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A history of reflection on city regions

“Informed by the writings of radical thinkers such as Ebenezer Howard, Patrick Geddes, Lewis Mumford & Charles Fawcett, debates in the 1920s and 1930s about the development of planning law focussed on the need to devise a spatial framework for treating cities, neighbouring small towns and the surrounding countryside, not as separate entities, but as a unity”

(Essex and Brayshay 2005)
The 1920s & 1930s

- Regional plans could bring together in an integrated fashion the needs of cities and their surrounding rural areas and settlements.
- Definition of the ‘region’ not clearly stated, however, not constrained by existing functional, natural or geographical boundaries.
- An area appropriate for the proper planning of population decentralisation, industrial location, transport development and protection of the countryside (Essex and Brayshay 2005).
- Formation of ‘Regional Advisory Committees’ around the UK from 1920s.
- County Councils granted powers to prepare regional plans by the 1929 Local Government Act.
- Patrick Abercrombie adopted and used the ‘regional approach’ (London plans, Hull, Bath, Edinburgh, Clyde Valley, West Midlands and North Staffordshire).
- The inter-war years were the ‘experimental era’ of regional planning (Massey 1989).
Background – post 1945

- Regional Planning gained importance post-1945 in the reconstruction of many bombed cities as well as a component of the emergent welfare state and social reform

- Planning aimed at - decentralisation / containment / redevelopment and regional balance, using tools of - new and expanded towns / greenbelts / residential densities and networks of open space (Essex and Brayshay 2005)

- However, such efforts faltered with failure to consistently follow-up plans or to reform local government on city region/region/regional lines
“The concept of planning at the city-region scale in the UK has had a chequered political history. Despite an enthusiastic push towards both strategic (metropolitan) and regional policy making in the postwar period after the late 1940s,… the UK has consistently turned away from instigating a formal, statutory system of city-region government and planning processes”

Tewdwr-Jones and McNeill (2000)
* Institutional fragmentation

“…most of the period from 1945 to 1974 was distinguished by the perpetuation of a fragmented system of local government and planning. This fragmented system of local government worked against the capacity to plan metropolitan regions as a whole, and also frequently divided responsibility for homogenous metropolitan areas between urban and shire authorities”

(Roberts, Thomas & Williams, 2000)
*Institutional Fragmentation?

What do we mean by ‘local’ government?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional government</th>
<th>Sub-regional government</th>
<th>Local government</th>
<th>Population of the basic unit of local government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected regional councils (26)</td>
<td>Départements (98)</td>
<td>Communes (36,433)</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Lander (Regional Governments) (16)</td>
<td>Kreis (groups of gemeinden) (633)</td>
<td>Gemeinden (7240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Devolved administrations in Scotland, Wales and NI, Appointed Regional Assemblies and RDAs in England</td>
<td>Shire counties in rural areas (56)</td>
<td>Unitary authorities elsewhere Shire Districts (482 inc. unitary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors.
Small is beautiful?

“Local democratic participation and civic engagement tend to be higher where there are smaller units of local government – yet British local authorities are already almost five times larger than their European equivalents, and the UK consistently records the lowest local election turnouts in the EU”

Addressing Institutional Fragmentation

- A fragmented system of local government and planning persisted until further reflection on the structure of local government and planning during the 1960s and 1970s:
  - Redcliffe Maud (England) and Wheatley (Scotland) Commissions
  - Greater London Council (1965)
  - Regional Authorities in Scotland
  - Metropolitan County Councils in England (1970s)

- 6 Metropolitan Counties created
- Although counties failed to recognise many of the ‘realities of contemporary urban geography’ (Hall 1992), the system provided a strategic capacity to address issues including:
  - land use planning, transportation, economic development, environmental enhancement & waste management
- Structure planning function was performed by Metropolitan County Councils and local planning by metropolitan districts
- However, division of planning function between Metropolitan counties and constituent districts led to disagreements about goals and implementation
- Structure plans were criticised for attempting to be too ambitious in addressing a wide range of economic and social issues, taking too long to prepare, and being too complex and providing too much detail
- Historical Context – critique also reflected the beginnings of the (Neo)Liberal era
The Critique of Metropolitan Councils

- Ideological issues impacted on the structures for metropolitan (city regional) government

- Post-1979 - the Thatcherite ‘project’ sought to redefine relations between state and society which had implications for how metropolitan governance was conducted (Tewdwr-Jones and McNeill 2000)

- Emphasis on competitive bidding for funding, and engagement with interests and actors outside local government and partnership with the private sector

- Interventionist approach of Greater London Council conflicted with new Government ideology and polarisation of politics in 1980s created some problems for Metropolitan Counties

- White Paper ‘Streamlining the Cities’ (1983) argued that Met. Counties had struggled to assert themselves and had consistently exceeded their expenditure targets
Abolition of Metropolitan Councils

• In the 1980s ideological positions influenced stances towards metropolitan government structures

• ‘Metropolitan Councils’ were Labour Party controlled and in the case of the Greater London Council in conflict with the central government.

• ‘Metropolitan Councils’ were abolished by the Conservatives in (1985/6) which had certain effects on planning in metropolitan areas:

  – More emphasis was place on local level and project based planning rather than on the strategic metropolitan scale. Some argue this led to a loss of strategic overview on the needs of such areas

  – Despite this in some places more bottom-up forms of cooperation kept the metropolitan scale alive and managed to compensate for some of the gaps in strategic thinking which the institutional structure tended to encourage
After the Metropolitan Councils

- A new system of *Unitary Development Plans* was introduced containing both general/strategic (Part I) and more specific policies (Part 2)

- Strategic dimension to be provided by a new informal system of collaboratively developed Strategic Planning Guidance (SPG) – joint boards were, however, retained for police, fire and public transport

- Instability of arrangements for city regional / metropolitan planning has led to ‘fragmentation of expertise and the constant need for authorities to adjust to new organisational geographies’ (Roberts 1999)

- UDP system had the advantage of having plan preparation & implementation being vested in the same authority, however, suffered from a reduction in the level of strategic coherence and implementation capacity at the metropolitan level - a ‘strategic vacuum’ (Roberts 2000)

- However, some innovative institutional associations also emerged e.g. the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA)

- Growing attention to the regional scale in the 1990s and 2000s
Planning and Urban & Regional Regeneration in the 1990s and 2000s

• From the late 1980s:
  – Start of a « réincarnation » (Hall 2007) of strategic planning at regional level (Regional Planning Guidance; Regional Government Offices « deconcentrated » branches of central state).

• From the late 1990s
  – 1997 – 1st/ Blair Government
  – A returned to a form of regional economic planning with Regional Development Agencies and ‘Regional Economic Strategies’
  – Devolution to Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and London
  – Concept of spatial planning’ had an influence on government and some scholars of planning.
  – Introduction of Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) in the 2000s

• Urban Renaissance under New Labour (1997-2008/10)
  – Investment in regenerating the big cities (especially the centres)
  – Town centre first policies for retail development
  – Brownfield targets for new housing to ensure reuse of previously developed land and limit sprawl (reurbanisation – see work of Chris Couch)
Regional Governance

- Varied 1990s efforts by Local Authorities (strategic planning role), business interests and others to work together in some regions (e.g. North East).

- 1998 Regional Development Agencies Act gave a “chamber” role to regional groups and focus for other roles (planning/transport)
The return of the city…

• Until twenty years or so ago, the great 19th century cities like Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool, Sheffield and Newcastle, were seen by most people as grim, overcrowded, polluted and poorly-built.

• The answer to these problems seemed to lie in dispersal, away from polluted industrial cities to green new towns and suburbs; it was a philosophy that dominated the UK’s planning agenda for the three decades after the Second World War.

• But cities have changed, entering a post-industrial era, and cleaning up their act as centres for culture, transport, creativity, innovation, medicine, education, tourism, finance, research, conservation, working… and living.

(Town and Country Planning Association, 2016)
Regional Issues in England

• Legislation for elected regional assemblies promised in 1997, but local government modernisation agenda and a lack of deep enthusiasm held action back.

• Legislation finally allowed regional referenda on elected assemblies, but first one (NE of England) lost by 4:1 majority.

• Regional assemblies abandoned; Regional Leaders Boards funding cut by Government.

• English regionalism... still the ‘dog that never barked’?

Sheffield Betrayed: Demand the Full Monty

South Yorkshire council leaders have divided up Yorkshire for their own gain, without public involvement. When it comes to devolution, Yorkshire First demand the Full Monty!

Yorkshire Betrayed
This is not God's own county

South Yorkshire council leaders divide Yorkshire for their own gain...

#OneYorkshire
Regional planning

- Pre-2004 Regional Planning Guidance was advisory only, i.e. was not part of the ‘statutory development plan’
- The 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act changed their name to Regional Spatial Strategies (RSSs), abolished County Structure plans and made RSSs part of the development plan
- Local Development Frameworks had to accord with RSS, and reflect their policy, in terms of housing, renewable energy, etc.
- The Localism Act abolished regional planning in the 2010s
City-Region Issues

- Mid-2000s interest in city-regions as drivers of change in a more knowledge-based economy, where the roles of innovation and creativity are crucial.

- Ongoing debate about boundaries of ‘functional’ urban areas (e.g. Travel to Work Areas).

- City-regions could be perceived as groups of Local Authorities representing a coherent area larger than the ‘local’ to generate critical mass, but less than a region.

- New governance structure of elected mayors in the leading city regions?

- Multi Area Agreements (MAAs) – to foster cross-boundary working (signed in September 2009).

- A number of the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) introduced by the new government are based around city-regional geographies.

- ‘City Deals’ and new ‘Combined Authorities’; 2015 – ongoing process of signing devolution deals.
Greater London

- Greater London Assembly (GLA) and elected Mayor
- Referendum in 1998
- Mayor appoints Cabinet from Assembly
- Other members exercise scrutiny
- The GLA has responsibility for:
  - Transport; strategic spatial planning; economic development; environment;
  - Policing; fire and emergency planning
  - Culture/sport; health; energy.
- London Boroughs - *most* functions, inc. local plans
- Last elections for GLA and Mayor held in May 2016
The London Plan (2016)

THE LONDON PLAN
THE SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR LONDON CONSOLIDATED WITH ALTERATIONS SINCE 2011

MARCH 2016
The 2000s and the re-emergence of city regions

• New economic geographies
• The search for a new ‘spatial fix’?
• A variety of initiatives and reports from Government, researchers and lobby groups are converging to place city regions on the agenda
• The city region has returned but the rationale for acting at this level is different
The State of English Cities

Competitive European Cities: Where do the Core Cities Stand?

Key reports in 2006
Government Research in the 2000s

• Emphasised the role of ‘Core Cities’ as drivers of regional economies (Our Cities are Back – Core Cities report 2004)

• But also suggested that England’s core cities were not ‘punching their weight’ in comparison with the leading regional cities in other European countries

• Pointed to the role of cities in the North of England in bridging the ‘productivity gap’ with the rest of the UK -> Northern Way
The Northern Way

- A UK Government inspired initiative intended to re-balance the national economy

- The Northern Way Growth Strategy (NWGS) developed by the three northern Regional Development Agencies (RDA) with the aim of bridging the £29 billion output gap between the north of England and the rest of the UK

- It sought to promote partnership working in the North and capitalise on the northern regions’ endogenous growth potential
The Northern Way

• The **Northern Way Growth Strategy (NWGS)** developed by the three northern Regional Development Agencies (RDA) with the aim of bridging the £29 billion output gap between the north of England and the rest of the UK.

• It sought to promote partnership working in the North and capitalise on the northern regions’ indigenous growth potential.
The Northern Way strategy’s primary spatial focus was on eight city regions which were seen as being the key to accelerating the growth of the North.
City regions were seen as the key to making the economy of the North grow faster.
Wider Context (?) - Vision for the North European Trade Axis (NETA) Corridor

Source: http://www.netaproject.org.uk
Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West Key Diagram (2006)

Central Lancashire City Region
Manchester City Region
Liverpool City Region
Rescaling post-2010...

- From… ‘standard’ (large regions) and institutions (Regional Development Agencies)

- To… sub-regional geographies (Local Enterprise Partnerships and ‘Combined Authorities’)

- Arguments about basing action on more ‘functional’ geographies that better reflects economic activities and markets in housing and employment.
The current criteria for defining TTWAs is that generally at least 75% of an area's resident workforce work in the area and at least 75% of the people who work in the area also live in the area. The area must also have a working population of at least 3,500. However, for areas with a working population in excess of 25,000, self-containment rates as low as 66.7% are accepted. TTWA boundaries are non-overlapping, are contiguous and cover the whole of the UK. TTWAs do cross national boundaries, although no account is taken of commuting between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland.

The Political Dimension - *devolution*

- The so-called ‘Core Cities’ have argued that there needs to be more devolution of public spending and revenue raising to the largest UK cities and city regions.

- Drivers of the process of devolution to English city regions:
  - Regional imbalances in England (the continuing ‘North-South’ divide and its variants)
  - The aftermath of the Scottish Independence Referendum (2014)
Metropolitan Governance the Return – Combined Authorities

Combined authorities are a legal structure that may be set up by local authorities in England. They can be set up with or without a directly-elected mayor. The relevant legislation is the *Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009* and the *Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016*.

Combined authorities may be set up by two or more local authorities. They may take on statutory functions transferred to them by an Order made by the Secretary of State, plus any functions that the constituent authorities agree to share.

The first combined authority to be established was the Greater Manchester Combined Authority, in 2011. In 2014-16, the Government has negotiated ‘devolution deals’ with several areas. Each of the existing combined authorities has negotiated a deal, and new mayoral combined authorities have been proposed in other participating areas. Orders implementing the devolution deals have been laid before Parliament during 2016.

A combined authority is a legal structure that may be established, via an Order made by the Secretary of State, at the request of two or more local authorities. The combined authority’s executive consists either of one representative of each member authority; or one representative of each member authority plus a directly-elected mayor (a ‘mayoral combined authority’).
Table 1: combined authority orders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Combined authority</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>Further orders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester</td>
<td>1 April 2011</td>
<td>Mayor: May 2017</td>
<td>Powers: May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interim mayor: 29 Jul 2015²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool City Region</td>
<td>1 April 2014</td>
<td>Mayor: May 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield City Region</td>
<td>1 April 2014</td>
<td>Mayor: May 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire</td>
<td>1 April 2014</td>
<td>Mayor: May 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East</td>
<td>8 April 2014</td>
<td>Mayor: May 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tees Valley</td>
<td>1 April 2016</td>
<td>Mayor: May 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>17 June 2016</td>
<td>Mayor: May 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Established combined authorities

- The Greater Manchester Combined Authority (Manchester, Salford, Stockport, Tameside, Trafford, Wigan, Bolton, Bury, Rochdale, and Oldham).

- The Sheffield City Region Combined Authority (Sheffield, Doncaster, Rotherham and Barnsley, plus associate members: Bassetlaw, Chesterfield, Derbyshire Dales, North-East Derbyshire, Bolsover.

- The West Yorkshire Combined Authority, covering Leeds, Bradford, Calderdale, Kirklees and Wakefield. York City Council is an associate member;

- The Liverpool City Region Combined Authority (Liverpool, St Helens, Sefton, Knowsley, Wirral and Halton);

- The North-East Combined Authority (Northumberland, County Durham, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Gateshead, Sunderland, North Tyneside and South Tyneside).

Each of these authorities, with the exception of West Yorkshire, has agreed to establish a directly-elected mayor under its devolution deal.
Greater Manchester Combined Authority

- **Greater Manchester** is the first city region to use new legislation to elect a "metro-mayor", a role similar to that of the Mayor of London.

- The mayor will have powers over transport, housing, strategic planning, and policing.

- The Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) is to acquire new powers including some control over business growth as well as health and social care budgets.

- Elections for Mayor take place in 2017.

- Other local authorities are set to follow Greater Manchester’s lead.
We are working together to produce a joint plan to manage the supply of land for jobs and new homes across Greater Manchester. The Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) will ensure that we have the right land in the right places to deliver the homes and jobs we need up to 2035, along with identifying the new infrastructure (such as roads, rail, Metrolink and utility networks) required to achieve this.

It will be the overarching development plan within which Greater Manchester’s ten local planning authorities can identify more detailed sites for jobs and homes in their own area. As such, the GMSF will not cover everything that a local plan would cover and individual districts will continue to produce their own local plans.
England
(population of 50 million)

Local authorities
(35,000 – 1 million)

Regions
(2.5 - 8 million)

Spatial Frameworks for city regions
(Manchester)

Community
(c. 100 upwards)

Pre-2004
Planning Policy Guidance notes
Regional Planning Guidance (advisory)
County Structure Plans
Local plans
Parish Plans (non statutory)

2004-2010
Planning Policy Statements
Regional Spatial Strategies
Local Development Frameworks
Parish Plans (non statutory)

2011-
National Planning Policy Framework
Local Plans
Neighbourhood Plans

2016
Sturzaker (2011)
The “Northern Powerhouse”

• Intended to be a counterbalancing pole to London’s economic success.
• Same basic goal as the earlier Northern Way – but more resources?
• Focus on major transport investment to link the Northern Cities
  - Electrification
  - HS3 (rail across the Pennines)
One North
A Proposition for an Interconnected North

July 2014

http://www.manchester.gov.uk/downloads/download/5969/one_north
The Northern Powerhouse

• What does it mean

– Substantial fresh devolution of powers to sub-regions with Combined Authorities (e.g. city regions)
– Directly Elected Executive ‘Metro’ Mayors with a first wave of elections to be held in 2017
– Substantial control over health budgeting
– A £900m investment budget (over 30 years).
– £300m housing investment fund (over 10 years)
– Statutory Spatial Strategies (e.g. Manchester)
– Taking on the Role of Police and Crime Commissioners
Conclusions

• Periodic re-organisation, or ‘re-scaling’ of sub-state governance occurs
• Shift from a top-down dynamic of analysis and institutional design (of the 60s and 70s to a more bottom-up logic.
• The structures of local government described today reflect this ongoing process
• Significant changes in the past 20 years include devolution to Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and London
• Experiments with and discussions about other relevant scales of governance have also occurred. Notably in relation to:
  – Regions in England
  – City-regions reflecting ‘functional’ geographies (e.g. Travel to work areas; transport; housing and labour markets)
• But questions remain:
  – Resources and political support (George Osborne has gone following EU referendum)
  – Democratic legitimacy? (low turnouts in local elections; what about city regions e.g. city regional mayoral elections in 2017)
  – Return of ‘nationalism’ v. regionalism/city regionalism? (a ‘national’ industrial strategy)
Some References


Appendix

• A few words on Brexit…
The overall result

Leave polled the most strongly in 270 counting areas, with Remain coming first in 129.

Key:  
- Majority leave  
- Majority remain  
- Tie  
- Undeclared

- Brexit vote…

- A very diverse picture

- Cultural issues very important as well as urban or rural, or wealth

- Strongest leave vote in some rural areas and smaller towns in those areas and also old industrial towns

- Division in metropolitan areas too between cores and peripheries
Britain has voted by a substantial margin to leave the European Union. The picture that is emerging is of a heavily polarised country, with remain areas coming in more strongly for remain than expected, and leave areas more strongly for leave. Geographically, Scotland and London have voted overwhelmingly for remain, but outside the capital, every English region had a majority for leave.

Follow our referendum liveblog here

How did my area vote?

Enter placename or postcode
Submit

Latest declarations

Cornwall voted to leave 4 days ago
Basingstoke & Deane voted to leave 4 days ago
Northampton voted to leave 4 days ago
Wealden voted to leave 4 days ago
Derby voted to leave 4 days ago
Stoke-on-Trent voted to leave 4 days ago
Guildford voted to remain 4 days ago
Cherwell voted to leave 4 days ago
Northumberland voted to leave 4 days ago
Arun voted to leave 4 days ago
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Leave</th>
<th>Remain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Helens</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowsley</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire West and Chester</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wirral</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Blue = Leave  
Yellow - Remain
Only 27% of Liverpool’s registered Voters Backed Leaving the European Union!

73% did not...

In some Parliamentary constituencies in Liverpool as many as 73% voted to Remain in the EU

A mandate for change or…

A clear democratic deficit?
Paddy Shennan: Liverpool kept its head - now WE need independence

10:13, 24 JUN 2016    UPDATED 10:38, 24 JUN 2016    BY PADDY SHENNAN

'The Far Right will be jubilant. Racists will be dancing in the street. The intolerant will be intolerable.'

Beautiful Sunrise over Liverpool's world famous skyline

Liverpool kept its head while all around were losing theirs.
But others have made OUR bed and now we have to lie in it.
We have been known as the Republic of Liverpool for decades - let's now make it official.
The country narrowly voted to cut its ties with Europe, but it wasn’t a narrow vote in Liverpool.

The sun rises on the Liver Building in Liverpool

Recommended in Liverpool News

CHESHIRE POLICE
Police have closed a road in Ellesmere Port over man “making threats” »

FACEBOOK
Crafty new Whatsapp feature now means people can’t ignore you »

WhatsApp

CRIME
Thug who robbed laughing gas van was on bail for raping child »

LIVERPOOL NEWS
St Helens schoolboy, 16, charged with sexual assault of young boy »
EU Referendum – “The Revolution eats its Children”

How different age groups voted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Leave</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>Remain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18–24</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–34</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–44</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–54</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–64</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lord Ashcroft Polls

Jacques Mallet du Pan

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-36616028
Brexit: Why Britain's eurosceptic regions have most to lose from EU withdrawal

Insight
John Springford, Phil McCann, Bart Les and Mark Thissen
13 June 2015

The Leave camp has signalled that it is going to talk about immigration for the remainder of the referendum campaign. This is not surprising: Brexiteers have struggled to counter the pro-Remain economic analysis from heavyweight institutions - the OECD, the Treasury, the Bank of England and the IMF, to name a few. A relentless focus on immigration keeps the public eye on the common (but erroneous) assumption that immigration depresses wages and piles pressure on public services. It also injects a pinch of identity and class politics into the campaign. Leave have portrayed Brexainers as rich Londoners who are out of touch - hence pro-Brexit employment minister Priti Patel's comment that "It's shameful that those leading the pro-EU campaign fail to care for those who do not have their advantages. Their narrow self-interest fails to pay due regard to the interests of the wider public." In case you need reminding, David Cameron and George Osborne are both from wealthy London or Home Counties-based families and both went to expensive private schools in the London area (as did Boris Johnson and Nigel Farage.)

Leaves anti-elite message resonates most strongly in regions outside of London, whose economies have been struggling since the 2008 crash. But the irony is that it is these regions, not London and its rich commuter belt, that have most to lose from leaving the EU.
Contrary to popular belief, 52% of people who voted Leave in the EU referendum lived in the southern half of England, and 59% were in the middle classes, while the proportion of Leave voters in the lowest two social classes was just 24%. Almost all other European countries tax more effectively, spend more on health, and do not tolerate our degree of economic inequality. To distract us from these national failings, we have been encouraged to blame immigration and the EU. That lie will now be exposed.

http://www.dannydorling.org/?p=5568
Ironically, Leave’s anti-elitist message resonates in UK regions that have most to lose from #Brexit

Chart 1 shows a positive correlation between a region’s level of economic integration with the EU and that region’s euroscepticism. The vertical axis, based on new data from the University of Groningen, shows the proportion of a region’s economic output which is sold to the rest of the EU – either in the form of exports, or indirectly, with domestic companies supplying goods and services to exporters. The horizontal axis is taken from the British Election Survey, which asks people how they would vote in the EU referendum and breaks down to a constituency level. The chart shows that London and Scotland, the most pro-EU areas of the UK, are less economically integrated with the EU than the UK average. Meanwhile, outside the prosperous South East, rural counties such as North Yorkshire and Dorset, and more urban ones, like West Yorkshire and Lancashire, are more integrated with the EU, and also tend to be more eurosceptic.

**Chart 1.** UK regions more economically integrated with the EU are more likely to be eurosceptic.