

# dear prime minister

open letters on green goals  
for the second term

“green alliance...”

Design by Upstream.  
Published June 2001

## green alliance

Green Alliance is one of the UK's foremost environmental organisations. An independent charity, its mission is to promote sustainable development by ensuring that the environment is at the heart of decision-making. It works with senior people in government, parliament, business and the environmental movement to encourage new ideas, dialogue and constructive solutions.

Green Alliance  
40 Buckingham Palace Road  
London SW1W 0RE  
tel: 020 7233 7433  
fax: 020 7233 9033  
email: [ga@green-alliance.org.uk](mailto:ga@green-alliance.org.uk)  
web: [www.green-alliance.org.uk](http://www.green-alliance.org.uk)

The Green Alliance Trust is a registered charity number 1045395. Company limited by guarantee, registered number 3037633.

## contents

Rebecca Willis, Director, Green Alliance	2
Graham Wynne, Chief Executive, RSPB	3
Tony Hawkhead, Chief Executive, Groundwork	4
Robin Bidwell, Chairman, Environment Resources Management	5
Charles Secrett, Executive Director, Friends of the Earth	6
Chris Hewett, Senior Research Fellow, Institute for Public Policy Research	7
Robert Napier, Chief Executive, WWF-UK	8
David Baldock, Director, Institute for European Environmental Policy	9
Peter Jones, Director for External Affairs, Biffa Waste Services	10
Kate Parminter, Director, CPRE	11

These letters are written in a personal capacity and do not necessarily represent the views of the author's organisation, or of Green Alliance

Dear Prime Minister,

Last year, you promised to “reawaken the environmental challenge as part of the core of British and international politics”. Britain re-elected you on a promise of delivery – and it is not just on health and education that people expect results.

To mark the start of your second term, Green Alliance has commissioned this collection of open letters from environmental organisations, business and think-tanks. We asked green leaders to tell you their hopes for what could be achieved over the next four years, and their fears for what might be forgotten.

So what do they say?

Of course each of us have our own priorities. But there is a striking degree of consensus on what needs to be done.

**“like your drive for public services, environment is about a focus on the public good. It is about providing benefits that individuals alone cannot provide”**

First, the jury is still out on your new government structures. Putting environment with food and farming may provide the much-needed impetus to drive through reforms to agriculture, both in the UK and in Europe. But it puts up artificial barriers to other important policy areas – transport, energy, industry, planning. It remains to be seen whether DEFRA will command enough respect to exert its influence more widely. Government will need to work hard, and work together, to mainstream the environment.

Following foot-and-mouth, there is an appetite for change in the countryside. Coupled with new reforming voices in the EU, we now have a once-in-a-lifetime chance to reform the Common Agricultural Policy. Over the last fifty years, intensive agriculture has caused immeasurable damage to our countryside – now’s the chance to turn that around.

Climate change policy has taken a knock, with Bush’s withdrawal from Kyoto. There’s nothing like a common environmental enemy, though, to provoke a response. On the international stage, we will expect you to push for early European ratification of Kyoto. At home, the energy review will be a chance to untangle the conflicting signals of a tangled energy policy, and put renewables centre-stage.

In your manifesto, you made some important commitments to environmental productivity – producing goods and services more efficiently, with less environmental impact. Environmental productivity should be as important as labour productivity in the eyes of the Treasury and the DTI. Energy efficiency, clean technologies and the environmental opportunities offered by e-commerce could all play their part in creating the green industrial revolution you have promised us.

Despite your convincing victory, you must have been worried by the apathy that we saw at this election. People are not seeing the connections between politics and their everyday life. Commitment to the environment could change this. Like your drive for public services, environment is about a focus on the public good. It is about providing benefits that individuals alone cannot provide. Showing people that politics is literally about the air that we breathe, the food we eat and the rubbish we recycle may just make the difference next time around.



Rebecca Willis  
Director, Green Alliance

Although green issues were conspicuous by their near absence during the election campaign, our million members will expect to see their concerns reflected in your drive for delivery through this second term.

One of the most pressing challenges facing the Government is the future of the countryside. The RSPB regards the creation of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs as a positive first step to integrating environmental considerations into rural policy. We particularly hope that DEFRA promotes the growing consensus that modern farming needs to be about much more than simply mass food production at 'lowest' cost.

Your Secretary of State at DEFRA, Margaret Beckett, also has the demanding task of presenting the UK case for fundamental and radical reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) in Europe. We have been arguing for this change for many years - but increasingly others are joining us. It almost goes without saying that your personal role here is absolutely crucial. With Germany developing into an ally on the Agriculture Council, and BSE and Foot and Mouth creating a genuine watershed in public opinion in the UK, there is an unprecedented opportunity for you to work with our European partners to provide international leadership on this issue. Your speech last March was a powerful call for change - we look forward to celebrating measurable success by the next election.

President Bush's stand on climate change makes it all the more essential that the EU, where the UK has played an important role, takes further action to meet the commitments of the Kyoto protocol. In the UK this will necessitate increased support for renewable energy and the setting of challenging long-term targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Climate change will add to the pressures on water resources. The first chance to make progress in this area, by introducing the long-awaited Water Bill in the first parliamentary session, has already been missed. Environmentalists and consumer groups - as well as the industry itself - are expecting a commitment to legislation at the first available opportunity.

Welcome though DEFRA is, the danger is that it becomes sidelined within government as a policy ghetto for green issues. One action could do more than all others to ensure that the divides with other sectors of government are bridged - strong personal leadership from you. Your first term brought significant advances for the environment: the UK position on climate change is commendable and the Countryside Act a noteworthy achievement. Our hope is that, by the end of this Parliament, your delivery on green issues will mean that the environment is seen as a truly integral part of your vision for a progressive, modern society.



Graham Wynne  
Chief Executive, RSPB

**“modern farming needs to be about much more than simply mass food production at ‘lowest’ cost”**

It was clear that the state of our planet was a long way down the list of priorities during your election campaign.

In your defence you would no doubt say this reflects the concerns of the voters - health, education, crime and the public services. After all, surely we need to get the basics right before people will start thinking about renewables and global warming?

Why bother planting trees when our parks are full of gangs and drug addicts? Why stop using our cars when we can't guarantee our kids are safe walking to school?

It's a powerful argument. However it's one that is deeply flawed. Getting the basics right is fundamentally an environmental issue, and one which reflects most people's priorities. What the majority of us worry about is the state of our home, our street, our neighbourhood, our town - in short the quality of life in our community.

When you spoke to Groundwork's conference in April you said that this was a central, not a peripheral issue. You said we need public spaces to be proud of, safe routes to school for our children, parks which are clean, attractive and accessible and businesses that are involved in the community.

Making our villages, towns and cities more liveable is as much an environmental issue as re-building momentum on climate change now that Kyoto has been am-Bushed.

**“Making our villages, towns and cities more liveable is as much an environmental issue as re-building momentum on climate change now that Kyoto has been am-Bushed”**

In the light of your reshuffle, however, it seems this connection has been broken. DTLR's neighbourhood renewal and urban policy departments have now lost their environment colleagues who move across town to become part of the countryside. You must ensure that sustainable development doesn't become an 'also ran', shoehorned into DEFRA under the guise of environmental protection and rural renewal.

Sustainable development must be central to the aims and objectives of every Government department. It is more than an environmental issue. At its most basic sustainable development is about building respect. We will never reach the critical mass needed to change the way global society works until we begin to respect the environment on our doorstep and other people in our community. This is as important to policies on education, employment, regeneration, crime and international development as it is to environmental protection.

Rebuilding a sense of civic, social and environmental respect must be the priority for the next five years. So why not push through some real examples of joined-up working that will make a practical and measurable difference to both our environment and our communities?

Let's respect the long-term unemployed by giving them real jobs to improve the physical fabric of their neighbourhoods. Let's help businesses respect their neighbours by reducing their environmental impact and playing a greater role in the community. Let's respect our heritage and our ecology by regenerating unproductive brownfield land as green spaces for wildlife and people. Finally, let's respect our future. Unless and until education for sustainable development takes its rightful place on the school curriculum we'll always be playing catch-up.

It's been a long time coming but now respect is due.



Tony Hawkhead  
Chief Executive, Groundwork

## The commitment made in the Queen's Speech to making sustainable development a reality establishes the vision.

Resource efficiency is central to the long-term delivery of this agenda. At the operational level, the goal is to meet the demands for goods, services, travel and housing while using less energy, less materials, creating less waste and avoiding the use of hazardous substances at every stage in the life-cycle.

We need an appropriate fiscal and regulatory framework that reduces inefficiencies and waste and promotes innovations for more eco-efficient products and services. There is also the potential for action through public sector procurement. The public sector is a major purchaser. It can influence the way a whole range of products and services are delivered; it can send a strong signal to other sectors; and it can stimulate innovation to minimise inefficiency. A clear message must be given to the purchasing agencies that 'value for money' must incorporate principles of resource efficiency.

Government can also take the lead by applying resource efficiency principles to the whole gamut of government decisions: whether on investment in transport, standards for housing, regulation of utilities, land-use reform or the host of other arenas where government actions impact the environment. Progress requires a change of culture in many departments - and a more explicit demonstration of eco-efficiency improvements. Decisions also need the support of sound science. Providing proper funding to build our environmental science base must be considered a priority.

Accountability is also crucial. The environment agenda involves every department, every business, every household. Every day a myriad of decisions are being taken that will affect our quality of life this year, next year and in ten years' time. This points to a need for transparency and accountability.

Within the public sector, there is a need for clear reporting, assessment and support to allow bodies such as the Environment Audit Committee to investigate decisions and hold individuals responsible in a way that would create a frisson of fear similar to a call from the Public Accounts Committee. With the private sector, there is an opportunity with the Company Law reform initiative to look at imposing duties on Directors and clarifying the conditions under which a company will be liable for its environmental impacts. Similarly, companies should be encouraged towards more consistent reporting of their resource use and waste production.

While regulation and the fiscal framework are of course essential to protecting and enhancing the environment, the cornerstone of progress must be strong leadership and a commitment to delivering progress. The statements in the Queen's Speech are an important signal.

Apart from articulating a strong vision at home, there will be a number of key opportunities during the next few years to take a leadership role abroad: at Johannesburg and elsewhere on issues of climate change, bio-diversity, environment-trade conflicts and sustainable development in the poorer countries. These and many other issues will require strong leadership if we are to move from the quagmire of endless debate to actions that will make a difference on the ground. We rely on you to provide that leadership.



**Robin Bidwell**  
Chairman, Environmental Resources Management

**“allow the Environment Audit Committee to hold individuals responsible, creating a frisson of fear similar to a call from the Public Accounts Committee”**

We're worried. We are not impressed by the new Departmental shake-up. First reaction to DEFRA from FOE? A botched job that owes much more to Robin Cooke's precipitous dismissal than any strategic determination to 'put environmental concern at the heart of government decision-making' (that awkward 1997 manifesto promise conveniently dropped for this year's election).

Sure, we've got to give the new arrangements - and new Ministers – a chance. But even the quickest analysis reveals fundamental flaws. In essence, environment officials and Ministers have been marginalised, and distanced from the big decisions in Cabinet, Treasury and No 10.

600 environment policy-makers into 10,000 MAFF officials just doesn't go. MAFF has beaten off every significant environmental reform for years, which is why agriculture is in such a bloody mess. Talk about Charge of the Light Brigade, Mark 2.

We're pleased that Michael Meacher deservedly retains his environment portfolio. He did a good job for you last time round, on GMOs and a host of other green problem areas that the Cabinet initially pretended did not matter (congestion, foot-and-mouth, incinerators, housing, roads). But surely he now needs more than desk space to fulfil his very wide brief? In DETR, Meacher had the Deputy Prime Minister, and two junior Ministers in support. Now he has none, and the Private Office is full of ex-MAFF officials.

“Environmental policy-making means managing demand, not stoking resource consumption and traffic levels”

And what about splitting environment from planning decisions, and regional and local government/housing budgets? We all know this is where Departmental power lies. Strip environment officials and Ministers from their main sources of strength, and what is left to get Whitehall to go green? Talk about sending the troops naked into battle. Stephen Byers has promise (as does Patricia Hewitt at DTI). But he will have to be a strong man to fulfil his vision of a 'green industrial revolution' in his new role. It means turning down the insane Hastings bypass proposals, along with Terminal 5 and new runways/airports. Environmental policy-making means managing demand, not stoking resource consumption and traffic levels.

Maybe we will see a greening of agriculture, energy and industry under your reign, as you proclaimed last October and again in March. We'll hold you to that. We just don't see MAFF - whoops, sorry, Environment, Food and Rural Affairs - convincing Whitehall's many skeptics to take urban and industrial environmental policies seriously. Mr Meacher cannot champion climate change, waste minimisation, traffic reduction, green taxation and spending, toxic chemical bans, green energy and Factor 10 resource efficiency targets on his own. More than ever, he needs the full support of No 10 and the Cabinet Office.

So, reassure us, Prime Minister. Use your Presidential-like office to integrate environmental priorities across government. Make sure Treasury, DTI and Transport, in particular, produce environmentally sound and socially just sustainable development. That is the only way forward.

Thanks for listening - and forgive our scepticism. It's just that you and your Cabinet promised so much last time around, and delivered so little. Once bitten, twice shy, as they say.

*Charles Secrett*

Charles Secrett  
Executive Director, Friends of the Earth

I hope you will be able to use the next four or five years to push green issues back up the political agenda, as you highlighted in three speeches towards the end of the first term.

Looking from the outside, however, the restructuring of Government departments appears to have downgraded the issue. Sustainable development was being championed by the Deputy Prime Minister in the last term, from a Whitehall department with clout. Merging environment with MAFF makes the issue look much more about old style countryside protection than the green industrial revolution you spoke of a few months ago. If you want to counter this impression then three areas need to be addressed quickly:

First, Britain must build on its deserved reputation for global leadership on climate change. Push for early ratification of the Kyoto Protocol in the EU. Make it clear to George Bush that Europeans wish to press ahead with the treaty with or without the US. Japan and Canada are supporting the Protocol and the Democrats in the US Senate are calling for mandatory CO2 targets in the US. Climate change policy must also be a key driver in the forthcoming energy policy review. The Performance and Innovation Unit are likely to give you plenty of evidence to press ahead with vigorous support for renewable energy and greater energy efficiency. This is a 21st century vision that will outlast and outperform the 1970's throwback that Dick Cheney is promoting in the US.

There is clearly a huge opportunity to reform food and farming policy and the new department will be well placed to tackle those reforms. There is also a window of opportunity in the EU to take on the CAP. A UK/German alliance could work well in pushing this issue up the political agenda in Europe. It may also be a good moment for UK engagement in a major European policy area. If UK views were demonstrably changing policy on the CAP to the benefit of British consumers and our environment, then this would surely help a Euro referendum campaign by showing the fruits of positive engagement in Europe.

Transport is clearly going to be the biggest environmental problem for the second term. The symbolism of splitting apart DETR appears to point towards a return to failed 1990s policies on road building. Here you might want to keep a close eye on the findings of the Social Exclusion Unit's study on transport and social exclusion. The quickest way to improve the transport experience of the poorest in society, as well as moving towards a sustainable transport policy, will be to focus on short journeys: buses, walking and cycling. This is not headline grabbing investment, but much more can be delivered in five years through these routes than a few prestigious rail, road and tram projects. These improvements are the glue that holds together an integrated transport system. Without them, the big projects could end up as white elephants attracting ridicule for their low use.

Environmental issues have never featured high on the agenda in party politics. Yet the falling turnout at this election is pointing to a population becoming disengaged with the ballot box, expressing their political views through consumer action and membership of NGOs. Sustainable development is a political concept that can re-engage those people.



Chris Hewett  
Senior Research Fellow, Institute for Public Policy Research

“merging environment with MAFF makes the issue look much more like old style countryside protection than the green industrial revolution you spoke of recently”

If delivery is to be the watchword of your second term, then “connect, connect, connect” should be the mantra to make it happen. Joined-up policy-making is the environmentalist’s dream. Your radical shake-up in Whitehall since 7 June could, I believe, bring this closer to reality.

Margaret Beckett’s new Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs has the opportunity to take a much-needed holistic approach to the future of the countryside and food production, particularly in the wake of the foot and mouth crisis. Mrs Beckett will be in a stronger position than any minister before her to push for a reform of the Common Agricultural Policy which genuinely promotes sustainable rural development. This, of course, is exactly in line with the keynote speech you made in March at WWF’s conference.

There is also a real chance now that the problems facing our marine environment can be tackled more effectively by a department that looks at both fishing and conservation interests together. With its strengthened integration brief, DEFRA is also better placed to work closely with departments responsible for areas that affect the marine environment, such as oil and gas exploration. In the beefed-up Cabinet Office, John Prescott should punch above his weight, ensuring sustainability genuinely runs through the heart of government policy. But have you missed a trick here? I can’t help thinking that his job would be easier if you had transferred the Sustainable Development Unit to the Cabinet Office.

I know from your WWF speech that you are acutely aware of many of the hard choices ahead if you are to meet the demands of what you called the “greatest challenge we face this century” – sustainable development. Choices will need to be made about your coming review of the planning regime: will less bureaucracy for businesses be at the expense of environmental progress? Does the separation of environment from transport mean that the Government will press ahead with its controversial road schemes like the Hastings by-pass? Will you continue to lead the way internationally on climate change by ratifying the Kyoto Protocol, even without George Bush on board?

In addition, you have spoken persuasively about the connection between poverty and environmental degradation in the poorest countries – but when will you bring this message closer to home and take a more strategic approach to addressing green concerns alongside social justice and poverty in the UK?

We will be looking for nothing less than delivery in a number of areas by the time you next go to the polls. I’m thinking of consolidated marine legislation that protects marine wildlife and fish stocks and provides prosperity for coastal communities. We expect tougher action on hormone disrupting chemicals, including a comprehensive plan to eliminate the threats from toxic chemicals by 2020, and the public right to know which toxic chemicals are present in consumer products.

Meanwhile, you should have ratified the Kyoto Protocol by the time of the Johannesburg Summit in 2002, at which you, and the heads of the devolved administrations who should be with you, will commit to reducing the UK’s own environmental “footprint” by 70% by 2030. And last but not least, will you and your ministers please provide leadership in the EU and go for radical reform of the CAP? You said yourself that the CAP was “distorted and outmoded” – so let’s seize the opportunity and replace it with something that benefits the whole rural economy and the environment.



Robert Napier  
Chief Executive, WWF-UK

“Mrs Beckett will be in a stronger position than any minister before her to push for a reform of the Common Agricultural Policy which genuinely promotes sustainable rural development”

Unlike the Euro, the environment didn't figure large in the election campaign, yet it lies close to the heart of many of the bigger, perhaps harder issues for the coming years. Think only of transatlantic relations or the reform of the CAP. Or of Britain's growing reputation for poor public transport and reluctance to recycle.

You have promised delivery in the second term. In Europe there are commitments on climate, agriculture, sustainable development, transport and other key issues to follow through. Don't shy away from the hard ones, like shifting transport from road to rail. This means firm fiscal policies, and demand management as well as greater public investment. Win/win solutions are not always enough – there has been under investment in the environment as well as in public services. This must be recognised in the Treasury and other government departments as well as inside DEFRA.

By the end of 2005 we will be looking for real achievements from the new strategic initiatives in Europe. Not only from the Sustainable Development Strategy and the now greener Lisbon Process but also from the everyday work of different Councils committed to environmental integration, most recently at Gothenburg. Europe should be taking a clear lead in implementing sustainability in the way it is now doing on climate. Within five years enlargement will be well underway and a new model of European development should be in place.

CAP reform will be a difficult challenge - past efforts have stumbled. Success this time will depend on a stronger alliance responding creatively to the unique opportunity of EU enlargement. Accession states need to be offered a radically different and more sustainable alternative to the present CAP over the next twelve months, to create a new majority for change. Otherwise the opportunities for reform could slip away. But you can't rely on CAP reform to deliver change in the British countryside. This requires fresh ideas, and more willingness to deploy national funds than in the past.

**“the government as a whole must underline its belief in a new direction to counter the impression that DEFRA was unplanned and could, therefore, be unloved”**

The creation of DEFRA was a surprise. It is a bold step that potentially could deliver much more than the proposed rebranding of MAFF as the Department of Rural Affairs. The Institute is not aware of other European countries where such an ambitious melding of agriculture, environment, food and rural affairs has been attempted. Clearly there are dangers too. Administrative upheavals may distract from the creation of a new culture, sense of mission and effective delivery on the ground. Separation of the environment from planning and transport, divided responsibilities for climate and for regional policies and the demands of the MAFF agenda could check rather than accelerate progress. So, it is the government as a whole, not only Margaret Beckett, which must underline its belief in a new direction to counter the impression that DEFRA was unplanned and could, therefore, be unloved. And don't forget fisheries, which has disappeared from the nameplate. It is on the edge of a once in a generation change with the 2002 reform of the Common Fisheries Policy.

Your speech last year set the scene – don't wait four years to put yourself at the centre of the debate again.



David Baldock  
Director, Institute for European Environmental Policy

You have won the historic second term, but as we all know, the market is unforgiving. The perception is that as Prime Minister you are reluctant to profile the environment simply because it continues to score low electoral awareness. When you do put your head over the parapet there is a howl of conflicting advice and over-hyping of threats which never quite seem to materialise as fast as you originally thought. As a result, sustainability makes it to the back end of the Queen's Speech – but only just!

It's time to think about the longer term fiscal opportunities presented by the environment. Indirect taxes on consumers are getting more sensitive – particularly on petrol. Direct taxation increases are not on the agenda. A framework of eco taxes with carrots and sticks is the only answer. Is there a chance that the Treasury team will realise that supply chain taxation is the next way to go? Putting taxes on industry via virgin input levies, fuel and carbon taxes and disposal/effluent taxes aimed at improving resource efficiency in the economy provides a potential double whammy. They encourage moves toward more sustainable whole life cycle eco-performance, and they mean that environmental impacts are reflected in the purchase price of products. Producer Responsibility and Integrated Product Policy are the icing on the cake. What's more, industry carries the can.

**“Will the Treasury team realise that supply chain taxation is the way to go? Taxes on industry provide a potential double whammy”**

Obviously there are some nuts and bolts to attend to. Looking in your own backyard, you have to green Government itself. It's about more than paper recycling bins parked next to red dispatch boxes. Government finances were in a position where capital costs had to be nailed down and everything was to do with revenue. This gives no incentive to whole life accounting. Whole life sustainability and carbon efficiency of Government infrastructures is generally in a mess.

Your own Environment Agency estimates the need for around 500 new waste management facilities. The creaking framework of the planning system has barely to connect with this rolling tide of environmental change – whether for incinerators or composting facilities. You can't really move in that area until you address the perplexities of having a non-unitary approach to the operational management of waste – with separate political bodies in the same patch responsible for collection and disposal. You now have DEFRA developing the targets and strategies whilst DTLR is running local authorities proper. Watch this space!

The cost of the municipal waste strategy is likely to add between £500m and £700m annually to the cost of Town Hall waste management – around 50% of their current costs. In the first term all the money ploughed into that area merely enabled them to stand still. A revised approach to PFI will help of course, as will Producer Responsibility but it won't cure the whole problem. Understanding the flow of money in the sustainability area has never been easy – with DEFRA, Environment Agency and Treasury all taking a slice of the action via a dozen or so distinct financial instruments. But will you have the boldness to create a Green Tax Commission to bring some transparency and equity to the process?

Finally – what do we tell the public they should be doing? With no data, 17 different types of sticks and carrots, no cohesive planning strategy and divided responsibility in the majority of local authorities for the management of collection and disposal, are we better off keeping our head below the parapet? Maybe we should. Let's put environment down for a third term. After all global warming should be a reality by then.



Peter Jones  
Director for External Affairs, Biffa Waste Services

The importance of a beautiful, tranquil and diverse countryside to the nation's economy as well as contributing to the quality of life – for those in urban as well as rural areas – is now widely accepted and enshrined in the Government's Urban & Rural White Papers. A stark reminder of this fact, if such was needed, came in the recent Foot & Mouth outbreak.

The countryside can contribute to meeting the Government's economic goals if it is seen not as a constraint but a national resource. Driving forward change nationally and across Europe so that we have a farming industry that provides a public service - delivering healthy food, attractive landscapes, recreational space and wildlife habitats. Supporting the growing tourism industry to deliver discerning development that enhances our natural and built environment and provides opportunities for rural people. Measuring the outputs of Government initiatives to help every region develops its potential to ensure they deliver sustainable growth and urban regeneration, not least to areas consistently underperforming economically. Recognising the environmental and social opportunities of urban regeneration and discerning rural development alongside the economic and other costs of overheating, sprawl and congestion in the south and east.

Decisive leadership on transport will be needed now if our quality of life is to be measurably better in five years' time. Whilst the commitment to investment announced in the 10 Year Transport Plan was welcome, the number of new road schemes now coming forward will do nothing to help people change the way they travel. Firm and early action needs to signal that outdated road schemes that don't guarantee economic regeneration and damage precious countryside are not acceptable to this Government.

**“No 50-year-old system is perfect, but investment in new skills and extra resources would help fulfil the potential of planning. Don't confuse speed with quality”**

CPRE welcomes your Government's commitment to a planning system which protects the environment and supports communities and economic development. No 50-year-old system is perfect, but investment in new skills and extra resources would help fulfil the potential of this important public service. What has to be avoided is confusing speed with quality and the legitimacy of decision-making. Modernising the planning system needs to connect with the Government's agenda for local democratic renewal. By ensuring more active public participation in plan-making and policy review, the lack of public confidence in politics and politicians to change anything for the better can help to be dispelled. Planning needs to involve the widest group of stakeholders within a revitalised framework so that we get decisions that have public legitimacy and don't make consensus on contentious issues even more elusive.

None of these ambitions will be achieved without leadership. One early signal of that would be for you to announce that you will lead the Government's promised Urban Summit next year to highlight the importance of an urban renaissance to both town and country. This would be leadership which ensures people right across Government - and at all levels - unite behind goals which ensure that all communities can share in our prosperity whilst protecting our national asset of a beautiful, diverse and tranquil countryside.



Kate Parminter  
Director, CPRE