

Complex London

Tony Travers

London School of Economics

London:

- Successful over the long term despite a long-criticised and much-reformed government system
 - Rapid 19th century economic growth took place against a backdrop of weak and often failed government
 - Metropolitan Board of Works a fragmented joint committee to retro-fit sewers, roads etc
 - Paris, by contrast: Haussmann
-

Evolution of government in London

□ London

- City of London
 - City, parishes, district boards, ad hoc commissions
 - Metropolitan Board of Works
 - London County Council + metropolitan boroughs/City
 - Greater London Council + 32 boroughs + City
 - Interregnum + boroughs/City
 - Greater London Authority + boroughs/City
 - 'strong', executive Mayor, weak upper tier
-

...and Manchester

□ Manchester

- Commissioners for local improvement
 - Borough within Lancashire
 - County Borough outside Lancashire
 - periodic boundary extensions
 - Greater Manchester County Council + 10 metropolitan districts
 - 10 Metropolitan districts
 - AGMA 'city region'
-

Systems of government have responded to change

- ❑ Population
 - ❑ Employment
 - ❑ Industrial base
 - ❑ Physical scale
 - ❑ Infrastructure needs
 - ❑ TfL; GMPTE
 - ❑ Development of the State
 - ❑ Latterly an 'economic development' role beyond 'planning'
-

Cities and development

- Government systems, the provision of infrastructure and delivery of services have facilitated city economic expansion
 - Structure/strategic/spatial and land use planning evolved after 1947, to include industrial and residential zoning etc
 - also, latterly, conservation
 - Economic development has evolved as a local government activity since mid/late 1970s
 - Britain's changed economy has led to dereliction and unemployment in many cities, including parts of London and Greater Manchester
-

London's 'complex' approach to economic redevelopment - 1

1970s: emergence of economic development challenges for London

- The decline of London Docks
 - and collapse of manufacturing
 - Sharp rise in level of unemployment
 - Decay and dereliction in inner London
 - London boroughs qualify for Urban Programme grants
 - Population fell from 7.4m to 6.6m
 - Lowest for Greater London since 1906
 - Inner London's population had halved since 1921 – down 25% between 1971 and 1981
-

London's 'complex' approach to economic redevelopment - 2

1980s: Mrs Thatcher vs New Left...a national political event represented in London government's approach to the economy, eg

- London Docklands Development Corporation (1981)
 - GLC – London Industrial Strategy (1985)
 - Greater London Enterprise Board
 - But, abolition of GLC in 1986
 - Boroughs start to evolve economic policies, especially in east London
 - But much of decade spent in conflict over finance and policy
-

London's 'complex' approach to economic redevelopment - 3

1990s: Major government and the evolution of a concerted approach to regeneration and renewal

□ City Challenge and many other funding programmes

- new, moderate, boroughs engage with new, moderate, Heseltine-led DoE

□ London First/London First Centre

- Created in 1992 – major companies and inward investment:
 - London Pride initiative – private and public sector
 - Weak 'growth coalition' achievements
-

London's 'complex' approach to economic redevelopment - 4

2000s: The Mayor, the *London Plan* and other mayoral strategies

- GLA created with spatial planning powers and a requirement to produce economic and transport strategies
 - London Development Agency
 - 'Growth Coalition' recedes
 - Boroughs required to set their own plans to conform with *London Plan*
 - Ken Livingstone evolved economic 'world view' through *London Plan*
-

Government and London's economy today – three levels

□ Whitehall

- Competition
- Taxation [City of London]
- Immigration
- Public spending

□ The Mayor

- London Plan, LDA (not for long); LEP?

□ The boroughs and the City

- Local planning
 - Sub-regional economic groupings, LEPs?
-

How complex? How competitive?

□ Complexity

- Two levels of 'London' government
 - Regular friction between tiers
- Many centrally-appointed governance bodies, eg CAA, PLA, English Heritage, Network Rail, ODA, Environment Agency, Homes & Communities Agency etc etc
- Four business lobbies (LFirst, CBI, LCCI, FSB)

□ Competitiveness

- Boroughs are to some extent competitive, eg:
 - City v Tower Hamlets (F&BS); Westminster v City (Skyscrapers, now retail); H&F/Westfield v West End (retail); Croydon v Merton (back offices)
 - London/GSE's integrated labour market
 - In future: tax base competition...
-

Conclusions

- ❑ History explains much of London's complexity
 - ❑ The Mayor acts as a (relatively weak) economic leader for the city, with a limited growth coalition
 - ❑ Boroughs to some extent compete for economic development
 - ❑ London's relative GVA growth does not imply complexity is a fatal impediment
 - ❑ But can't know what would happen with a different system of government
-

Complex London

Tony Travers

London School of Economics