# Keir Starmer’s planning reforms risk repeating Boris Johnson’s environmental missteps



Keir Starmer stands at a precarious juncture, seemingly following the ill-fated footsteps of Boris Johnson in his approach to planning reform in the UK. The recent proposals not only echo the catastrophic missteps of the past but also threaten to dismantle hard-won environmental protections and local democratic rights. Observers are left pondering whether Starmer’s strategy is a gamble that could undermine Labour’s electoral prospects.

In 2020, Johnson’s vision for a "whole new planning system" promised an ambitious drive to build 300,000 new homes annually. The rhetoric was compelling: economic growth anchored in development. Yet, it soon became clear that his narrative was marred by misleading claims about environmental hurdles, most infamously characterised by the imagery of newts obstructing progress. As communities rallied against what they perceived as an assault on their local environments, the backlash culminated in the shocking defeat of the Conservatives in the Chesham and Amersham by-election, a seat they had long considered safe. Tory commentators admitted that simmering discontent over planning system reforms significantly contributed to this electoral upheaval.

Now, as Labour’s environment secretary, Steve Reed, oversees a similarly ambitious bill, he faces accusations that mirror those levied against Johnson. The proposed reforms threaten to strip protections for wildlife and green spaces, ostensibly to pave the way for new housing development. Reed has argued that the obstacles to building homes lie not within the planning process but rather in the hands of developers who engage in 'land banking'—holding onto land with planning consent in the hopes of selling it at a higher price instead of actual construction. This claim holds considerable weight, as evidence suggests that over 1.1 million approved homes remain unbuilt, not due to bureaucratic red tape but rather market speculation.

Yet, Starmer has aligned himself with a narrative framing local residents who wish to participate in development discussions as “nimbys” and “blockers.” This language is reminiscent of past Conservative rhetoric and raises questions about Labour's commitment to community engagement. Critics argue that the proposed changes will not only deregulate planning processes but could also lead to the erosion of rights that allow individuals to influence development in their own neighbourhoods. Furthermore, experts have voiced alarm over the implications for biodiversity, stressing that this rush to build will fail to address the deeper systemic issues plaguing the housing crisis.

Reacting to concerns, Reed's office held press briefings which ultimately revealed the potential negative impacts of the bill. Notably, provisions that would allow developers to disrupt local habitats, provided they offset the damage elsewhere, threaten community access to green spaces. The Office for Environmental Protection has expressed that the proposed changes could represent a regressive step for environmental safeguards, a sentiment echoed by various ecological experts and community advocates.

The governmental push for these reforms has drawn scrutiny from unlikely quarters, including factions within the Conservative Party who view such moves as detrimental to local democracy. Ironically, as Starmer attempts to reform Labour’s image and broaden its appeal, particularly among environmentally conscious voters, he risks alienating the very constituents whose support is crucial for electoral success. The parallels to Johnson's failed policies are stark, presenting a dilemma: will Labour learn from history, or is it destined to repeat the mistakes of its predecessors?

In a landscape increasingly dominated by corporate interests, the question remains whether Starmer's vision will ensure progress or merely perpetuate previous errors. As polling suggests a shift in voter sentiment regarding planning permissions, Labour's trajectory may hinge on its ability to balance development needs with genuine community engagement and environmental stewardship. The stakes are high, and the political climate is as risky as ever.
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