

Table 1 Massachusetts and England distinctions and aims

	Massachusetts		England	
	Choice	Aims Encouraged	Choice	Aims Encouraged
Role of Government	Active convener	Planning improvement (accountability); Provide space for political expression	Passive recipient (and police)	Enhance strong democracy; Build community
Effect of Participation on Government	Advisory	Planning improvement (improve inputs)	Binding	Enhance strong democracy
Timing	Public input on projects	Planning improvement (accountability)	Public input on plans	Substantive policy (pro-development); Build community; Enhance strong democracy
Availability of Judicial Review	Widely available	Planning improvement (accountability);	Available only to denied applicants	<i>For planning applications:</i> Substantive policy (pro-development) <i>For NDP applications:</i> Enhance democracy
Costs in Judicial Review	Each side bears its own	Substantive policy (anti-development)	Loser pays	

Despite having different aims, both systems share a critical similarity: they are built around a perceived need to disempower local government. Massachusetts's system reflects a suspicion that planners with free reign will approve too much housing, contrary to the wishes of the communities they serve. In England, the coalition that enacted the Localism Act was openly hostile to local government.