an existing County Borough, it would seem appropriate that when dealing with normal planning applications affecting the new area, the local planning authority should consult the Development Corporation". (Para.11)

The consequences of these paragraphs were that the County Borough Council and the ministry would appoint consultants and determine the master plan for both old and new areas and the County Borough would be the planning authority with powers to withhold planning permission. Thus when the Development Corporation finally was established it:....

a) Could not operate in the existing town without County Borough permission.

b) Would have to operate in the new areas within the context of an established master plan drawn up by consultants appointed jointly by the ministry and the County Borough.

c) Would be asked to secure in the new areas detailed planning permission, as opposed to Section 6(i) authorisation which was regarded as outline planning permission, for individual schemes from the County Borough in the manner of a normal planning applicant.

Paragraph 16 of the Agreed Memorandum was concerned with finance. It was particularly vague:

"In principle, financial responsibility for all the normal local authority services required for the expansion would fall on the County Borough Council, to whom the additional rate income would accrue. But, in practice, the planned growth of the town would throw additional burdens on them in advance of the growth of rateable value; and the financial arrangements between the County Borough Council and the Corporation would take account of this."
Although vague, it was to be the basis of the undue burden principle which was to assume particular importance for the County Borough. It was to be used as the means of making a bid for additional financial payments (of considerable significance) from central government. (See Page 170).

The network of relationships that was established for the expansion of Northampton was, however, considerably more than that enshrined in the "Agreed Memorandum". In particular the partnership involved the establishment and use of personal contacts.

There is an important strand in the study of business and public administration which stresses the importance of personalities and people over structures and procedures. Without entering this argument too closely, there is no doubt that the close personal and professional relationship that developed between the General Manager of the Development Corporation and the Chief Executive of the County Borough was a major force in the development of effective and meaningful partnership arrangements. This close harmony at the head of the two administrative systems ensured that the spirit of cooperation filtered through to all the departmental heads and other officers involved.

"In Northampton....in the opinion of the General Manager of the Development Corporation, the successful running of the scheme hinged largely on the close informal relationships he had established with the Town Clerk, together with a series of parallel relationships between heads of professional departments." (13)
Both men were serious about the philosophy and practice of partnership and were moving towards a commonality of view as to how the partnership arrangements were to be integrated into the overall town expansion programme. This harmony was enhanced by the very special contribution made by the first Chairman of the Development Corporation, Sir William Hart. As a former General Manager of Harlow new town, he was clearly familiar with that tradition. However, he was by profession a lawyer and thus had much in common with the Borough's Chief Executive. This commonality and overlapping of professional and career experience was an important feature of many of the appointments within the Development Corporation. Its Chief Finance Officer, Basil Bean, later to be General Manager, had had extensive local government experience and, on the retirement of Sir William Hart, his place was to be taken by Mr. Alan Davis, a former Chief Clerk of Nottinghamshire County Council.

This relationship was at the heart of the officer network that was established at Northampton. As a working practice, however, it was to be extended to all the chief officers of the County Borough Council and the Development Corporation, effectively creating a network of professional and personal relationships.

In 1966 the Ministry of Housing and Local Government, following on from consultations and discussions with the County Borough, had produced a paper on staffing which had suggested the
principle of "no duplication". That where a department or officer of the County Borough was performing a particular function, there was no need for the Development Corporation to create such a department or appoint such an officer. This paper was circulated and discussed at the second meeting of the Board, when it was agreed that the newly appointed General Manager, Dr. John Weston, would produce a general paper on staffing which would be discussed at the fourth meeting. (15)

Within the Ministry guidelines, the matter of function and staffing was very much a matter for the Board. As Dr. Weston outlined in his paper to the Board, there were few rules or common standards for the Board to follow in terms of its size, but given the common nature of their business as a Development Corporation, there were certain functional departments that could be identified from the activities of their predecessors. These included......

a) Finance
b) Administration
c) Estates
d) Legal
e) Architecture and Planning
f) Engineering
g) Social Development
The paper that was presented to the Board at its fourth meeting had something quite clear to say about partnership. For example, Page 2, para. 1 reads... "while the Development Corporation needs financial and economic advice, it does not need to have a large staff of clerks and a computer to duplicate facilities already existing within the Treasurer's Department of the County Borough".

However, it was also clear that the new General Manager was keen to develop a powerful development agency worthy of his professional skills and the task ahead. Page 1, Paras. 4 & 5 state:-

"There are certain general principles which can contribute to securing the effective collaboration between organisations. Each must have respect for the legitimate interests of the other and at the same time must be able to preserve its own individual identity. It seems to follow from this, in the context of Northampton, that the Development Corporation must have access to its own advice, independent of that given to the County Borough".

By the seventh meeting of the Board on 14th May 1969 the General Manager had produced a paper that outlined the key principles for the officer network. (16). This paper sought to provide a rationale for officer sharing and to identify which activities would be undertaken directly by the Development Corporation and which should be undertaken on its behalf by the County Borough. The paper reiterates the principles of the paper discussed at the
fourth Board meeting; that the independent identity of the Corporation required the appointment of certain key officers. These were to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Resulting date of Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>January 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Finance Officer</td>
<td>March 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Estates Officer</td>
<td>March 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Architect</td>
<td>June 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Secretary</td>
<td>July 1969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the paper also identified the central principles which would result in areas of work being given to the County Borough.

Para 3 - "Matters of routine (as opposed to policy and control)"

Para 4 - "The need to maintain a balanced programme".

Para 6 - "The Development Corporation will have insufficient work which will provide an inadequate base for building an effective department".

Para 7 - "Programme matters that are important but are not in a policy sense central to the concern of the development Corporation...and this arrangement would appear to make for efficiency in joint working, but leave sufficient control to the Corporation...relatively easy to put alternative arrangements in hand."

Thus

a) Routine.
b) Balance.
c) Insufficient work.
d) Not central to policy.
e) Efficiency.
f) Reversibility
were the particular reasons for allowing work to be transferred to the County Borough.

In those areas where the Development Corporation was to provide services for the County Borough, the principles were less clearly stated.

Para 5 - "The Chief Estates Officer has been appointed and it seems desirable that he should also act as agent for the Borough Council.

Para 8 - "Programme co-ordination....It seems clear that the Development Corporation, having taken steps to recruit a programme co-ordinator should act in this way for the whole of the programme including the central area redevelopment".

Nevertheless, the commitment to officer sharing had been underlined and these principles were brought into practical effect following the ninth Board meeting on 12th June 1969 when the following was agreed:-

"that the General Manager discuss with the County Borough Council the division of work between the Council and the Development Corporation and particularly the following proposals:

a) **Finance.** That the County Borough be asked to provide accounting services and the use of their computer at an agreed charge.

b) **Planning.** That a joint technical committee consisting of officers of the planning departments of the County Council and the County Borough Council and the Development Corporation be set up for consultation on the inter-relation of major planning proposals and to deal with matters arising from development applications."
c) Architectural Services
That the County Borough be invited to undertake architectural commissions from time to time.

d) Engineering.
That the County Borough be invited to provide engineering design and constructional services on an agreed fee basis.

e) Legal.
That the County Borough be invited to provide routine legal services on an agreed fee basis.

f) Co-ordination.
That the services of the Development Corporation's co-ordinator be made available to the County Borough Council without charge.

g) Social.
That the question of responsibility for social development and housing management be deferred for six months."

These officer sharing arrangements were the most distinctive and unique feature of the Northampton partnership experiment.

It is important to underline that at the earliest discussions on the principle of no duplication (Town Expansion Committee, 20th October 1965) the possibility of joint staff appointments was rejected. It was considered that joint officers would become over-mighty subjects who could play one authority off against another and thus ensure their own position. Shared officers avoided any such difficulties in that the officer was responsible to one organisation and the exact nature of the shared officers' responsibilities was a matter for the two organisations to work out clearly between themselves.
By the fourteenth meeting of the Development Corporation in December 1969, the County Borough Chief Executive had been appointed the solicitor for the Development Corporation and fees for the services of County Borough staff had been agreed by both parties. At that same meeting it was agreed that "all enquiries for industrial land or premises or for accommodation in the whole of the designated area should be referred to and dealt with by the Chief Estates Officer of the Development Corporation. In March 1970 it was agreed by the two partners that the Housing Committee of the Borough Council would become responsible for the maintenance of all houses and other properties built by the Development Corporation and that the Borough Housing Manager would become the Housing Agent for the Development Corporation and thus responsible for the management of all their housing estates.

All these developments involved the County Borough in considerable extensions to their housing and maintenance departments and clearly involved them considerably in the detailed implementation of expansion in the new areas. The Development Corporation referred to these provisions with some satisfaction in its Third Annual Report.

"We regard this as a useful step in the road to the desirable objective of unifying the provision of rented housing throughout the town" (17).
Given the sharing of officers, an interesting and important feature of this experiment was the decision to set up a joint administrative centre. The Development Corporation clearly required a substantial administrative headquarters, in that its own staff was expected to grow to some three hundred in number and the Borough also had accommodation problems. Thus a joint administrative centre was designed and built to contain the staff of the Development Corporation and those two County Borough departments most involved with expansion, the Engineer's department and the Planning and Architect's department. This administrative centre was designed by the County Borough Architect and in return the Development Corporation's architect designed the dual use education and leisure facilities associated with Lings Upper School. The joint administrative centre was a physical expression of the partnership arrangements and the new school entwined the two functions of education and leisure into a partnership service provision for the new developing area.

Another important development in the partnership arrangements and the establishing of a network for expansion concerned the relationship between Board members and County Borough Councillors and the Chief Officers of each organisation. At the eleventh meeting of the Board in September 1969 the following item appeared under the General Manager's report......

"Collaboration with the County Borough."
Arrangements have been made for joint meetings of the Chief Officers of the Development Corporation with those of the County Borough who are concerned with expansion. It is expected that these meetings will be held quarterly. In place of the ad hoc meetings which have taken place between the County Borough and the Development Corporation on one or two occasions in the past, it is now proposed to have regular joint meetings, again at quarterly intervals. This would be attended by the Development Corporation (including the General Manager) and by the Town Expansion Committee (including the Town Clerk). These meetings are seen as providing an opportunity for the two bodies to inform each other of their progress rather than as a basis for joint policy formulation". (18)

Such meetings of members and officers fairly quickly became a regular part of the partnership routine, the first members meeting being on 20th May 1969. This first meeting established certain ground rules in that it was agreed that the chairmanship should be taken in turns, that there should be minutes but no formal decisions taken. These meetings were to exchange information and explain and explore policy considerations. This was a particularly important point for the councillors as they clearly could not take decisions outside the normal constitutional processes of the Council. This first meeting considered the key observations of council committees on the consultant's proposals and was felt to be a considerable success. (19).

The expansion partnership was not just a matter of officers, however, a political network was established whereby the local political figures established supportive relationships with members of the Board of the Development Corporation and indeed with ministers. This aspect of the network was enshrined by
placing the four members of the County Borough Council, Dilleigh, Trusler, Corrin and Lewis on to the Board of Northampton Development Corporation on its establishment in 1968. (17).

Throughout the negotiations over the partnership arrangements the key strength of the County Borough had been its capacity to offer political compliance and acceptance of a policy of central government that involved very significant local disruption. This bargaining strength of the County Borough was strongly enhanced by its capacity to mobilise bias based on its County Borough status. It effectively convinced Central Government that the normal central/local government relationships were not appropriate and that existing legislation was inadequate when expanding a County Borough. The establishment of the County Borough's ad hoc committee and the recognition by the Ministry of its right to negotiate with it on the machinery of expansion was an endorsement of the County Borough's success in this mobilisation of bias.

This success of the County Borough in establishing a near equality with the Ministry over expansion, the expression of this equality in the term "partnership" was a crucial development and allowed the construction of a formal framework of rules for expansion.
Much of the success enjoyed by the County Borough in its negotiations with the Ministry was the product of its own unanimity. Whilst this unanimity owed much to established working relationships and a common interpretation of local needs, it was also in part founded on the uncertainty of political power in Northampton at that time.

Not only was the original ad hoc committee set up by the County Borough to negotiate with the Ministry established in a balanced party political basis but so also was the formalised Town Expansion Committee.

In paragraph 13 of the "Agreed Memorandum" it stated: -

"It would be important that the County Borough Council should, for their part, set up a small committee with delegated powers to settle day to day matters arising out of expansion". (20)

In fact, just such a committee had already been established and indeed had had its first meeting on the 4th May, six days before the acceptance of the Agreed Memorandum. The membership of this committee was also one of equal party political balance and, despite the October 1965 County Borough elections which produced a Conservative controlled authority, this balance was maintained. This Town Expansion Committee was to be the major administrative reference point and decision making centre for all matters concerning the early expansion of Northampton. It was an extremely powerful committee in terms of constitution,
membership and powers. The bi-partisan approach to expansion was maintained by having a committee of eight, four Conservatives and four Labour members, with the Conservatives holding the Chairmanship. With annual elections to the County Borough there was always a possibility of political change and it was agreed that such changes would be discounted as far as the membership of this committee was concerned. Changes in political fortunes would be restricted to changes in the Chairmanship of the committee. The actual members themselves were the most senior and experienced Council members and most of them were from the former ad hoc committee of the Finance and General Purposes Committee. In October 1965 the membership was:

J. Corrin - Chairman  
(Also Chairman of Finance and G.P.)  
Conservative.

R. Dilleigh - Deputy Chairman  
(Also Deputy Chairman of Finance and G.P.)  
Labour.

R. Dolman - (also Chairman of Planning).  
Conservative.

C. Trusler - (also Deputy Chairman of Planning).  
Labour.

J. Lewis -  
Conservative.

D. Gregson -  
Labour.
P. Keedle - Labour.
D. Walmesley - Conservative.

Most unusually the committee was appointed for four years and to it was delegated all the powers of the Council with respect to expansion.

The power-dependence balance established within the town expansion policy community during the period 1965-1968 was an unusual one in that, whilst central and local government enjoyed matching goals and had devised a framework of rules to govern their relationships, it is difficult to identify clearly a dominant coalition within the policy community. Whilst central government retained the coercive initiative and the flow of centrally provided resources, as yet there was no development corporation that could act on its own behalf and it was faced with a County Borough Council enjoying the power dependence of the "Agreed Memorandum". Rather than a dominant coalition, there emerged a form of stalemate which was manifest in a lack of development strategy. From the summer of 1965 a massive calm fell over the town expansion process generating a long period of inactivity.

Given the pace of the previous months it is hard to understand the lack of progress that followed. But from October 1965 until April 1967 the impetus of development seems to have been totally lost and was not recaptured until February 1968 and the announcement of designation. It may well be that such a period
of calm was inevitable, that a master plan takes time to create, that the appointment of members to the Development Corporation needs careful thought, but this period of relative inactivity lasted some two and a half years and clearly requires some more detailed explanation.

Without doubt the cause of the reduction in momentum lay with the central government. Although October 1965 saw a Conservative majority on Northampton County Borough Council, the objectives of the Council remained the same and their experience of partnership had been very encouraging. Indeed the Council's expectations were for rapid progress and they continued to implement the "Agreed Memorandum" by continuing with the Town Expansion Committee. Its continued existence underpinned the commitment of the Council to the whole issue of town expansion. The local authority was clearly anxious to maintain the pace of expansion, in particular to begin its specific task of re-developing the town centre. However, this process was dependent upon the second part of the consultant's report for the master plan, and there was no prospect of this emerging until the completion of the first part of the report, which the Ministry appeared reluctant to see take place. (21).

Clearly the Ministry had put on the brakes. In the words of Mr Alan Parkhouse, later to be the Chief Executive of the Borough Council,
"Around the summer of 1966 a deadly stillness fell upon Whitehall - no longer were we urged to use the motorway, on the contrary a slow train via Aberdeen would have been equally effective". (22).

The reasons for the Ministry's attitude probably lay in two areas. Firstly, there was a change of Minister: Richard Crossman was moved to become Leader of the House of Commons and was succeeded by Tony Greenwood. The personal links forged by Crossman no longer applied and a new Minister needs time to feel comfortable and in control of key Ministry policies. July 1966 also witnessed serious cuts in public expenditure programmes in an effort to stave off the devaluation of November 1967. This was not the climate within which the objectives of the third generation new town programme would find enthusiastic support amongst Cabinet Ministers and Treasury officials. Thus a certain wobbling in central government goals, a major change of personnel in the Ministry and the unique position of the County Borough with its "Agreed Memorandum" produced a hiatus in the policy community, the dominant coalition and strategy generation.

In 1965 there were three main areas where action was expected. Firstly, the implementation of a two-part study by the consultants Wilson and Womersley, in which Part I would define the designated area and be for the Ministry, and Part 2 which was for the County Borough and the Ministry and, under the "Agreed Memorandum", was to be the basis for the County Borough
Master Plan. Secondly, the Development Corporation was to be established and organised. Thirdly, the County Borough was to get on with the job of developing the central area.

In May 1965, almost immediately after the determination of the "Agreed Memorandum", the consultants Wilson and Womersley were appointed to advise upon an appropriate designated area (Part 1) and also to produce a master plan. The consultants were most acceptable to the County Borough as Lewis Womersley had been the first Borough Architect in Northampton from 1946 to 1952 and it was hoped that local knowledge would enhance professional sensitivity. (23).

The original time scales within which the consultants were expected to operate were that by 1st June 1966 they would have finished their preliminary considerations for the Ministry (Part 1) and would have completed their overall task by 1st June 1967, (Part 2). Then on receipt of the consultants' report and after satisfying objections, the Development Corporation would be appointed to get on with its task in the new areas and the County Borough could get on with its task in the central area. This last point was of considerable importance for the successful development of the central area was crucial to setting the pace and tone of expansion. This was perhaps best illustrated by a verbal comment recorded by the then Town Clark,
Mr Alan Parkhouse, as having been made at an early joint meeting between the Development Corporation and the Town Expansion Committee.

"The quality of the new housing to be erected in greater Northampton will be influenced by the quality of the occupants. The quality of the occupants will be influenced by the quality of the sources of employment which can be attracted to the area. The quality of the sources of employment will be influenced by the quality and attractiveness of the redeveloped town centre".

The time scale for events, however, was not to be followed from the outset. The County Borough Council was unable to get on with the job of developing the central area because of the delay in the initial stage of the work of Wilson and Womersley for the Ministry. The consultants had produced a copy of Part 1 of their report for the Town Expansion Committee on 10th August 1966, and the Ministry in turn had used this as a basis for discussions with the County Council. The County Council had strong objections to the proposals and it took until January 1967 for the consultants, in response to this opposition, to instigate a major review which involved revisions in the boundaries of the suggested designated area. The County Council objections, however, were only a partial explanation for the delay. The Ministry was obligated under new town legislation to hold a public inquiry if there were other objections to the designated area, and this inquiry was held in October 1967 by Mr R Wotherspoon. With minor amendments, it confirmed the order.
In addition, there were other influences and changes with the Ministry. Firstly, Evelyn Sharp was preparing to retire. Secondly, there was a more general concern about planning procedures associated with new towns and their relationship to normal planning processes and the Ministry had established a Planning Advisory Group to look at the difficulties. Thirdly, it had been discovered that Paragraph 9 of the "Agreed Memorandum" was almost impossible to implement.

Under the Town and Country Planning Act 1947, local authorities had to submit a plan for approval to the Minister, known as the Development Plan. Paragraph 9 of the "Agreed Memorandum" stated that the plan for the expansion of Northampton would take the form of an amendment to this Development Plan. Thus the plan and its implementation would be entirely that of the County Borough. This was quite a different approach from the normal New Town procedures where a Development Corporation submitted a Master Plan to the Minister for approval.

Unfortunately for the County Borough Council, to make the basic planning document an amendment to the Development Plan was not possible as the area of expansion involved substantial areas outside the existing County Borough boundaries. Thus amending the Development Plan would require the extension of the County Borough boundaries, and this was a lengthy and difficult process. At a Town Expansion Committee meeting on 22nd November 1967, a Ministry official agreed stating that:
"Paragraph 9 had been agreed on the spur of the moment without due thought". (24)

In June 1967 the Ministry asked the Town Expansion Committee for a change in the "Agreed Memorandum" and the acceptance of a set of processes whereby a Master Plan would be jointly submitted by the County Borough and the Development Corporation when it was established. The County Borough was most concerned at the loss of control over the planning aspects of expansion, implied in the new procedures suggested by the Ministry and on 3rd July the council put forward an alternative proposal to the Ministry. This was the suggestion that the County Borough should submit the Master Plan to the Ministry for approval. Council leaders had been assured by Bob Mellish, Parliamentary Secretary, that a local authority could put forward a Master Plan, and they felt that such an arrangement was within the spirit of partnership and the original agreement. (25) This, however, was not acceptable to the Ministry who now wished to bring the Development Corporation into the planning process. The County Borough finally agreed to the joint submission of a Master Plan by themselves and the Development Corporation on 27th February 1968, having received a letter from the Ministry accepting that the new procedure involved:-

"no diminution of Northampton County Borough as the planning authority". (26)
Thus the County Council, the consultants and the Ministry generated considerable delay in the expansion process and a serious loss of momentum was experienced which posed a number of real difficulties for the County Borough, in particular the development of the central area. It was not until April 1967, barely two months before their proposals were due for the whole town, that the County Borough obtained a copy of the consultant's proposals for the town centre, which allowed initial development proposals to be formulated, and even this required special Ministry approval as it was to be almost 12 months before designation. The delay and the decision for a joint submission of a Master Plan, indicated a significant shift in the nature of partnership. Partnership increasingly was being seen as between the Development Corporation and the County Borough rather than the Ministry and the County Borough. Whilst retaining the spirit of the earlier partnership arrangements, the Ministry appeared to be determined that the Development Corporation, when appointed, would have an honourable and significant role in the expansion of Northampton. Thus the policy community was to be expanded to include the Ministry, the County Borough and the Development Corporation. After this re-arrangement the momentum of expansion was re-established by the Ministry announcement of designation in the House of Commons on February 14th 1968.
The period 1965 to 1968 was one which witnessed considerable negotiation and bargaining between the Ministry of Housing and Local Government and the County Borough of Northampton. The substance of the bargaining was the establishment of partnership relations. In negotiating over the rules of relationships, the role of the Development Corporation, the nature of the Master Plan, the Ministry and the County Borough were each seeking to establish a framework that gave them a central place in the dominant coalition. The initial early success of the County Borough in securing the "Agreed Memorandum" in May 1965, with control over the town centre and the Master Plan, veto powers and consultation rights, was by 1968 partially eroded by the Ministry securing a more significant role for the Development Corporation with respect to the Master Plan. Such negotiations on the fundamental nature of the partnership inevitably negated the generation of town expansion strategies.
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Chapter 7

HISTORY OF TOWN EXPANSION 1968-1974

On the 14th February 1968 in the House of Commons, the Minister, Anthony Greenwood, announced that Northampton was officially designated as a new town and the area for expansion was clearly delineated.

With the establishment of the Northampton Development Corporation in 1968, the pivotal point of the partnership became the relationship between the Development Corporation and the County Borough Council. Previously the negotiation and bargaining had taken place between the Ministry of Housing and Local Government and the County Borough. The debate had been concerned largely with structures and processes, essentially laying the groundwork for expansion. No physical town expansion had actually been undertaken.

Central to the new partnership was the membership of the Board of Northampton Development Corporation. From the outset the County Borough had wanted four seats on the Development Corporation. Firstly, to maintain the interests of the existing town and secondly, to provide for the continuation of cross party support for town expansion by providing two places for each party. The normal size of membership for a Development Corporation was nine and the Ministry tended to feel that having four County Borough Council
representatives would be over-representation of the local interest, especially as a place on the Board was to be made available for a County Council representative and a representative from South Northamptonshire District Council. However, the County Borough felt very strongly about this matter and the political lobbying went as far as the Prime Minister in order to achieve the desired result. (1)

Thus the first Northampton Development Corporation Board was made up of the following members in September 1968:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir William Hart</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Hirschfield</td>
<td>Deputy Chairman</td>
<td>Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Freeman</td>
<td>GLC. Rep.</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Cripps</td>
<td>NCC. Rep.</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Harwin</td>
<td>South Northants.</td>
<td>Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Dilleigh</td>
<td>NCB. Rep.</td>
<td>Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Trusler</td>
<td>NCB. Rep.</td>
<td>Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Corrin</td>
<td>NCB. Rep.</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Lewis</td>
<td>NCB. Rep.</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was felt to be particularly important by certain local Labour Party councillors that an overall political balance should be maintained, and the appointment of Lord Hirschfield as Deputy Chairman was arranged by the East Midland Regional Agent of the
Labour Party, Jim Cattamoll, Ron Dilleigh and the Minister, Tony Greenwood, on the steps of the Winter Gardens, Blackpool, during the 1968 party conference.\(^{(1)}\)

The placing of four Northampton County Borough representatives on the Board of the Northampton Development Corporation had considerable significance. The interface between the Development Corporation and the Borough Council became the focal point for bargaining and negotiation over town expansion. This was the forum for the majority of key decisions. Central Government bargaining with the County Borough was now largely conducted through its agent, the Development Corporation, in consequence the Ministry became more remote from the County Borough which thus lost some of its special negotiating status and returned to being just another local authority.

During this period the dominant coalition within the Northampton town expansion policy community was made up of certain key members of the Board together with certain officers. Sir William Hart, Chairman of the Board, and a former Clerk to the LCC, together with the General Manager, John Weston, could deliver the Development Corporation; Jack Corrin, Ron Dilleigh and the Town Clerk, Alan Parkhouse, could deliver the County Borough. When these five individuals were agreed on a policy then that was the one to be pursued. Of course there were constraints on the work of this dominant coalition. As County Borough Councillors, J. Corrin and R. Dilleigh, were required to sustain the support of their political
groups, Sir William Hart and John Weston had to retain the confidence of the Ministry and both Alan Parkhouse and John Weston had to sustain the professional respect of their colleagues, in particular those who were shared officers. It is also important to stress that initiatives were to come from other participants within the partnership and that these five individuals were not always totally agreed, but the general day-to-day machinery of decision making revolved around their individual consent and group consensus.

Input elements that underpinned the partnership were the gradual growth of commitment based on regular professional interaction, commonality of background and a sense of group identity.

An important feature was legal training. Sir William Hart, the first Chairman of the Development Corporation and Mr. Alan Davis, his successor, were both lawyers by training, as was Mr. Alan Parkhouse, the Chief Executive of the Borough Council. In fact, Sir William Hart had lectured to Alan Parkhouse when they were both at Oxford. (3) David Walmsley, a member of the original Town Expansion Committee and a member of the Board for nine years, was also a lawyer. Secondly, there was the strength of the local government background for those individuals at the heart of the decision making process. Taking the key personalities of the dominant coalition, evidence is clear that this was a key element in their background.
1968/69 Local Government Background

Sir W. Hart, Chairman NDC. /
J Corrin, Board Member /
R Dilleigh, Board Member  /
J Lewis, Board Member  /
C Trussler, Board Member  /
A Parkhouse (Shared Officer NBC)  /
J Weston, General Manager NDC  ---

Only J Weston had not worked previously in local government.

From 1968 to 1974, the town expansion programme was at its height and the impact of commitment reinforced the oneness of the dominant coalition.

The position of each of these participants was enhanced as a result of their contacts with and support from elements of Central Government. (4) Councillors Corrin and Dilleigh had political contacts in both Westminster and Whitehall. Sir William Hart, Alan Parkhouse and John Weston enjoyed personal and professional contacts in the Ministry of Housing and Local Government and in the wider New Town movement through the Local Authorities and New Town Associations. Two other County Borough Councillors, who were also members of the Board of the Development Corporation, played important supportive roles with respect to the dominant coalition.
Miss Carol Trussler (Labour) and Mr. Jim Lewis (Conservative) both acted as securers of local party political support for their respective leaders.

The position of the partners was enhanced by the strength of the links between the Development Corporation and the County Borough.

The sharing of officers, resulting as it did in fewer officers, went some way to creating a tightly knit group, as did the significant representation of the local authority on the Board. The placing of architecture, planning, engineering and highways sections of the local authority in the same building as the Development Corporation also contributed to this unity. Agency arrangements and the division of expansion activity between the partners created organisational structures and processes that eased the emergence of a common personality. To develop the analogy, the partnership possessed some of the characteristics of the modern marriage, a merging of identities yet a retaining of individuality, a division of function together with shared facilities and joint activities, sustained around common goals and involving a common response to the rest of the environment.

Whilst this dominant coalition operated against the backcloth of central government coercion, a number of influences strengthened this local element within the partnership. Firstly, local government, in particular the County Borough, generally enjoyed an influence within the nation's affairs greater than was to be
subsequently the case in the 1970's and 1980's. Secondly, the nature of a new town programme in its size and extent precluded detailed ministerial control, which therefore tended to concentrate upon annual budgets and major project approvals. Finally, the common accord enjoyed between the Northampton Development Corporation and the County Borough Council, the product of the partnership arrangements, was not typical. Historically the role of central government in the new town development was an arbiter between development corporation and local authority. For the Ministry to face a County Borough-Development Corporation acting as a single policy making institution was a unique experience.

Thus we have indicated the small group of individuals who made up the dominant group within the partnership. A groundwork of rules governing their activities was established based on joint meetings, rotating chairmanship, shared officers and agency agreements.

Collectively as a group they exercised control over considerable resources in that the major central government restraints largely operated within an annual cycle. There was an established framework of rules laid out in the "Agreed Memorandum" and the financial reflections of the undue burden agreements; and the County Borough was able to employ its status as an instrument of negotiation with central government.
Partnership was also a concept that had the full support of the Ministry. On 21 October 1968 I.V. Pugh, Head of the New Town Directorate, writing to Sir William Hart, stressed the importance of the "Agreed Memorandum".

"It contained a number of undertakings and proposals which we believe have gone a long way to convince the Council that they will be treated by the Corporation as equal parties in the project; and we rely on the Corporation to build on that foundation." (5)

The partnership enjoyed a level of resources and had established a rule framework for their activities that allowed for a massive town expansion programme. At the focal point of the Board of the Development Corporation, the two authorities were acting as one. Inter-organisational conflict, common enough with other development corporations, enjoyed mechanisms for their resolution. The authority of individuals within the partnership was also enhanced, particularly that of the County Borough representatives.

In terms of the Board, they spoke as democratic guardians of the local interest, and in terms of their council colleagues, as key members of an independent local organisation with powers beyond the control of the local authority and with direct links to, and support from, central government.

The power of patronage was much greater for those local elected representatives who were also on the Board of the Development Corporation. They were in a unique position vis-a-vis their colleagues on both organisations. Harmony was further enhanced by the fact that collectively the partners could more effectively cope
with 'noise' and negative feedback. Each partner was prepared to offer its expertise to the other in these two fields. The Borough Council in particular was able to assist with local negative feedback experienced by the Development Corporation, which in turn reciprocated with assistance on 'noise' experienced by the Borough Council in its dealings with central government and statutory bodies. The scope for reticulist judgements as developed by J.M. Power (1971), (6) was vastly increased. The members of the partnership not only had access to a wider range of information/decision making points, but time provided an education in their use.

The information network established through shared officers, borough representation on the board and the consultation and agency arrangements, further enhanced the mutual nature of the decision making process. For this constituted an open information system in which it was difficult for one partner to keep secrets from the other. Problems between members of the dominant coalition were identified early, before entrenched positions-developed, and this early identification was a major factor in minimising conflict and easing decision making.

A major feature of the partnership during this period was this containment of friction and disputes. Throughout this period of major development, there was not a single serious clash between the partner organisations that frustrated or slowed down the pace of development. (7) There were disagreements, even occasional clashes
but nothing that remotely compared with the experiences of previous Development Corporations and their local authorities. This lack of friction is all the more remarkable in that previous Development Corporations had to relate to parish councils, urban and rural district councils; in Northampton there had existed a more potent mixture of Development Corporation and County Borough Council. Thus the dampening effect of the partnership arrangements were that much more remarkable. It would be wrong, however, to restrict the achievements of the partnership solely to the curtailment of conflict. There were many other initiatives developing mutual co-operation and support. A particularly important facet of this was the role of the multi-disciplinary and inter-authority project teams that were established for individual development schemes. New housing estates, new factories, roads and open spaces involved architectural, engineering, financial and legal expertise that was drawn from the two partnership authorities. This officer sharing, together with the common experiences shared in the work of the project teams, broke down traditional defensive attitudes, often found in joint undertakings, and allowed the project and the associated professional skills necessary for its achievement to be the dominant theme of officer activity.

The partnership was thus able to delineate areas of activity, demarcate functions between the authorities, and generate areas of fruitful co-operation. These were clearly positive achievements. However, even greater integration and a more complete merging of function and activity may have allowed the Borough to avoid perhaps
its most serious misjudgement over town expansion. For with hindsight senior officers and councillors would have admitted that keeping the Development Corporation out of the central area was a mistake and that the town could have derived significant benefits from the availability of Development Corporation resources in its central area redevelopment. (8)

The nature of the partnership also affected the balance of incrementalism and theory in decision making. Social development programmes such as that of New Towns contain within them a clarity of objective that reduces the acceptability of incrementalism as a basis for choice making. The Master Plan and the Management Accounts constituted a basis for non-incremental choice making. However, the intrusion of the local authority element of partnership with its traditions of reactive and responsive patterns of choice making tended to inject a basis for an incrementalist approach not normally found in a New Town programme.

The effectiveness of the partnership is to be seen in the speed of town expansion post 1968, especially the emergence of the Master Plan.

As early as 1965, the County Borough had been anxious to get on with redevelopment of the town centre but its momentum had been seriously impaired by the processes associated with the creation of the Master Plan. The consultants, Wilson and Womersley, had been charged with preparing a Master Plan (9) for the whole of the designated area and
this included the town centre. Thus County Borough plans for the
town centre were to fit in with the Master Plan as it emerged from
the consultants' report. The delay was somewhat aggravated by
initial ministry indications that the County Borough would not be
appraised of the consultants' views until the publication of the
Master Plan. This was contrary to all partnership concepts and in
flagrant breach of the "Agreed Memorandum" and proved to be a most
contentious issue until it was resolved through an adjustment in the
brief of the consultants. It was agreed that part of the overall
brief for the consultants would be a requirement to provide for the
redevelopment of the town centre by the County Borough. This was
presented to and agreed by the Town Expansion and Development
Committee, in October 1967 (10). The consultants duly presented
outline proposals of Action Area No.1 in November 1968, identifying
the priorities of:-

i) A multi-storey car park

ii) A new bus station.

iii) A major commercial/retail development.

The town expansion committee rapidly accepted their proposals and
now that designation had been announced and the Development
Corporation was being established, events moved very quickly.
1968 August. Chairman of Development Corporation, Sir William Hart and other Board members appointed.

1968 October. First Board meeting.

1968 December. Consultants' proposals published and exhibited.


1969 December. Joint submission of Master Plan to Minister.


This constituted fairly rapid progress and indicates considerable co-operation by both parties in preparing the joint submission. This was well illustrated by the Town Clerk, Mr Alan Parkhouse, appearing as advocate for both the County Borough and the Development Corporation at the public inquiry. In his letter of decision to both parties, the Minister commented on the speed of presentation that had at the same time thoroughly consulted local opinion.
It is interesting that much of the town centre development planning took place at a time when there was no ministerial approval of the Master Plan. It is indicative of the self-confidence of the Dominant Coalition at this stage of town expansion.

This implementation period of six years from 1968-1974 significantly altered the physical features of Northampton as a town; in terms of architectural and townscape development it was a period of immense change.

The redevelopment of the town centre was a major undertaking by the County Borough Council and involved the successful application and co-ordination of a very wide range of professional skills. The responsibilities of the County Borough included site assembly, financial negotiations with a selected developer, the general monitoring of the public interest. These were the responsibilities of the County Borough as a developer, it also retained, however, other significant interests as a local authority in terms of planning, building control etc.

From the beginning there existed for Northampton County Borough the urgent requirements to assemble for a private developer, a physical site available on a specified date, 31st March 1972. To meet this obligation the County Borough was to be involved in:-
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1. Land purchase and valuation.

2. Boundary realignments and land swops.

3. Housing clearance and relocation.

4. Commercial company clearance and relocation.

5. Negotiations with statutory undertakers.

6. Road closures.

7. Compulsory purchase.

8. Public exhibitions.

9. Public Inquiries.

This was by no means an exhaustive list and any one of these activities may have involved several officers in many hundreds of hours work. Clearly the administrative and legal resources of the County Borough were to be put to the test, especially as their own Town Clerk was acting as solicitor for the Development Corporation. At this time the existing Town Clerk, Mr Vivian Rowe, retired to be succeeded by his deputy, Mr Alan Parkhouse, who now became the officer most singularly charged with implementing the programme of town centre redevelopment.

The County Borough began the search for a private development company that would be prepared to develop the new commercial areas of the town centre. On 22nd October 1969, it was reported to the Town Expansion Committee that Grosvenor and Eaton Estates had been appointed to this task and a detailed agreement was drawn up between the County Borough Council and Grosvenor and Eaton Estates covering the progress of physical development, development finance and the
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final financial arrangements. The County Borough was reasonably pleased with the agreement as it obtained a share of the current and future equity in the project. There was also the crucial item whereby the council gave an undertaking to make the site available to the developers by 31st March 1972.

The following four years witnessed all the activity that is normally associated with a major redevelopment of a town centre; the emergence of plans for the new expansion area, the progressive clarification of schemes by developers, objections from local interested parties such as the Civic Society, and the gradual resolution of conflict through inquiries and ministerial decisions. The key landmarks in this progression for Northampton were:-

April 1970. Preliminary scheme from Grosvenor Estates for re-development

June 1970 Further details from Grosvenor on relocation of Chronicle and Echo newspaper offices and site for new bus station.


January 1971. Emporium Arcade to be demolished. Developers stress the commitment that a cleared site should be available by 31st March, 1972. Eastern District plan published.

February 1971. The Council decides to seek ministerial approval for the demolition of the Welsh House and several other buildings of historical and architectural interest.

March 1971. Publication of comprehensive strategy plan involving central area together with plans for Southern High Speed Road and Urban Expressway.

September 1971.  Publication of design for new bus station.


April 1972.  Minister indicates that the Welsh House cannot be demolished.  County Borough makes several major central area purchases.  Agreement with Prudential Co., on Abington Street development.

September 1972.  Arup Co. Ltd. produces final scheme for Bus Station with associated 212,000 sq.ft. of offices all costed at £5.5m.


As the major landmarks of central area redevelopment, such bare bones do not fully express the magnitude of the task undertaken by the Council and its officers, nor the opposition with which certain aspects of development were met. What is evident, however, is the speed of the expansion process given the stability of relationships stemming from partnership.

An interesting example of the partnership in operation was afforded by the "undue burden principle". At the second meeting of the Development Corporation on 9 January 1969, a paper was circulated from the Ministry of Housing and Local Government on the powers and duties of Development Corporations. On finance, the document stated:

"the latter (the Development Corporations) may, however contribute such sums as the Minister, with the concurrence of the Treasury, approves towards expenditure of a local authority or statutory undertaker in carrying out any of their statutory duties in relation to the new town eg: 'Bridging the gap' between capital expenditure and the date when the resulting revenue accrues." (11)

This statement constituted a response to the great concern of local authorities with the local costs of expansion and their anxiety to avoid any undue burden falling upon local rate payers. For a town like Northampton to be presented with the experience of taking in 100,000 new "foreign" inhabitants was to expect much in the way of patience and understanding from the existing residents, especially as it involved considerable upheaval and physical changes to the
town. What made this experience marginally acceptable was the constant reiteration that it would not be paid for by Northampton ratepayers, that there would not be an undue burden. This form of words, although not specifically detailed within the "Agreed Memorandum", certainly embodied the spirit in which local government expected expansion would be viewed. Certainly they were encouraged by central government that this was the financial basis for expansion. (12)

The trigger which required some quantification of the level of support the County Borough could expect was the document prepared by the Borough Treasurer, Mr Leslie Salt, on the total consequences of expansion for County Borough services. The figure produced was £10.3m, and this was presented to the Finance and General Purposes Committee of the County Borough Council on 16 February 1970. (13) (A revised figure of £17.3m was produced a month later, 23 March 1970). At this meeting the committee accepted that it was not unreasonable for the town to bear an additional burden of 6d (2.5p) rate, but that was all, and the committee authorised Mr Salt to negotiate with the Development Corporation on the full cost of providing County Borough services in the expansion areas. It was not, however, until October 1972 when the Finance Committee began the task of considering the estimates for 1973/1974 that the task of quantifying any undue burden claim was begun. By October 1972 the expansion process had obtained significant momentum and intermediate
output in the form of housing and roads was clearly visible, population was moving in, the commitment of local authority services to the expansion areas was growing.

Given his instructions, the Treasurer prepared an estimate of the cost to the County Borough of town expansion in 1972/1973 and 1973/1974. This estimate was prepared on the basis of the costs of each individual County Borough service and the effect on Rate Support income of the Development Corporation's activities. (14) This exercise produced the following figures which were put to the Chief Finance Officer of the Development Corporation, Mr Basil Bean, in a letter of 12 December 1972.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972/73</td>
<td>£198,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973/74</td>
<td>£479,540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his reply of 24 January 1973 (15) Basil Bean outlined an alternative procedure.

"To try and identify each item of expenditure incurred by the County Borough Council in the expansion areas or to try and allocate the County Borough's costs and revenues between existing population and newcomers will, I feel, be exceedingly tedious, in many cases arbitrary and will lead to all manner of demarcation disputes. What is required is a financial agreement which provides for an annual contribution by the Development Corporation towards the County Borough Council's overall general rate fund expenditure which:-

a) fairly reflects the additional financial burden falling on the County Borough Council as a result of town expansion."
b) can be easily calculated and understood.

c) can be ascertained fairly accurately before the beginning of each financial year.

d) is abated year by year over the development period to take into account the fact that the greatest burden will fall on the County Borough Council during the early years in providing services in advance of the incoming population before increased rate support grant is receivable and that at the end of the development period these contributions will cease.

e) avoids the need for the Development Corporation to become involved in the detailed financial affairs of the County Borough Council.

f) contains an assurance that the County Borough Council will provide all normal local authority services for the incoming population in accordance with the Development Corporation's own programme.

g) will make it unnecessary for the Development Corporation to contribute towards specific items or services with the exception of non-principal roads."

The new approach suggested by Basil Bean involved the application of a formula, one on which he had already had some preliminary discussions with Leslie Salt.

The suggested formula was:-

1) Increase in the County Borough rate 1973/74 over 1972/73.

2) Less the average increase in the County Borough rates (nationally).

3) Less average benefit to County Borough of redistribution of resources element. (Grant change introduced 1973/74).

4) Multiply result by penny rate.

5) Abate result each year by an agreed percentage that would increase each year.
On 27 January, Leslie Salt replied that he was prepared to recommend the principle of the formula to his finance committee, although there were some technical adjustments which he felt would more accurately reflect the true situation. (Original formula included an additional payment of £120 000 specifically for open spaces. This was withdrawn as a result of being unacceptable to the Department of the Environment). At the same time Leslie Salt was able to provide a provisional calculation as to what the claim for 1973/74 would be. The total reimbursement under the formula was £677 811.

Clearly the two Chief Finance Officers were working closely in harness together. There was a commonality of objectives and their formal correspondence was something of an administrative minuet; Basil Bean's suggestion of 24 January 1973 being accepted, calculated and replied to by 29 January 1973. What is of further interest is that whether the method used was the cost analysis formula of Leslie Salt or the formula method of Basil Bean the actual sums of money turned out to be approximately the same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Salt (Cost Basis)</th>
<th>Bean (Formula Basis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972/73</td>
<td>£198 500</td>
<td>£678 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973/74</td>
<td>£479 500</td>
<td>1973/74 £677 811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£678 000</strong></td>
<td><strong>£677 811</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once again we have a situation of a search for a stability of procedures and rules.

The preference expressed by the Chief Finance Officers for the Bean formula was to have quite significant repercussions.

These discussions took place against a background of the 1972 Local Government Act and the changes that would result from it. For Northampton the changes were considerable. The all purpose County Borough was to disappear to be replaced by a two tier system under which the County Council would provide education, social services, emergency services and highways for all the county of Northamptonshire. The County Borough was to become a lower tier authority, a District Council essentially responsible for housing and a number of lesser local services such as health, leisure, transport, rate collection, etc.

Basing the undue burden payment on the Bean formula linked it with rate formulation and collection, which would continue to be a function performed by the Borough of Northampton, even with its reduced status. It would appear that choosing the Bean formula...
rather than the Salt cost basis was an attempt to ensure that the undue burden payments would be made to the District Council rather than the County Council after reorganisation.

Whilst the department of the Environment was prepared to accept the Bean formula, the Treasury was not. The Treasury wished to confine the Development Corporation contribution to "County Services". Despite discussions, the Treasury view prevailed and the Bean formula was abandoned in favour of a cost based analysis of county services only which yielded a claim of £396 480. (Originally an additional £30 000 was included for roads but was subsequently withdrawn). This sum was paid to the County Borough Council before its finances were wound up in 1974.

Thus the issue of the "undue burden" claim was to a large extent resolved on a satisfactory basis as far as the County Borough was concerned and, although there was some debate as to the actual sum of money involved, certainly the spirit of partnership had been sustained by central government, the Development Corporation and the County Borough. The success enjoyed by Northampton on this financial issue encouraged other authorities to take up the problem. For example, Milton Keynes in its eighth Annual report 1974/75 commented on ...

"the limited resources available to the County Council, the Borough Council and other statutory authorities to enable them to keep pace in the services they provide with our increasing housing programme." (16)
However, a seedbed of financial problems had been laid for the District Council which would now not be included at all in any "undue burden" provisions.

Nevertheless the bargaining/negotiation over the "undue burden" formula provided an insight into the practical workings of the partnership at this time.
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The year 1974 represented a watershed in the history of partnership in Northampton. Essentially the fundamental conditions which established and sustained partnership were undergoing change. Firstly, Northampton County Borough Council became Northampton Borough Council, a change not only in status but also in function. The powers of Education, Social Services, Highways and Emergency Services were transferred to the new Northamptonshire County Council. The original partnership between the all-purpose County Borough and the Development Corporation was now to be replaced by a tripartite partnership between Borough Council, Development Corporation and County Council. Secondly, there was a change in the central government with the Labour Party once more moving into Whitehall. Thirdly, this new government was beginning a re-appraisal of the third generation new town programme.

Thus the number of parties within the partnership was increased and the nature of relationships became more complicated.
The advantages obtained as a result of a Development Corporation working with one local authority had long been recognised. As early as its Third Annual Report the new city of Milton Keynes had recognised such advantages.

"We have informed the county council that we are ready and anxious to support them in the establishment of one elected authority to cover the designated area." (1)

Warrington Development Corporation in its Third Annual Report (1971/72) was delighted that in its case local government reform meant a reduction in the number of local authorities with which it would have to deal.

"The Corporation looks forward to the prospect, under the proposed arrangements for local government reorganisation, of a reduction in the number of local authorities involved with the new town. It can only be regarded as beneficial for the designated area to be situated within the confines of one County and of one District, instead of, at present within those of two Counties, one County Borough and several Districts." (2)

In these terms, local government reform was a retrograde step as far as Northampton was concerned. The spirit of the new functional arrangements for local government also contained psychological consequences for the policy community.

Essentially, the status and authority of the Development Corporation within the policy community was increased and enhanced, for it was transformed from a junior partner and a
relative newcomer to the town expansion process into the single authority charged with the responsibility of expansion with two local authorities to relate to.

As stated in the Seventh Annual Report of Northampton Development Corporation 1974/75:

"The reorganisation of local government has materially affected the partnership arrangements. From the date of designation of Northampton under the New Towns Act until 31st March 1974, partnership was the concern of the Development Corporation and the County Borough Council which exercised all the powers of local government within virtually the same area.

Since 1st April 1974 these local government powers have been divided between the new Borough Council ... the new Northamptonshire County Council. This change calls for a broadening of the concept of partnership." (3)

The new relationships were to influence many aspects of the policy community, including Board membership, partner meeting, the Master Plan, roads, undue burden arrangements and relations with Central Government. Virtually every feature of the special partnership went back into the melting pot to be reforged. However, although legal powers and institutional arrangements had undergone major change, it is important to identify a number of key influences that in the short run were to dampen down their impact and which allowed the dominant position of the Borough to be sustained in practice for a number of years.
Firstly, a number of officer changes were of particular significance. The new County Council was to have a new Chief Executive, Mr Jeffrey Greenwell, and his drive and enthusiasm was directed initially towards getting to understand his new authority, its members and functions. The new County Education Department was to be headed by Mr Michael Henley, the existing County Borough Education Officer. The officer to head the County Social Services Department was new to both his position and to Northamptonshire. These circumstances were not such as to encourage County dominance in the expansion of Northampton. This was further emphasised by the Highways agreement that was negotiated between the Borough and the County Council. Essentially the Borough Council was to become the Highways agent for the County Council in the area of Northampton. The reason for this was that the Borough Engineer's Department was considerably larger than that of the County Council, with greater professional and technical resources. The Borough Engineer had developed a department not only for the Borough's own purposes, but also for the Development Corporation and the Anglian Water Authority for whom it provided agency services. Thus to give the Borough Council the powers of the Highway Authority was an obvious decision for a fledgling County Council with a much smaller Engineering Department.
The dominance of the Borough was preserved further through certain political events. Following the 1973 Borough elections, two Development Corporation members, who had previously been County Borough Council members, were elected to the new Borough Council. Ron Dilleigh became leader of the majority Labour group and thus Leader of the Borough Council. Jack Corrin became Leader of the Conservative minority group and thus Leader of the Opposition. Miss Carol Trusler, who was also a member of the Board of the Development Corporation, was elected to the County Council, as were several other senior Borough Councillors including Dilleigh and Corrin. Ron Dilleigh became Deputy Leader of the County Council, Carol Trusler became Chairman of the Social Services Committee and Jack Corrin became Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Thus the key individuals who had sustained the partnership between County Borough Council and Development Corporation, established a political position that allowed them to sustain a similar harmony between the three authorities, Borough, County and Development Corporation.

Another factor that encouraged the continued leadership of the Borough Council was that the election results in 1973 and 1974 had produced majority Labour groups on both the Borough and the County Councils, the County's was the first in living memory. This limited the possibility of disputes between County and Borough that may have spread to and disturbed the Borough-
centred equilibrium over town expansion. Thus we had a new County Council, with a new Chief Executive and an untried majority party with the senior councillors from the old County Borough protecting the new Borough Council's interests. In these circumstances the partnership input and significance of the County Council was to be low key for a number of years.

A further unifying element within the partnership at this time was the common local government background of the members and officers of the Northampton Development Corporation, which provided a common knowledge base for the negotiation and consultation between Borough Council and Development Corporation. In 1976/77 the position was:
1976/77

Board Members and Officers

A Davis – Chairman NDC
J Nardeccia – D/Chairman NDC
J Corrin – Board Member
H Cripps –
R Dilleigh-
C Trusler-
M Jenkins –
D Walmsley –
G Roberts –

J Weston – General Manager NDC
B Bean – Finance Officer NDC
G Callaghan – Chief Architect NDC
L Austin Crowe – Chief Surveyor NDC
H Almond – Shared Officer (NBC)
N Bucci – Shared Officer (NBC)
N Kirby – Shared Officer (NBC)
G Bott – Shared Officer (NBC)

Local Government

Background

/
The Partnership relationship established in 1974 was to remain virtually unchanged in composition until wind-up in 1985. Of course individuals were to change, especially at central government level, but the institutions represented and the distribution of functions between them remained largely unaltered - a stability in the ground rules was largely attained.

The ideas developed by H. Heclo and A. Wildavsky (1974) (4) in terms of a common culture were clearly evident within the partnership arrangements associated with expanding Northampton. The community element in Northampton was underpinned by various institutional arrangements that enmeshed the two key organisations, the local authority and the Development Corporation. Shared Officers, agency arrangements and joint project teams created focal points for common activities. Common membership of professional associations such as CIPFA and the local authority associations and their study groups produced occasions when Development Corporation and local authority officers were singing from the same hymn sheet. Where such activities became routine and where, in addition, the political leaders of the Borough Council and the Development Corporation members were similarly facing common problems and jointly
seeking solutions, mutual trust became a necessary basis for the successful progression of expansion. The nature of the political climate in some part added to a common culture within the partnership.

The new Borough Council which assumed its local powers in April 1974 had in fact been elected in April 1973 and had run parallel with the old County Borough for one year, appointing its officers, preparing its programmes and budgets. The new Borough and County Councils also brought with them a political change, for the first time in eight years there was a Labour Party majority controlling the Town Council and for the first time in living memory a similar situation prevailed in the County Council. The first agreed decision of these two new authorities was to resolve an issue of town expansion that had caused considerable controversy for a number of years. They decided to abandon the proposal for an urban expressway through Northampton. Although in many senses a political decision it had the spin-off advantage that it successfully defused the most potent challenge that had grown up to the whole concept of town expansion. This issue more than any other had threatened to destroy the existing political concensus on expansion and its resolution considerably eased the work and the public image of those concerned with town development throughout the 1970's.
At first sight the political change to Labour would appear to have strengthened partnership, in that the new leader of the Borough Council was Councillor R Dilleigh, who had played such an important role in creating the original partnership arrangements, and who was also still a board member of the Development Corporation and Deputy Leader of the new Northamptonshire County Council. However, the experience and knowledge of Councillor Dilleigh was exceptional as far as the new Labour group of councillors were concerned. Fourteen of the twenty three Labour councillors were new to local government and of the remaining nine Ron Dilleigh was by far and away the most experienced. This somewhat fragile hair of experience was broken in 1975 when Councillor Dilleigh became involved in a Companies Act criminal case with his business colleagues T.D.Smith and Councillor Cunningham from Newcastle. This event precipitated his resignation from the leadership of the Borough Council and thus the affairs of the new authority were largely handed over to the leadership of Councillor R Winter, supported by a group of largely inexperienced councillors.

Given the suddeness of Councillor Dilleigh's resignation, it is not surprising that those thrown unexpectedly into the major decision making positions within the Borough Council,
concentrated most on gathering an understanding of its operations rather than concerning themselves with the subtleties of partnership and the expansion network.

The strength of the partnership structures and processes is perhaps most seen during this period when their significance was perhaps only partially understood by the leaders of the Borough Council and when such leaders did not have the regular contact with the Development Corporation which comes from a seat on the Board. Despite these serious problems the partnership survived. However, whilst the partnership inexperience of the Borough Council leaders did not seriously damage partnership, it in part led to a failure to grasp the last opportunity to involve the Development Corporation in town centre development. There was a period in 1975/76 when had the Borough Council invited the Development Corporation into the town centre as a developer, it may well have enjoyed access to considerable resources. The opportunity was missed, however, and the rest of the 1970's was to witness such a stringent attitude towards public expenditure that the opportunity was not to occur again.

The structures and processes which had provided the framework for the original County Borough/Development Corporation partnership were in consequence amended to provide a similar formal framework
for the new partnership situation. "Partnership II" the quarterly meetings between the Development Corporation and the Borough Council was now supplemented with "Partnership III" regular meetings between the Development Corporation and the County Council. (In practice these meetings of "Partnership III" took place with considerably less frequency than those of "Partnership II"). The County Land Agent became the Land Agent for the Development Corporation and joined the select band of shared officers. The main flow of officer collaboration was not significantly disturbed except that in Education and to a reduced extent Highways, the officers now had new political masters.

The relationship between the new Borough Council and the Development Corporation, although different from that of the old County Borough continued to remain close. Indeed, the Department of the Environment had agreed that the Borough Council was to remain the "Partner" for the purposes of the "Agreed Memorandum" (5). The common physical area of operations maintained a powerful joint interest between the Borough and the Development Corporation, whereas the County's interests were not confined to Northampton. These factors, together with the continuation of many well established links and friendships, did much to preserve the essentials of the pre 1974 partnership relations. For example, in February 1976 a joint management team was established
for Lings Forum, a major sporting/cultural/educational complex into which both partners had made significant financial contributions.

However, the reduced status of the Borough, the limited commitment of the County, restricted the network in a fashion which enhanced the position of the Development Corporation, which increasingly began to develop new initiatives within the expansion programme.

Following the reorganisation of local government, the County Council constituted a relatively minor element in the partnership network. In 1974, however, it developed an initiative that threatened to fundamentally alter its character. The 1974 consultative document "New Towns in England and Wales", issued by the Department of Environment (6), was to stimulate an interesting reply from the County Council. It produced its own response entitled "New Towns in England and Wales - Observations of Northamptonshire County Council" (7). This document suggested a major regrouping of the various new and expanding towns, that existed within the county, under two new Development Corporations. One would be concerned with Northampton and
Daventry and the other with Corby and Wellingborough. New partnership arrangements were suggested which included six safeguards for the County Council.

1. The boundaries of the designated areas would have to be agreed between the County Council and Central Government.

2. The two Development Corporations would operate on a partnership basis with the local authorities having a right of direct nomination to and a majority on the boards of the Development Corporations.

3. There should be an opportunity for the local authorities to share in the benefits accruing from the operations of the Development Corporations.

4. The financial arrangements for supporting the County Council's expenditure must be acceptable to the County Council.

5. The master plans prepared by the Development Corporations must be in accordance with the County structure plan strategy.
6. Local authorities should be responsible for all land assembly within the administrative county, including new and expanded towns.

These proposals from the County Council were extremely radical and in a sense represented something of a mistake by them in that it indicated a lack of sensitivity to the essential nature of the partnership arrangements. Partnership was aimed at making the expansion of Northampton acceptable. It implied a recognition of the need for expansion and the major role of a Development Corporation with wide powers to achieve this objective. The County Council in its proposals was going far beyond minor refinements and improvements to a system of checks and balances. The County appeared to be seeking a totally new partnership arrangement where the County Council was dominant and the agents of Central Government, the Development Corporations, were completely devoid of any significant powers and initiatives. These partnership proposals undoubtedly raised a toscin of alarm amongst many Development Corporation chairmen, especially in the older new towns.
The reaction of Northampton Development Corporation was muted, perhaps hopeful that its new partner would come to understand the true meaning of partnership. In a letter to the Department of the Environment it made four main points:

1. that the Development Corporation welcomes the interest by the County in the use of Development Corporations and their powers under the New Towns Act 1965 in controlling the future expansion of the county.

2. that the financial contribution already made by the Development Corporation, either through direct or indirect means, to the work and responsibilities of the local authorities should be recognised.

3. that the Development Corporation has co-operated with the planning authority regarding detailed working out of the Master Plan through the medium of the Eastern District and Southern District plans.

4. that the proposal that land assembly should be undertaken by the local authorities for all land required for expansion purposes was not practicable or desirable. (8)
The Central Government did not take up the County Council scheme and thus Northampton and its Development Corporation became just one of the many development issues facing the County Council.

Thus the network of relationships established in 1965-68 was to remain recognisable up to the wind-up of the town expansion process in 1985. Personnel changed, of course, in part the network was extended and developed especially during the period leading to wind-up, but its essence remained intact.

The network and partnership established at Northampton was to be the subject of certain debate and analysis in the early 1970's. In the consultative document "New Towns in England and Wales" (9), the Department of the Environment had offered the Northampton model to the other Development Corporations as containing much that was of value. The following extracts indicate the seal of approval that was given to the partnership model.

"2.12 In recent years areas including the old towns of Northampton, Peterborough and Warrington have been designated for new town developments. Such sites offer a bonus over predominantly "greenfield sites" in that they do not involve starting entirely from
scratch...if one starts with an existing town, one can take advantage of the sound social capital that already exists; parts of the old town that are worn out can be renewed at the same time as the new areas are being developed and as experience has shown, there can be significant new working relationships between the Development Corporation and the Local Authorities.

2.13 Local Authorities have always had a part to play in new town development, but individual new town Local Authorities and Development Corporations have not found it invariably easy to work in harness together. In three of the new towns based on large existing communities, specific partnership arrangements between Local Authorities and Development Corporations have been concluded.. extending in the case of Northampton to joint working by staff shared between the Development Corporation and the Borough Council.... where appropriate the partnership principle could be applied to other new towns as well.
4.2 Development Corporations and their respective Local Authorities will be encouraged to examine the scope for entering into partnership arrangements akin to those mentioned in Parra. 2.13 above, where these do not exist already. Such agreements will obviously vary from town to town, and it is not possible to lay down a rigid framework. But Local Authorities could formally avow their support for the new town project; more Local Authority members could be appointed as members of Development Corporation boards; and there could be joint planning of land assembly and new town development by Local Authority-Development Corporation committees and joint use of staff of both authorities (or all three authorities if the county as well as the district council wanted to participate) in pursuit of a joint development and management programme.

The publication of this consultative document represented something of a high spot for the partnership arrangements, as developed at Northampton. For they were now being publicly offered by the Department of the Environment as good practice which others would do well to follow. The enthusiasm of the Department was not shared throughout the new town movement.
All the chairmen of the Development Corporations met with the Minister to discuss the consultative document. Sir William Hart, Chairman of Northampton Development Corporation, reported back to his board member colleagues on what had transpired.

"Some doubts were expressed about the exhortation for closer partnership between Development Corporations and Local Authorities. This reflected, in part, the difference between the older new towns and the more recent partnership new towns, who were used to working with Local Authorities."

"Arising out of the latter discussion, the Minister felt that in some older new towns there was room for a closer relationship between the Development Corporation, Local Authorities and the local community. It was possible that the Minister would seek to be empowered to increase the number of members of Development Corporation boards to eleven rather than nine as present." (10)

Sir William was sensitive in his remarks for there had been a very strong response from the chairmen to the consultative document. Lord Campbell, Chairman of the Chairmen's Conference in a letter to the Minister, John Silkin, strongly argued against partnership (11); and collectively the chairmen submitted a document that was very negative in its attitude towards partnership (12). The Minister, however, was determined that the benefits of the Northampton experiment should, wherever possible, be passed on to other new towns.
The idea of partnership had also attracted some interest from the House of Commons. In CMND 6616 the Public Expenditure Committee published a report on new towns. Recommendation 2 stated:

"There should be established in each new town formal joint machinery for the mutual exchange of information between the Development Corporation, the County Council and the District Council." (13)

It is customary for the government of the day to respond to such reports from the House of Commons and in "Government Observations on the Thirteenth Report of the Expenditure Committee" it stated:

"Because of the differing interests and aims of the Development Corporations and Local Authorities, there is invariably some stress in the day to day relationship between them. However, the Government do not think that the introduction of standardised consultation machinery would necessarily help. In fact, joint machinery, whether formal or not, already exists in most towns whereby members or senior officers of the relevant authorities meet at regular intervals to co-ordinate activities and discuss issues of common concern. Also the presence of members of the County (or Region in Scotland), and District Councils on the Development Corporation Boards makes it possible to disseminate information in both directions. Nevertheless the Department of the Environment has started a survey of consultation arrangements in the towns and, if it is felt that the existing machinery in any town is inadequate, the Department will invite the Development Corporation concerned to consult with Local Authorities with a view to improvements." (14)
In some senses the publication by the Department of the Environment of the consultation document "New Towns in England and Wales" represented the high point of the partnership idea as practised in Northampton. However, there existed a contrary point of view and this was to some extent pressed by the chairmen of new towns when meeting together to consider a response to the consultation document. Appendix VI is the detailed response, largely the work of Mr Wyndham Thomas and Appendix V is the covering letter from Lord Campbell of Eskan, Chairman of the Chairmen's Conference.

The detailed response makes the case for the traditional Development Corporation, a purposeful, unified agency with clear objectives to achieve in the national interest, unencumbered by the need to achieve local support and approval.

1.2....."The New Towns Act of 1946 was a model of legislation in the way that it marshalled the powers, the machinery, the procedures and the financial basis for the building of new towns. The Development Corporation consistently pursuing the objectives given to it by the responsible minister, has proved itself one of the most effective instruments of public purpose yet devised to deal with the complex urban and regional problems of the Western democracies" (15)
The paper went beyond this, however, and sought to highlight the potential disadvantages of a partnership relationship. Firstly, they emphasised that local needs and opinions are expressed through many agencies other than local government and that the Development Corporation must relate to these other agencies of public participation. Secondly, they made a general point about Board membership.

2.4....."...simply appointing more district and county members to serve on a Corporation will not of itself improve communications or secure reader cooperation. Effective co-operation or joint working of a formal partnership can be established only where the Local Authorities, in the words of the document, 'avow their support for the new town project'." (16)

The third point they were concerned to develop involved the background and experience of partnership Board members.

2.5....."membership of a Development Corporation places individual councillors in an invidious position. Conflicts of interest can arise between the authorities even when policy and working relations are good.....A councillor can be inhibited in discussions in either forum or both."

2.6....."many would argue that the breadth and variety of experience of members has been one of the great strengths of Development Corporations. Ministers have always made it clear that all corporation members serve in their own right, not as representatives, much less as delegates, of any other body to which they may belong. While understanding ministers wish to appoint more councillors to corporations, we urge that personal
qualities, breadth of experience and the independence of corporation chairmen and members as such, be given the same weight as in the past". (17)

Thus the chairmen's conference wished to retain the status quo and only accepted change reluctantly.

2.7....."We urge that each Corporation and its District and County Council be allowed to work out for themselves the best local arrangements for closer co-operation. They will all be aware of achievements elsewhere and of ministers wishes in this respect....But individual councils and corporations will know local needs and circumstances best and therefore be best placed to produce practical proposals". (18)

Lord Campbell was equally forceful in his covering letter to John Silkin, the Minister of Housing and Local Government.

"....what I think worries us all is the danger that with the best will in the world we shall fall between two stools. Divided responsibility is surely to be avoided like the plague....What none of us want to see is a situation where Local Authorities become discredited by doing some of the unpopular things that Development Corporations have to do - or more probably failing to do them because of political unpopularity. While at the same time Development Corporations are disabled from their present efficiency in getting on with the job, by the weight of Local Authorities' intervention or over-representation. The worst of both worlds. Now I know you have tentatively suggested partnership agreements even when there is not a direct partnership with a Development Corporation. But with respect, once there is a shot gun wedding between separate bodies with separate sources of authority and separate responsibilities; one gets into the difficulty I have just foreshadowed".
Local Authorities are essentially concerned with local interest and are responsible to their electors - largely for management with development taking second place. But Development Corporations responsible to a Minister of central government, are set up essentially to undertake development for the future. That is why we feel that the roles of Local Authorities and Development Corporations are complementary but distinct." (19)

In some senses the opposition to the idea of partnership could be viewed as a clash between first and second generation new towns on the one hand and the new third generation new towns on the other. However, the two main architects of the chairmen's responses were Wyndham Thomas, General Manager of Peterborough Development Corporation and Lord Campbell of Eskan, Chairman of Milton Keynes Development Corporation, both of these were third generation new towns. Clearly Sir William Hart, the Chairman of Northampton Development Corporation was very isolated and at odds with his colleagues, but he clearly enjoyed the support and confidence of the Minister of State; and John Silkin, as the son of Lewis Silkin, the original architect of development corporations, enjoyed an impeccable lineage for discussing and debating the role of new towns. As the Minister responsible, Silkin was prepared to brush aside the protests of the chairmen and press for the implementation of the partnership principle. However, events from another dimension were to prevent this revolution. John Silkin left to become Secretary of State for
Defence in 1976 and Peter Shore became the new Secretary of State for the Environment following the cabinet reshuffle precipitated by the resignation of Prime Minister Harold Wilson.

Thus the partnership established at Northampton was not to be as a model thrust upon other expansion areas.

We have seen that although local government reform produced significant structural changes in the town expansion partnership relationships, the partnership, in terms of key individuals, was largely preserved for a number of years. The key personalities were able to reshuffle themselves in response to the changing structures. Central government had introduced a major change in the rules but to a considerable degree, in the short-medium term, the partnership personalities had been able to respond to these changes in a fashion that allowed for continuity and stability.

In these ways the impact of the Local Government Act on partnership was significantly dampened. Nevertheless, changes in the partnership were necessary; expansion now involved three rather than two agencies. An important area for change was in the composition of the Board of Northampton Development Corporation.
The members of the Board of the Development Corporation were usually made up of either senior local councillors or men of business, the public service and the professions coming towards the final chapters of their career. There were clearly some exceptions, but in general this basis for recruitment resulted in a relatively high average age for Board members. Retirement, illness and death inevitably resulted in a fairly steady turnover in Board membership and this gave the Secretary of State the flexibility to mould and guide Board membership in the way in which he felt was most appropriate to the needs of the Development Corporation. Clearly the central government now possessed a different view as to how the partnership system should function and what changes in Board membership were now necessary. The changes in Board membership for Northampton Development Corporation are outlined in Appendix IX. Clearly the period of partnership between the County Borough and the Development Corporation (1968-1974) was one of reasonable stability. Ill health had forced the retirement of Roland Freeman in 1971 and he had been replaced as representative of the Greater London Council by Geoffrey Gardner. The only other change was the death of Alderman Lewis in 1973 and the decision of the Secretary of State not to make a replacement. The act of omission was of considerable significance as it not only broke up the delicately negotiated balance of 1968, but also heralded further changes.
In its Seventh Annual Report (1974/75) under the heading of "Membership", the Board clearly identified the new realities.

"The local government reorganisation with effect from 1st April 1974 resulted in a reapportionment of responsibilities and you (the Secretary of State, Anthony Crossland) felt that the new pattern should be reflected in the composition of the Board". (20)

The coalescence of need and opportunity during the period April 1974 to March 1977 resulted in major Board membership changes which reflected the new "apportionment of responsibilities". In detail the changes were:-


Mr Hawtin's period as a member finished and no replacement made.

1975-76. Mr Alan Davis appointed Board member.
1976-77. Chairman Sir William Hart and Vice-Chairman Lord Hirschfield retire.

Mr Alan Davis appointed Chairman.

Mr J Nardecchia appointed Board member and Vice-Chairman

Councillor D Walmsley appointed a Board member.

Councillor G Roberts becomes a Board member.

In 1968 there had been two critical yardsticks for Board membership. Firstly, the fine balance between County/County Borough members and secondly, the political balance. On the original Board there had been nine members, four of whom were County Borough Councillors (Corrin, Dilleigh, Trusler and Lewis), and one a County Councillor (Cripps). The remaining four members were regarded as neutral, the Chairman, Deputy Chairman, the representative of the Greater London Council and the representative of South Northants Rural District Council. By March 1977, the Board had fully adjusted to local government reform in that of the nine members, three were neutrals, the Chairman, Deputy Chairman and the representative of the Greater London Council. There were now three
County Councillors, (Roberts, Cripps and Trusler), and three were now members of both the County Council and the Borough Council. In a sense the position had changed in the following manner.

1968 County Borough - 4 exclusive members. County Council - 1 member.
1977 Borough 1 exclusive member. County Council - 6 members.

In terms of local authority representation on the Board, the County Council had moved from one representative (Cripps) to six (Corrin, Walmsley, Trusler, Dilleigh, Roberts and Cripps) and in Roberts and Dilleigh there were the Leader and Deputy Leader of the County Council. However, although the influence of the County Council was undoubtedly enhanced, four members of the Board were former County Borough Councillors and, whatever their current position, were strong in their support for the urban area of Northampton.

The political balance had swung towards the Labour Party, but this was not the result of local changes where the representation was three Conservative Party members (Corrin, Walmsley and Cripps) and three Labour Party members (Dilleigh, Roberts and Trusler). Rather it was the result of the change in the representative of the Greater London Council, Mrs M. Jenkins, who was a member of the Labour Party.
The changes initiated by the 1972 Local Government Act and the period of
time up to the 1979 General Election produced major changes in the
partnership. The balance of power had tipped toward central rather than
local government. Not only was the bias of County Borough status lost
as a result of reform but there were fundamental changes in the rules.
The "Agreed Memorandum" had been drawn up by the Ministry with the
County Borough, which now no longer existed and, whilst the Department
of the Environment agreed that for the purposes of the "Agreed
Memorandum" the Borough Council was the successor authority, the
document was to have a decreasing significance despite repeated
references to it by the Borough Council.

The "undue burden" agreement so carefully negotiated by the
County Borough Council from 1974 was only to apply to County
services and all payments were consequently paid to the County
Council despite protests from the Borough Council. The
Secretary of State and the Treasury made their position clear in
a letter from John Silkin, the Secretary of State, dated 3rd
July 1975.

"It was, therefore, right that the partnership agreement
between the Development Corporation and the County Council
should provide for the possibility of financial
contributions being made by the Corporation to the Council
in the event of an undue burden falling on existing
ratepayers. In the detailed application of this
provision, it was made clear that only 'County' services
provided in advance (which the department thought would be
limited to education and social and local health services) would be taken into account in determining the extent of any contribution." (21)

Particularly important for the balance of power between central and local government was the fact that the resource base of development was now shared between the Borough Council, the County Council and the Development Corporation, and the deployment of this resource base was progressively no longer affected by a small group of like-minded individuals. The fact that for two years the Leader of the Borough Council was not a member of the Board of the Development Corporation severely handicapped a unified approach to central government.

However, whilst the partnership inexperience of the Borough Council leaders did not seriously damage the continuation of town expansion, it in part led to a failure to grasp the last opportunity to involve the Development Corporation in town centre development. There was a period in 1975/76 when, had the Borough Council invited the Development Corporation into the town centre as a developer, it may well have enjoyed access to considerable resources. However, the opportunity was missed and the rest of the 1970s was to witness such a stringent attitude towards public expenditure that the opportunity was not to occur again.
The introduction of the leaders of the two main political parties on the County Council introduced a duality in the interpretation of local need. The loss of Sir William Hart and Lord Hirschfield, Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Board, closely followed by John Weston, the General Manager, significantly broke up the old local dominant coalition. These factors, together with the reduced status of the Borough and the limited commitment of the County, led to something of a vacuum which was filled by the Development Corporation, which began increasingly to develop new initiatives with the expansion programme related to the new areas around the periphery of the old town. Nevertheless the new partnership personalities were able to function effectively as was seen with the new agreement over roads.

The provision of roads for town expansion had long been a bone of contention between the former County Borough and the Central Government. It had, in part, been resolved through the two partners agreeing that the County Borough would provide all grant-aided roads and the Development Corporation would provide all spine and estate roads. Thus actual physical progress could be maintained and the dispute curtailed to one between the
County Borough and the Central Government over finance. Under the 1972 Act the County Council became the Highways Authority and the Borough Council its agent within the Borough boundary.

Following the six counties report, a new set of functional arrangements was introduced, involving the designation of roads associated with town expansion into either category 1A or category 1B.

Category 1A roads were defined as those resulting exclusively from the expansion programme and with such roads the Development Corporation was empowered to pay a 100% grant towards their construction. Category 1B roads were those which were in some part necessitated by expansion and the Development Corporation was empowered to pay a negotiated percentage towards their construction. Thus a flexibility was introduced into the financing of the roads programme which was based on criteria which up to a point were capable of quantification. This resolution of the conflict over road programming and finance was to be further eased with the introduction of the "Transportation and Planning" system of road finance. Under this the County Council, as the Highways authority, every year submitted a five year programme on transport. This programme was largely concerned with roads and it provided a regular opportunity to
review and negotiate on which were to be category 1A or 1B. This introduced a greater clarity and stability in the road programme associated with expansion. Partnership was sustained in that the "Transportation and Planning" bid was ultimately the responsibility of the County, but inevitably the Northampton part only emerged after considerable consultation with the Development Corporation and the Borough. The implementation of the policy, actually building the roads, was the task of the Borough Council acting as agent for either the County Council or the Development Corporation.

Other examples of decisions taken by the new partnership are:-

March 1978. The Board of the Development Corporation purchased Derngate Bus Station so that a long term cultural complex could be developed in the town centre by the Borough Council.

February 1979. The Borough and the Development Corporation commenced to implement the joint scheme for Riverside Walk, part of the programme intended to open the Nene Valley for leisure activities.

Another major force for change which was to have major significance for the dominant coalition was a reappraisal of national strategy consequential to political change.
In February 1974 Harold Wilson and the Labour Party became the party of Central Government. Traditionally Labour governments had been supportive of new towns and the new town movement. However, they were the party of existing urban areas and could not help but be sympathetic to the newly articulated problems of the inner city areas. Early in 1971 the Greater London Council's Strategic Planning Committee highlighted the new problem of the inner cities and called for a massive redirection of national development resources to such urban areas. In July 1971 Northampton, Milton Keynes and Peterborough Development Corporations sent a joint letter to Peter Walker, then the Minister responsible, asking for a recommitment to the new towns programme. In reply the Minister confirmed that the government's strategy involved five major national growth points of which the Milton Keynes, Northampton, Peterborough area was one. These earlier reassurances seemed to need some confirmation from the new government. In order to test the situation, throughout 1974/75, Northampton Development Corporation sought the views of the Greater London Council, the London Boroughs' Association and the Department of the Environment, on the issue of continuing to expand Northampton with overspill population from London. All were emphatic that
expansion must continue. In August 1975 a further meeting was held with all the parties and some further clarification of their attitude emerged.

"The meeting emphasised two main points - on the one hand the continuing need for movement of population from London to new and expanding towns, while on the other hand a reluctance to lose employment from London, particularly in manufacturing industry". (22)

However, by January 1976, the Board was being told that:-

"The Greater London Council has produced a further review of the programme for new and expanding towns. The document shows some further hardening of the GLC's attitude. They have hitherto taken the view that while they did not push manufacturing industry to move, they raised no objection to the move out of London of other forms of employment. In this document they express the view that new towns should look elsewhere than London for their employment base. They are also suggesting that consideration should be given to slowing down the development of existing programmes of new towns around London and to diverting resources thus saved to the task of urban renewal in London". (23)

Although the S.E. Economic Planning Council in its document "Development of the Strategic Plan for the South East" challenged the Greater London Council view and considered that even the total abandonment of the new town programme would have only a marginal effect on London's employment, there was now a considerable head of steam blowing up for a radical change in the new town programme.
In September 1976 public expenditure cuts had forced a drastic cut back in the new town housing programme. The new towns had hoped that housing tenders in 1976 and 1977 would have been 15,000 and 14,000 respectively. The new target was to be 10,000 units in each year. In effect this meant that some English new towns would be without any sort of house building programme. In November 1976, the New Town Chairmen collectively met the Minister, and their conclusions were that he was clearly preparing for a major announcement on the future of the New Towns programme.

Under considerable political pressure, Peter Shore, the Secretary of State for the Environment, had prompted a thorough re-consideration of the New Town programme. This Dispersal Policy Review, 1976 had taken place against a background of:-

a) An almost static national population. (When the third generation New Town programme was launched, forecasted UK population for 1991 was 60m. By 1977 that had been revised to 51m.)

b) Great pressures on scarce public expenditure resources.
c) The need for inner city regeneration.

The blow fell for the New Towns on 5th April 1977 when, in a statement to the House of Commons, Peter Shore outlined the Government's new thinking. This statement was to be rapidly followed by the traditional explanatory White Paper "Policy for the Inner Cities" (24). Shore's statement contained four main elements:

1. A commitment from Central Government to regenerate inner urban areas through the provision of increased funds for economic, social and environmental projects.

2. Major administrative changes for the channeling of funds and the identification of projects. Essentially the responsibility for an expanded urban aid programme was transferred from the Home Office to the Dept. of the Environment. New special partnerships were to be established between Government and inner city authorities to prepare programmes for spending the extra cash. Special partnership committees were to be made up of representatives of Central Government and local authorities with added members from Health, Water and Police authorities where necessary and such
committees to be chaired by a Minister. Such partnerships were to be offered in the first instance to Liverpool, Birmingham, Manchester/Salford and London/Dockland authorities.

3. A major reduction in the population targets for the six third generation new towns as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes.</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton.</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough.</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telford.</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington.</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lancs.</td>
<td>To be designated but on a reduced programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Assets of New Town Development Corporations on wind-up were to be transferred to the New Towns Commission.

The implications of these changes were considerable as far as Northampton was concerned. The reduction of the population target clearly was to affect future programmes and future
resource availability, but also was to have fairly critical consequences for existing programmes and their future financial performance. In particular the commercial/retail developments sponsored by the Borough Council in the town centre had a question mark next to their future viability. Previous to the review, Northampton, along with the other Mark III new towns, had presented the Secretary of State with a series of options regarding Northampton's future development. Northampton had expressed a preference ranging over five possible options from only completing current contracts to full implementation of the original Master Plan. These options had been discussed with the Secretary of State on his visit to Northampton on March 10th 1977. (25).

Peter Shore's April statement basically identified option three as the strategy for Northampton's future expansion. This represented a cut back in the expansion programme of some 55%. In terms of the ground development, it involved the completion of the Eastern District together with a continuation of expansion in the Southern District which could be served from existing, and shortly to be built, roads.
This substantial reduction in the programme was a blow for both the Development Corporation and the Borough Council. The Development Corporation together with those of Milton Keynes and Peterborough had tried to diminish the impact of the review with a joint paper to the Secretary of State on the importance of their activities in providing for London's disadvantaged and stressing that London would lose office rather than manufacturing employment. A further attempt to soften the cutbacks was made by the three partnership authorities, the County, the Borough and the Development Corporation, in a joint paper sent to the Secretary of State, itemising three key points:

1. Northampton had been invited to co-operate in expansion.
2. A reduced programme would have unfortunate consequences for the Borough Council, in particular in the central area.
3. Incomplete development would inevitably throw a burden on the ratepayers.

All this activity failed to produce any change in the Government's policy and the newly appointed General Manager, Basil Bean, was facing a very different future from that of his predecessor.
The reappearance of the New Towns Commission was a longer term worry for the Borough Council in that it reflected the fact that new general rules were being developed for all new towns with respect to the valuable assets arising from expansion and their ultimate disposal. Northampton had aspirations arising from the "Agreed Memorandum" that industrial and commercial assets as well as housing would be transferred to the local authority. This aspect of Peter Shore's statement was in breach of the "Agreed Memorandum" and the whole spirit of partnership. Northampton was no longer a special case and the government clearly no longer recognised the "Agreed Memorandum" as a basis for treating Northampton differently to any other new town.

The April 1977 announcements affected the style and confidence of Northampton Development Corporation in that, whilst there was still an important task to perform and major programmes to implement, the clarity of purpose was now blurred. This is, perhaps, best explained in terms of the Management Accounts. The Management Accounts of the Development Corporation up until 1977 contained identified physical targets that were the foundation of performance assessment. Their annual revision was a meaningful analysis of progress and a restatement of goals in terms of physical outputs. Targets for population growth, land purchase, land development, land sales, housing,
employment, factory square footage, retail square footage, office space, open spaces and other associated capital expenditure were projected five years forward and collectively represented the co-ordinated path that town expansion was expected to follow. It was a blueprint for development that was linked into the central government's PESC cycle. The fact that these Management Accounts involved an existing town, made calculations more difficult as there existed the operations of the Borough Council and the private sector to take into account, but these problems were largely resolved through the partnership mechanism. The revision of population growth targets was to substantially undermine the validity of the Management Accounts as such a development blueprint. It was not just a question of redrafting in the light of new targets, for the very idea of targets had been significantly downgraded. Population growth and all other physical performance indicators in the Management Accounts were now to be regarded as guides rather than targets. The Development Corporation was to do the best it could in following them, but the availability of resources from the Central Government would determine the pace of development and in the new overall national circumstances the Management Accounts had little influence. Thus the clarity of purpose and
the clear measurements of performance provided by the Management Accounts was lost and replaced by a document more concerned with guidelines and aspirations.

Although the 1977 review was to significantly limit Northampton's expansion programme, one aspect of the review must have given considerable pleasure to officers and members of both the Development Corporation and the Borough Council. This was the development by Central Government of the partnership principle and its extension into the inner city programme.

Without doubt the adoption of partnership as the administrative mechanism to secure the regeneration of the inner city areas was seen in Northampton as founded on the Northampton experience.

The rest of 1977 was concerned largely with allowing the dust to settle and the renegotiation of a coherent strategy for the remaining town development. A series of meetings took place between Northampton Development Corporation and the Department of the Environment and a number of key decisions were agreed:

1. No redesignation.
2. No premature land sales.
3. New housing to have a 50/50 ratio of public to private.
4. The remaining housing programme of the Development Corporation was to be 3,700 houses for rent and 4,100 houses for sale.
The review and the reduced programme meant a major staffing upheaval, especially in the Chief Architect's department and for a time staff morale was low. There was, however, one interesting local development which added positively to the process of expansion, namely the Parkwood Street development. The Borough Council owned housing land in the town centre which it could not afford to develop. The proposal was that this land should be acquired by the Development Corporation who would then build fifty one dwellings on it to the specification of the Borough Council. This was the first and only occasion that the Development Corporation, as a developer, had become associated by invitation with central area development.

In November 1977 the partners agreed the fundamental framework for the future expansion programme as determined by the Policy Review. They agreed that the population of Northampton was 145,000 (March 1977) and thus the expected increase in population to be achieved by mid 1980 was some 28,000 and that this necessitated a number of adjustments to the Southern District Plan. The partners continuing commitment and belief in what they were doing was underpinned by the statistics presented to the Board in March 1978.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northampton</th>
<th>Milton Keynes</th>
<th>Peterborough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Completions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All agencies)</td>
<td>16,071</td>
<td>16,127</td>
<td>12,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Completions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All agencies)</td>
<td>4,625,000</td>
<td>2,940,000</td>
<td>2,970,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sq. ft.</td>
<td>sq. ft.</td>
<td>sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Completions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(All agencies)</td>
<td>1,210,000</td>
<td>710,000</td>
<td>370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sq. ft.</td>
<td>sq. ft.</td>
<td>sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Capital advances at 31.3.77.</td>
<td>£82m.</td>
<td>£202m.</td>
<td>£122m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Deficiency</td>
<td>£3.1m.</td>
<td>£11.4m.</td>
<td>£7.0m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Northampton had completed substantially more industrial floor space, offices and shops, and was a close second in housing completions for a markedly smaller amount of capital advances. Its revenue deficiency was also considerably smaller than its sister Mark III new towns.

Under local government reorganisation in 1972, it had become the task of the County Council to be responsible for the construction of the County Plan. This was to be the fundamental blueprint for all land use development. It was clearly important that the County Structure Plan and the Master Plan were in agreement as to the future planned expansion of Northampton. There existed a crucial distinction between the two plans in that the County Structure Plan was a statutory plan founded on Parialmental authority, whereas the Master Plan was not. Undoubtedly this situation offered tremendous scope for expressions of conflict and rivalry between the Borough Council, the County Council and the Development Corporation. However, the majority of difficulties associated with this particular situation were largely resolved through the partnership mechanism. The preparation of the County Structure Plan was a considerable task for the County Council and it was involved in a wide ranging series of consultations and participation.
exercises. As early as 1977, in their discussions with the Secretary of State on the new towns review, the partners had pressed on the government the need for comparability in the County Structure Plan and the options available for the expansion of Northampton. However, part of the process of producing a Structure Plan was that known as "the examination in public" and the Secretary of State had invited the Northampton Development Corporation to participate in this phase of the structure plan. Participation involved the submission of written statements and the Development Corporation in fact offered a number of these statements to the County Council. These were presented to the Board for their acceptance and approval in June 1978.

"The statements have been written with the intention of giving general support to the County's strategy at the Examination in Public and to highlight the part that the Development Corporation can play in the achievement of its objectives. There are matters in which the Development Corporation has an interested viewpoint, however, in particular:-

**Employment Growth.**

In view of the uncertainties of forward projections, the Development Corporation believes that it would be unwise at this stage to place undue restrictions on employment growth in Northampton.

**Central Area.**

There is a need for a central area local plan following approval of the Structure Plan to serve as a framework for job promotion within Northampton central area.
Public Transport.

The Development Corporation would welcome early Government approval for its proposals to make contributions to the local transport undertakers.

Co-ordination with other New Towns.

It would be desirable for the development of Northampton, Milton Keynes and Peterborough to be kept in step.

Al-M1 Link.

The County's "alternative strategy" should be modified to keep heavy goods traffic using this route out of the residential areas of the Southern District." (26)

The harmony and co-ordination exhibited by the partners over the County Structure Plan was a triumph for the partnership principle and provided a concrete example of its benefits for the processes of public administration.

Any successful partnership, however, involves periodic occasions when partners blow off steam, grumble and declare dissatisfaction with the nature of the partnership agreement and over the many years of partnership in Northampton there have been inevitably such outbursts of feeling and dissent. Such an occasion developed in April/May 1978 under the promptings of one of the local Members of Parliament, Michael Morris. Mr. Morris and some of his political colleagues on the Borough and County Councils expressed concern that the influx of population into Northampton was unhealthily skewed towards the disadvantaged in
the community and that this was generating a range of additional social problems for Northampton that were likely to be long term in nature and a possible cause for concern for a number of generations. To a degree these attitudes were a response to declarations by the Northampton Development Corporation of their superior record compared to other development corporations in offering homes and jobs to the handicapped, the disabled, single parent families and those on social security. Michael Morris called for a social audit of Northampton and outlined the sort of social indicators that he would like to see included. These were:

- The number of pensioners.
- The level of unemployment and its nature.
- The numbers on supplementary benefit.
- The number of children receiving free school meals.
- The level of disconnections from public utilities.
- The incidence of crime.
- The case load of the Probation Service.
- The number of inquiries at the Citizens Advice Bureau.

The implications of this were fairly clear that Mr. Morris was articulating a fear that expansion was damaging the social fabric of Northampton. This fear was to some extent reinforced by the Borough Council producing in October 1978 a new undue burden claim. This covered the three years 1976-77, 1977-78, 1978-79 and totalled £484,661, and was based on the argument
that the Borough Council was bearing additional costs with respect to town centre redevelopment because of the reduction in the population targets.

When pressures build up to such a point where one partner begins to have doubts about the common purpose, the usual response in a sensible partnership is to react positively to the fears of the partner whilst stressing the overall value of the partnership. This was the reaction in this case both by the Development Corporation and the County Council. They both agreed to participate in such a social audit and pari passu with this, the Development Corporation in April 1979 produced this short list of its contributions to local authorities and other agencies in Northampton:

- Undue Burden contributions ................... £3,216,000
- Direct contributions to Anglian Water Authority and Highways Authority ..................... £9,645,000
- Provision of Amenities - Lings Forum, Community Centres, Thorplands Adventure Playground ..................... £890,000
Tree belts, interest-free loans for playing fields and allotments €498,000
Statutory Undertakers €98,000
Unremunerative bus Services €221,000
Area Health Authority €500,000

£15,068,000

Thus to a degree the critics of expansion had been given an opportunity to blow off steam but the Development Corporation had taken the opportunity to put the record straight. The social audit, when produced, was a document that none of the three partners chose to publish, largely because in their view it proved nothing. Northampton remained, despite expansion, a typical county town largely free of major social problems. The social audit did, however, throw up certain long term questions about the nature of the town, the role of the Development Corporation and the partnership arrangements. This to a degree was very appropriate as in May 1979 a new Conservative Government took office under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

The attitude of this Government to the New Town programme and the role of the Development Corporation was to be very different to that of previous governments. As long as the cross party
support at a national level was sustained for the new town programme, then the partnership could survive their local minor differences and the various surges and cuts in public expenditure. The most serious blow to the partnership was the loss of this cross party support in 1979, with the accession of Mrs Thatcher's first administration. Against a background of cuts in public funding and the asset sale programmes, there developed a fissure in the community that firmly placed the local authorities and the Development Corporation in one camp and the political leaders of the central government departments in the other. Undoubtedly, there developed a difficult period for the new town division of the Department of the Environment, whose sympathies must have been for the functional activity they had supported for so long. Yet their loyalties lay to their Minister.

May 1979 represents the ending of the political consensus over New Towns between the two major political parties. In efforts to curtail public expenditure and roll back the role of the State, New Towns were to be subject to a new set of instructions from the Secretary of State, Michael Heseltine, and his Junior Ministers, John Stanley and Geoffrey Finsburg.
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The 1979 General Election and the District Council Elections were all held on the same day and nationally there was a sufficient swing to the Conservative Party to provide Mrs. Thatcher with a handsome working majority in the House of Commons, and in Northampton a continuation of the Conservative control of the Borough Council. The advent of the new Conservative controlled Central Government represented a major watershed in the history of the New Town movement and was to have an important impact on the partnership policy community concerned with the expansion of Northampton.

Mrs. Thatcher's new Government was pledged to curtail the role of the state in our society, to reduce bureaucracy and public expenditure, to revive traditional values of self reliance and self help, and in this way secure and extend freedom and democracy and rejuvenate our flagging economic performance. Against such a backcloth it is not surprising that the post war all-party consensus on the New Town Programme was broken.
There was to be a major reduction in expenditure under the New Town heading, the New Town Commission was to be wound up, as were as many individual New Town Corporations as possible. A more radical change would have been difficult to devise, and is indicative of a major new "Appreciative system" at Central Government level.

Changes not too dissimilar in magnitude were also to take place at the local level. The all party consensus on Northampton expansion had, especially in the late sixties and seventies, been sustained in large part by two local politicians, for Labour Ron Dilleigh and for the Conservatives Jack Corrin. As their respective party leaders, they had led the County Borough and Borough Councils for some fifteen years (1975-1976 R. Winter as Labour Group Leader was Leader of the Council). Both were committed to expansion and both had been members of the Board of Northampton Development Corporation since its establishment; both had been County Councillors and Deputy Leaders of the County Council. Individually and collectively they had the influence to underwrite and support the expansion of Northampton. In 1979, following the local elections, they were both to disappear completely from the local political scene. Jack Corrin, after some thirty years of public service, decided to retire from public life and consequently had not stood in the Borough Council elections of 1979, the leadership of the Conservative group passing to Councillor Cyril Benton. For Ron Dilleigh matters had been more involved.
A problem for all part-time unpaid politicians who reach positions of local leadership is to perform the tasks expected of a leader, dealing with Ministers and senior Civil Servants, attending and participating in the work of regional and national organisations on the one hand and maintaining one's local political base on the other. Overwork, misunderstandings, personal jealousies, arrogance, all contributed to a major row breaking out between Dilleigh and his local Labour Party; the outcome of this was his non-selection as a Labour candidate, his decision to stand as an independent and his loss of his Borough Council seat by seven votes.

The position of both Corrin and Dilleigh on the Northampton Development Corporation Board was dependent upon their position as local Borough councillors. In October 1979 it was announced to the Board of the Development Corporation that both Jack Corrin and Ron Dilleigh were to lose their board membership. After consultations, they were eventually to be replaced by Cyril Benton, leader of the Conservative majority party on the Borough Council and Tony Berry, deputy leader of the minority Labour group. In this readjustment of personnel the essential partnership personnel links were sustained but the accumulated contacts, personal relationships and experience associated with Corrin and Dilleigh were lost.

The prospect of wind-up made it inevitable that both the County and the Borough Councils would be increasingly concerned with protecting their own interests, generally seeking to acquire the assets of the Development Corporation and minimising their own future liabilities. The partnership arrangements brought to this situation a history of
co-operation and a tradition of talking to each other. The Development Corporation was also very positive towards the aspirations of both County and Borough and prepared to push strongly for them at the Department of the Environment.

These changes were to have a dramatic significance for the partnership. The climate of opinion that was successfully maintained for most of this period was one that presumed that the whole New Town programme was undesirable, that bureaucratic government in particular 'quangos' such as development corporations and local authorities were inefficient and wasteful. The purpose of Central Government was seen as freeing the public from the dead hand of bureaucracy.

Central Government not only mobilised a new bias but set about energetically changing the rules in order to achieve its new goals. These rule changes were to fundamentally alter the resource base of the partnership. Utilising its coercive powers, Central Government was no longer to provide resources for town expansion - in fact the previous policy was reversed and the assets of the Northampton Development Corporation were to be sold off to provide resources for Central Government.

Local authorities also were to experience a severe reduction in the flow of Central Government resources and significant Central Government control of their ability to raise their own resources.
Typical of the rule change initiated by Central Government was its decision to end all undue burden payments to the County Council. The principle and the agreements were simply eliminated at a stroke.

The fundamental coercive power of Central Government was utilised to produce the end of the Town Expansion Programme and the demise of the partnership. The local authorities were reduced to employing what limited power they enjoyed to securing what they could from the wind-up programme. Symptomatic of the change was an article written by the last remaining member of the original Dominant Coalition, the Chief Executive of the Borough Council, Mr Alan Parkhouse.

In the Northampton Town Annual Report for the year up to March 1981, Mr. Parkhouse expressed in the Forward serious doubts as to whether the Development Corporation continued to work to the same objectives as the Borough, namely the residents of the town. The real object of his criticism was not the Development Corporation, but successive governments that, in contradiction of the "Agreed Memorandum" had, under Peter Shore, stated that assets would be transferred to the New Towns Commission, and under Michael Heseltine, sold them off to private enterprise. Given that, under directions, the Development Commission was selling off houses and also industrial and commercial assets at the rate of £5m to £7m per year, it was possible to objectively state that the Chief Executive not only had a strong case but had clearly identified the realities of power within the Town Expansion policy community.
Thus political changes were to determine the pace and direction of what was to remain of expanding Northampton. In the area of housing, the change of policy was to be evident very quickly. Instead of building dwellings to let for population moving out of London, increasingly the Northampton Development Corporation was selling existing dwellings, encouraging its tenants to take full advantage of the available discounts and introducing a shared ownership scheme. It continued to sell plots of land to both builders and individuals wishing to build their own house and also introduced a number of low cost starter home schemes for local builders.

"With the reduction in public expenditure, emphasis has been placed on home ownership and the increasing sales of homes to sitting tenants and to those eligible to buy a vacant house". (16)

In 1981 was started the last public housing scheme of the Development Corporation, forty nine old persons dwellings, and in the 1982 Annual Report it stated:-

"...rented housing completions for year amounted to 811 dwellings and saw the virtual completion of the Development Corporation's own housing programme. In the Southern District, too, all the remaining housing land has been allocated for private residential development". (17)

Of the 8,114 dwellings constructed by the Development Corporation as at March 1983, 1,355 had been sold, but 84% of these (1,145) had been sold in the four years since May 1979. Most of these sales were through private mortgages although there had been sixty equity sharing completions and the terms had been agreed on another fifty.
Throughout this final period in the life of the Development Corporation the sales of private plots to individuals remained buoyant.

In June 1979, the Government announced the following reductions in the New Town Programme. The Housing Programme was to be reduced by 13%. In financial terms this was a cut of £20m. The Roads Programme was cut by 5% and Other Local Expenditure (mainly Commercial and Industrial development) by 35%. In future the bulk of Other Local Expenditure was to be financed by the sale of existing assets. Major restraint was also being sought in manpower usage. On 16th July the Chairmen and General Managers of the new towns had a meeting with the Secretary of State, Michael Heseltine, when they were informed that they were required to raise £100m. from the sale of assets. To ensure that there was no delay in the identification of such assets, there was to be a moratorium on the issuing of any new contracts. Although the moratorium was lifted a month later, it amply illustrates the determination of the Secretary of State to establish a significant asset disposal programme from all the new towns. Ultimately these programme targets were to be:-
Of this programme Northampton's contribution was to be £11.7m in 1979/80 and £9.2m in 1980/81. The Government set up a special adviser to identify, for each Development Corporation, the assets that could be disposed of immediately on the open market. For the Borough Council this represented a further breach in the "Agreed Memorandum" which had sought to provide the Borough Council with a claim on these assets.

In September 1979 the Chairmen of the six Mark III new towns met with the Secretary of State to discuss with him the best ways of developing those towns. Three points in particular emerged from these discussions:

1. The Government wished the New Towns to press forward vigorously in the promotion of home ownership through selling off their housing stock.

2. Every effort should be made to take advantage of private finance for future industrial and commercial development.

3. The important role of Development Corporations in creating effective economic growth centres.

Asset sales, the use of private finance, reductions in existing programmes and the elimination of new ones, were breathtakingly new parameters for the New Town movement to work within. Added to this was a new uncertainty about the life of particular new towns. In October 1979 it was reported to the Board (18), that the Secretary
of State had indicated that the future of the Mark III New Towns would be decided on an individual basis. The likely consequences of this news for Northampton was clearly seen by the General Manager, Mr. Basil Bean. He expected a wind-up date for Northampton. In the light of this attitude the Board felt it necessary to begin the process of consultations that wind-up would require.

"The General Manager reported that he had agreed with the Chief Executives of the County and Borough Councils that a working party would be set up to consider the implications arising from the eventual demise of the Development Corporation. The working party would consider matters such as the disposal of assets, the undue burden contribution to the County Council, the transfer of assets and staff and the implications of de-designation." (19).

The consequences arising from this major change in the attitude of Central Government were to be very significant for the partnership arrangements in Northampton. Inevitably there developed tighter supervision and control by Central Government over the operations of the Development Corporation. Flexibility and discretion were to be replaced by a flood of directives which limited the extent to which the Development Corporation could respond and react to the needs and pressures of its partners. Its future path was now much more carefully prescribed and directed by the Department of the Environment. However, faced with a loss of Central Government commitment to the new town programme, bound by central Government prescriptions and facing an uncertain life, it is not surprising that the Development Corporation and its partners reacted by seeking to co-operate even more extensively than in the past. Those trying
to secure the successful completion of Northampton's expansion
sought stability by clinging even more tightly together. Examples
of co-operation abound in these years.

June 1979 .......... County Council drops idea of A45 as
alternative M1-A1 link following
representations from the Borough Council and
the Development Corporation.

September 1979 ... Establishment of complementary rent levels
in Borough and Development Corporation
housing.

December 1987 .... Development Corporation gives financial
support to County project - Northamptonshire
Industrial Promotion unit.

January 1980 .... Rationalisation of office accommodation by
Borough and Development Corporation.

March 1980 ...... Development Corporation gives further
financial support for Borough projects -
Riverside Walk and Derngate.

June 1980 ...... Further interest free loan by Development
Corporation to Borough for open space
developments in the Eastern District.

October 1980 ... The three partners establish Northampton
Training Workshop for the unemployed.

October 1982 ... In response to a Borough request, five
dwellings made available for Vietnam
refugees.

Perhaps it was this defensive 'laager' mentality that allowed two of
the partners to cope with the problems posed by the Thorplands Brook
project. In many ways this project was to be among the most severe
tests of the partnership arrangements between the Borough Council
and the Development Corporation, as the dispute sprang from within
the partnership system itself.
The Borough Engineer possessed a dual role as far as the construction of new housing estates by the Development Corporation was concerned. Acting as the Engineering Agent for the Development Corporation, he was responsible for structural engineering and its associated supervision of the sites. Acting as Building Control Officer for the Borough Council, he was responsible for enforcing building regulations. In September 1980 it was reported to the Board that part of a newly constructed house had collapsed and further investigations had revealed that there was a need for substantial remedial work to the foundations of similar properties. This discovery completely upset the schedules of the Contractor, and rescheduling and remedial works were expected to cost between £300,000 and £500,000. Allocating responsibility for the additional expenditure offered enormous scope for a complete breakdown in the partnership between the Borough and the Development Corporation. The Borough Engineer felt that he had performed his duties adequately and that the responsibility lay with the Chief Architect of the Development Corporation, who, in turn, considered that the responsibility was the Borough Engineer's. The fundamental issues were whether or not the Development Corporation felt that it had a claim on the Borough Council or the Borough Engineer and, if so, was it prepared to pursue it, and what would be the attitude of the Department of the Environment. Three factors led to the avoidance of a major dispute.

Firstly the realisation that any action would involve an intricate legal dispute, involving counsel's opinion and considerable further expense for all parties. Secondly, the unwillingness of the
Department of the Environment to intervene, preferring to leave a solution to be found by the two parties. It did indicate, however, that there was the possibility of financial adjustments at the end of the life of the Development Corporation. Finally, the determination of the Board and the Borough Policy Committee to avoid a breakdown in the partnership arrangements because of this issue. At the Board meeting of October 1980, Mr. Alan Davis, Chairman of the Development Corporation, reporting on the possibility of an inquiry, stated...

"The ultimate result of such an inquiry would be either to put the blame on the Architect or on the Engineer (either as Engineer or as Building Control Officer) or both. We have to remember that as a partnership authority we have no Engineer of our own, we use the Borough Engineer as Agent....in these circumstances I hesitate to think that the Board would wish to contemplate action against the Borough". (20)

The Thorplands Brook problems had been a severe test for the partnership arrangements, especially as it involved one of the key props of the partnership, namely the use of shared officers. Indeed at one point the Chief Legal Officer of the Development Corporation, who was also the Borough Solicitor, had to withdraw his services on this matter from the Development Corporation. Nevertheless, the crisis was dealt with and confidence was restored. Such diplomacy and statesmanship was in part the result of the fact that it was known that the life of the Development Corporation was actively under consideration by the Minister. This certainly was not the time for a public row between two of the partners.
The uncertainty over the future of Northampton Development Corporation was to be resolved by a statement by the Secretary of State, Michael Heseltine, to the House of Commons on 4th February, 1981.

"I have now completed my examination of the third generation new towns. In all six new towns the Development Corporation will be expected to rely substantially on private sector investment. Public sector funding will be restricted to the minimum needed to support further growth....In the case of Northampton, the Government considers that the aim should be to wind up the Development Corporation on 31st December 1984. By these dates the population of Northampton should be of the order of 170,000."

The announcement of a definite date for the wind-up of the Development Corporation was not in itself so very much of a surprise. Of all the Mark III New Towns, Northampton had probably been the most successful in meeting its task, and it was most likely to leave behind it a town that would be able to look after itself successfully, once the Development Corporation disappeared.

From the wind-up announcement, there emerged three key parameters for the future partnership arrangements. Firstly, the Development Corporation still had some four years to run and a significant task to perform, especially in maintaining the momentum of expansion in the Southern District. This required the partnership arrangements to be sustained and continued in the traditional manner. Secondly, this normal activity was inevitably to be influenced by wind-up. Thirdly, there existed the need to achieve a wind-up package. The partners found themselves increasingly adopting wind-up postures with respect to many of the issues that were to come up before them.
For the remaining four years, the existing structures and processes of partnership were very much as they were, and in some areas the process of development and extension was to continue as if there was no wind-up on the horizon. In February 1981 the Development Corporation renewed the Agricultural Management Agency agreement with the County Council. In June 1981 the Development Corporation agreed the continuation of the unremunerative bus services payments to the Borough Council's transport undertaking. In September 1981 a grant was made to the Borough Museum of Leather Craft and in that same month the Board were told formally that the Chief Estates Officer of the Development Corporation had successfully let the Greyfriars office block owned by the Borough Council, securing a rent and rates income for the Borough of some £500,000 per annum. Joint ventures continued to be explored between the partners, successfully in the case of Thorplands Adventure Playground, unsuccessfully in the land development venture that had also involved British Rail. In January 1983 the Borough accepted the task of acting as agent for the Development Corporation with respect to the Unified Housing Benefit Scheme. Thus in many areas the partnership progressed as normal. However, the influence of wind-up was beginning to have an impact. Essentially the Borough and the County Councils were examining each decision in the light of possible future financial liabilities. Without the long term support and potential financial safety net of the Development Corporation, the Borough Council turned a somewhat jaundiced eye towards the offer of Hunsbury Hill Country Park and a number of other open spaces. All of these were considered as desirable amenity assets but would involve considerable maintenance.
expenditure at a time when local authority expenditure was under extreme pressure from the threat of financial penalties imposed by Central Government. The Borough Council's attitude towards the ultimately abortive, three way venture of the Development Corporation, Northampton Town Football Club and the Borough establishing a new football stadium, was to limit rigorously its commitment to providing land. Not only were the Borough and County Councils anxious to limit future financial liabilities, they were also very eager to extract as much as possible from the Development Corporation before it disappeared. They subjected it, therefore, to a fairly constant stream of requests for additional financial support for such things as the Derngate leisure centre and the Repertory Theatre. The County Council was particularly interested in extracting as much as it could with respect to new roads. Here its activities ranged from packing as many Development Corporation financed roads, (Category 1A and 1B) into its Transport and Planning Programme as possible, to a little gentle pressure over withdrawing its objections to detrunking a section of the A43 in return for certain assurances on the provision of a graded interchange on the A508. In such ways did the interjection of an end date influence partnership behaviour over fairly straightforward development matters.

However, the most important pressures on the partnership arrangements were to result from the problems associated with preparing for wind-up. In many senses this was the most significant test of the partnership arrangements. The question arose as to whether or not they would ease or undermine the whole
wind-up process and the nature of their contribution to the remaining years of the expansion programme. A report on the implications of wind-up was presented to the Board of the Development Corporation in February 1981 by the General Manager. It clearly highlighted the major areas of difficulty.

"It is equally desirable that the Development Corporation makes the maximum contribution to the amenities of the town....it will be necessary to evolve arrangements for the transfer of appropriate assets to the local authorities....Arrangements are in hand to ensure that the planned maintenance of the rented housing stock will ensure that it is in good condition when handed over to the Borough. Discussions will take place about the possible transfer of staff from the Development Corporation to the local authorities, although the numbers involved are expected to be small....The local authorities will obviously be anxious to ensure that the wind-up arrangements will incorporate satisfactory agreements with regard to such matters as the provision of infrastructure and amenities and financial arrangements consequent upon the wind-up of the Development Corporation." (21)

It was now inevitable that both the County and the Borough Councils would be very much concerned with their own interests, generally seeking to acquire the assets of the Development Corporation and minimising their own future liabilities. The partnership arrangements brought to this situation a history of successful co-operation and a tradition of talking to each other. The Development Corporation was also very positive towards the aspirations of both County and Borough and prepared to push strongly for them at the Department of the Environment.

In terms of a strategy towards wind-up, each of the three partners had its own separate approach. It was, perhaps, the County Council that had the clearest idea of where its vital interests lay. There were essentially three problems to which it required solutions.
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Firstly, there was the questions of roads, where the County Council sought the maximum road building financial contribution during the remaining years of the Development Corporation. Secondly, there was the issue of the abandoned undue burden payments. The County Council was clear that the momentum of expansion would continue well beyond December 1984 and this, together with second generation expansion, would involve the County in considerable expenditure on services in advance of population. Therefore, they were seeking some mechanism for the continuation of undue burden payments, or the payment of some income generating assets in lieu. Finally, the County Council was interested in land, in particular the "yellow land" that was surplus to Northampton's growth up to 1996. The County wished to ensure that it would not be involved in the considerable infrastructure costs associated with its possible development.

The Borough Council's position was one that saw two bundles of problems. Firstly, the Borough had to produce a shopping list of development to be undertaken by the Development Corporation, which was necessary to complete, in a sensible and rounded way, town expansion. Secondly, there was the wind-up package itself, which it viewed as a subject of separate negotiation.

The Development Corporation's position was basically that it wished to obtain the most favourable arrangements possible for its partnership authorities. With respect to the Borough Council it
believed that this could best be achieved if there was one total package put to the Minister, incorporating both the necessary development and the wind-up package.

However, as the months passed towards wind-up, the two stage strategy of the Borough Council essentially became that of the Department of the Environment and emerged as the basis for discussions between the Borough and the Development Corporation. The Development Corporation also recognised that as the successor authorities, the County and the Borough, ought to be free to structure their own negotiations. Also a complete and total wind-up package needed certain central government decisions to be taken early. This was particularly the case with the financial framework required for the transfer of rented accommodation to the Borough which was scheduled to take place on 1st April 1984. Such decisions were not forthcoming from central government, which was now beginning to experience the clogging of arteries induced by the imminence of a General Election.

Thus phase one of the wind-up strategy was the preparation by the Borough and the County of their shopping lists in the way of future development by the Development Corporation to ensure a viable town. The role of the Borough was probably the more significant here, but the County was very quick off the mark and in June 1982 secured from the Minister approval for a final road programme that would be financed by the Development Corporation. The Borough's initial shopping list was presented in June 1982 to the Development Corporation. There followed a series of meetings between officers
and elected representatives to try to produce an agreed package. A most important landmark in this process was a joint meeting between the Borough Policy Committee and the Development Corporation Board on 20th October 1982. At this meeting some major items were explained and some minor items were resolved, but by far and away the most important result of the meeting was the spirit of partnership and co-operation that prevailed between those concerned. From this momentum of co-operation generated by the meeting, many constructive processes were initiated.

1. A joint study on conditions of housing assets to be transferred to the Borough.

2. A proposed £250,000 payment by the Development Corporation for an extension to the Borough Museum.

3. A resolution of future open space provision and the transfer of associated Development Corporation staff.

4. Resolution of the problem of maintenance depot provision.

5. The creation of a post Development Corporation job creation agency.

6. The Development Corporation supported the Borough delegation in their visit to Sir George Young in their attempt to obtain his approval for the Development Corporation to provide:-
   a) A new multi-storey car park in the Central area.
   b) A new sports pavilion at Lings Park.
   c) The resurfacing of the market square.

Thus a substantial measure of agreement emerged over the central issues with phase one of the wind-up strategy. The second phase of the process was essentially concerned with asset disposal. On 31st December 1984 the Northampton Development Corporation was to
disappear, as a legal personality it would no longer exist and its assets of land, buildings, legal rights and personnel had to be either sold or transferred to some other organisation. In general the assets to be disposed of fell into seven categories:

1. Land.

2. Housing.

3. Industrial and commercial premises.

4. Retail premises.

5. Community related assets.

6. Staff.

7. Miscellaneous items including liabilities.

The general predisposition of the Government was to sell the land and the industrial, commercial and retail premises and transfer to the local authorities the housing, community related assets and perhaps some staff, although the majority of staff were to be covered through a redundancy package. Northampton was the first of the Mark III New Towns to go through this process of wind-up and the resulting package was clearly to be of great interest to the other Development Corporations. The Government was also acutely aware that in these negotiations it was possibly establishing precedents.
The local authorities were faced with a number of key questions:

1. Which of the assets sold on the open market would the local authorities wish to purchase?
2. Which of the assets to be transferred to them was likely to involve long term financial liabilities?
3. Would Central Government accept that compensation for the financial liabilities could be arranged through the free transfer or favourable sale of assets, due to be sold on the open market?

The first question was something to be determined by the local authorities themselves. The second question was a matter of analysing and negotiating with the Development Corporation. The Central Government would undoubtedly strike an attitude towards all three questions but was particularly involved in the last one.

To answer the first question, in 1982 a joint planning study of officers was established by the three partners under the general guidance and direction of the leaders of the County and Borough Councils together with the Chairman of the Development Corporation. These were in turn advised by the General Manager of the Development Corporation and the two Chief Executives. The joint planning study was never published, never approved by the Borough or County Councils. It possessed the status of a working document which had been received and noted by the Development Corporation and the relevant committees of the two local authorities (12). It was nevertheless a most important document as it clarified the land use issue with respect to the ultimate demise of the Development Corporation. The planning study was concerned to establish the
possible extent of development likely to take place up to 1996 in terms of land requirements. The land holdings of the Development Corporation were divided into:

1) Land not needed for development before 1996 and thus surplus to requirements.....Yellow.

2) Land allocated for development.
   a) with 6(i) approval and infrastructure provided and committed.......Red.
   b) with 6(i) approval but no infrastructure and none committed.......Edged Red.
   c) without 6(i) or 7(i) approval...Hatched Red.

The land use analysis of the land allocated for development was as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Colour</th>
<th>Industrial (Acres)</th>
<th>Commercial (Acres)</th>
<th>Housing (Acres)</th>
<th>Total (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern District</td>
<td>Southern District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED.</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDGED RED.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATCHED RED.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL.</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| YELLOW LAND.         | 1537               |
| TOTAL.               | 2904               |
The County Council's land interest was largely confined to the fate of the yellow land. The Council wished to avoid the large infrastructure costs associated with its development and there was also a very powerful environment lobby which wished to prevent any development of the Yellow Land at all. Initially it had considered the possibility of purchase but quite early on in the negotiations in March 1983 it was seeking an alternative solution through use of restrictive covenants on any sales that might take place. The County hoped that this might produce a solution to their problem.

The position of the Borough Council was also fairly straightforward. Firstly, it was clear to everyone involved that the Government wished for all the land to be returned to private ownership. It was very much against increases in local authority land holdings. For the Borough to obtain any of this development land, it would have to buy it. Given the state of its financial position, this was not a practical proposition.

The second and third questions were to be the basis for discussions around the Housing Transfer package and the Community Related Assets package. The transfer to the Borough Council of thousands of houses, community centres, tree belts, open spaces, etc., would involve a major balancing of assets and liabilities. With both packages the objective was that transfer would leave the receiving authority no better or no worse off. However, the assembly of both
packages involved valuations, calculations of future revenues and costs and definitional clarifications that allowed for favourable or unfavourable emphases.

The fuel for this decision making process and the behaviour of the participants was provided by their expectations of the future. The Central Government's expectations were very much centred around the continuing need to curtail public expenditure. They had experienced considerable success in extracting large sums of money from the New Towns, through pushing through a programme of asset disposal, and Northampton's demise was but the first steps towards the eventual ending of the New Towns Programme. Central Government was determined to obtain a wind-up, it definitely preferred a negotiated package, publicly acceptable to the local authorities concerned, yet such a package had to avoid setting precedents that would detract from the progress towards ending the New Town Programme or dissipating the future financial benefits.

The expectations of the Borough Council were edged with apprehension. Central Government was engaged in a process of curtailing the financial freedom of local authorities, not only through the Rate Support Grant but also the Housing Investment Programme and detailed control of capital allocations and the use of capital receipts. The status of the "Agreed Memorandum" had been progressively downgraded to the point where it was virtually totally disregarded by Ministers. The Borough felt very much a supplicant in terms of hoping that the history of successful co-operation in
town expansion would be the basis for receiving favourable treatment in the determination of the wind-up packages. Apprehension tinged with hope constituted the expectations of the Borough Council. The participants to these negotiations were essentially the Department of the Environment and the Borough Council. However, the Development Corporation was to play a most significant role in successfully moving towards its own demise. The wind-up packages in housing and community related assets were to be the final test of the value of the policy community, the network of relationships that had been established at the beginning of the expansion process. The packages were not to emerge as the product of a negotiating and bargaining process where the relative strengths and weaknesses of the participants were tested and exploited around clearly specified issues. Rather they emerged from a protracted dialogue where discussions were routed through intermediaries, where many issues were examined, many alternatives considered and the avoidance of confrontation around a single problem was anxiously pursued.

The role of the Development Corporation, both Board members and officers, was a central ingredient in this more subtle and diffused activity. Off the record conversations between Development Corporation personnel and their counterparts at the Department of the Environment and the Borough Council were at the heart of this reconciliation/negotiating process. Of course, single issues did arise, fundamental positions were abandoned, particularly by the Borough Council, but whenever such a situation occurred, strenuous efforts were made with the policy community to rebuild the dialogue.
relationships through concessions or accommodations elsewhere. The mutual confidence, common professionalism and the comprehensiveness of access to key information produced a clarification of perceptions about the operating environment, policy guidelines and relationships with other communities that allowed participants in the network to accurately judge which was an issue capable of negotiation and amendment and which was not.

The matter of land disposal was also bound up with the issue of housing transfer. The original schedule for Housing Transfer envisaged all Development Corporation housing being transferred to the Borough Council by April 1984. However, the prospect of a General Election in 1983 had led to considerable indecision in Marsham Street. The return of the Conservative Government with an increased majority allowed the continuation of the main thrust of Government policy. For Northampton, the election result was an affirmation of wind-up and the process was reactivated by the Chairman of the Board of Northampton Development Corporation, Mr. Alan Davis, writing to Mr. John Stanley, the Minister responsible for the clarification of certain issues, one of which was housing transfer.

The Chairman's letter, whether or not a catalyst for decision making, provided a valuable framework of the outstanding issues associated with wind-up. By the July 1983 Board meeting it was clear that certain of these issues were now receiving Ministerial
attention. In a written answer in the House of Commons, Sir George Young indicated that the key benchmarks for moving towards wind-up had been identified.

Mr. Murphy asked the Secretary of State for the Environment:-

"What progress is being made with the winding up of New Town Development Corporations for which target dates in 1984 and 1985 were announced?".

Sir George Young:

"We have now sent to the local authorities concerned our conclusions on the financial basis for the further transfers of the New Town Housing to them. We shall be opening discussions with them including the formal consultations required by statute as a preliminary to discussions on whether to proceed with housing transfers. We have issued guidelines on the basis for the transfer of community related assets, such as open spaces and community centres to the district councils. We have set out the basis on which we expect the New Town Development Corporations to continue the programme for the disposal of industrial and commercial assets to the private sector, and we have indicated that we expect any such assets which have not been sold by the date of winding up will, in accordance with the New Towns Act, be transferred to the Commission for the New Towns. In these ways, we believe that we are making good progress towards achieving the targets which we announced. The final decisions, however, on the dissolution of the Development Corporations, will be taken in the light of the consultations with the local authorities concerned in each town, in accordance with the New Towns Act 1981". (21)

On Thursday 21st July 1983 a joint meeting took place between Northampton Development Corporation and the Policy Committee and the Housing Transfer Committee of the Borough Council. This meeting discussed the central issue of wind-up, namely that of housing transfer. The formal First Directive had been received from the Secretary of State whereby the Development Corporation and the
Borough Council had until September 1983 to agree that they could try and draw up a housing transfer scheme. Central to this joint meeting was a letter received by the Chairman of Northampton Development Corporation, Mr. Alan Davis, in his capacity as Chairman of the Chairmen's Conference from Lord Bellwyn, who had replaced John Stanley as the Minister of State and the senior Minister concerned with Development Corporations. The letter confirmed the wind-up dates for Northampton and tackled a number of other key issues.

"The most significant element still to be tackled in this respect is your rented housing. We hope that all corporations will continue to promote the sale of their houses to sitting tenants as successfully as they have in the past. But we recognise that there will inevitably remain a substantial stock for which a new landlord must be sought"....

"Where after consultation with you and with the District council we come to the conclusion that transfer is not feasible on acceptable terms, or that another form of disposal would be preferable, we shall want to explore the possibility of disposal of the rented housing to one or more housing associations. This course is not without its difficulties, but may offer a solution in some cases".

"You will recently have received the guidelines for the transfer of community related assets to the District Councils. Development Corporations should achieve such transfers before their target wind-up dated".

"We expect Development Corporations to continue with a vigorous programme for the disposal of completed commercial and industrial assets and of the remaining development land. Consistent with our undertakings that there will be no disposals contrary to the best professional advice, we expect Development Corporations to continue to obtain the best consideration reasonably obtainable for these assets and this land. In deciding what this is in each case, the Development Corporation should bear in mind the advantage of a quick disposal for a certain price, against the risk of continuing to hold the asset; and the discount which must apply where increased values lie in the future. In cases where marriage
values might be obtained, Development Corporations should also bear in mind the need to obtain a publicly defensible share of the marriage value". (21)

The joint meeting was urged by the Development Corporation to go for a joint package on a total wind-up. The Borough, however, pressed the importance of housing transfer and the need to obtain a defensible deal for the Borough on housing. The issues of asset disposal, undeveloped land and the condition of the housing stock were also discussed.

Certain positions emerged from the joint meeting. Firstly, the crucial importance of a housing transfer, the willingness of the partners to negotiate a scheme in line with the First Directive and the practical impossibility of meeting an April 1st 1984 target date for housing transfer. Secondly, an agreement to continue the programme of examining the housing stock of the Development Corporation and the associated remedial works. Thirdly, that the Borough had an interest in the disposal of undeveloped land which it felt had been originally recognised in the "Agreed Memorandum" of 1965.

This joint meeting had been conducted in a friendly but frank manner, it exhibited much of the spirit of partnership that had been developed over the years. However, wind-up was producing significant changes in the partnership arrangements. Just as the initiation of town expansion had involved negotiations between Central Government and Northampton County Borough many years before
the Development Corporation had been established, so also negotiations on the ending of town expansion were to be increasingly between the Borough Council and Central Government, with the role of the Development Corporation moving to one of friend and ally to the Borough. The Development Corporation wished to complete its task with honour and leave an expanded town which would survive and prosper in consequence of its activities. Within the guidelines laid down by Ministers and its statutory responsibilities, the Development Corporation was very conscious of the wind-up problems facing the Borough and sought to provide sympathetic support. In particular the General Manager, Leslie Austin-Crowe, clearly set the tone for the Development Corporation in his own personal decision that on wind-up he was to retire and remain in the town that he had helped to expand.

The joint meeting clarified for the Development Corporation what its role was to be in the months leading to wind-up. In particular it underlined its future partnership role and what it in turn hoped to obtain from the partnership. Essentially the Development Corporation wished for the partnership arrangements to ease the securing of an effective and efficient wind-up. This would involve the Board in three major activities, the first two of which contained a partnership dimension...The Board identified that it would be involved in....

1. Providing accurate and comprehensive information together with realistic advice to the partner local authorities, in particular the Borough Council.
2. Supporting the local authorities in their negotiations with Central Government.

3. Obtaining from Central Government the means for achieving a successful wind-up.

An early example of the first activity was concerned with housing transfer. The July Board Meeting was informed of the Government's guidelines for housing transfer. The major items were:-

a) Housing transfer should be broadly neutral in its financial impact and schemes should not place any significant initial burden on the receiving authorities.

b) All assets should be transferred on the basis of outstanding debt, and the receiving authority would pay the annual loan charges.

c) Part of any surplus on the Housing Revenue Account would be subject to a once and for all claw back by the Government.

In general terms it was clear that the Board felt that there were significant short term financial advantages available to the Borough Council arising from housing transfer in Northampton. The Housing Revenue Account of the Development Corporation was in considerable surplus, and surpluses of a substantial nature were likely to be enjoyed for some years. Housing transfer in April 1984 would secure the largest slice of these surpluses for the Borough Council. This information was pressed by the Development Corporation on the Borough Council at every opportunity.

With respect to the third of its activities, the Board of the Development Corporation experienced some difficulty in the last six months of 1983. Although not discussed at the July joint meeting,
the Board was unhappy with that element of Lord Bellwyn's letter that was concerned with the disposal of undeveloped land. There had been no real clarification of the problem concerning the low prices needed to secure disposal and the wider public responsibilities of the Board. In fact the issue of disposing of surplus land became increasingly intricate and a major threat to a clean and effective wind-up. The Board required Ministers to determine whether or not such land was to be:

a) Sold on the open market regardless of price.
b) Offered to previous owners with all the associated problems of determining "hope" value.
c) Sold or in some other way made available to the local authorities, as per the spirit of the "Agreed Memorandum".

The delay over this was to cause the Board considerable problems and made it difficult for them to meet the target date set by the Government.

The Board received another setback in its third activity of securing the means from Central Government for an efficient wind-up when it received a second letter from Lord Bellwyn. Amongst other matters the letter referred to the issue of retaining key staff.

"John Stanley made clear to you that he was not prepared to accept an incentives package for staff retention on the lines put forward by the Development Corporation, even though this was consistent with the Whitley Council circular. As you know, I suggested in my letter of 1st July that there should be early discussions between the Commission for the New Towns and yourselves in order to identify staff who should be retained."
It seems to me that this would be a more fruitful approach than trying to reopen the question of a staff retention package."

For Central Government the key issue of wind-up was the disposal of the physical assets of the Development Corporation. In general terms it wished to see such assets sold to the private sector. It had for some years encouraged Development Corporations to dispose of their housing stock, particularly to sitting tenants. Michael Heseltine, when Secretary of State, had also required the sale of industrial and commercial assets. However, it was clear that even with Development Corporations such as Northampton, that had enthusiastically pursued such policies, there would be considerable residue of houses, community assets, industrial and commercial properties and undeveloped land which would not be sold to the private sector.

Part II of the 1981 New Towns Act was devoted to the disposal of such residual assets, which were to be transferred either to the Commission of the New Towns, reconstituted under the Act, or to the local District Council. Land and industrial/commercial properties would go to the Commission for ultimate disposal. Housing and community assets would go to the District Council for management. Under the "Agreed Memorandum" the Borough Council had aspirations concerning the industrial/commercial properties built up by the Development Corporation during the period of town expansion. This part of the "Agreed Memorandum" was now regarded by Central
Government as inoperative, however, and with reluctance the Borough Council had to concentrate its energies towards securing favourable transfer arrangements for both housing and community assets.

The initiation of the process leading to a housing transfer package lay with Central Government. Under Section 43 of the 1981 New Towns Act the Secretary of State had the power to issue a first directive, requiring the parties to enter into consultation with each other to determine whether or not there existed the basis for an agreed scheme. Under Section 44 he could issue a second directive requiring the parties to submit a scheme. This scheme the Secretary of State could accept, reject or amend.

The Secretary of State had issued the first directive on 15th July 1983 with the intention of securing a housing transfer package that could be operational as from April 1984. The first directive is essentially a ranging shot to see whether or not there exists the possibility of local agreement on the package. If the local parties are so antagonistic towards each other that there appears to be no basis for ultimate agreement, then the Secretary of State may proceed himself to determine the nature of any housing transfer package without proceeding to the second directive. In Northampton, the first directive was regarded as the green light for establishing an agreed housing transfer package. The prospect of an imposed package was quite unacceptable. It would also have been
a very sour comment on the partnership if the Borough Council and the Development Corporation could not meet the requirements of the first directive.

The details of the housing transfer package were vital to the Borough Council, for the scale of what was involved would be immense for the local authority, but in particular for the Housing Revenue Account. Some 6,500 properties were to be transferred to the Borough Council's Housing Revenue Account at an outstanding loan debt of £86m., involving a debt finance burden of £12m per annum. The Borough Council's concern on housing transfer centred around four key issues.

Firstly, there was the problem of housing subsidy. The Development Corporation received significant housing subsidies from Central Government. Central Government policy was to eliminate housing subsidies, certainly as far as local authorities were concerned. The Borough Council had no wish to take over the properties only to find the subsidy withdrawn. There was an additional complication with this problem in that local authorities in receipt of housing subsidy were penalised under the Rate Support Grant formula in Section E7 of the calculations. The Borough saw little prospect of housing transfer with this E7 penalty in operation.

The outstanding Loan debt to be inherited by the Borough Council was of the order of £86m. This was the sum borrowed by the Development Corporation for the construction of its housing stock. It had been borrowed from the Treasury at a time when the prevailing interest
rates were high and the average rate of interest was 13.2%. The Borough Council wished to be given the opportunity of refinancing this loan debt should the opportunity of lower interest rates materialise in the future.

The third area of difficulty was one that had been identified very early on in the discussions between Borough Council and Development Corporation, namely the physical state of the housing stock itself. The Borough was particularly wary about taking over the timber framed housing which it suspected might not enjoy the anticipated life of sixty years. In addition it required a substantial remedial works programme so that the housing stock would be in pristine condition on transfer. The Development Corporation for its part did emphasise in discussions that these were new houses, which had sold very well under the right to buy legislation and that the Borough Council had been responsible for their management and maintenance from the beginning under the agency agreement. Associated with this issue of the nature of the housing stock was that of the contractors' outstanding liabilities. The Borough Council was anxious that unresolved claims on contractors should be settled before housing transfer and that they were in receipt of all guarantees outstanding after housing transfer.

Following the receipt of the first directive, the Borough Council had established its own Housing Transfer Committee. Nominally this Committee was concerned to negotiate with the Development Corporation on the details of housing transfer. However, it was perfectly clear that the housing transfer package was only part of
the total wind-up picture and thus the Housing Transfer Committee in reality was concerned with the totality of negotiations associated with wind-up.

In terms of the total wind-up package, housing transfer constituted the strongest card in the Borough Council's hand. Public housing had to be transferred somewhere and alternatives available to Central Government, other than transfer to the Borough, were very limited. Under the 1981 New Towns Act, Part 1, Section 6, empowered the Secretary of State to give the function of one New Town Development Corporation to another New Town Development Corporation. Under this authority the houses and estates of Northampton Development Corporation could be transferred, for example, to the Milton Keynes Development Corporation. Other alternatives available to the Secretary of State were the establishment of a housing Association to take over the properties, or to sell them in parcels to private property development companies. Clearly there were degrees of reality associated with these alternatives and each possessed the disadvantage of creating two towns, whereas transfer to the Borough Council created a one town in terms of public housing provision. Both Central and Local Government desired the transfer of Development Corporation housing to the Borough Council; the centre piece for negotiations were to be the proposed terms of the transfer.
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One major consequence of the negotiations over the wind-up of the Development Corporation was that increasingly the Borough Council found itself in fact negotiating directly with the Department of the Environment. The Development Corporation was in broad sympathy with the general aims of the Borough to secure as much advantage for the town as possible and it developed a supportive stance for the local authority in its dealings with Central Government. The most immediate problems associated with housing transfer that could be resolved by the Development Corporation alone were those concerned with the physical state of the housing stock and the issue of contractors' outstanding liabilities. Each estate that was to form part of the housing transfer package was subject to investigation by technical officers of the two partners and joint parties made up of members of the Borough Housing Committee and the Board of the Development Corporation. Consequential to these visits, a special programme of remedial works and accelerated repairs and maintenance was instituted and effected up to March 1985.

In total a sum of £1.75m. was spent in meeting the requirements of the Borough Council. Pari passu with this programme the Development Corporation followed up and finalised all outstanding claims on contractors. This work was carried out enthusiastically by the Corporation's Chief Legal Officer, Mr. Hedley Almond, who was also the Borough Solicitor. Through these activities the fears of the Borough Housing Committee as to the physical nature of the stock it was inheriting, were largely allayed. By September 1983 it was
clear that the target date of April 1984 for housing transfer would not be met and representations were made to the Department of the Environment on this matter. On the 16th February 1984 it was reported to the Board of the Development Corporation that the Chairman, Mr. Alan Davis, had received a letter from Lord Bellwyn to the effect that the Northampton Development Corporation would now be wound up on 31st March 1985, and that the date for the transfer of housing and community assets to the Borough Council would take place on the 2nd April 1985. (24)

By February 1984 the outstanding issues on housing transfer that needed to be resolved before the Borough would agree to the package were reduced to two. These were the E7 factor and the refinancing of loan debt. In its negotiations on housing transfer the Central Government sought to emphasise one key principle and reserve one important policy position. The key principle was that the housing transfer package should leave the recipient local authority no better or no worse off than it was previous to the exercise. The policy position was concerned with the fact that Northampton was the first of a number of development corporations to be wound up and therefore the Central Government was anxious to avoid establishing unhelpful precedents.

An important meeting to resolve the remaining problems of housing transfer took place on the 19th January 1984, when Alan Simcock, Assistant Secretary at the Department of the Environment, came to Northampton to discuss the issues with a joint meeting of the Board
of the Development Corporation and the Housing Transfer Committee of
the Borough Council. At this meeting Simcock reiterated that the
policy of Central Government was that housing transfer should leave
the recipient local authority no better or no worse off. He
conceded that the E7 factor was a matter that would have to be taken
up with the Treasury and offered some optimism for a favourable
result. On refinancing he felt that this was a matter that might
require legislation and that here again the attitude of the Treasury
would be critical. In general terms this was a most significant
partnership meeting. Under the chairmanship of the Deputy Leader
of the Borough Council, Mr. D. Walmsley, a very positive and
mutually supportive atmosphere was in evidence throughout the
meeting and it provided an important psychological foundation for
the remaining wind-up negotiations. This optimistic outlook was
further enhanced when the Borough Treasurer, R.D. Whittaker, reported
to the Housing Transfer Committee in February 1984 that he
anticipated a surplus of some £685,000 on the Housing Revenue
Account in 1985/86, should housing transfer take place on 2nd April
1985.

By March 1984 a draft housing transfer scheme had been prepared and
on the 2nd May 1984 the Borough Council voted its approval on the
scheme subject to satisfactory resolution of the two outstanding
issues of the E7 factor and the refinancing of loan debt. That
same month the Secretary of State issued the second directive
requiring the two partners to produce an agreed scheme to be
deposited with him by August of that year.
Of the two unresolved issues concerning housing transfer, by July 1984 the Borough Council knew that its arguments had been accepted over the E7 factor and that special arrangements were to be made to eliminate its adverse effect of Borough finances. On refinancing, however, the Treasury was adamant that the possible future intrusion into the money markets by the Borough Council on such a potential scale was unacceptable, especially as it constituted a major precedent for other new towns. This was a significant blow for the Borough Council and in a sense the worst fears of the report of the Public Expenditure Committee of the House of Commons 1973 had been realised. However, the Treasury's view was that the Borough Council would enjoy rising income from rents which would meet this financial burden. The Borough Council now recognised that it had exhausted negotiations with Central Government and its final judgement was that, in the final resort, the package was acceptable. At the joint meeting of the Housing Transfer Committee and the Board of the Development Corporation held on 18th October 1984 it was announced that the package was with the Secretary of State awaiting his approval. Such approval was received by the partners on 20th December 1984 and formal implementation was fixed for 2nd April 1985.

The other major set of physical assets to be transferred to the Borough Council were the playing fields, tree belts, open spaces and community centres that had been developed by the Development Corporation. These were to be transferred in what was known as the Community Related Assets Package. Many of these assets would be a
continuing liability to the Borough Council in terms of maintenance and repair. The package had to be so constructed that income earning assets would be included in the form of land, shops, public houses etc., that would offset these liabilities.

"annual maintenance liability on non-revenue producing land and buildings should be offset by the inclusion of revenue producing assets so that maintenance liabilities and revenue are in balance." (25)

Whilst there was an element of negotiation over the size of future liabilities and income, as a package it was considerably easier to construct than the housing transfer arrangements. The partners were able to put together a package that included a number of very desirable assets for the Borough, in particular Upton Hall and part of the estate which the Borough hoped to develop eventually as a local park. At the joint meeting of 18th October 1984 the Borough Council representatives were able to inform their colleagues on the Development Corporation that the Community Related Assets Package had received the informal approval of the Minister, which was to become formal approval in January 1985.

The successful wind-up of Northampton Development Corporation not only required the transfer of housing and community assets to the Borough Council but also involved the disposal of surplus agricultural land and the sale of commercial/industrial assets. The sale of the surplus agricultural land was of considerable interest to a number of parties, including the Borough Council, the
County Council and the former owners of the land. Surplus agricultural land was land held by the Development Corporation which would not be developed in the near future. The Development Corporation defined the near future in terms of the Joint Planning Study undertaken together with the County Council and the Borough Council, which had examined land use requirements in Northampton up until 1996. Within this definition, there existed some 960 acres of surplus agricultural land, the most important part of which was 650 acres at Upton, to the West of the town. Both the County and Borough Councils were interested in this particular land holding. The Borough Council did not want development to take place until the Southern District was complete and the County Council was greatly concerned over the infrastructure costs it might be called upon to bear should such development take place. The County Council was prepared to purchase the land if necessary and together with the planning controls exercised by the Borough Council it was felt that this would best safeguard their respective interests. The Development Corporation was not unsympathetic to the aspirations of its partner authorities.

"Members accepted that the existence of the "Agreed Memorandum" between the then Northampton County Borough Council and the Ministry of Housing and Local Government was a factor that could not be ignored...the Development Corporation ought to support such a step." (26)

The Central Government, however, was opposed to a growth in the land holdings of focal authorities and in June 1985 it was reported to the Board that Ministers had rejected the purchase proposals of the
County Council. The Department of the Environment further objected to the proposal of selling the land with restrictive covenants preventing development. The Development Corporation was thus required to dispose of its 600 acres at Upton in some other fashion. This posed the Board the problem of identifying the hope value associated with such a sale, for although the Joint Study stated that the land would not be required before 1996, certainly parts of it contained a significant hope value and the placing of an acceptable figure on this was particularly difficult. The Board's solution to this was to sell the land on the open market and allow market forces to make the valuation. However, there existed a further complication in the claims to the land possessed by the former owners and existing tenants. Board members were well aware of the Critchel Down case of 1954 when the ignoring of the rights of former owners in a similar situation led to the resignation of the minister, Sir Thomas Dugdale.

Board members were also aware of their duty towards the public purse and the scrutiny of their action by the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons. The sale of the land to the former owners, with a hope value placed upon it by the District Valuer, could lead to a substantial loss to the public purse for which the Board would be responsible. The Board raised their dilemma with the Department of the Environment and indicated that they would require a formal directive from ministers if they were not to sell in the open market. A letter from Alan Simcock, Assistant Secretary in the
Department, was reported to the Board at its January 1984 meeting which stated ministers considered that...

"the issue of formal directions to be neither necessary nor appropriate".

The Board, however, found this reply unsatisfactory.

"Members reaffirmed their previous decision that from the point of view of public accountability it was not in the best interests of the Development Corporation to offer to sell back by negotiation (as opposed to competitive bidding) agricultural land with hope value to the previous owners or, failing this, the tenants, though accepting it was national policy that this should be done...the Board should continue to press the Minister to issue a formal directive on this matter." (27)

In June 1984 the Chairman of the Board, Alan Davis, received a letter from Sir George Young which clearly stated the Central Government's view on the matter.

"Having considered the matter carefully, I have no doubt that the Government's guidelines on surplus land disposal, which in principle are common to all public sector surplus land, should be followed even when there is a risk that the highest price will not be achieved, since against this has to be balanced the equity of allowing first refusal to former owners and certain categories of tenant. I intend therefore to direct the Corporation to proceed to sell this land by negotiation with former owners and tenants, in the categories specified in the guidelines, at a price agreed by the District Valuer." (28)

On the basis of this letter the Board considered that the issue of the sale of surplus agricultural land had been resolved.
Of the remaining physical assets of the Development Corporation the most important were the industrial and commercial properties and the building land. In this area the policy to be followed was crystal clear. The Board had to sell on the open market as much as possible before the wind-up date and whatever was left would be transferred to the Commission for the New Towns on 1st April 1985. This was without doubt a breach in the spirit, if not in the letter, of the "Agreed Memorandum" and for the Borough Council it represented the greatest failure of the partnership arrangements. However, such was the value of the assets and such was the need of the Government to reduce its Public Sector borrowing requirements that it was difficult to envisage Central Government allowing such a windfall to the local authority. All the Borough Council could do was to plead this in evidence of support for its case that Central Government could be generous with the town in a parting gift of community assets.

The final disposition of all the physical assets of the Development Corporation was outlined in a Board Paper of June 1984.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total land acquired.</td>
<td>6310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land disposed of including adoptions.</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus agricultural land.</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and Roads to NCC.</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing land to NBC.</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land to Commission (unless sold)</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land expected to be sold for development.</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land on industrial estates that might be sold or otherwise goes to the Commission.</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The money raised by the Development Corporation for Central Government through the sale of assets was considerable. An auction of the less desirable industrial properties raised £3.2m. in March 1984. In April another £1m. worth was disposed of. H. Barty-King (30) has briefly explained the history of asset disposal.

"Before 1979 Development Corporations could not dispose of the freehold of industrial and commercial assets. At Northampton £11. m. was raised in the ten years since designation from the sale of rented houses to tenants, of housing land to speculative builders and from the sales of other land to local and public authorities. In 1979 Central Government amended its policy....from 1979 to March 1985 nearly £60.m. was raised (in Northampton) from the sale of industrial and commercial assets. During the same period a further £47.m. was raised from the disposal of both completed rented housing and private housing land." (31)

The money raised under this asset disposal programme was progressively clawed back by Central Government using the provisions of Sec 63(1) of the 1981 New Towns Act.

"The Secretary of State may direct a development corporation of the commission to pay to him on the date specified in the direction, such sum as is so specified."

The wind-up of the Development Corporation involved much more than the disposal of its physical assets. The Development Corporation had to disentangle itself from the web of relationships that it had established with its staff, a wide range of local organisations and the partnership authorities.
The staff of a development corporation accept their position as one which involves limited job security. Development corporations have a task to perform and when that task is complete, or when the Central Government invokes the provisions of the 1981 New Towns Act, the life of the corporation will come to an end. To a degree the remuneration received by development corporations' staff compensates for this element of insecurity. Nevertheless the announcement of an end date to the life of a corporation involves its Board in two major problems. Firstly, it must seek to maintain staff morale in circumstances that are bound to depress it and secondly, it has to make arrangements for the progressive rundown of its employees. In July 1982 the Board had commissioned a consultant, Mr. Dennis Strange, who had had experience of this problem with Corby Development Corporation, to produce a financial package involving an incentives element which it was hoped would solve both the Board's problems. There was also the position that staff affected under housing transfer would benefit from the provisions of the Crombie code which involved especially generous provision. Ministers were ultimately to reject the incentives package devised by the consultant and legislation was introduced to eliminate the Crombie code provisions. Thus in the event the permanent staff of the Development Corporation were to face one of five options.

a) obtain alternative employment on their own initiative.

b) take redundancy payments.
c) transfer to the Commission for the New Towns.
d) transfer to the Borough Council.
e) leave the employment market.

Not everyone of the 300 plus staff enjoyed all these options and the great majority found themselves in a redundancy situation.

Besides their staff, the Development Corporation had established a network of relationships with local organisations and had indeed itself established and sponsored particular organisations which it felt met a specific community need. Of these the Board was particularly concerned over the Northampton Arts Centre, the Northampton Family Welfare Association and the Residents Councils. In the event these organisations were all to survive the demise of the Development Corporation. The Borough Council agreed to provide funding for the Arts Centre and additional support was forthcoming from the East Midlands Arts Association, whose new Chairman, Mr. R. Dilleigh was a former member of the Board of the Development Corporation. The Borough Council also agreed to take over the support for the Residents Councils and the County Council provided funding for the Family Welfare Association.

The Development Corporation, over its lifetime, had made regular payments to a variety of local organisations and in some cases supplemented this with interest free loans. On demise, it was necessary to tidy up these arrangements and the Corporation sought to do so in such a fashion that would not put at risk the organisations that had received
their help. In September 1984, £33,000, the interest free loan to Northampton Repertory Players was waived. In March 1984 a final grant of £45,000 was given to the Northamptonshire Ironstone Railway Trust in order that they could complete their engine shed and depot. In October 1984 arrangements were completed for the sale of Hunsbury Hill Farm complex to the Northamptonshire Rural Community Council. In February 1985, £3,258 was given to Northamptonshire Natural History Society to assist the rehousing of their 30 cm. telescope.

That same month a £41,877 tender was accepted for creating a parking and landscaped area for the Lodge Farm Meeting Hall which also served the Eastern District Social Club, the Northampton Sub Aqua Club and the Hesketh Youth Centre.

The Development Corporation was, of course, particularly concerned to successfully disengage itself from its partnership authorities, the Borough and County Councils. This was to be an easy exercise as far as the County Council was concerned. Under Section 41 (1) of the New Towns Act 1981, the Secretary of State has to consult with the County and District Councils as to whether or not the purpose for which a Development Corporation has been established has been achieved. The County Council had developed a worried concern about the provision of support services in the Southern District of Northampton and it took this opportunity to formally object to the dissolution of the Development Corporation. In July 1984 the letter from the County Council's Chief Executive, Mr Jeffrey Greenwell, to the Minister was reported to the Board of the Development Corporation.
"The dissolution of the Corporation does not mean that development of the town will cease on 2nd April 1985. The momentum will continue for several years to come and this will be manifest in the following areas:-

a) Traffic will grow at a faster rate than nationally, resulting in further road improvements being required to service the town.

b) The population of the town will continue to be weighted towards the younger age groups, resulting in above average requirements for schools and employment for school leavers.

c) The continuing development of the Southern District by private developers will require sites for schools, social services establishments and a library. (33)

The County Council, thus informed the Department of the Environment that in its view the purpose, for which the Development Corporation had been established, had not been completed.

Under the guidance of its Chief Executive, Alan Parkhouse, the Borough Council had always sought to distinguish between:-

a) What was necessary for the Development Corporation to complete the purpose for which it was established.

b) The wind-up package.

As early as 1981 a deputation from the Borough Council had been to London to see Sir George Young to place before him the final projects which were considered necessary to complete the expansion process. These were in order of priority:-
1) A multi storey car park.
2) The resurfacing of the market square.

Throughout the subsequent years, there was a regular correspondence with the Department on these three issues and they were reiterated as the Borough Council's requirements in response to the Secretary of State's inquiry under Section 41 (1) of the New Towns Act 1981.

In addition the Borough Council was concerned with the wind-up package itself, where there remained a number of outstanding issues. Firstly, there was the question of Cliftonville House. The Development Corporation and the Borough Council shared this accommodation and the Department could require the Development Corporation to sell the property with the Borough as part tenant or make some other arrangements. Secondly, there was the issue of the archaeological remains that had been acquired by the Development Corporation over its lifetime as a result of the work of its archaeological unit and what provision was to be made for their final disposition. The Borough and the Development Corporation were hopeful that the Department would allow the Development Corporation to pay over to the Borough Council a sum of £250,000 for a new museum extension that could house the exhibits. The third unresolved item was that the Development Corporation had a bid in with the Department of the Environment, under the major amenities fund heading, for £2m. for a new Sports Centre in the Southern District and the Borough has aspirations to be the authority to design and implement...
this scheme. Finally, Upton Hall, which had been included in the Community Related Assets package needed some £300,000 worth of repairs if it was to be put into good order.

The Department of the Environment was well aware of the outstanding issues raised by the Borough Council and had been for some considerable time. On the other hand, the requests raised by the County Council had been put forward rather late in the day. The County Council had always pressed the Department very strongly on the issue of the Roads programme and indeed had enjoyed considerable success in this area. This concern with the future problems arising from the growth of population in the Southern District was a rather late recognition of the problem.

On March 7th 1985, Alan Simcock, Assistant Secretary at the Department of the Environment, sent out two letters, one to Jeffrey Greenwell, Chief Executive of the County Council, and one to Alan Parkhouse, Chief Executive of the Borough Council. These letters contained the responses of Ministers to the outstanding issues raised by the County and Borough Councils.

For the County Council the contents of its letter were unsatisfactory.

As you will be aware it has always been our view that the Corporation should only contribute towards road schemes started in its lifetime and that for this reason a generous view was taken of the schemes likely to begin in its final years. Indeed I understand that all the schemes have now been started....Ministers have therefore decided that they are not able to offer a contribution from the New Towns programme to these schemes....New Town contributions have generally been confined to social and recreational facilities arising directly from the needs of the new town itself....the provision of libraries and fire stations in the
new town have hitherto been solely the responsibility of the County Council. In the case of the Southern District there is little evidence that these facilities will be provided in advance of need and, in view of the rapid development of the area, the County will soon be able to enjoy a substantial income from it. For these reasons Ministers are not prepared to agree to the Corporation contributing towards the cost of these facilities." (34) 

The County Council was most concerned about this response from the Department and some of the issues were taken up again by Jeffrey Greenwell. In particular he made the point that increased rateable value was in fact of no advantage to the County Council under the existing resource grant arrangements of the Rate Support Grant. Nevertheless the Department remained unmoved by such appeals.

For the Borough Council, the Department's letter covered not only the Section 41 (1) issues, but also the final wind-up package. There was much in it to provide the Borough Council with satisfaction.

"deciding to accept the case for a Sports and Leisure Centre in the Southern District and they therefore have agreed to the Corporation providing a site for this purpose and incurring expenditure up to £2m. on construction costs....Ministers have also accepted the case for a contribution not exceeding £250,000 being made towards capital expenditure incurred by the Council on the extension of the Borough Museum....Finally you will wish to know that Ministers have also agreed to the Corporation making a contribution not exceeding £300,000 towards certain structural repairs of Upton Hall, proposed by the Development Corporation, and to the transfer of Cliftonville House to your Council on the basis that it will assume responsibility for the outstanding loan debt." (35) 

Ministers had thus met a fair proportion of the Borough Council's shopping list. The Council was particularly pleased as the land for the Sports Centre was also included in the arrangements and that apart
from the Museum extension none of the projects would count against
the Council's capital borrowing allocation. The greatest
disappointment was over the multi-storey car park which the Borough
Council felt was desperately needed and, on this one issue, further
representations were made to Minister. They were, however,
unsuccessful.

Whilst there were Councillors who remained dissatisfied, the majority
of those involved with the Housing Transfer Committee felt that this
final package was acceptable and indeed, 'given the climate of public
expenditure, possibly generous.

It would be nice if the Department's decisions could be laid at the
doors of the spirit of partnership that had prevailed over much of the
expansion period and indeed there may have been an element of this
present, but undoubtedly the biggest influence upon Ministers was the
vast sums of money raised through asset disposal, some £50m. during
1985. This reality was in fact alluded to in Simcock's letter.

"In reaching their conclusions, Ministers have taken account of
the rapid way in which housing is being developed in the
Southern District and the Corporation's success in stimulating
development and in its overall commercial performance." (36)

Thus for the Borough Council the wind-up package was completed and
the demise of the Development Corporation took place on 31st March
1985 without rancour or bitterness but rather in a spirit of mutual
regret.
Northampton would continue to expand but now as a result of natural growth and the responsibility for this reverted back totally to the local authorities. The unique partnership experiment had run its full course.
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Chapter 10

CONCLUSIONS

The capacity to give orders within the United Kingdom is founded in the rule of law and essentially such powers are based upon statutory or prerogative sources. Local institutions of government do not possess innate or original law making powers. Local discretion is founded therefore on the extent to which statutory powers are granted by central authority together with the supporting administrative arrangements for their application and implementation. The Northampton partnership arrangements can be viewed as considerably increasing the local authority contribution to the new towns programme as it specifically applied to Northampton.

The major elements that can be identified as providing for this were:

a) The Agreed Memorandum
b) The Master Plan
c) Consultative arrangements
d) Shared Officers and Agency arrangements
a) The Agreed Memorandum (1)

This key document not only provided for the contribution of the then County Borough into the mainstream of decision making associated with town expansion, but also reserved certain aspects of the activity exclusively to it. The County Borough was to be consulted on the appointment of the independent consultants. The County Borough was to receive assigned places on the Board of the Development Corporation and possess a veto over ministerial appointments. Development proposals were first to be submitted to the County Borough before going to the Minister who would informally resolve disputes. The development of the existing town, including the town centre, was to be the sole responsibility of the County Borough.

Of these arrangements, the most effective for securing local discretion, and the one which was to survive in fact throughout the expansion period, was that which reserved the central area to the County Borough. One small housing scheme, at the specific request of the County Borough, was the only Development Corporation project that was to take place in the central area throughout the expansion period. A further example illustrating the significance of this central area arrangement for local discretion is concerned with the Central Area Distributer Road. The Master Plan envisaged such a road as a key feature of traffic provision within the central area. The Conservative controlled Borough Council had plans to implement this part of the Master Plan during the financial year 1974-75.
There was, however, substantial opposition to it. The 1974 councils in Northamptonshire, elected under the 1972 Local Government Act, were controlled by the Labour Party and the scheme, known as the Expressway by its opponents, was abandoned by them. Thus, as a result of the local authorities' control of development in the existing town, this development proposal was rejected. This decision most strongly underlines the extent to which local discretion was injected into the Northampton expansion process. In terms of planning generally the provisions of the "Agreed Memorandum" operated very successfully and, over the whole period of town expansion, the Minister never had to adjudicate on development proposals between the Local Authorities and the Development Corporation. In fact, the arrangements of the "Agreed Memorandum" were extended by the partners to give planning control in both new and existing areas to the Borough Council.

On the issue of Borough representation on the Development Corporation, the Central Government maintained faith with the County Borough up to 1972 when, as a result of the death of Alderman J Lewis, the County Borough's representation was reduced to three. Central Government decided not to fill this vacancy. This was not in strict breach of the "Agreed Memorandum" - rather the County Borough's interpretation of it. The County Borough maintained three members out of eight up until 1976, and the retirement of Sir William Hart and the membership changes required by local government reform. Despite these latter reforms, the Borough always enjoyed 3 members on the Board of the Development Corporation. The veto on
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ministerial appointments to the Board of the Development Corporation was an aspect of local discretion that survived up until 1979. It was used on two occasions, once under the County Borough Council and once under the Borough Council. After 1979, with the Central Government intending to end the New Town programme, there were in fact few appointments made to the Board, the last being Councillor J Kane, the Leader of the County Council. On this last occasion the Borough Council was informed after the appointment was made.

b) The Master Plan

The original intention with respect to the Master Plan, which was to provide for the whole of the designated area, was that it would be the County Borough's plan. They were consulted over the appointment of the independent consultants and were delighted that one of them was a former Northampton County Borough Architect. However, the delay in producing the plan, boundary problems and initial opposition from the County Council resulted in such a delay that the Master Plan eventually became the joint plan of the both the County Borough Council and the Development Corporation. Although a joint plan, it provided considerable discretion for the local authority in that its application in the central area was entirely a matter for the County Borough.

History has amply illustrated that the local authority made full use of its discretion to implement or change the Master Plan as it applied to central Northampton. Much of present day (1987) central
Northampton bears little resemblance to the Master Plan. This is particularly the case with the road network, where such major schemes as the Central Area Distributer Road and Talavera Way have never been undertaken.

The acceptability of such a flexible Master Plan is seen in its incorporation into the County Structure Plan in 1976 and its continuation as the major planning reference for the town up until 1987 when it still retained this status.

c) Consultative Arrangements

The formal centrepiece of the consultative arrangements were the quarterly meetings between the Board of the Development Corporation and the Town Expansion, later the Policy, Committee. However, in practice, the major consultative processes took place at board meetings and at the informal meetings between officers and between members.

Fundamental to the consultative arrangements was the exchanging of information. This more than anything was to establish confidence, minimise secrecy, pre-empt conflict and create one community out of two organisations.

Information was the fundamental raw material for the town expansion programme and all the members of the partnership brought to it their individual information resources. The County Borough up to 1973,
and the Borough and County Councils after 1973, would bring those resources particularly associated with local authorities. These included:

(1) Information available from the members of the Council, eg political and professional.

(2) Information arising from the existing functions undertaken by the authorities, eg School roll statistics, housing information, the electoral roll, licenced activities.

(3) Information available as a result of the exercising of their professional skills by the officers of the authorities.

(4) Information available through the professional contacts of officers and members.

(5) Information from other local organisations with which the local authorities had established good working relations eg, Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, Law Society, estate agents.

(6) Information from the various Local Authority Associations, eg Association of District Councils, Association of County Councils, NALGO.
(7) Information from central government departments.

The information resources available from the Northampton Development Corporation included:

(1) Information available from Board members, political and professional.

(2) Information available from the progression of expansion.

(3) Information available as a result of the exercising of their skills by officers of the Development Corporation.

(4) Information available through the professional contacts of Board members and officers.

(5) Information available from the national organisations associated with the New Towns programme, eg Chairmen's Conference.
(6) Information from central government departments.

(7) The Development Corporation brought with it a greater willingness to spend money in order to obtain information through the employment of experts and consultants. It was less constrained by finance and traditional working practices than the local authorities.

The Consultative arrangements involved therefore a continuous sharing of information, but consultation was more than this. Over the years, reciprocal favours were performed, experiences were shared, loyalty and commitment developed. As a result of all this, the local authority made a sizeable contribution to decision making.

d) Shared Officers and Agency arrangements

The provision of shared officers in engineering, law and housing meant for the Borough Council that those individuals who were responsible to the Council for the provision of key services widened their responsibilities to include the new expansion areas. Such arrangements, especially in engineering and housing, maintained substantial local discretion and control.
The key agency arrangements that underpinned local discretion were those in engineering, highways and housing, although there were more limited agency arrangements in finance and transport. Under the agency agreements the County Borough council was paid by the Development Corporation to provide all the engineering works, highways and housing services that would normally be provided by a development corporation for itself. Whilst general policy was still determined by the Board of the Development Corporation, its implementation was a Borough task. Thus the Borough Engineer and the Borough Housing Officer were responsible for the provision of services throughout the designated area. As Local Authority Officers they were responsible to the appropriate Council committees. Councillors representing wards in the new areas particularly enjoyed this access and were able to use it to good effect. Whilst the Chief Housing Officer maintained two housing lists, one for the Borough and one for the Development Corporation, there existed a flexibility in their use, to the benefit of both organisation but encouraging greater local discretion. (3).

Thus we can say that the partnership arrangements established within Northampton significantly enhanced local discretion. Although formally established between the Ministry of Housing and Local Government and the County Borough of Northampton, they largely survived local government reform and many continued until the demise of the Development Corporation in 1985. They allowed a significant local government input into a local expression of central government policy. It was underpinned by the resource implications and
established rules for the behaviour of participants and provided an ethic or bias in favour of local discretion which the local authority mobilised effectively in its favour on several occasions.

It is precisely in its encouragement of local discretion that the Northampton experiment had its greatest significance. New rules, positions and procedures were introduced in 1965, some of which survived for twenty years, which allowed local institutions and individuals to make major inputs into an area of central government activity which up until this experiment was particularly characterised by its lack of local input.

Greater local discretion has thus been suggested as a key element within the special partnership arrangements. Closely associated with this but additional to it is the idea of greater accountability ie, that partnership increased the accountability to local people of central government, or its agent the development corporation, for the decisions made on town expansion.

The concept of accountability has a number of interpretations. It may range across a spectrum where, at one end, accountability involves an obligation to provide limited information in certain circumstances while, at the other end, accountability involves a power to dismiss agents instantly. Between these two extremes different degrees of accountability will involve the extent of access to information, the right to request explanations and reasons for decisions, the extent and the timing of mandate renewals. An
organisation may find itself with different relationships of accountability with different institutions, groups and individuals. The chairman and board of a traditional development corporation were responsible to the minister, and ministerial powers over appointments, finance and project approval were such as to make this accountability a reality. The accounts of development corporations were subject to scrutiny and comment by the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons and they were required to make an annual report to Parliament. Beyond this, the accountability of a development corporation was restricted to what it decided was necessary for affected institutions, groups and individuals.

The partnership arrangements at Northampton radically altered this situation. The membership of the board, the appointments process, the information network and the role of shared officer moved those responsible for town expansion significantly along the accountability spectrum. Accountability acquired a very important local characteristic. The nature of the Northampton arrangements ensured that local Borough Councillors, if not the local Northampton public, could obtain information, determine projects and ultimately influence board membership. Consequently, town expansion in Northampton involved a unique degree of local accountability.

In normal circumstances one may reasonably ask the question "How far is the Development Corporation accountable to the local authorities within its designated area?" The whole point of the partnership arrangements in Northampton was to make such a
question unnecessary. The local authority was a partner in responsibility for town expansion. Those elements underpinning local discretion together with the fact that local authority representation on the Development Corporation was largely party politically balanced, ensured that the accountability of the Development Corporation to the Borough Council was not an issue. All political elements within the Borough Council were part of the town expansion partnership. In terms of access to information and securing explanations, the Borough Council was able to hold the Development Corporation fully accountable. A simple example of this was the letting of Greyfriars House office block. This task was performed on behalf of the Borough Council by the Development Corporation, and on a number of occasions the Chief Estates Officer of the Development Corporation was interviewed on progress by the full Policy Committee of the Borough Council. In terms of renewing mandates, in theory at least, the Council enjoyed a five yearly veto on all appointments to the Board and of course some of the Chief Officers of the Development Corporation were its own officers.

A second more pertinent question is "How far were the Development Corporation and the County Borough accountable to the general public with respect to their town expansion activities?" In one respect the partnership arrangements significantly increased accountability to the general public, namely the renewing of mandates. As a partner to town
expansion, the Borough Council was accountable to the general public in the same way that it was accountable for its normal local government activities. Local elections provided an opportunity for the general public to withdraw their mandate. The reality of local government being accountable through elections and what determines voting patterns in local elections is another issue. Nevertheless, it constituted an element of public accountability not found within the traditional new town arrangements. Indeed the "Expressway" issue was a powerful local issue in the 1973 local elections.

The fact that the local authority itself was a partner in town expansion, provided some advantages. Information and explanations were more readily available on town expansion via traditional local government processes of accountability. For example, in 1980 there were a series of fires on one of the new estates built by the Development Corporation, Blackthorn Estate. Residents of the estate, concerned that there was an electrical design fault responsible, employed a fire consultant to substantiate their case to the Development Corporation. They approached their local councillor, Councillor A Berry, to press their case, as he was also a member of the Board of the Development Corporation, they obtained a very speedy hearing from the Chairman of the Board and a resolution of their problem.
Also as a result of such arrangements, the major local pressure groups, notably the political parties, were provided with information and explanation concerning town expansion. The support of the political parties was almost as vital to the town expansion process as the support of the elected representatives.

We have thus concluded that the partnership arrangements associated with the expansion of Northampton increased local discretion and local accountability. This is, however, very much a pluralistic perspective, one that places decision-making into a context of conflict and its reconciliation through representative institutions and administrative bargaining. It is a perspective which suggest that the totality of interests associated with town expansion were the better balanced because of the development and implementation of the partnership arrangements.

This holds little attraction or interest for those that view local politics from an elitist standpoint. The Northampton partnership arrangements are capable of an elitist interpretation, however. Elitism involves ideas of control, domination and above all stability; a stability of systems and decision-making either controlled by or operated in the interests of one particular elite. Indeed a major feature of the Northampton experience was the search for stability undertaken by those participants in the policy community. This is in part alluded to by Rhodes (1986) when quoting Wildawsky (1980).
"Policy making in policy community seems to sustain, even reinforce, therefore, the existing distribution of power." (4)

The search for stability by public organisations is at the heart of much of the literature on bureaucracy, M Albro (1970) (5) D Silverman (1970) (6), and there are those that have strongly emphasised this particular feature.. A Schutz (1964) (7) P Berger and T Luckermann (1966) (8) S Clegg and D Dunkerley (1980) (9).

One may interpret the Northampton partnership arrangements not as an improved mechanism for reconciling many interests, but rather as a device for eliminating all conflict, for establishing a powerful and secure decision making coalition which will be immune from pluralist pressures. Such a view emphasises stability of personnel, continuity of policy making, the elimination of opposition. Such an approach, however, must make some effort to identify the elite who thus capture and control the decision making process.

We have seen that P Saunders (1981) (10) had identified two strands of elitist thought which he respectively describes as instrumentalism and managerialism. Instrumentalism is elitist theory which sees power with a specific societal group such as business, landowners, the military, etc. Managerialism sees power in the hands of technocrats and managers.

It is not possible to identify any specific societal group as being associated with the process of town expansion in Northampton. In terms of individual decision makers or the system of decision making there is no evidence of control by business or any other
occupational or social grouping. A careful look at the partnership arrangements which concentrates upon its anti-pluralist and pro-elitist elements requires a serious consideration of managerialism. The anti-pluralist elements of partnership can be found in the undermining of representative processes, the failure of pressure group activity and the confusion of the public.

The undermining of representative processes is evident in the minimising of political party debate and controversy over town expansion. A political party consensus was initially established which involved a clear division of spoils, for example, in County Borough representation in the Development Corporation. This "partyline" resulted in no vote on expansion in full council and a continuity of key personnel which largely survived electoral defeat and local government reform.

Local pressure groups, in particular those concerned with conserving parts of the old town, found great difficulty in winning any battles once the Development Corporation and the Borough Council were agreed. The Peacock Inn, the Market Square Arcade and the Welsh House were all lost despite protests from local civic groups. Throughout the twenty year history of town expansion only one development proposal was lost due to pressure group and public activity - the Central Area Distributer Road, The Expressway - and this was a result of political party activity.
To a considerable degree partnership was confusing for the general public, especially for the individual citizen. On the one hand, the key departments of two authorities, engineering, architects and planning, were located cheek by jowl in Cliftonville House, which itself caused confusion for the general public, but in addition the various agency arrangements posed problems as to who was responsible for any particular activity. New arrivals with housing problems, for example, could find themselves lost between the social development office of the Development Corporation and the Housing Department of the Borough Council.

These anti-pluralist elements within the partnership arrangements sustained an inner group of party leaders, chief officers of the local authority and the Development Corporation together with certain Board members - in particular, the chairman. It is this inner group of professional managers and virtual professional politicians who were to benefit most from the partnership arrangements. This elite has been analysed by a number of writers, H Heclo and A Wildawsky (1974) (11), R Pahl (1975) (12) Rex and Moore (1967) (13) and is a subject of interest and comment by most writers concerned with specific case studies K Newton (1976) (14) A Blowers (1984) (15). Such a close-knit group appears to exist in some form in every major local authority whether it is politically dominated by one party, balanced or a hung council. Aspects developed by corporatist literature J Winkler (1977) (16) P C Schmitter (1979) (17) also find a reflection in the Northampton partnership.
arrangements. They emphasise structured, closed communities of professionals concerned with the inter-mediation and monopoly licensing of sectional interests.

A corporatist interpretation of what existed in Northampton would perhaps see partnership as an elite centred on local government institutions that for the purpose of town expansion was restructured to include and accommodate central government interest and then granted a monopoly basis by central government to get on with the job. In its analysis of structures and processes such a corporatist approach would appear to reflect much of the reality experienced in Northampton, where the corporatist approach is perhaps of less value in the issue of motivation.

We may pose the question "Was a specific interest served by the local elite being so licensed by central government either a local interest or a wider national interest?". Having failed to identify any specific interest served by the Northampton partnership arrangements, there would appear to be three further scenarios. Firstly, the structuralist approach would consider that town expansion and the central-local government apparatus established for its achievement illustrated the role of the state in underpinning the capitalist system. Secondly, the managerial and quasi-corporatist view that the arrangements were established to underpin the power of the politico-administrators. Finally, the pluralist view that sees the partnership arrangements as an attempt to minimise
the uncertainties, mistakes and ignorance associated with such a varied and diverse activity as town expansion, that it was a response to conflicting multiple pressures.

Such views are not irreconcilable, however. Although the functional based dualism of P Saunders (1981, 1986) (18) is not to be found in Northampton, nevertheless a hierarchy of human behaviour and motivation can be identified around corporatist and competitive modes of interest mediation that recognises the autonomy of politics and ideology. There is little doubt that central government over the twenty years of town expansion was seeking to create a new town that broadly reflected the essentially capitalist system; certainly no alternatives were considered. To this extent there would appear to be merit in the structuralist approach. To achieve this within a capitalist value framework required the establishment of a trusted local elite supplemented with central government representatives.

This local elite was founded on the powerful politico-administrative group then controlling local government in Northampton. The elite functioned as a closed political community but had to meet the diverse uncertainties associated with town expansion, many of which were expressed via the pluralist representational system of the local council. Like A Blowers (1984) (19) at Bedford, we seem to find evidence at Northampton of the range of theories concerning the role of the state. One of the mediating elements developed by Bowers was that of "issues". Issues were capable of structuralist, elitist and pluralist dimensions. Issues are reconciled through the
taking of decisions, and the decision making process may be viewed as a means of widening understanding about structuralist, elitist and pluralist perspectives of the role of the state.

We may propose a continuum of decision making associated with town expansion which we may label as primary, secondary and tertiary:

1. Primary decisions - were national in resource implications, non-incremental, often creative, involved considerable uncertainty and were made by central government. They were structuralist in nature involving a macro view of society. 1977 P Shore decision to shift resources from the new town programme to the inner cities. 1981 decision to end the new town programme.

2. Secondary decisions - were made by local government with the approval of central government. They had significant resource implications, were innovative and creative, involved risk and often negotiations with other parties. They had strong elitist elements and were occasionally subject to some pluralist elements. 1971 Eastern District Development Plan 1973 Abandonment of Central Area Distributer Road.
3. Tertiary decisions - were made by local institutions with no central government input. They involved limited resources management and were more regulatory in nature. They were incremental, routine, with some elitist element but open to pluralist influences.

Housing rent increases
Road widening schemes.

Most of the decisions associated with the town expansion of Northampton fell somewhere within such a continuum if not exactly within a specific category.

The role of the state involves a hierarchy of decisions and such a hierarchy implies gradations of resource use, individuals affected, theoretical and value inputs. It is suggested that the role of the state itself is in turn influenced by such gradation and that different types of decision involve different motivations and decision makers. Against this background the partnership arrangements at Northampton would appear to be a recognition that town expansion was an issue that involved secondary decisions on a grand scale and that it was to the advantage of both central and local government to sustain the local elite and minimise pluralist influences.
The partnership experiment in Northampton was an attempt to establish a structure that would stabilise and freeze the rules of the game, to provide some order in an ever changing situation. Those local decision makers who sought to establish a partnership with central government were motivated by a desire to secure a significant measure of local control over the process of expansion in Northampton. This in itself was an 'heroic' objective but en-passant they were seeking to establish a framework for decision making that would survive over time free from those pressures that impinge upon and constantly reset central local relations.

We must now highlight the particular recommendations we wish to offer to those associated with localised expansion programmes as the issues raised by the Northampton "partnership" experience remain relevant to the current debate on central-local relations.

"The Government is planning to set up at least two new urban development corporations before the next election, in an attempt to tackle inner-city dereliction by taking large urban areas out of local authority control ... The models for the experiment are the London Docklands Development Corporation and Merseyside Development Corporation ... The LDDC and MDC attracted strong Labour criticism on the grounds that their creation reduced democratic representation for local people. Residents complained about lack of information and influence on planning decisions. The plan now is to set up new urban development corporations in areas where co-operation can be expected from Labour councils." (20)

With such new developments the Northampton experience has some lessons.
1. Central government started out with a flexible view as to the nature of the programme and the local authority as the local elite was allowed to negotiate on what it considered were its vital interests, and implementation of the programme was conditional on a satisfactory conclusion to these negotiations.

2. The statutory body acting for central government possessed carefully defined functions and particular areas and functions were reserved for the local authority.

3. The statutory body was funded by central government and additional financial resources were provided for the local authority via the "undue burden" arrangements.

4. The decision making body of the central authority's agent was comprised of both ministerial appointments and local authority representatives in careful balance with the local authority enjoying a veto over all appointments.

5. Both organisations participated in a scheme of officer sharing.

6. The programme involved local management and the use of agency agreements.

The central lesson to be learnt from the Northampton experiment is that the successful implementation of a major local programme, that requires significant central government resources, requires the structuring of a genuine policy community around the existing local power elite with clear enduring rules of the game. It is the need to recognise the concept of "locale", that local political activity is not a straight reflection of national political behaviour. To call something a partnership without at the same time establishing an institutional framework, which will allow for the development of such a local policy community, is to risk the devaluation of a term which has much to offer both central and local government.
A true partnership between central and local government that seeks to implement a major local programme, whether it be town expansion, urban renewal or economic development requires the abandonment of the central-local government perspective and the recognition that the most successful framework for meeting central-local aspirations is the establishment of an appropriate policy community and careful attention needs to be paid to the network of relations that are relevant to the successful attainment of the local programme so that established patterns of negotiation may take place with known and permanent rules.

In Northampton the provisions of the New Town Act were supplemented by the "Agreed Memorandum", particular attention was given to the contribution of the major local authority, its officers and elected representatives. Systems were devised to meet the consequences of party political balance and change. The resource base for the power dependence relationship was at the onset amended to provide for a measure of local input, acquiescence and control that could be exchanged for Treasury support and Department of the Environment approvals. The resulting pattern of exchange was of benefit to all the partners, securing value for money as well as additional real resources. The partnership established a common framework which, whilst allowing central government control, provided for local management, local discretion and local accountability.
These features need to be present and catered for when facing the issues of central/local relationships, when dealing with centrally funded major local projects, and when considering the integration of the major field organisations associated with its implementation. The Northampton experiment cannot be exactly duplicated elsewhere, but it has helped to identify the areas that need to be carefully thought through at the outset when similar major initiatives are being considered.
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THE AGREED MEMORANDUM: 10 May 1965
APPENDIX I

NT/264/53/1

10th May 1965

MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The expansion of Northampton using the machinery of the New Towns Act 1946

Agreed Memorandum

The problem

1. The Government propose that Northampton should be expanded to accommodate London overspill. They have in mind a planned intake of about 70,000 by 1981, followed by natural growth thereafter.

2. This involves a scale and rate of growth comparable to that of a new town; and it is thought that it would be necessary to utilise the machinery of the New Towns Act if the expansion is to be carried out at the rate required. This memorandum sets out, as a basis for discussion, the way in which this might be done.

Preliminary Study

3. The Minister proposes to appoint an independent consultant to advise where expansion on this scale might best be carried out; and for this purpose the Consultant would be asked to study a wide area and to consider the impact of expansion on settlements within range of the County Borough. The County Council and the County Borough Councils would be consulted on the selection of the Consultant, and on his terms of reference. Each Council might like to appoint a small consultative group to maintain informal contact at member level with the Consultant while the study is proceeding. (This would, of course, be in addition to close contacts at technical level). It is hoped that the preliminary study might be completed by about the beginning of 1966.

Designation

4. In the light of the Consultant's recommendations, and after statutory consultations with the County Council and the County Borough Council, and other local authorities concerned, the Minister would publish a draft designation order. It is hoped that the area to be designated would have been agreed with the County Council and the County Borough Council before the formal procedures are initiated; but no doubt there would be objections, and these would be subject to a public local inquiry before a substantive order was made. The statutory processes might take a further nine months or so after the consultant's recommendations are received; but, subject to whatever objections emerge, designation might be completed in the autumn of 1966.
5. At the preliminary informal consultation with representatives of the County Borough Council, they were inclined to think that the existing town should be included in the designated area, and the Department agreed that, for the reasons given in the next paragraph, the expansion would be much better done as an integrated part of a Greater Northampton if the whole of the town, old as well as new, were so included.

6. It will be very important to avoid any feeling of "two towns" old and new. One plan should cover the whole (see below); and the development powers and finance of the Development Corporation should be available for use in the old part of the town as in the new. Further, the Corporation have power under the New Towns Act to acquire land in the designated area at a price which excludes any increase of value arising from new development, or the prospect of new development elsewhere in the area. It might be very helpful to the County Borough Council if the Corporation could exercise this power on their behalf in the old town - e.g., in the town centre. They might also want the Corporation to undertake and finance development on their behalf in the old town.

7. Accepting that the existing town should be included in the designated area together with the new land, it would be understood that the Corporation would not exercise their acquisition or development powers in the existing town except at the request of, or in agreement with, the County Borough Council; provided that, if in any particular case, it seemed to the Minister that the exercise of powers by the Corporation in the existing town was essential to their development, in accordance with the plan, of land in the new area, he could authorise them to do so after consulting the County Borough Council. Nor would they carry out any development in the old town which the County Borough Council preferred to do themselves. Meanwhile, if the County Borough Council wanted to do some building in the new area, no difficulty should arise over that.

Planning

8. Initiative in planning the whole of the town (new as well as old) should be with the County Borough Council working in consultation with the Development Corporation. For this purpose it is accepted that the Consultant commissioned to advise on the area for expansion should, at the outset, be commissioned also to prepare the plan for the whole of the enlarged town. This should be done jointly by the Minister (acting on behalf of the future Development Corporation) and the County Borough Council.

9. So continuity would be assured from the initial designation to the final approval by the Minister of a plan for the whole town. When the Corporation is appointed, they would take on the Consultant jointly with the County Borough Council, and the "single mind" would continue. Instead of a master plan put forward from the Corporation (the usual practice in new towns), the plan would come forward from the County Borough Council, supported by the Corporation, as an amendment of the development plan. (This assumes that by then the boundaries of the county borough would have been extended to take in the whole of the designated area - see below).

10. Once the Corporation is in being, they would develop within the framework of the County Borough Council's plan. Under section 3(1) of the New Towns Act, development corporations are required to submit their development proposals to the Minister, who must consult the local planning authority
before giving his approval. Under the Town and Country Planning (New Towns Special Development) Order 1963, such approval constitutes a deemed planning permission. It would be right, however, when expanding an existing county borough that the corporation should always put their proposals first to the County Borough Council in the manner of the normal planning applicant; in the event of the County Borough Council having any objection thereto, the Minister will hold informal discussions with the parties to resolve the matter.

11. Where the new town machinery is being used to expand an existing county borough, it would seem appropriate that when dealing with normal planning applications affecting the new area, the local planning authority should consult the development corporation, and that if there is disagreement the Minister will consider with the local planning authority and the corporation whether the application is one which should be referred to him for determination.

Development Corporation

12. It will be clear that the Corporation and the County Borough Council will have to work in closest harmony. A corporation consists of up to nine (normally part-time) members, including a Chairman and Deputy Chairman, all of whom are appointed by the Minister after consultation with the local authorities concerned. When using new town machinery to expand an existing county borough, the Minister would think it appropriate that the personnel of the corporation should be agreed between himself and the County Borough Council, and that there should be adequate representation of the Council on the Development Corporation. (It would be premature to settle an exact number until the Department and the County Borough Council together can see what other members they would think desirable. The County Borough Council has particularly asked for four representatives, and the only reason that the Department cannot agree to this at this stage is that there is a statutory limitation of nine on the total number.)

13. It would be important that the County Borough Council should, for their part, set up a small committee with delegated powers to settle day-to-day matters arising on the expansion.

14. So far as possible, and provided no conflict of interest arose, the Corporation and the County Borough Council should, in addition to employing a common Consultant, share staff; or use each other as agents to carry out particular services. The object all through should be to get a common approach to the problems arising anywhere in the town, whether in the old part or in the new.

Local government boundaries

15. It is understood that the County Council would be likely to agree that the boundaries of the county borough would, as soon as possible after designation, be extended to include any land included in the designated area and simply enlarging the existing borough. At this time the County Borough Council and the County Council will discuss with the Minister the question of whether it would be desirable for any part of the proposed extension of the County Borough to be phased to coincide with the actual development of that part. This would seem right, so that the County Borough Council would not only be able to plan the whole of the town, but would also assume responsibility for providing the services required in the enlarged area.
Provision of services and financial arrangements

16. Although a development corporation has power to provide services normally provided by the local authority, there would be no need for this where there is a County Borough Council already in existence. But the Corporation would be prepared to contribute to the cost. In principle, financial responsibility for all the normal local authority services required for the expansion would fall on the County Borough Council, to whom the additional rate income would accrue. But, in practice, the planned growth of the town would throw additional burdens on them in advance of the growth of rateable value; and the financial arrangements between the County Borough Council and the Corporation would take account of this. Broadly speaking, it seems appropriate that the Corporation's share of the costs of expansion should bear roughly the same proportion to the share borne by the County Borough Council as the intake of planning overspill bears to the population increase arising from other causes. Further discussion of this matter will be necessary.

Disposal of assets

17. It is envisaged that when the time comes for the Corporation to dispose of its assets, the County Borough Council will have the opportunity to acquire, on financial terms to be agreed, land of and assets created by the Development Corporation in the course of the expansion (except to the extent that it might be agreed that any should be disposed of to private interests.) The timing however, would depend on the Government securing a reasonable return on their investment; and whatever arrangements were made, it would be necessary to ensure that the purpose of the expansion (viz., provision for London overspill) continued to be served. It might well be right that the management of some of the new development (eg. housing) should be handed over to the County Borough Council as it was completed, provided that the above requirements could be met. This would certainly not be ruled out. It would in any event seem desirable that County Borough Council houses and Development Corporation houses were treated as a common pool (thus avoiding old town/new town split), provided that rent policies could be harmonised. This possibility is one which should not be ruled out, but it will require careful further consideration.
APPENDIX II

STAFFING PAPER TO THE BOARD OF NORTHAMPTON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION March 1969
Most Development Corporations, because of the common nature of their business have developed a similarity of organisational structure. There are some differences arising from local circumstances, from history or from the composition of the Corporation and its officers. But the broad outline is of a series of functional departments including:

(a) Finance  
(b) Administration  
(c) Estates  
(d) Legal  
(e) Architecture and Planning  
(f) Engineering  
(g) Social Development

These are usually under a Chief Officer though the departments dealing with administration and legal matters are often combined, and the social development function is sometimes carried on directly within the General Manager's own office.

Two other functions, public relations and project co-ordination (when undertaken) which cut across the activities of all the functional departments are almost always carried out within the General Manager's office.

Collaboration with the County Borough Council

So far as Northampton is concerned, obviously the same functions have to be performed, but the situation is different from that of most of the earlier New Towns in that there is, within the designated area, a substantial and well-staffed County Borough. Indeed this will be the first time that development under the New Towns Act will have been carried out as a joint operation by a Corporation and a County Borough Council.

There are certain general principles which can contribute to securing effective collaboration between organisations. Each must have respect of the legitimate interests of the other, and at the same time must be able to preserve its own individual identity.

It seems to me to follow from this, in the context of Northampton, that the Development Corporation must have access to its own advice independent of that given to the County Borough. Equally, the County Borough cannot be expected to accept dependence on the Corporation for essential activities on which it requires advice.
While independence of advice seems essential, it does not follow that the executive work within the various functions needs to be kept separate between two bodies. For instance, while the Development Corporation needs financial and economic advice, it does not need to have a large staff of clerks and a computer to duplicate facilities already existing within the Treasurer's Department of the County Borough.

**Size of Staff Involved**

While it is premature at this stage of our development to be unduly concerned with the ultimate size of our organisation, it will not be long before the Development Corporation will have to consider such matters as more permanent office accommodation. It is also desirable that we should all begin to realise the size of staff which is likely to be involved in the entire operation.

There are no collated statistics on the size of New Town Corporation staff in relation to their programmes. It would in fact be difficult to produce them with any precision because of changing circumstances of their programmes. But from conversations with General Managers, from annual reports and other material, it seems that New Towns with housing programmes of between 800/1000 dwellings a year — coupled with the rest of New Town development — need an administrative, professional, technical and clerical staff of about 300. Of these, about one third are in the architect/planning department and one third in the engineering department.

The Northampton programme will call for 3,000 houses a year over a long period, as well, of course, as the town centre development and other facilities. Extrapolation of the figures for the other New Towns to the situation of Northampton is complicated by the newly proposed 50/50 split between rented and owner-occupied housing. Taking the suggested rate of one third of the private housing being built by the Corporation, suggests that the effective programme would be about 2,000 houses a year. But the Development Corporation will be responsible for many other facilities and will in any event have to devote a good deal of attention to the general aspects of the private developer.

All things considered, it seems likely that, ultimately, the total administrative, professional, technical and clerical staff involved between the Development Corporation, the County Borough and private practice or consultants, is likely to be between 800 and 900.

The Borough Architect and Engineer have between them, a staff of about 140 at the present time, so that whatever the relationship between the Development Corporation and the County Borough's technical staff, there must be a very considerable growth of professional and technical staff in the town end substantial use of other agencies.

**Proposed Departments**

In the light of the foregoing, the following structure is proposed.

(i) **Chief Finance Officer**

This post has been advertised and the final candidates will
be interviewed at the meeting. Agreement has been reached with the City Treasurer that he will handle the clerical and computer work, but the Chief Finance Officer will obviously require some sort of support staff to fulfill his functions and to act as the Development Corporation's Accountant.

(ii) Administration

At the moment, with little or no staff, the administration work is being carried on by the Corporation's secretary, Mr. A.R. Wardle, and there is no reason for the time being, to disturb this position. But in the longer term, I have in mind that we should have an administrative Chief Officer with a legal background who can provide the necessary advice to the Development Corporation whilst we rely substantially for legal work on the County Borough.

(iii) Chief Estates Officer

This post has also been advertised and the final candidates are to be interviewed at the meeting.

It has been suggested that the Development Corporation may undertake the estates work for the County Borough also.

(iv) Architect/Planning

The field of architecture and planning is undoubtedly one on which the Development Corporation needs direct advice. At the same time this is an area in which, within the framework of the Master Plan, variety of approach as represented by different architectural terms, is most desirable. It seems to me, therefore, that we should regard the Borough Architect as our agent, but not our sole agent. At the same time, it is very desirable that the Development Corporation should plan to use to the greatest extent possible, any available resources in the Architect's department of the County Borough.

However, if the Development Corporation is to obtain independent advice, it must have a competent and effective Chief Architect. A top quality man is unlikely to be recruited unless he can also be involved in design work.

I would propose, therefore, that we should recruit a Chief Architect/Planner as soon as possible, so that he can familiarise himself with the philosophy of the Master Plan, and play an equal part in its final formulation. We should recognise that he would wish to build up at least a limited staff and that we should use the Borough Architect as one of our agents to the extent that he has facilities available at any stage. We shall certainly want to employ other practices for some of our work, as do most of the Development Corporations.

(v) There is less need for a variety of design approach in engineering than in architecture, and more validity in considering that the Borough Engineer might be our sole agent. Nevertheless the Borough Engineer's department is, like the Architect's, small in relation to demand. There is also the need for the Development Corporation to have independent advice.
It seems premature to make a final decision in this matter, since we have access to advice from the Highways Engineers, Jamieson and Hackney, at this stage, it might be sufficient for the time being to retain them as consultants on road work and use the Borough Engineer as our main agent until it becomes clear how far our demands can be met.

(vi) I have some doubt about whether social development should be a Chief Officer function, and it might be appropriate to regard it as one of the functions to be carried out by one of the personal assistants to me — the others being project co-ordination and public relations. I wish to give further thought also to the relation between the social department and housing management because discussions with other General Managers have led me to the view that making housing management part of the Estates department, as it usually is, may not be the most satisfactory solution.

(vii) Project Co-ordination and Programming

I regard project co-ordination as a key function both now and throughout the programme. It does not need an appointment at Chief Officer level, and I would intend to regard it as a job for one of my personal assistants. I have accepted the offer of the NBA to carry out an initial analysis of the Weston Favela development as a preliminary to a possible limited contract with them to prepare a master programme. The NBA does not want to be regarded as continuing consultants, but aims to help organisations to set up their own project co-ordination activities. I would therefore propose to appoint as a personal assistant, at Grade 7 or 8, an officer to work on project co-ordination. He should be appointed as soon as possible, because he could then work with the NBA during the interim period and take over from them within a few months.

(viii) An operation on the scale of the Northampton expansion, coupled with the complexities arising from a large population, put public relations in the forefront of my concern. It seems to me that we shall, from now on, have a growing involvement with the press, with the public, with providing exhibitions, organising talks with residents, publications and so on. Again, I think it is imperative to proceed to recruit a suitable officer, again in Grade 7 or 8 as one of my personal assistants as soon as possible.

RECOMMENDATION

In the light of the foregoing, it is proposed that steps should be taken immediately to recruit the following officers:

1. Chief Architect/Planner
2. Two assistants to the General Manager, one to concentrate on the project co-ordination, and the other on public relations.

J. WESTON

6. 3. 69.
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RELATIONS WITH THE BOROUGH COUNCIL: PAPER TO THE
BOARD OF NORTHAMPTON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION JULY 1969.
1. Introduction. The partnership between the Development Corporation and the County Borough is fundamental to the expansion of Northampton and its importance and inherent problems have been recognised from an early stage. In 1966 the Ministry of Housing produced a broad outline of its thinking about sharing the staff between the two bodies. At that stage it was recognised that no firm arrangements could be made before the Corporation was effectively in action. The document concerned was circulated with the papers for the second meeting of the Development Corporation.

2. Principles. Certain matters have already been decided by the Corporation, either specifically or by implication through the appointment of Chief Officers. The general principles were discussed in a paper to the fourth meeting of the Development Corporation. As recruiting is going ahead and with the demands of the programme decisions are now essential. The aim of this paper is to review the present position as a basis for an approach to the County Borough with proposals.

3. Finance. The Chief Finance Officer has been appointed by the Development Corporation, to be responsible for general advice on financial policy and for the development of financial control. It is suggested that the County Borough should be asked to provide routine accounting and the use of their computer at an agreed charge.

4. Architect/Planner. The Chief Architect/Planner is being appointed by the Development Corporation. He will be responsible for the development of designs in the new areas. In order to maintain a balanced programme, he may need, from time to time, to ask for the help of the Architect's department of the County Borough on an ad hoc basis. It is expected that the Chief Architect of the County Borough will be largely pre-occupied with work on the redevelopment of the central area. Our Chief Architect/Planner will also be responsible for advising us on planning matters in the new areas. It appears that the Ministry will expect the County Borough to be the planning authority. Since our development takes place within the County Borough as it expands, we can naturally expect to be consulted about any proposals in areas recently taken into the County Borough. This consultation is likely to be achieved by the Ministry issuing a "Direction" to both the County Borough and the County Council to consult us on any developments in the area within the designated area but outside the 1968 County Borough boundary. It will also be necessary for the County Borough to consult the Development Corporation on major planning proposals with the Borough, where these may have a material effect on the overall programme for the expansion, and may carry implications for our work in the new areas. These may be left to less formal arrangements and be handled by the technical committee which has been set up between the planners for the County Borough, the County Council and the Development Corporation.
5. Estates. The Chief Estates Officer has been appointed and it seems desirable that he should act also as the agent for the County Borough. This was envisaged in the original Ministry suggestions. The fee for this service will have to be negotiated.

6. Engineering. Who should undertake the Civil Engineering work was left unresolved in the paper to the fourth meeting of the Corporation. Further discussions have made it clear that for the Development Corporation to set up its own Engineering Department would present recruiting difficulties. The "interesting" engineering work like the new sewage plant, the main outfall, the principal roads and so on, falls automatically to the Borough Engineer. This leaves the Development Corporation with estate roads and sewers which provide an inadequate base for building an effective department. It seems desirable, therefore, that the Development Corporation should look to the County Borough for its engineering work.

At the same time, it seems undesirable that the Borough Engineer should be regarded as the Chief Engineer to the Development Corporation. A more workable formula would seem to be to ask the County Borough to provide us with a service in Engineering Design and Construction on an agreed fee basis. This would leave it open to them to decide the extent to which the work was undertaken directly by the Borough Engineer or sub-contracted by him to outside agencies.

While engineering is an important element of the programme of work, it is not, in a policy sense, central to the concern of the Development Corporation, and this arrangement would appear to make for efficiency in joint working, but leave sufficient control to the Corporation. It has the further merit, that if for any reason, the situation does not develop as it is hoped, it will be relatively easy to put alternative arrangements in hand.

7. Legal. When the replacement for Mr. Wardle, who acts as the Development Corporation's Secretary is recruited, it is hoped that we shall acquire someone with sufficient legal background to provide advice on such matters, but that the County Borough should be asked to make provision to give routine legal service on a few basis.

8. Programme co-ordination. It is obviously necessary for the major departments both of the County Borough and the Development Corporation should programme their own activities. But they are all part of a single overall activity leading to the expansion of Northampton. It seems clear that the Development Corporation, having taken steps to recruit a programme co-ordinator should act in this way for the whole of the programme, including the central area redevelopment. This should be a service with the Development Corporation might undertake without charge on the County Borough.

9. Social Development and Housing Management. In the original expression of view by the Ministry of Housing, Social Development was seen as an activity which the Development Corporation might undertake and Housing Management, which might be undertaken by the County Borough for the Development Corporation. This stage is too early to determine on these issues, particularly Housing Management, which raised many other problems. It is suggested, therefore, these activities should be left out of current discussion.
10. **Recommended.** That the General Manager should discuss with the County Borough, the division of work outlined in paragraphs 3 – 8 above, and subject to their agreement, negotiate appropriate financial arrangements.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The new towns of post-war Britain have been among the most effective developments of their kind anywhere in the world. They have successfully pioneered, in the public interest, the positive approach to planning, land assembly and development which the Government has recently announced its intention of introducing on a national scale (in Cmd 5730: "Land"). They have given a new way of life to thousands who had previously lived in overcrowded city areas, and have become thriving communities. Strong local loyalties have been established amongst those who have moved there. They have been highly attractive to industrial and commercial developers and have provided an environment that is praised not only in this country but by a continuous flow of visitors from abroad.

1.2 Nevertheless conditions change, new ideas are developed, and new pressures arise. Now, therefore, a generation after the first new towns were started, the Government has thought it right to take a fresh look at the principles on which the new towns were based.

1.3 Credit for the considerable achievement to date must of course be given to the development corporations, the Commission for the New Towns, and all who have worked with them. The proposals in this consultation paper are designed to enable those bodies, and the communities they have helped to create, to build on past success.

1.4 The new town situation in Scotland is in a number of ways different from that in England and Wales. This paper therefore relates only to England (where the Secretary of State for the Environment is responsible) and Wales (where responsibility lies with the Secretary of State for Wales). Part 2 discusses what has been achieved so far; Part 3 highlights those areas where some rethinking seems to be called for; and Part 4 sets out the Government's ideas on what needs to be done.

1.5 Comments on this paper are being sought specifically from the New Towns Association; from the Association of County Councils, the Association of Metropolitan Authorities, the Association of District Councils, the Greater London Council, and the London Boroughs Association; and from the Welsh Counties Committee and the Council for the Principality. Other organisations or individuals wishing to comment should do so in writing by the end of February 1975, addressing their letters to

The Secretary
Department of the Environment
Room 458
Caxton House
Tothill Street
LONDON SW1H 9LZ

The Secretary
The Welsh Office
Summit House
Windsor Place
CARDIFF CF1 3BX

2.0 THE ACHIEVEMENT

2.1 Since 1946, new homes for more than 700,000 people have been provided in the new towns of England and Wales; over 200,000 houses and flats have been built or are being built there; and besides those firms which have expanded there, over 1,800 more firms have moved into the new towns, bringing with them over 160,000 jobs (see Appendix 1 for more details). The new towns have in the main drawn their people from the most congested of our cities, and provided a real improvement in the lives of many thousands of ordinary people. Moreover, they have also embodied a good deal of ingenuity on the part of those called upon to solve the inevitable problems of urban design.
living conditions in order to arrest rural depopulation.

2.8 During the last ten years, new towns (notably Washington, Warrington and Central Lancashire New Town) have also been designated to act as spearheads in the revitalisation of a region. The original ring of new towns around London was part of a policy for dealing with the London region, but the designation of Washington marked a new departure in that the New Towns Acts were being used for the first time deliberately to promote regional renewal as well as to cater for spontaneous growth.

New Towns of Different Sizes

2.9 Besides allowing new towns to be built for a number of different purposes, the key provisions of the New Towns Act 1946 (re-enacted in the New Towns Act 1965) have allowed both large and small towns to be built — and on a variety of sites: some of them already fairly fully developed.

2.10 With the earlier new towns, a population of about 60,000 was generally the limit. Over the years, however, a number of much larger new towns have been started, and a number of “first generation” new towns have been expanded.

2.11 The larger the new town, the longer the development time-scale. The first new towns were expected to be substantially complete within quite a short time; but towns like Milton Keynes and Central Lancashire New Town are not expected to be complete before the end of the century. Given the lengthening of the new town development time-scale, it is most important for the relationship between development corporations and local authorities to be close and harmonious.

The “Partnership” Concept

2.12 In recent years, areas including the old towns of Northampton, Peterborough, and Warrington have been designated for new town development. Such sites offer a bonus over predominantly “green field” sites in that they do not involve starting entirely from scratch (which can be difficult, especially at times when industrial expansion is slow and industries willing and able to set up in a new town are in short supply). Such figures as there are about the relative costs of new town development on predominantly green field sites and new town development based on sizeable existing towns do not prove that one method is cheaper than the other. But if one starts with an existing town, one can take advantage of the sound social capital that already exists; parts of the old town that are worn out can be renewed, at the same time as new areas are being developed; and, as experience has shown, there can be significant new working relationships between the development corporations and the local authorities.

2.13 Local authorities have always had a part to play in new town development, but individual new town local authorities and development corporations have not found it invariably easy to work in harness together. In three of the new towns based on large existing communities, specific “partnership” arrangements between local authorities and development corporations have been concluded — extending in the case of Northampton to joint working by staff shared between the development corporation and the borough council. For the fruitful initial move Richard Crossman was largely responsible. But where appropriate, the partnership principle could be applied to other new towns as well.
The Development Corporations

3.6 The development corporations for their part are entitled to a fair deal in their relationship with central as well as with local Government. It may be that too much central control is exercised over the detail of corporations' activities at the moment. A number of measures were taken to relax the extent of detailed central Government control over development corporations as recently as 1971, but the Government will be considering further possibilities with the New Towns Association.

The Development Phase

(i) Planning

3.7 The new local authorities will be planning for the generality of development required in England and Wales, through the machinery of structure plans and local plans. But there may well be further special cases where the need for development does not arise locally and where the national interest will be best served by setting up under the New Towns Act a single-minded development corporation both to plan and to promote the development. This is a possibility which the Government would wish to leave open - but with a careful eye for its effect on job distribution, both inside and outside the assisted areas, and for the need to conserve high quality agricultural land as far as possible: from this point of view, the more development that can suitably be sited off good agricultural land and, for example, on reclaimed or "infill" land, the better.

3.8 In Wales, the Government's intention to strengthen the statutory machinery for developing rural Wales will be a relevant consideration.

3.9 The new towns have been a testing ground for much that is good in new town design today. There should be continued innovation both in the interests of new town development itself and in the interests of development elsewhere, in the planning of which local authorities will, under the Government's land proposals, play an increasingly positive role. The possibility of accommodating considerable population growth in clusters of new villages or small new towns within reasonable travel-to-work distance of each other seems to be a possibility worth investigating further; and other new types of layout may spring from a growing appreciation of the best ways of conserving energy and land. The future role of public transport will affect the basic design of new towns and growth areas.

3.10 Whatever the form they have taken in the past and wherever their location, new towns have shown a tendency to grow beyond the size originally envisaged; flexibility to accommodate further growth is therefore important. Those engaged in the preparation of structure plans will no doubt consider how far to allow for or encourage the dynamic expansion of new town communities or sub-regions including new towns.

3.11 Structure planning will also have an impact on new town master planning. The separate identities of development corporations and local planning authorities, which reflect their different statutory responsibilities, will be preserved. But if both structure planning and new town master planning are to be successful, a high degree of harmonious collaboration between the authorities is essential.

(ii) Housing

3.12 It would be a mistake if the new towns did not make some provision for people who want to own their own homes. It would be an even greater mistake if the new towns did not provide for those people whose only hope of a decent home is a house or flat for rent.

3.13 In the early days of the new towns, nearly all the new housing was built for rent. The
Commercial and Industrial Development

Since 1970, there has been a tendency to relax the earlier general rule that, with the sole exception of land disposed of for private sector housing, new town land should be disposed of leasehold. But if commercial or industrial land and buildings are disposed of freehold, the community cannot fully share in the long-term increase in their value. The community at large should benefit financially from private sector development which depends partly upon communal activity for the profits that it earns. It follows that leaseholds should be the rule.

The Commission for the New Towns

Since the passing of the 1946 Act, there has been only one really significant change in new town legislation. This was the setting up of the Commission for the New Towns — the prime object of the Conservative Government's New Towns Act of 1959. This provided that the Government-appointed Commission should take over the assets of development corporations in England and Wales — at least for the time being — as development came to a close and corporations were wound up. At present, the Commission is administering the former development corporation assets of four towns.

The Commission for the New Towns has done a good job within the terms of reference given to it. But its role should now change. Bearing in mind that a number of development corporations now have a life expectation far beyond that envisaged in 1959, there seems everything to be said for accelerating the transfer of the ownership and management of certain new town assets — particularly, but not exclusively, rented housing — to the elected local authorities. In this respect, the "Commission phase" may in the case of a number of towns prove unnecessary. In others it should be kept as short as possible. The Commission could then concentrate on the management of industrial and commercial property, and on using its considerable management and financial expertise on a specialised basis for the good of the whole new town programme. It is for consideration whether it might also use its expertise outside the new town context: eg by assisting local authorities in the management of their industrial and commercial property, perhaps on an agency basis. New tasks could well bring with them a need for a new mixture of expertise on the Commission itself: eg from the field of local government as well as from the field of finance and property management.

PROPOSED ACTION

The action the Government proposes is as follows.

Rights and Relationships

The sharing of the benefits derived from new town development should be a function of the support which the various parties involved have given the project (see paragraph 3.5 above). Development corporations and their respective local authorities will be encouraged to examine the scope for entering into partnership agreements akin to those mentioned in paragraph 2.13 above, where these do not exist already. Such agreements will obviously vary from town to town, and it is not possible to lay down a rigid framework. But local authorities could formally avow their support for the new town project; more local authority members could be appointed as members of development corporation boards; and there could be joint planning of land assembly and new town development by local authority/development corporation boards.

1 Cawley, Hatfield, Hemel Hempstead and Welwyn Garden City.
and to taking a proportion of individuals and families whose heads, perhaps because they are in special circumstances — eg single parents or disabled, do not need a job in the town to which they would like to move. The new towns must provide more direct help for people in such particular housing need.

4.8 The Government proposes to relax the rule that for a family to be housed in one of the development corporation’s rented houses, the breadwinner must work within the designated area of the town. There is already a measure of commuting to and from new towns. This must not, however, be carried too far. The idea is to establish a happy medium between the new towns becoming mere dormitories and new town designated area boundaries acting as an iron curtain. The Government will seek to retain a suitable balance between jobs and living accommodation within the journey to work area.

4.9 Development corporations will also be invited to make due provision for “second generation” families in their towns and for the parents of “first generation” families, though this will, of course, reduce somewhat the number of first generation people they can take from the cities in the long term. The housing “mix” must include provision for single people and for those who take jobs of a casual nature.

4.10 The changes outlined in paragraphs 4.7–4.9 above will, of course, marginally reduce the priority that can be given to other categories of people (see paragraph 3.18 above), but they are necessary in the interests of social balance.

4.11 In any case, a substantial rented housing programme will continue to be required. New town development corporations will also continue to make available houses built for sale: Cmd 5730 ("Land") makes it clear that corporations will continue to be responsible for making land in new town designated areas available for private development. Some corporations are keen to build houses for sale themselves because it offers them the chance of incorporating special design features and of filling any gaps in the range of housing for sale provided by private enterprise. It is right that this should be allowed where corporations consider it to be in the local interest and as public funds permit, though private sector speculative house-builders will still be encouraged to play the major role in the provision of new housing for sale in the new towns. From now on, development corporations providing land for speculative house-building will, however, be encouraged to offer it on licence, with the plots being conveyed direct to the house purchasers. Plots for owner-occupation will also be made available freehold.

4.12 It is important that the production of housing in the new towns in the immediate future should not be curbed simply for the sake of maintaining at all stages that balance between housing for rent and housing for sale which may seem most desirable in the long run. In drawing up their immediate housing programmes, development corporations will therefore be asked, for the time being, to give special emphasis to the current strong demand for housing for rent. They should also, however, give particular consideration to the demand for low-priced housing for owner-occupation. In addition, encouragement will be given to the building of houses by housing associations; and by co-operative or co-ownership groups, which give tenants a chance to share in the management and ownership of their homes.

4.13 For the time being also, there will be no further sales, without prior approval, of development corporation or Commission housing built originally for rent — except where an undoubted commitment already exists. Approval will only be given where there are exceptional circumstances requiring different treatment for a particular new town or for particular properties.

(iii) Industrial and Commercial Development

4.14 An important consideration in the industrial and commercial field is to ensure that the right proportion of benefits that may accrue over the years is shared by the community. In
The record of achievement of the new towns in England and Wales is something to be proud of. It is not going to be easy to emulate, let alone surpass, it in the future. The proposals in this consultation paper, many of which complement the proposals in Cmd 5730 ("Land"), have as their main purpose the need to promote and encourage continuing initiative, imaginative effort, and substantive achievement in the development of new towns by adapting policy and administration to the changing needs and challenges of the present and the foreseeable future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Town</th>
<th>Date of designation as New Town</th>
<th>Population At designation</th>
<th>Population Present estimate</th>
<th>New houses and flats Completed</th>
<th>New houses and flats Under construction</th>
<th>New schools No. completed</th>
<th>No. of children provided for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENAGE</td>
<td>11.11.46</td>
<td>7 000</td>
<td>74 000</td>
<td>19 951</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22 552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAWLEY*</td>
<td>9.1.47</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>71 000</td>
<td>15 591</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20 960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMEL HEMPSTEAD*</td>
<td>4.2.47</td>
<td>21 000</td>
<td>73 000</td>
<td>14 224</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18 775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARLOW</td>
<td>25.3.47</td>
<td>4 500</td>
<td>81 000</td>
<td>22 316</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYCLIFFE</td>
<td>19.4.47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24 062</td>
<td>6 900</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETERLEE</td>
<td>10.3.48</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25 650</td>
<td>7 359</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HATFIELD*</td>
<td>20.5.48</td>
<td>8 500</td>
<td>25 000</td>
<td>4 516</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.L.E.Wwyn Garden City*</td>
<td>20.5.48</td>
<td>13 500</td>
<td>46 000</td>
<td>6 648</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASILDON</td>
<td>4.1.49</td>
<td>25 000</td>
<td>23 700</td>
<td>20 608</td>
<td>1 221</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19 570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRACKNELL</td>
<td>17.6.49</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>39 950</td>
<td>10 766</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7 950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORBY</td>
<td>1.4.50</td>
<td>15 700</td>
<td>51 140</td>
<td>8 641</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16 926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKELMERSDALE</td>
<td>9.10.61</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>37 700</td>
<td>7 604</td>
<td>1 227</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10 090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDDITCH</td>
<td>10.4.64</td>
<td>32 000</td>
<td>45 000</td>
<td>5 266</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6 020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUNCORN</td>
<td>10.4.64</td>
<td>28 500</td>
<td>44 803</td>
<td>6 352</td>
<td>1 631</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4 740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>24.7.64</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>35 000</td>
<td>5 941</td>
<td>2 023</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILTON KEYNES</td>
<td>23.1.67</td>
<td>40 000</td>
<td>61 000</td>
<td>3 302</td>
<td>2 861</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7 620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETERBOROUGH</td>
<td>21.7.67</td>
<td>80 500</td>
<td>94 400</td>
<td>2 207</td>
<td>1 555</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHAMPTON</td>
<td>14.2.68</td>
<td>131 000</td>
<td>138 000</td>
<td>3 183</td>
<td>1 500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARRINGTON</td>
<td>26.4.68</td>
<td>124 000</td>
<td>132 000</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELFORD</td>
<td>13.12.68</td>
<td>70 000</td>
<td>92 500</td>
<td>6 099</td>
<td>1 081</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL LANCASHIRE</td>
<td>26.3.70</td>
<td>234 500</td>
<td>240 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for England</td>
<td></td>
<td>885 960</td>
<td>1 509 405</td>
<td>178 378</td>
<td>17 573</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>210 399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWMBRAN</td>
<td>4.11.49</td>
<td>12 000</td>
<td>43 200</td>
<td>8 730</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWTOWN</td>
<td>18.12.67</td>
<td>5 500</td>
<td>6 500</td>
<td>4 98</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 500</td>
<td>49 700</td>
<td>9 228</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12 505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Commission for the New Towns

* Transferred to Commission for the New Towns
APPENDIX V

LETTER FROM LORD CAMPBELL OF ESKAN TO JOHN SILKIN,
MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT
FEB. 1975
17th February, 1975

The Rt. Hon. John Silkin, M.P.,
Minister for Planning and Local Government,
Department of the Environment,
2, Marsham Street,
London, S.W.1.

Dear Minister,

I enclose Wyndham Thomas' magnum opus - embodying the response of New Town Chairmen to your consultation document - "New Towns in England and Wales". We all, including Wyndham, apologise for the length of this but there is so much meat in the consultation document that it demanded not only a considered but a wide-ranging reaction. Moreover Wyndham has tried to embody the variegated views of Chairmen with diverse responsibilities. Consequently I have been asked to write a shorter covering letter to you making one or two central points.

The first is that we all warmly welcome both the technique of issuing a consultation document, and your reaffirmation of your faith in the past and future achievements of New Towns.

Secondly, we all recognise and accept the imperative need - not to mention the commonsense - of forging the most constructive possible working relationships between Development Corporations and Local Government. I am sure that this now dominates the policy and thinking of every New Town Corporation; and it would be wrong to underestimate how much has been done to improve these relationships in recent years. Of course there can be, and are, widely differing views about the relative merits and capabilities of elected authorities and nominated agencies; about the quality of staff that each can attract; about the advantages and disadvantages of Central Government control; and about the extent to which the policy of Central Government in fields such as housing and social services can be best fulfilled by the one or the other; and about the merits and demerits of "partnership New Towns" as such.

But whatever their individual views on these subjects, the main concern of all Chairmen and Development Corporations must be the efficient fulfilment of the strategic and tactical objectives set them by the Minister. In this context what I think worries us all is the danger that, with the best will in the world, we shall fall between two stools. Divided
The Rt. Hon. John Silkin, M.P.  
17th February, 1975

politically difficult and socially undesirable, to erode the quality of services by further over-stretching those that exist. But where, as in the case of a New Town - especially a "green fields" New Town or a New Town where the proportion of development to existing population is very considerable - there are to all intents and purposes no services to be stretched or eroded.

This leaves the Local Authority with the real and obvious difficulty that they are bound to incur hostility among the whole of their present population if they spend a disproportionate amount of money on providing adequate new services for new growth. "Why should the whole of the rest of a county have to accept erosion of services while a New Town is provided with new and adequate services?". And it is impossible to see an acceptable answer to this from the County Council or Local Authority point of view. For the New Town Development Corporation on the other hand to go on building houses regardless of the inadequacy or at times non-existence of social services is utterly irresponsible. It is very noticeable that areas of New Town activity which are causing the most problems, and which are suffering most at present, are those for which Corporations are not directly responsible to you.

My fellow Chairmen and I urge you to consider making special grants to Development Corporations to enable them to pay Local and Health Authorities for services essential to the building of houses for New Towns. This would enable the Authorities to make some sort of peace with rate payers, electors and existing populations; and it would enable Central Government to maintain stringency in Local Government expenditure while not cutting back new housing growth.

I have written frankly because I am sure you want the frank opinion of New Town Chairmen. But we all know that you are the Minister and that you will exercise your political judgment in reaching a decision. It goes without saying that there is not one of us who will not do everything that within us lies to make your decision work.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the Secretary of State for Wales.

Campbell of Eskan
APPENDIX VI

NEW TOWNS IN ENGLAND AND WALES:

"NEW TOWNS IN ENGLAND AND WALES"

The response of the New Towns' Chairmen's Conference to the consultation document prepared by the Minister for Planning and Local Government and the Secretary of State for Wales

1. INTRODUCTION AND THE ACHIEVEMENT

1.1 We welcome the action of the Minister and the Secretary of State in initiating discussion of the several important aspects of new towns policy and machinery covered by the consultation document. Open debate leading to changes which sustain the dynamic of the new towns programme is bound to be beneficial. And periodic reviews of this kind are likely to be more fruitful than the sometimes haphazard changes in objectives and methods which have been imposed in the past.

1.2 We are particularly encouraged by the ministers' clear endorsement of the new towns achievement, and of the method of that achievement. The New Towns Act of 1946 was a model of legislation in the way that it marshalled the powers, the machinery, the procedures and the financial basis for the building of new towns. The development corporation, consistently pursuing the objectives given to it by the responsible minister, has proved itself one of the most effective instruments of public purpose yet devised to deal with the complex urban and regional problems of the western democracies. And we emphasise this at the outset: that development corporations (and the Commission) operate wholly within the democratic framework. They are appointed by and are accountable to a minister who in turn is answerable in Parliament for all and any of a corporation's actions. It is one of the great strengths of Britain's new towns movement that each post-war government has reviewed afresh the principle of using a centrally-appointed agency to build new towns, and has re-affirmed its aptness.

1.3 We do not believe that the intention is to propose changes which would derogate from the principle. Instead the consultation document conveys the wish of ministers to remove the one possibility of criticism of it by promoting even closer cooperation between the authorities principally involved in building the new towns - the development corporations set up for this purpose, and the local authorities of the areas concerned. We support this. Our main objectives in commenting on the consultation document, therefore, are to help secure the speedy completion to the best attainable standards of the present new towns, and to ensure that their development and administration proceeds with the active support of all the participating agencies and of their citizens.

1.4 This response follows the layout of the consultation document except that we combine, under the appropriate section headings, our comments on the discussion of "changes needed" and on the "proposed action".
2.5 Even so, membership of a development corporation places individual councillors in an invidious position. Conflicts of interest can arise between the authorities even when policy and working relations are good - possibly, for instance, over the speed of a new town's growth and therefore of the demand for new local authority services. A councillor can be inhibited in discussions in either forum or in both; or if he (or she) speaks out in favour of one view, criticism for partisanship or even disloyalty may follow. Similarly, people in an area which a councillor-member represents on the council may press for his public commitment to their opposition to a corporation's plans or activities. If it is not given, his electoral support could be prejudiced. Such dilemmas are always in the background, and it needs exceptional personal qualities - sound judgment, tact, and an objective sense of responsibility among them - if the difficulties that inevitably occur are to be handled well.

2.6 In appointing members of corporations, ministers have generally sought people with qualities of this kind as well as good relevant experience. Indeed many would argue that the breadth and variety of experience of members has been one of the great strengths of development corporations. Ministers have always made it clear, too, that all corporation members serve in their own right, not as representatives, much less as delegates, of any other body to which they might belong. While understanding ministers' wishes to appoint more councillors to corporations, we urge that personal qualities, breadth of experience and the independence of corporation chairmen and members as such, be given the same weight as in the past.

2.7 Thirdly, we urge that each corporation and its district and county council be allowed to work out for themselves the best local arrangements for closer cooperation. They will all be aware of achievements elsewhere and of ministers' wishes in this respect. And over recent years a great deal has been done to anticipate these wishes. But individual councils and corporations will know local needs and circumstances best, and therefore be best placed to produce practical proposals. The councils in particular will appreciate the extent to which the strong distinctions between corporation and council - in structure, methods and objectives - should be blurred or accentuated. In some localities the district council, for instance, may prefer quietly to build easy working relationships while retaining a clear detachment in respect of transiently unpopular things a corporation may have to do. The effectiveness of each of these very different bodies, and of both in combination, could be considerably reduced by the imposition of a structural integration that neither particularly may want.
to launch further projects, but the paradox is that the very nature of the crisis gives a new validity to the concept of reasonably self-sufficient towns or cities, carefully designed to secure efficiency, reliability and flexibility in the use of all its services and resources, making it better able to cope with the dislocations that could arise.

County structure plans

2.12 Most development corporations have discussed the relationship of structure plans and new town master plans with their county councils. In most cases no significant problems seem likely to arise. The incorporation of a new town and its main structural features in a county structure plan could be the occasion for the county council's re-endorsement of the new town's objectives within the larger planning framework and as contributing positively to it.

A new approach to housing layouts

2.13 On one aspect of local planning, we believe that considerable benefits could flow from changes in the regulations which govern street design and construction. These standards impose high financial costs on all developers, including the local authorities themselves as house-builders. They also inhibit good design and the most economical uses of land. At national level and in each locality, corporations would welcome the opportunity to experiment and to work out new standards. We are confident that significant gains can be made without increasing the authorities' maintenance costs or the risk of accidents.

The Government's land policies

2.14 Generally, development corporations acquire the land needed for all new town purposes; and on the basis of a nationally agreed formula transfer to the local authorities the land they need for their services. This arrangement works well. Where it does not fully apply it could readily do so, including to the acquisition of built-up land wanted by the district council for redevelopment or rehabilitation schemes. The corporation's experienced staff, and possibly its powers and its funds, would then be used in support of the council's own resources. The corporation's services in this respect could, if county and district councils so wished, be available to help with land acquisition in the rest of the county as well, in implementation of the Government's policy for the public ownership of development land.

Housing balance

2.15 The concept of balance is of paramount importance to a new town's objectives and programme. The town should attract a cross-section of income or social groups that closely matches the pattern in the country as a whole. This requires the building of such variety
immigration. We accept also that they should look for ways of giving more help for particular categories of need - such as single-parent families. The corporations are ready to allocate more homes for this purpose and to discuss arrangements with the city authorities. It will be important, however, for a new town district and county council to endorse this policy because the provision of welfare services for these new households must, as things now stand, fall mainly on them.

Local housing needs

2.20 In all new towns it is important that housing needs arising from the established population be seen as a charge on the total building programme and not left solely to the local authority. In the earlier new towns, local needs are in the main "second generation" needs, and effective arrangements for housing these newly-formed families have been or are being jointly worked out. In later new towns the "old town" base was often much larger, and it has not always been easy to reconcile the different responsibilities of the development corporation and the district council.

2.21 There is a genuine dilemma. When jobs are being filled by a new firm they must first be offered in the locality. Similarly, it may be that one of the first objectives of the corporation and district council together should be to satisfy all local housing needs (including, later, the "second generation" need). But this could not easily and quickly be done without prejudice to the basic objective, which is to attract new enterprises and to promote the growth of established ones by providing homes for their staff. This is another case where collaboration between local authorities and development corporations must find the right balance between local and national interest, and between present and future needs.

Housing objectives

2.22 All this emphasises the need for each town's housing objectives to be clearly set out at the beginning of a corporation's life, and reviewed periodically by the Department/Ministry and the corporation, after consultation with the district council. This would give clarity to the objectives and secure continuity of policy over a period for which housing needs and supply can be assessed with fair accuracy.

2.23 This approach would also acknowledge the fact that each new town is different. For towns near the end of their programmes, for instance, the use of the remaining housing land as between housing for rent or for sale or for housing associations may have to be finely determined. But in most the opportunity exists to gear up all programmes. In some areas private developers will build on leasehold terms; in others they readily agree to pay for a licence to build with the plots being
2.27 On leasing terms generally, it will always be necessary for corporations and the Commission to be able to negotiate competitively if the new firms and institutional funds are to be attracted to the new town. The consultation document clearly states ministers' general objectives while allowing reasonable freedom to corporations and the Commission to negotiate the best terms obtainable. We welcome this.

The Commission for the New Towns

2.28 We welcome the proposals in the consultation document that use may be made of the experience and expertise of the Commission in its management of commercial and industrial assets and the financial arrangements consequent upon that; in particular that it might be used to facilitate financing in the newer new towns and possibly outside the new town movement. The working out of such a role in detail may well involve a little time but it would appear to be important for the lines of it to be made clear as soon as possible so that the legislation which would be likely to be required is not delayed. The present surplus of the Commission is about to be paid to the Government and it may well be that in working out the new role of the Commission an amendment to the present law in that regard may be necessary.

3. STAFF

3.1 We agree that new towns' staff should be consulted about possible arrangements for the transfer of assets and of the staff concerned. We hope that they will be given good notice and full information about the arrangements in mind, and that new towns staff as such be given full opportunity to put their own views directly to the Government.

3.2 We would also welcome the recognition, so admirably expressed in the companion consultation document for Scotland, that development corporations' staffs represent a valuable asset in their combination of training, experience and skills. This asset should not be dispersed as that document says, "as each new town ends its development phase".

4. CONCLUSION

We share the ministers' pride in the new towns achievement; and we acknowledge that it is right to consolidate that achievement by strengthening the means for bringing all the present new towns to successful completion. For this the simple need is to establish common cause between development corporations and their county and district councils without weakening the essential nexus between development corporations, the national interest and central
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COST OF TOWN EXPANSION - 1972/73 and 1973/74

LETTER FROM L. SALT TO B. BEAN. 12 DEC. 1972.
TEXT BOUND INTO

THE SPINE
## Costs of Town Expansion, 1972/73 and 1973/74

### Committee and Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee and Service</th>
<th>1972/73</th>
<th>1973/74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Net Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allotments Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Schools</td>
<td>53,950</td>
<td>132,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Schools</td>
<td>38,180</td>
<td>133,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Schools</td>
<td>73,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Schools</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further Education</td>
<td>87,010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Education costs, excluding Administration and Inspection</td>
<td>27,640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Inspection</td>
<td>18,630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>130,550</td>
<td>494,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estate, Parks and Cemeteries Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Open Spaces and Sub Depots</td>
<td>28,480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire, Civil Defence and Ambulance Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Brigade and Civil Defence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance Service</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>5,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance and General Purposes Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coroner, Magistrates Courts Committee, Probation, Registration Births, Marriages and Deaths, Registration of Electors, Concessionary fares, Archives</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>8,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Health Authority Services</td>
<td>8,030</td>
<td>11,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health, Licensing, Weights and Measures, Other Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads: maintenance, repairs, patching etc.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trees and verges maintenance</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>8,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal roads construction</td>
<td>96,460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lighting</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>125,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Markets and Town Hall Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Control Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Control Functions</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>4,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Libraries and Museums Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries - Mobile Library Service</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above table summarizes the estimated net expenditure for various committees and services in the County Borough of Northampton for the years 1972/73 and 1973/74.
**Committee and Service**

### Public Services Committee
- Street sweeping, gully cleansing, sewage pumping station, refuse collection, refuse disposal
  - 1972/73: £9,590
  - 1973/74: £22,090

### Social Services Committee
- Children's Homes
  - 1972/73: £40
  - 1973/74: £5,610
- Nursery
  - 1972/73: £60
  - 1973/74: £3,250
- Other Child Care Services, Prevention of illness, care and after care of the mentally disordered, services for the handicapped, residential accommodation for aged, infirm, etc. services for the elderly, and other Social Services Committee functions
  - 1972/73: £10,940
  - 1973/74: £39,150

### Town Expansion Committee
#### Precepts
- Mid Northants Water Board
  - 1972/73: £6,400
  - 1973/74: £2,570
- Northampton and County Police Authority
  - 1972/73: £920
  - 1973/74: £22,930
- Welland and Nene River Authority
  - 1972/73: £7,320
  - 1973/74: £23,720

#### Discount on Rates
- 1972/73: £620
- 1973/74: £2,020

**TOTAL ESTIMATED NET EXPENDITURE**
- 1972/73: £227,480
- 1973/74: £780,200

**INCOME**

#### Rate Income - additional rate income from Town Expansion
- 1972/73: £72,100
- 1973/74: £224,050

#### Rate Support Grant - Needs Element
- additional grant due to Town Expansion
  - 1972/73: £10,230
  - 1973/74: £149,960
  - 1974/75: £374,020

#### Loss Reduced Resources Element of Rate Support Grant
- 1972/73: £53,370
- 1973/74: £73,360
- 1974/75: £289,860

**NET ESTIMATED COSTS OF TOWN EXPANSION**
- 1972/73: £288,980
- 1973/74: £300,660
- 1974/75: £377,530
APPENDIX VIII

LETTER FROM B. BEAN TO L. SALT. 24 JAN 1973
Dear Mr Salt,

I refer to your letter of 12 December setting out your estimates of the County Borough Council's expenditure incurred on town expansion and to our subsequent discussion on the form of the overall financial arrangement to be agreed between our authorities, subject to the approval of the Department of the Environment and the Treasury. Although we are meeting tomorrow to consider the County Borough Council's rate poundage estimates and their relationship with the rate increases of all County Boroughs as well as the method of eliminating the effects of revaluation, it will I feel, be useful if I set out for the consideration of your Council the proposals I made at our last meeting and which I am recommending the Development Corporation and the Department of the Environment to accept.

To try and identify each item of expenditure incurred by the County Borough Council in the expansion areas or to try and allocate the County Borough Council's costs and revenues between existing population and newcomers will, I feel, be exceedingly tedious, in many cases arbitrary and will lead to all manner of demarcation disputes. What is required is a financial agreement which provides for an annual contribution by the Development Corporation towards the County Borough Council's overall general rate fund expenditure which:

(a) fairly reflects the additional financial burden falling on the County Borough Council as a result of town expansion;

(b) can easily be calculated and understood;

(c) can be ascertained fairly accurately before the beginning of each financial year to enable the amount to be included in the County Borough Council's rate poundage calculations;

(d) is abated year by year over the development period to take into account the fact that the greatest burden will fall on the County Borough Council during the early years in providing services in advance of the incoming population before increased rate income and rate support grant is receivable and that at the end of the development period these contributions will cease;

(e) avoids the need for the Development Corporation to become involved in the detailed financial affairs of the County Borough Council;

Cont/...
(f) contains an assurance that the County Borough Council will provide all normal local authority services for the incoming population in accordance with the Development Corporation's own programme;

(g) will make it unnecessary for the Development Corporation to contribute towards specific items or services with the exception of non-principal roads and main drainage where the existing arrangements will continue for the time being and any item which the Development Corporation agrees beforehand shall be wholly reimbursable. For example, the proceeds of whatever rate in the £ the County Borough Council decides shall be spent next year on the provision of public open space in the expansion areas in accordance with last month's decision of the Development Corporation.

A formula which would achieve these objectives was suggested at our last meeting. Under this proposal a measure of the additional burden will be ascertained by comparing the County Borough Council's rate poundage increase between 1972/3 and 1973/4 ignoring the contribution with the average rate poundage increase for all County Boroughs. It is suggested that for 1973/4 the Development Corporation should contribute 80% of the amount by which Northampton's rate increase exceeds the County Borough average, this proportion decreasing by 10% each succeeding year so that by the anticipated end of the development programme in 1982 these contributions would cease. Clearly the Development Corporation cannot be expected to pay the whole of the rate increase; it would be tantamount to giving the County Borough Council an annual blank cheque unless a system of estimate scrutiny by the Development Corporation was introduced. It is also reasonable to expect that the County Borough Council's rate poundages over the next few years will increase by rather more than the national average in any case because of its massive spending on central area redevelopment, its main road improvements and the extension now being carried out to the sewage disposal works, not all of which can be attributed to town expansion. Furthermore, as the County Borough Council will be incurring a proportion of the annual rate increase, Development Corporation involvement in the County Borough Council's financial affairs will be unnecessary. Because of the forthcoming local government reorganisation for the year 1974/5 and thereafter, Northampton's rate poundage increase will need to be compared with the average for all County Districts.

I think at our last meeting you agreed with the validity of this approach and I understand that the formula, together with the amounts involved, will be considered by your Finance Committee at its meeting on 19 February. The preliminary reaction of the Department of the Environment is favourable and its formal approval is now being sought. The proposals will be submitted to the Development Corporation at its next meeting on 8 February, and for the purpose of the Board report which will be sent to members next week, I hope that fairly firm figures will result from our meeting tomorrow.

As mentioned previously, I also want to consider tomorrow the method of eliminating the effects of revaluation on the distribution of the resources element of the rate support grant. I have considered this matter very carefully and with the help of estimates

Cont/...
supplied by the Department attached as Appendix B, which I must ask you to treat in strictest confidence, I have prepared figures shown on the attached Appendix A which indicate that the average revaluation factor for County Boroughs is less than the national average, resulting in County Boroughs receiving more resources element grant and so being able, on average, to reduce their 1973/4 rate poundages from what they would otherwise have been. This, in my opinion, is the most satisfactory way in which the effects of revaluation can be eliminated and is a factor which must be taken into consideration in comparing your authority's rate increase next year with the average for all County Boroughs.

Perhaps you would care to consider these figures and the consequences to be drawn from them prior to our meeting.

Yours sincerely

B Bean

L S Salt Esq FIMTA FCA
Borough Treasurer
Fish Street
Northampton
a) Deficiency percentages

i) The revised 1972/3 and the estimate for 1973/4 are shown on the attached Appendix A. They have been copied from the DOE computer printouts – see Appendix B attached.

ii) The figures for 1972/3 can be taken as reflecting each authority’s position before revaluation, being calculated on the authority’s revised 1972/3 pound rate product and the national sum of such products giving the standard pound rate product. I have ignored the fact that each authority’s product of a pound rate will have been calculated after varying allowances for voids etc.

iii) The figures for 1973/4 can be taken as reflecting each authority’s position after revaluation. The figures have been based on the new rateable values. Whilst the figures will subsequently be amended to reflect the revaluation of Crown properties which has not yet been done, appeals against the new list, voids etc, and the eventual June 1973 population I feel that for the purpose of this exercise they can be accepted.

iv) The difference in the two percentages can therefore be taken as a measure of the effect of revaluation.

b) Expenditure

The difference in the two percentages can then be applied to each authority’s 1973/4 expenditure. The figures shown by the DOE are a repeat of the revised 1972/3 figures. An adjustment is made to each DOE grant figure to bring the total of the grants up to the predetermined national total. This adjustment is an addition of 4.9179% and means that the 1972/3 expenditure figures can be increased by this same percentage before any limitation of grant may become operative. Although the 1973/4 expenditure figures for each authority may vary from these calculated figures I feel that they are a reasonable guide for this exercise.

c) Penny rate product

The resultant difference in the Resources grant can then be divided by the rate product to give the difference in the rate poundage. The rate product figures for those authorities which do not receive grant in either year have been included in the increase column purely to reconcile the total figures and do not affect the results. Each treasurer will have his own view on the allowance which should be made for further new properties coming into rating after 1 December 1972, Crown revaluation, appeals against the new list and voids etc. For the purpose of this exercise it is necessary to assume a consistent allowance for these factors and I have taken 96% of the new rateable values. This figure has been based on figures calculated from the DOE publication “Rates and Rateable Values” for recent years. The effects on my conclusions of taking alternative percentages are indicated in paragraph 3b below.
Resources Grant Northampton

The new valuation list indicates a factor of 2.56 for Northampton as against 2.52 for the country as a whole. One would therefore expect that Northampton's deficiency percentage would fall rather than the apparent increase shown in the DOE figures. This increase could be due to a number of factors including the following -

a) An optimistic view of Northampton's 1972/3 rate product (perhaps more new properties than the national average or lower voids etc than the national average);

b) A pessimistic view of rate products taken by treasurers in general so giving a lower standard product (less new properties, more voids etc).

If the deficiency percentage had fallen in 1973/4 this would have resulted in a reduced resources grant because of revaluation and a consequent increase in the rate poundage.

Could I please have your observations on this point.

Conclusions

a) The attached Appendix A shows that the new average County Borough rate will have been increased by 1.498977 pence because of the effect of revaluation. I feel that this figure should be added to the average County Borough rate increase before comparing it with the rate increase for Northampton.

b) Alternative rate product figures would give the following -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product as percentage of new rateable value</th>
<th>Increase in average County Borough rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>pence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.514757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.483523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average increase is therefore 172.0424
Less 49.1263
\[\frac{122.9161}{82} = 1.498977\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County or City</th>
<th>New RV</th>
<th>1973/74</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>70,906,597</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merthyr</td>
<td>3,484,333</td>
<td>44.007</td>
<td>51.627</td>
<td>7.5763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>29,409,437</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>12,260,801</td>
<td>7.039</td>
<td>16.7765</td>
<td>9.7376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>19,409,910</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>37,070,054</td>
<td>4.6308</td>
<td>4.6308</td>
<td>3.6467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oldham</td>
<td>9,243,959</td>
<td>36.1949</td>
<td>32.5482</td>
<td>1.6547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>18,613,224</td>
<td>10.3444</td>
<td>25.2420</td>
<td>14.8976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>24,883,131</td>
<td>2.3029</td>
<td>13.4613</td>
<td>11.5844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>10,657,439</td>
<td>4.7534</td>
<td>15.4720</td>
<td>10.7196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>21,578,747</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td>8,380,389</td>
<td>38.1366</td>
<td>31.7892</td>
<td>6.3474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>8,947,841</td>
<td>11.5953</td>
<td>19.9022</td>
<td>8.3069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>12,015,361</td>
<td>21.0590</td>
<td>12.8976</td>
<td>8.1614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salop</td>
<td>13,335,873</td>
<td>20.1343</td>
<td>21.5800</td>
<td>1.4457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>56,428,971</td>
<td>6.8879</td>
<td>16.7774</td>
<td>9.8995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solihull</td>
<td>15,916,387</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>27,560,603</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend</td>
<td>24,156,272</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southport</td>
<td>10,338,295</td>
<td>0.7056</td>
<td>8.1936</td>
<td>7.4880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shields</td>
<td>8,068,943</td>
<td>32.0583</td>
<td>38.0538</td>
<td>5.9955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport</td>
<td>15,808,881</td>
<td>16.4717</td>
<td>13.7553</td>
<td>2.6652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke</td>
<td>20,262,993</td>
<td>22.8579</td>
<td>18.0837</td>
<td>4.7742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td>17,738,435</td>
<td>25.0700</td>
<td>37.6222</td>
<td>12.5442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>15,346,747</td>
<td>11.1058</td>
<td>32.2639</td>
<td>21.1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teesside</td>
<td>49,925,853</td>
<td>5.9833</td>
<td>5.9833</td>
<td>5.9833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torbay</td>
<td>15,146,030</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynemouth</td>
<td>6,312,542</td>
<td>18.1107</td>
<td>29.5986</td>
<td>11.4879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>7,072,576</td>
<td>13.9232</td>
<td>10.5264</td>
<td>3.4088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallasey</td>
<td>9,852,685</td>
<td>21.7224</td>
<td>22.2600</td>
<td>0.6366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>25,393,258</td>
<td>12.7868</td>
<td>12.7868</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>23,533,043</td>
<td>5.7632</td>
<td>5.7632</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bromwich</td>
<td>24,402,567</td>
<td>2.6838</td>
<td>3.9987</td>
<td>1.3409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigan</td>
<td>8,556,336</td>
<td>17.9992</td>
<td>20.4436</td>
<td>2.4544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td>37,550,108</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>11,212,890</td>
<td>5.1164</td>
<td>5.1164</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total excl Nton</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,652,912,044</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,003,4518</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,207,3621</strong></td>
<td><strong>300,9910</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTHAMPTON</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,268,548</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3373</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.3741</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0368</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IX

NORTHAMPTON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION MEMBERSHIP
1968-1985
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - CHAIRMAN</th>
<th>2 - VICE-CHAIRMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREMLETT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALMSLEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARDECCIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENKINS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARDNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUSSLER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARWIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEMAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DILLEIGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cripps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIRSCHFIELD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>66-69</th>
<th>69-70</th>
<th>70-71</th>
<th>71-72</th>
<th>72-73</th>
<th>73-74</th>
<th>74-75</th>
<th>75-76</th>
<th>76-77</th>
<th>77-78</th>
<th>78-79</th>
<th>79-80</th>
<th>80-81</th>
<th>81-82</th>
<th>82-83</th>
<th>83-84</th>
<th>84-85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX X

LETTER FROM JOHN SILKIN TO A.C. PARKHOUSE,
CHIEF EXECUTIVE NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL. 3 JULY 1975.
Thank you for your letter of 12 June amplifying your Council's arguments in support of their claim for financial assistance from Northampton Development Corporation. As you will recall, I indicated that I was not sanguine about your chances of success when Councillor Winter raised the matter at our meeting on 28 May. Nevertheless I have, as promised, carefully reconsidered the decision in the light of all that has been said.

I should perhaps hark back to the original situation when the Development Corporation was set up. At that time all local authority services in the designated area of the new town were the responsibility of the Northampton County Borough Council. This was a comparatively small authority with a low rate income and restricted ability to spread the load of expenditure on new services for the accelerated development programme. It was therefore right that the partnership agreement between the Development Corporation and the County Borough Council should provide for the possibility of financial contributions being made by the Corporation to the Council in the event of an undue burden falling on the existing ratepayers. In the detailed application of this provision, it was made clear that only "county" services provided in advance (which the Department thought would be limited to education and social and local health services) would be taken into account in determining the extent of any contribution. There was no commitment for payment of contributions to the County Borough Council for any year beyond 1973/74, after which they were superseded as a result of local government reorganisation.

As from 1 April 1974, the new Northamptonshire County Council assumed responsibility for the services which had been seen as qualifying for consideration for assistance from the Development Corporation. Although the extension of the rate base, over which the burden of provision is now spread, could have been held to remove the need for financial contributions, we decided that the impact of four new town and town expansion schemes within the county had placed an unusually heavy strain on the county's financial resources, meriting special assistance. Accordingly, with the consent of the Treasury, we approved a contribution by the Corporation to the County Council in respect of the undue burden of provision of education, social services and libraries for 1974/75 only.
I must emphasise that it has never been the intention nor the practice to contribute towards current expenditure on refuse collection, street cleaning, public conveniences, concessionary fares and transport deficit financing or the running expenses of an amenity complex as we do not accept that there is any significant element of advance provision in respect of such services. And I regret to have to tell you that nothing in your letter of 12 June has persuaded us that it would be right for expenditure on these services to be assisted by the Corporation in your case.

You also mention the new arrangements for financing the construction of roads in new towns. While no final agreement has yet been reached between the Development Corporation and Northamptonshire County Council, you will be pleased to know that the Association of County Councils has agreed in principle that the County share of expenditure on roads (other than trunk and estate roads) in new towns can be "net of grant" and ineligible for TSG.

On your second roads point, while the Development Corporation has responsibility for the new town development programme, the County Council must retain the statutory responsibilities of highway authority and be generally responsible for design and programming of its overall transportation network. Since, like the new towns programme, the Transportation Policy and Programme of each county is subject to scrutiny and approval on behalf of the Secretary of State, I hope that we shall be able to contrive that the road-building programme in Northampton is kept in step with the requirements of the new town; and I am mindful of the undertakings that have been given in the past that the new roads required for contractors' traffic in the Southern District should be available before house building is allowed to start.

The precise arrangements for the design and construction of future new town roads will no doubt vary from town to town, and as has always been the case, must be left for local resolution. Highway authorities seem to have dealt very fairly with development corporations in the past and I trust that working arrangements which have proved their worth over time will not be disturbed for the sake of change. In your own case I would hope that the excellent agency arrangements you now have with both the County Council and the Development Corporation will be continued.

Mr Freeson will be replying to your other letter about Section 105 of the Housing Act and my proposals for the future membership of the Development Corporation are also being dealt with separately.
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APPENDIX
1. INTRODUCTION

1.01 The purpose of this study is to examine the continuing growth of the town, up to 1996, to identify the services and infrastructure required and to consider the possible de-designation of any part of the Designated Area and the transfer or disposal of agricultural land which has been acquired within the Designated Area.

1.02 The report contains two alternative population projections which, in turn, are compared with alternative densities of development for housing and employment in determining likely future land needs. The report goes on to form conclusions in respect of the possible transfer or disposal of agricultural land.

1.03 In carrying out the study, consideration of the future growth of the town has generally been restricted to land within the Designated Area.

1.04 The information is presented under the following headings:

i) Past performance
ii) Planning requirements and land supply (including open space and recreation)
iii) Evaluation of potential sites
iv) Future growth pattern
v) Conclusions

1.05 The evaluation of potential sites comprises two schedules indicating physical requirements and costs involved in providing off site infrastructure for new development.

1.06 Two plans are included in the report as follows:

Plan 1 - A land use appraisal indicating potential sites for housing and industrial development and including information on land in public ownership.

Plan 2 - A plan indicating the land which will be required for development by 1996 and those areas which are likely to be surplus to requirements.

2. PAST PERFORMANCE

2.01 In 1979, the wind-up of the Development Corporation was announced and it is particularly relevant to examine the scale of change from that time up to Mid 1981, which is the base date for this report, since the changes during this time will influence the projected requirements for future change. During this period the following changes have occurred.
TABLE 2. POPULATION PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>HIGH GROWTH*</th>
<th>LOW GROWTH*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Growth in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 (Preliminary Census Figure)</td>
<td>155,540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>171,000</td>
<td>15,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>178,130</td>
<td>7,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>182,250</td>
<td>4,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The High Growth projection is based on Natural Increase + Net Inward Migration in the order of 2400 persons p.a., 1981-86; Natural Increase + Net Inward Migration of 500 persons p.a., 1986-91 and Natural Increase only after 1991.

The Low Growth projection is based on Natural Increase + Net Inward Migration reducing from 2200 to 800 p.a., 1981-86 and then follows the same pattern as the High Growth projection.

Source: County Planning Department

Housing Demand

3.02 Housing demand has been derived from the population projections using headship rates and household formation forecasts. In producing the forecasts it has been assumed that vacancy rates will average out at about 5% and that future housing closures and clearance will be balanced by replacement. On this basis, the projected housing demand for the Borough is as follows:

TABLE 3 HOUSING DEMAND FORECASTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Increase to Dwelling Stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-86</td>
<td>7,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-91</td>
<td>4,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-96</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>14,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: County Planning Department
Job Demand

3.05. Forecasts of the increase in job demand have been reassessed in line with the two population projections. On the basis that the increases in net inward commuting and unemployment would be in balance (assumed to be at a level of 5%) the following job demand forecasts are obtained.

TABLE 5. JOB DEMAND FORECAST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Increase in Job Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-86</td>
<td>10,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-91</td>
<td>4,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-96</td>
<td>2,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.06. An assessment of the locational requirements of the increase in jobs has been made by reference to the provisions made for Northampton in the approved County Structure Plan. In particular, the County Structure Plan makes provision for about 35% of new jobs to be located on employment areas and a further 27% within offices. The remainder of new jobs are deemed to require no specific land provision. However, in order to provide additional capacity for the likelihood of some office development taking place on industrial areas and the possible relocation of some industry from within the town to the new employment areas a figure of 40% has been used to estimate the proportion of new job growth which would take place on employment areas.

3.07. The industrial land required to provide for this increase will depend on the density of employment likely to be achieved. On the one hand a figure of 35 workers/hectare has been used reflecting the national trend of falling densities from the levels included within the County Structure Plan of 45-50 workers per hectare. However, whilst the figure of 35 workers/hectare is considered adequate for the overall assessment of industrial land demand, densities are continuing to fall in certain types of employment and it is therefore considered appropriate to indicate the scale of land demand at a density of 30 workers/hectare.

3.08. Table 6 below, therefore, sets out the likely scale of industrial land requirements up to 1996.
Comparing the levels of industrial land demand with industrial land availability in Tables 6 and 7, then even in the situation of high growth and low employment density it would not be necessary to bring the Watermills industrial area into operation prior to 1996. This assumes that the Lodge Farm Extension Land, a significant part of which may be scheduled as an Ancient Monument by virtue of its archaeological interest, will be available for development during the Plan period.

In April 1982, 10,400 of the workforce in the 'Northampton travel to work area' were unemployed, and it would be prudent to assume that this figure will be reduced to a more acceptable level during the plan period. For a reduction to 5% unemployment, some 4,500 extra jobs would have to be created within the travel to work area over and above those required for the normal growth pattern. Whilst a proportion of these would be re-absorbed into the underutilised commercial and industrial floorspace; and the 2km sq ft of currently vacant floorspace in the town, there could ultimately be a demand for land to accommodate the jobs provided for the remainder. This in turn could have the effect of accelerating the take-up within the plan period, of the land assigned to industrial use.

Open Space and Recreation

Within the major housing areas identified for future development, provision is made for normal open space requirements for informal and formal activities. It is not considered necessary, therefore, to make additional provision for public open space in the context of the study proposals.

Apart from the current discussions concerning the provision of a major sporting complex in the Southern District, the only major recreational land user where additional provision may be necessary is golf. Figures in the County Structure Plan, provided by the Regional Council for Sport and Recreation indicated that there was a shortfall in golf courses in the Northampton-Wellingborough area, amounting to four 18 hole courses and one 9 hole course, based on the scale of population growth anticipated up to 1991. The proposed new golf course at Overstone is expected to replace the existing Northampton Golf Course at Kettering Road, when this is released for residential development. However, the new 18 hole course at Great Harrowden for Wellingborough Golf Club which has replaced the former 9 hole course has provided for a small part of the deficiency. Furthermore, the likely lower levels of population growth now anticipated within the area suggest that by 1991 the shortfall may not be so great as projected. Nevertheless, there appears to be scope for additional golf facilities within the area and a further golf course in Northampton could be considered. Such a development comprising an 18 hole course and clubhouse facilities would require a site in the order of 50 hectares.

An assessment of possible sites for new golf courses within the District has been undertaken. With particular reference to land currently within the ownership of the Development Corporation, two sites appear to have potential for such development both of which enjoy a pleasant environment and are conveniently located for the town. The sites are:
4. EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

4.01 The following two schedules indicate for housing and employment areas, the evaluation made of the infrastructure costs involved in developing potential sites. These schedules outline the fundamental off-site infrastructure requirements of each site in terms of transportation, drainage and services (gas, electricity, GPO) plus education requirements, together with an assessment of the agricultural value of the land and an estimate of the unit cost (cost per dwelling or cost per hectare) for each site.

4.02 The schedules were originally prepared in 1979 and since they are included largely for comparative purposes, it is not considered necessary to update the figures. Financial information, therefore, remains as at 1979 levels.

4.03 In referring to the schedules, it should be noted that the costs of infrastructure for Upton and Watermills have been treated separately. However, if both sites were developed then the two areas together could be served by Kislingbury Valley Way and Valley Way, thereby making substantial savings in unit costs.

4.04 The continuing development of the town involves further costs not appropriate to only one site. In particular, important road links are required to serve growth envisaged by 1986 to overcome significant transportation problems associated with the presently programmed growth (see para. 5.03). The full list of schemes which the Highway Authority identify as necessary by 1986 are shown in Appendix 1. Other costs will be incurred in terms of further upper school facilities to serve wider areas which include several individual potential sites.

4.05 The land use appraisal which identifies all committed and potential sites and the appropriate transportation infrastructure is indicated on Plan 1.
5. FUTURE GROWTH PATTERN

GROWTH UP TO 1986

Housing

5.01 Between 4920 and 7240 new dwellings will be required up to 1986. It is anticipated that growth to meet this need will comprise the completion of the Eastern District and the development of much of the Southern District Section 6(1) approval area, together with the majority of outstanding planning permissions (OPP's) and the identified municipal housing programme within the former Borough area. (Table 4).

Industry

5.02 It is estimated that provision will need to be made for between 2460 and 4000 new jobs on employment areas up to 1986. This should involve the substantial completion of the existing employment areas and the bringing into operation at an early stage some of the further sites as indicated in Table 7. This will allow for take up of land in new employment areas arising from loss of employment within the older parts of the town and will provide necessary choices for prospective industrialists.

Transportation

5.03 The continuing growth of the town arising from New Town expansion will require improvements to transportation infrastructure extending beyond the life of the Development Corporation. A list of schemes requiring a 'New Towns' contribution has been agreed by the officers of the three authorities and submitted to the Government as part of the bid for continuing financial assistance after the demise of the Development Corporation in 1984. The list of schemes is given in Appendix 1 but in broad terms they are required in five main areas as follows:-

i) completion of Tollgate Way
ii) construction of the Northern Distributor (Cock Hotel to Moulton Park)
iii) improvements to Radial Routes
iv) improvements in the Central Area
v) transportation infrastructure for the Southern District

Education

5.04 The development of the residential areas of the Eastern and Southern Districts with the benefit of Section 6(1) Approval should require the provision of some 7 lower and middle schools. Only two of the schools are programmed at the present time, but sites are being reserved for the remaining schools. The schools are as follows:-

1. Schools programmed:
   i. Goldings Lower School new 175 places Programmed 1982/83
   ii. Southfields Lower School new 175 places Programmed 1983/84

2. Schools with Sites Reserved
   i. Camp Hill Lower School new 175 places
   ii. Camp Hill Middle School new 420 places
   iii. Shelfleys Lower School new 175 places
   iv. Penn Valley Lower School new 175 places
   v. Ladybridge Lower School new 175 places
Although the land at Nene Employment Area has certain problems related to possible flooding, it seems likely that the site will be developed before 1996. Similarly, whilst part of the Lodge Farm Extension could be scheduled as an Ancient Monument, it should be available for development at the end of the Plan period. On the other hand, land at Watermills which has high infrastructure costs should not be required in the context of growth up to 1996.

The transport and education requirements associated with the land identified for development during this period are indicated on the evaluation schedules in Section 4.
With regard to housing land, only in the situation of high population growth and low housing density achievement would it be necessary to bring into development one of the three additional areas at Kings Heath, Upton or West Hunsbury before 1996. In all other circumstances there should be sufficient housing land to meet the requirement during the Plan period. This assumes that all other sites will be available, including the 'White Land' at Wootton Fields Extension, which could be sensitive to development in environmental terms.

It is considered unlikely that the combination of high population growth and low housing density will be sustained throughout the Plan period.

Similarly, in respect of industry even in the situation of high population growth and low employment density assuming that the Nene and Lodge Farm Extension sites are available for development during the Plan period, it would not be necessary to bring the Watermills Industrial Area into development prior to 1996. Furthermore, no account has been taken of the possibility of some further land being opened up for industry in association with the projected Eastern Approach Road.

Regarding public open space the authorities have made sufficient provision for those public open space requirements which are derived from accepted standards within the expansion areas 'in progress' or 'committed' for development. Furthermore, the areas identified for further growth around Wootton and Hardingstone also contain sufficient land to make similar provision for public open space.

However, there appears to be scope for the provision of a further 18 hole golf course in the District during the Plan period and possible sites at Upton and west of Great Houghton could be suitable. Advice from the Ministry of Agriculture indicates that a site west of Great Houghton would have a less harmful effect on agriculture. Preference for the Great Houghton site is reinforced by the consideration that this is 'white land' which should act as an open buffer whereas the land at Upton has potential for housing development and could be developed for this purpose after 1996. Hence, a site of 56.75 hectares (approx.) between Brackmills and Great Houghton is indicated on Plan 2, as a proposed Golf Course.

In the light of these conclusions, a number of areas currently in the ownership of the Development Corporation, some of which were formally allocated for development and others, mainly fringe areas, which remained as 'white land' on the Master Plan, now appear surplus to needs in the context of growth up to 1996. These are indicated on Plan 2.
APPENDIX 1

HIGHWAY REQUIREMENTS

Completion of Tollgate Way
- Dallington Bypass
- Mill Lane, River Crossing to Kingsthorpe Road
- Mill Lane, Railway Bridge

Construction of Northern Distributor:
- Cock Hotel to Moulton Park

Radial Routes:
- Barnes Meadow Interchange
- Eastern Approach Road
- Bedford Rd/Cheyne Walk
- Weedon Road Improvement
- Weedon Rd/Harlestone Rd Link
- Spencer Bridge Road Improvement
- Grafton St/St Andrews Road
- Kingsthorpe Hollow
- Harborough Road Improvement
- Britannia Inn Improvement

Town Centre:
- Regent Square
- Campbell Square Improvement
- The Mounts Improvement

Southern District:
- Wootton Fields Grade Separation
- Southern Approach Road
- Quinton Road Link
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NEW TOWNS ACT 1981.

DISSOLUTION OF NORTHAMPTON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

LETTER FROM DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT TO

CHIEF EXECUTIVE NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL. MARCH 1985
NEW TOWNS ACT 1981
DISSOLUTION OF NORTHAMPTON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

I am writing to let you know that Ministers have now completed their consideration of the case put forward in your Council's letters of 24 June and 15 October 1984 that Northampton Development Corporation should contribute towards certain additional projects related to new town expansion before the Corporation is wound up.

2. In reaching their conclusions Ministers have taken account of the rapid way in which housing is being developed in the Southern District and the Corporation's success in stimulating development and in its overall commercial performance. These factors have been the major consideration in their deciding to accept the case for a sports and leisure centre in the Southern District and they have therefore agreed to the Corporation providing a site for this purpose and incurring expenditure up to £2 million on construction costs. It will be for the Council to arrange the letting of the contract and it should be understood that any cost overrun above the £2 million figure will be the Council's responsibility together with the running cost of the scheme.

3. If your Council should decide to construct the centre on another site or do not wish to spend as much as £2 million, Ministers would be prepared to consider alternative arrangements or uses to which any savings might be put.

4. In view of the impressive results of secure archaeology in Northampton sponsored by the Corporation and in response to the detailed proposals submitted by the Corporation for improving and extending the existing museum Ministers have also accepted the case for a contribution not exceeding £250,000 being made towards capital expenditure incurred by the Council on the extension of the Borough Museum. This is subject to the expenditure counting against the Council's resource allocation.

5. In my letter of 2 August I explained it was unlikely for agreement to be given to your request that the Corporation should provide facilities for a playing field in the Eastern District and for assistance with the development of the Upper Nene Park. Ministers have confirmed that they are not prepared to see the Corporation provide these, in view of the substantial provision already made by the Corporation. Ministers do not accept that there is any case for the Corporation making any contribution towards the cost of resurfacing of Market Square.
6. The case for the Corporation contributing towards the cost of a town centre multi-storey car park has been reexamined and Ministers have concluded that since the Corporation have not been concerned with development or redevelopment of the town centre it would be inappropriate for them to make such a contribution now to such a scheme, the need for which must be a matter for the local authorities to assess.

7. Finally you will wish to know that Ministers have also agreed to the Corporation making a contribution not exceeding £300,000 towards certain structural repairs of Upton Hall, proposed by the Development Corporation, and to the transfer of Cliftonville House to your Council on the basis that it will assume responsibility for the outstanding loan debt.

8. I hope that your members will find Ministers' decisions helpful and that any remaining matters relating to the wind up of the Development Corporation and the transfer of its assets can be easily resolved.

Yours sincerely,

A J C SIMCOCK
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NEW TOWNS ACT 1981.
DISSOLUTION OF NORTHAMPTON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.
LETTER FROM DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT TO
CHIEF EXECUTIVE NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL. 7 MARCH 1985
Dear Mr Greenwell,

NEW TOWNS ACT 1981
DISSOLUTION OF NORTHAMPTON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

I am writing to let you know that Ministers have now completed their consideration of the case put forward in your letters of 26 June and 6 August 1984 and 21 January 1985 that Northampton Development Corporation should contribute towards certain additional projects related to new town expansion, before the Corporation is wound-up.

2. As you will be aware it has always been our view that the Corporation should only contribute towards road schemes started in its lifetime and that for this reason a generous view was taken of the schemes likely to begin in its final year. Indeed I understand that all the schemes in the agreed programme have now been started. In exceptional cases there might also be justification for the Commission making a contribution towards a scheme where it could be shown that the traffic growth underlying the need for the scheme was mainly the result of new town growth. However there is no indication that this is the case where the four schemes mentioned in your letter of 26 June are concerned. Ministers have therefore decided that they are not able to offer a contribution from the new towns programme to these schemes.

3. Turning now to the other issues raised in your letters to me I would not dispute your view that section 4(4)(a) of the New Towns Act 1981 could be used to enable the Corporation to make contributions towards a library and a fire station for the Southern District. However it has never been the practice for new towns to contribute to the provision of services which have always been clearly local authority responsibilities. New town contributions have generally been confined to social and recreational facilities arising directly from the needs of the new town development itself. The critical factor has been local circumstances and the spheres of responsibility agreed between local authorities and development corporations.

4. Turning to the situation in Northampton, the provision of libraries and fire stations in the new town has hitherto been solely the responsibility of the County Council. In the case of the Southern District there is little evidence that these facilities will be provided in advance of need and in view of the rapid development of the area the County will soon be able to enjoy
a substantial rate income from it. For these reasons Ministers are not prepared to agree to the Corporation contributing towards the cost of these facilities.

5. In your letter of 21 January you put forward a case for the provision of more buildings for social and community purposes in the Southern District and suggested returning to the original proposals of 1973. However given that Ministers have agreed to the Corporation providing a site for and making a contribution of £2 million towards a sports and leisure centre for the District, this together with the proposed community facility at Camp Hill Middle School should represent sufficient assistance on the Corporation's part. Ministers are not therefore prepared to agree to further commitments from the Corporation but they would be content, if the Borough Council were to make savings on the cost of the sports and leisure centre, to spend the balance of the £2 million on other community facilities for the District.

6. I am sorry that this reply will be disappointing to your Council on a number of matters but I hope this can be viewed against the very considerable programme of County road schemes in recent years to which there has been a very substantial Development Corporation contribution.

Yours sincerely,

A J C SIMCOCK
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