Economic Society and Humanities Vol. 2 No. 6, 2025

Green Gambling: Local Government Sustainable Energy Investments amid UK Austerity

Junrong Chen*
School of Environment, Education and Development, The University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom
**Corresponding Author*

Abstract:This article examines how Nottingham City Council and Thurrock Council, two English local authorities, pursued ambitious sustainable energy investments amidst severe austerity measures and dwindling central government funding. The research draws on the debt-driven development model, which synthesises entrepreneurial urbanism with austerity urbanism, to investigate how local authorities, under acute fiscal constraints, initiate ambitious energy projects to generate revenue and address social priorities. Using a qualitative, document-based case study approach, the study analyses council records, financial statements, policy documents, and external audit reports to investigate the motivations, strategies, and outcomes of these investments. The results demonstrate that Nottingham City Council adopted a municipalist approach by establishing a not-for-profit energy company, while Thurrock Council undertook large-scale investments in renewable energy projects, predominantly funded through short-term borrowing. Both councils initially aimed to generate revenue and deliver social or environmental benefits, but ultimately experienced severe financial losses. These failures are attributed to inadequate risk management, weak oversight, and overly optimistic financial projections. The article concludes that debt-driven development models require robust oversight and risk management frameworks, and that local authorities navigating fiscal crisis should balance innovation with prudent governance to safeguard public resources and maintain financial resilience.

Keywords: Austerity Urbanism; Debt-Driven Development; Municipal Investment; Sustainable Energy; Local Government Finance; Financial Sustainability

1. Introduction

Since the global financial crisis of 2008, local governments in the United Kingdom have faced intense budgetary pressures as a result of austerity policies and reductions in central government funding [1-3]. In response, many councils have pursued innovative and sometimes risky strategies to sustain essential public services. Among these strategies, investment in the sustainable energy sector has attracted particular attention, as it promises not only much-needed revenue but also progress towards environmental and social goals, such as combating energy poverty and supporting the transition to net zero.

This policy shift has unfolded amid lively academic debate regarding the appropriate frameworks for understanding urban governance under fiscal constraints. Two prominent perspectives dominate the literature. The first, known as entrepreneurial urbanism, views cities as active agents that seek growth and resilience through market-oriented strategies and partnerships [4,5]. The second, austerity urbanism, highlights the challenges local governments face as they are forced to cut public spending and reorganise services in response to declining resources [6,7]. Recent scholarship has proposed a new model to explain the distinctive British response: debt-driven development, where councils borrow extensively in order to finance commercial and sustainable projects in the hope of stabilising their finances. Some researchers see this approach as a pragmatic adaptation to an era of declining support, while others point to the dangers of speculative investment, weak governance, and the risk that public assets may be placed in jeopardy [1,8,9].

Despite increasing attention to these issues, the field still lacks detailed empirical studies of how such investment strategies are developed and managed, as well as analyses of their governance and financial consequences. There is also ongoing disagreement as to whether these approaches represent new forms of local empowerment and municipal innovation, or whether they instead reflect a deepening of financialisation and the erosion of democratic oversight [5,10]. Furthermore, high-profile failures, such as the collapse of Robin Hood Energy in Nottingham and unsustainable renewable energy investments by Thurrock Council, have sharpened calls for a critical reassessment of current practice. The complexity of these dynamics, and the divergent pathways to address fiscal constraints of local authorities, highlight the urgent need for detailed, context-sensitive case studies.

This article addresses these gaps by posing three central research questions: (1) How do British local governments formulate investment decisions in the sustainable energy sector during periods of austerity, and what are the key motivations underlying these decisions? (2) What governance structures and risk management practices shape these investments, and how do they influence financial outcomes? (3) To what extent do these cases reflect broader shifts in local governance models in the UK, particularly with respect to the debt-driven development model?

To answer these questions, this study conducts a comparative analysis of Nottingham City Council and Thurrock Council. Situating these cases within wider theoretical and policy debates, the research demonstrates that debt-financed innovation is often pursued due to a combination of fiscal necessity and political ambition. However, such debt-driven strategies frequently suffer from weak governance, over-optimistic risk assessments, and insufficient oversight, leading to substantial financial losses and heightened vulnerability. Notably, the analysis concludes that these cases do not merely reflect isolated governance failures; rather, they exemplify a broader transformation in British local governance. Councils are increasingly adopting hybrid models that blend entrepreneurial ambition with the constraints and risks of austerity.

These findings underscores the necessity for stronger regulatory frameworks, greater transparency, and improved risk assessment practices to safeguard public resources under austerity. Policymakers should consider how to balance the pursuit of financial innovation with the need to maintain public accountability and long-term financial sustainability at the local level.

The structure of this article is as follows. The next section reviews the relevant literature on entrepreneurial urbanism, austerity urbanism, and the debt-driven development model, establishing the theoretical context for the study. This is followed by a description of the research methodology and case selection. The main empirical findings are then presented and analysed through the two case studies. The discussion interprets these findings in relation to the broader research questions and theoretical frameworks. Finally, the article concludes by summarising the principal insights and outlining implications for future research and policy.

2. Literature Review

This review examines the principal theoretical and empirical contributions concerning how local governments in the UK have responded to post-2008 austerity, with particular attention to the intersections between urban governance, fiscal constraint, and debt-financed investment.

2.1 Entrepreneurial Urbanism

The concept of entrepreneurial urbanism, originating in the work of David Harvey and subsequently elaborated by others, has provided a valuable framework for understanding the transformation of urban governance since the 1980s [4,11,12]. This shift, arising from the decline of Fordism and the transition to post-Fordist regimes of accumulation, compelled municipalities to develop innovative strategies to attract external investment, foster economic growth, and enhance urban competitiveness.

The weakening of the Keynesian welfare state in the wake of 1970s economic crises further intensified fiscal constraints at the local level [13,14]. With the advent of neoliberalism, marked in the UK by the Thatcher government's consolidation of central authority, local governments were forced to pursue market-oriented policies to maintain viability [15,16]. This context catalysed a shift from a

managerial to an entrepreneurial paradigm in urban governance, characterised by three principal features: public–private partnerships (PPPs), speculative investments, and selective spatial development [4,5,17].
While PPPs enable municipalities to leverage private capital for public objectives, speculation entails cities assuming significant financial risks in pursuit of future returns. Selective spatiality, meanwhile, denotes a move away from equitable development towards targeted investments expected to deliver economic spill-overs. However, critics argue that entrepreneurial urbanism frequently exacerbates social and spatial inequalities, as risks are ultimately socialised whilst rewards are often privatised [18-20].
Therefore, entrepreneurial urbanism has become a dominant framework for understanding contemporary urban policy, illuminating the complex interplay between economic regeneration and social justice. Nevertheless, it also raises fundamental questions concerning the inclusivity and sustainability of such approaches.

2.2 Austerity Urbanism

The concept of austerity urbanism, as articulated by Jamie Peck, captures the strategies adopted by local authorities in the face of significant reductions in central government funding following the 2008 global financial crisis [6]. This framework focuses on the mechanisms by which austerity policies—characterised by substantial cuts to public spending—compel local governments to prioritise efficiency and cost-containment, often to the detriment of social equity and welfare provision [8,21,22].
In addition, austerity urbanism has emphasised a broader neoliberal shift towards market-driven governance, including the commodification and privatisation of public goods [3,5,8]. The resultant effects have been widely documented in many western countries: increased social inequalities, regional disparities, and the retrenchment of democratic participation, as financially weaker areas bear a disproportionate share of the burden [2,16,23-27].
While Peck's framework offers a persuasive account of post-crisis governance, it has been critiqued for its 'determinism' and insufficient recognition of local agency and diversity. Empirical studies highlight significant variation in local responses to fiscal stress, with some authorities adopting 'degrowth' strategies [28], collaborative governance [29], or forms of 'pragmatic' or 'entrepreneurial' municipalism [10,30]. Such evidence suggests that, despite the homogenising tendencies of austerity policies, local governments retain a degree of autonomy, adapting strategies to suit particular socio-economic and political contexts.
In conclusion, austerity urbanism remains a critical lens for analysing shifts in urban governance under fiscal constraint, yet the heterogeneity of local responses demands a nuanced and context-sensitive approach.

2.3 Debt-Driven Development Model: Entrepreneurial Urbanism Meets Austerity Urbanism

Recent scholarship, notably that of Hulya Dagdeviren, has introduced the debt-driven development model to explain divergent patterns of local government investment in the UK in the austerity era [1]. Unlike the US, where municipal debt decreased following the crisis [31], English local authorities substantially increased their borrowing, often to finance commercial or quasi-commercial ventures [1]. Between 2008 and 2021, per capita debt rose sharply, with a corresponding surge in capital investment, particularly in property and energy sectors [9].
Dagdeviren argues that this model constitutes a hybrid of austerity and entrepreneurial urbanism. Encouraged by low interest rates and central government policy, councils turned to borrowing as a means of mitigating the impact of budgetary cuts—an adaptation to the UK's highly centralised local government system and constrained fiscal autonomy. However, the pursuit of speculative investments, including in sustainable energy, introduced new risks and, in some cases, precipitated financial crisis [1]. The issuance of Section 114 notices by several local authorities—including Nottingham and Thurrock—underscores the perils of such strategies, particularly where governance and risk management prove deficient [32,33].
Despite the growing prevalence of debt-financed municipal investment, there remains a paucity of detailed case studies examining the dynamics, governance challenges, and social outcomes of such

approaches. As Dagdeviren observes, further empirical research is required to understand the evolution of these models and their implications for urban governance and fiscal sustainability.

Overall, the literature reviewed herein delineates the principal theoretical and empirical contours shaping local government responses to austerity in the UK and other western countries. Notwithstanding the value of frameworks above, a critical gap persists concerning the governance of debt-financed investments, especially in the context of sustainable energy transitions. The subsequent empirical analysis aims to address this lacuna, offering insights into the opportunities, risks, and institutional innovations that have characterised local authority strategies in the post-crisis period.

3.Materials and Methods

3.1 Overview

This study adopts a qualitative research design, anchored in the case study methodology, to critically examine the strategic decisions and governance practices surrounding sustainable energy investments in British local government under austerity. The case study method is particularly well-suited for the investigation of complex social phenomena within their real-life contexts [34]. This approach enables an in-depth and contextualised understanding of both the motivations for and the consequences of local authority investment strategies, whilst allowing for theoretical reflection and critical comparison.

3.2 Case Selection and Rationale

The research focuses on two purposively selected cases: Nottingham City Council and Thurrock Council. Both authorities have become prominent examples in recent years for their ambitious investments in the sustainable energy sector and for subsequently experiencing acute financial crises, including the rare invocation of Section 114 notices—an indicator of de facto bankruptcy in the UK local government context.

Nottingham City Council was chosen due to its pioneering creation of Robin Hood Energy, a municipally-owned energy supplier established with the dual aim of addressing energy poverty and supporting environmental sustainability. However, the failure of this venture not only precipitated a major financial crisis for the council but also raised important questions regarding governance, risk management and the limits of municipal entrepreneurship.

Thurrock Council provides a contrasting but complementary case. Its strategy centred on large-scale investments in renewable energy projects, primarily through high-yield financial instruments and partnerships with private sector entities. This council's rapid accumulation of debt and reliance on short-term borrowing mechanisms culminated in significant financial distress. Both cases exemplify the 'debt-driven development model' that has recently emerged in the literature as a key framework for understanding post-austerity local governance [1].

The selection of these cases thus reflects both their empirical importance and their theoretical salience as 'critical cases' [35], offering insight into broader trends in local government finance and governance in the UK.

3.3 Data Sources and Collection

The study relies exclusively on documentary and secondary data sources, reflecting both the constraints of the COVID-19 and post-COVID era and the practical challenges of access in highly politicised research contexts. The use of documentary research is well established in urban studies and public administration for reconstructing decision-making processes and governance arrangements.

The principal sources of data include:

(1) Council documents and official records

·Cabinet, council and committee meeting minutes;

·Investment strategies and policy papers;

·Annual statements of accounts and treasury management reports;

·Internal audit and scrutiny reports.

(2) External audit and regulatory investigations

·Grant Thornton's Public Interest Report (2020) on Nottingham;

·Essex County Council's Best Value Inspection (2023) of Thurrock.

(3) Regulatory and sectoral publications

·Ofgem market reports;

·Publications from the Department for Energy Security & Net Zero;

·Industry analysis by Energy UK.

(4) Press and media reports: Used primarily to

triangulate official narratives and supplement gaps in formal documentation.

All efforts were made to obtain comprehensive and up-to-date records. For Nottingham, relevant council documents for the period from 2014 to 2023 were available through the council's website. For Thurrock, certain financial records for the period after 2021 remain unpublished due to ongoing external audit and government intervention; this limitation was addressed by consulting government-commissioned reviews, Parliamentary records, and independent investigations.

3.4 Analytical Framework

3.4.1. Thematic Analysis

Data were subjected to thematic analysis, an established approach for the qualitative interpretation of documentary evidence [36]. The analytical process was as follows:

(1) Initial immersion

Close reading of all documents to gain familiarity with the language, framing and chronology of events.

(2) Coding

Open coding was applied to identify recurrent themes and motifs, such as strategic motivations, risk perceptions, governance arrangements, decision-making rationales, oversight mechanisms, and the articulation of financial pressures.

(3) Theme development

Codes were grouped into higher-order themes that capture the intersections between governance models, financial strategy, risk management, and political narrative.

(4) Case comparison

A comparative analysis across the two councils was conducted to identify both commonalities (e.g., drivers of debt-financed investment) and divergences (e.g., variations in governance structures and risk culture).

(5) Theoretical integration

Empirical patterns were interpreted through the lens of entrepreneurial urbanism, austerity urbanism, and the debt-driven development model, in order to assess how these frameworks illuminate (or fail to explain) the observed outcomes.

The entire analytical process was carried out manually, without the use of computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software, to ensure close engagement with the context and discursive nuances of the material.

3.4.2. Validity, Reliability and Reflexivity

To enhance the trustworthiness and transparency of the findings, several measures were taken:

(1)Initial immersion

Multiple sources of data were used wherever possible to verify factual claims, especially in relation to financial figures, key decisions, and timelines.

(2)Coding

All coding and interpretive steps were documented to provide a clear methodological record.

(3)Theme development

The limitations of documentary analysis are acknowledged, particularly the potential for selective disclosure in council records and the retrospective framing of events in audit reports. These limitations were partially mitigated by triangulating official documents with press and regulatory investigations.

4.Results

This section focuses on the case councils' sustainable energy investments in the context of austerity, their underlying motivations, the nature of their financial strategies, and the governance arrangements and risk management practices adopted.

4.1 Case Study 1: Nottingham City Council

The case of Nottingham City Council exemplifies the complex intersections of fiscal constraint, political ambition, and market risk that has come to characterise local government investment under austerity. Situated in a context of prolonged central government funding cuts, Nottingham City Council faced a widening budget gap, with projections in 2015 indicating a shortfall exceeding £34 million within three years. In response, the Council pursued an innovative but ultimately hazardous strategy: the establishment of Robin Hood Energy, a municipally-owned, not-for-profit company designed to provide affordable and sustainable energy to local residents. This initiative was framed not only as a response to fuel poverty but also as a means to generate new revenue streams, reflecting the Council's dual objectives of social mission and fiscal imperatives.

Specifically, internal documentation and public statements reveal expectations that Robin Hood

Energy would deliver substantial returns. The Council initially provided an £11 million business loan to the company, projecting returns over £4 million—well above the rates achievable through conventional municipal investment. These projections relied on the advantageous terms offered by the Public Works Loan Board and were predicated on the belief that a publicly owned energy supplier could effectively compete in an ostensibly lucrative market.

However, these optimistic expectations soon confronted the realities of the UK's highly competitive and volatile energy sector. By 2018, the retail energy market had expanded to approximately seventy suppliers, resulting in intense competition, shrinking margins, and growing customer acquisition costs. Although Robin Hood Energy attracted considerable attention through its low tariffs and environmental credentials—offering a voluntary Warm Home Discount and pledging to supply 100% renewable electricity—its financial resilience was fragile. The firm's sole profitable year, 2017/18, saw only a marginal surplus of £202,000. Subsequent years were marked by escalating losses, reaching £23.1 million in 2018/19, as the company struggled to cope with wholesale price fluctuations, increased bad debt provisions, and the regulatory impact of the Domestic Gas and Electricity (Tariff Cap) Act 2018.

A close reading of Council minutes, audit reports, and external investigations highlights serious deficiencies in risk management and governance throughout the lifespan of Robin Hood Energy. Despite mounting evidence of financial distress—including repeated emergency loan requests and negative cash flow forecasts—the Council continued to provide further loans, ultimately exposing public finances to unsustainable risk. Much of the decision-making process was shrouded in secrecy, justified on the grounds of commercial sensitivity. Significant financial information was withheld from public scrutiny and even from some elected members, while warnings from the Chief Finance Officer and external auditors were consistently marginalised. The governance structure suffered from a lack of specialist expertise among board members, frequent changes in directorship, and insufficient challenge at both executive and shareholder levels. This lack of effective oversight was further compounded by the unlawful transfer of £16 million from the Housing Revenue Account to the Council's general fund in an attempt to mask deficits—a practice subsequently condemned by government-appointed reviewers.

The collapse of Robin Hood Energy in 2020 precipitated a fiscal crisis for Nottingham City Council, resulting in the issue of a Section 114 notice and intervention by central government. While the venture succeeded, for a limited period, in supplying affordable energy and advancing the Council's green agenda, it ultimately demonstrated the vulnerabilities of debt-financed municipal entrepreneurship in the face of market complexity and institutional fragility. The Nottingham case thus underscores the dangers inherent in ambitious investment initiatives undertaken without rigorous risk assessment and transparent policy-making process.

4.2 Case Study 2: Thurrock Council

The experience of Thurrock Council offers a contrasting yet equally instructive example of local authority investment under conditions of austerity. Thurrock, a unitary authority in southeast England, faced a particularly acute fiscal environment, operating with one of the lowest net budgets among English councils and experiencing a 25% reduction in central government funding by 2015/16. In this climate, the Council embarked on an aggressive investment strategy centred on the sustainable energy sector, seeking not only to generate new sources of income but also to position itself as a forward-thinking and environmentally responsible local authority.

The Council's initial approach drew heavily on the perceived success of peer authorities—most notably Warrington Borough Council—which had pursued a mass of investments in renewable energy through partnerships with private companies. Thurrock's leadership presented its investment programme as a prudent, even validated, response to financial constraint. At the heart of this strategy was an extraordinary concentration of capital in a single sector: by March 2020, nearly 80% of Thurrock's investment portfolio, amounting to £815 million, was channelled into the renewable energy market. The majority of these funds were directed via complex financial instruments to third-party companies, predominantly Rockfire Investment Finance, for the development and acquisition of solar farms.

A striking feature of Thurrock's strategy was its reliance on short-term borrowing to finance long-term investments. Between 2016 and 2020, the Council borrowed more than £1 billion—largely through short-term loans from other local authorities—enticed by the prospect of lower interest costs. However, this approach left the Council acutely vulnerable to rising interest rates, a risk that became pronounced as the Bank of England's base rate climbed steadily after 2021. Forecasts indicated a dramatic escalation in interest costs, reaching £35.8 million in 2023/24, which placed overwhelming pressure on Thurrock's already stretched finances.

The Council's investment practices were further undermined by profound failures of governance and scrutiny. Key financial decisions were made by officers with minimal reference to elected members, exploiting delegated powers and procedural ambiguities under the guise of commercial sensitivity. The finance officer responsible for orchestrating many of the investments frequently delayed or bypassed formal reporting to the Council, sometimes only disclosing transactions months after their completion. These decisions were neither scrutinised by members nor subjected to effective challenge by external advisors, whose warnings regarding the high-risk nature of Thurrock's strategy were repeatedly ignored. Internal capacity for financial oversight was weak: councillors received only limited training in treasury management, and the complexity of the investment portfolio further hampered effective understanding and debate. At the same time, transparency for both elected members and the public was extremely limited, with information requests routinely refused and official records of key meetings often missing or incomplete.

Ultimately, the Council's approach proved catastrophic. The anticipated returns failed to materialise, key investments performed poorly, and Thurrock was left with enormous debt obligations and unsustainable interest costs. By late 2022, the situation had deteriorated to such an extent that the Council issued a Section 114 notice, effectively admitting bankruptcy. The consequences have included widespread asset sales, severe cuts to services, and a loss of financial and political autonomy as central government and Essex County Council intervened to oversee recovery.

In sum, Thurrock Council's experience demonstrates how a combination of fiscal desperation, optimistic emulation of other authorities, concentrated and opaque investment strategies, and fundamental weaknesses in governance can create conditions for systemic failure. The case illustrates the dangers of speculative, debt-financed investment strategies pursued without robust risk management or democratic accountability, providing a powerful cautionary example for local government under austerity.

4.3 Green Gambling

Taken together, the experiences of Nottingham City Council and Thurrock Council reveal a striking convergence in the risks and consequences associated with local government investment in the era of austerity, despite clear differences in organisational culture and the precise form of their strategies. In both cases, acute fiscal pressures and the relentless drive for financial self-sufficiency led local authorities to pursue innovative, yet high-risk, ventures within the sustainable energy sector. These ambitions were initially justified on the basis of social need—addressing energy poverty in Nottingham, and supporting environmental transition in Thurrock—yet were underpinned by an urgent imperative to replace diminishing central government funding with alternative revenue streams.

Across both councils, the decision to embrace debt-financed investments was shaped by an environment in which favourable borrowing conditions coincided with mounting expenditure demands and declining income. In Nottingham, this resulted in a municipally owned, not-for-profit energy company operating in a highly volatile and competitive retail market. In Thurrock, the strategy manifested in the assembly of an extensive portfolio of renewable energy investments—almost entirely concentrated in a single sector and channelled through complex financial arrangements with private partners.

Crucially, the comparative analysis identifies a consistent pattern of governance failure. Both councils exhibited a willingness to accept optimistic revenue forecasts and to discount or obscure the true risks associated with their investments. Internal checks and balances were either circumvented or rendered ineffective: in Nottingham, through opaque decision-making and selective disclosure of information; in Thurrock, through the delegation of vast powers to financial officers and the marginalisation of elected member scrutiny. In each case, external warnings—whether from auditors, financial advisors, or regulatory authorities—were insufficient to counter the prevailing institutional optimism and the desire to avoid politically damaging service reductions.

The consequences were severe. In both authorities, projected financial returns failed to materialise. Instead, investment losses, escalating debt, and mounting interest costs ultimately resulted in insolvency and the suspension of normal local democratic control. The repercussions have included not only direct financial loss but also wider impacts on public trust, the quality and availability of local services, and the long-term capacity for autonomous decision-making. Both cases underscore the dangers of speculative investment strategies by public authorities when driven by fiscal desperation and undertaken in the absence of robust risk management and democratic accountability.

The comparative findings thus provide strong empirical support for emerging theories of debt-driven development within British local government. They illustrate how the blending of entrepreneurial aspiration and austerity-induced necessity in finance can generate new vulnerabilities, particularly when local authorities lack the institutional capacity, technical expertise, and governance frameworks required to manage risk in complex markets. Under intense urban competition and enormous financial pressure, these entrepreneurial councils are like gamblers betting on a 'sustainable future' that is doomed to fail due to their imprudence.

5. Discussion

The present analysis interrogates the sustainable energy investment decisions of Nottingham City Council and Thurrock Council, situating these cases within the broader theoretical frameworks of entrepreneurial urbanism, austerity urbanism, and the debt-driven development model. The empirical findings both confirm and extend extant scholarly accounts, providing nuanced insights into how local authorities respond to the constraints and imperatives of the post-2008 austerity landscape.

The results reveal that the pursuit of debt-financed sustainable energy investments by British local governments during periods of fiscal stress is fundamentally driven by a combination of acute budgetary pressures and the imperative to demonstrate environmental leadership. This aligns with Dagdeviren's working concept of the debt-driven development model and is consistent with previous research highlighting the tendency of local authorities to adopt entrepreneurial strategies in response to financial retrenchment [1,2,4,6]. In both Nottingham and Thurrock, austerity served as a catalyst for innovation, compelling councils to seek alternative revenue streams through high-stakes investments. Yet, the pathways diverged: Thurrock favoured aggressive investment in external private enterprises, whereas Nottingham sought to operationalise municipalism by creating a not-for-profit energy provider—thus reflecting the hybrid and context-contingent character of the debt-driven model in the UK.

Interpretation of these results illustrates coherence with established scholarly expectations. While the move towards entrepreneurial and speculative investment is widely documented as a feature of contemporary local governance, the present findings highlight the particular vulnerabilities that arise when such initiatives are pursued without sufficient risk management or governance oversight. The failures in both cases were not solely the consequence of market volatility but were substantially exacerbated by governance deficiencies, over-optimistic financial assumptions, and a tendency to limit scrutiny under the guise of commercial sensitivity. This pattern resonates with earlier critiques of public-private partnerships and municipal entrepreneurialism, which have warned of the tendency for risk to be externalised when returns prove illusory [19,20]. Futhermore, the erosion of transparency and accountability observed here also echoes Jamie Peck's account of austerity urbanism, wherein democratic processes are frequently diminished as a consequence of managerial expediency [6]. In both councils, optimistic assumptions displaced more cautious financial planning, and the lack of independent and rigorous oversight resulted in elected representatives and the public playing a marginal role in major investment decisions.

From a broader perspective, these cases illustrate the growing complexity and heterogeneity of local government responses to austerity. Rather than conforming to a singular model, councils adapt, hybridise, and experiment within their structural constraints, resulting in governance forms that frequently combine elements of entrepreneurialism, municipalism, and speculative finance. The implications of this are significant for the future of local government finance and the delivery of public goods. There is a clear policy imperative to strengthen governance frameworks, prioritise transparent and accountable decision-making, and ensure that public investments are consistently justified by rigorous risk assessment and demonstrable social value.

Future research should seek to further disaggregate the varieties of debt-driven municipalism evident across different local authorities, exploring how local socio-economic context, political culture, and the broader policy environment shape investment strategies and outcomes. Comparative studies across both sectoral and national boundaries would help elucidate the specific contingencies and institutional logics at play. In addition, further enquiry into the long-term social and spatial impacts of debt-driven investment, especially as they pertain to social equity, local autonomy, and democratic legitimacy, would enrich theoretical understanding and provide vital guidance for policymakers confronting the evolving landscape of local governance under austerity.

6. Conclusion

This study has critically examined the sustainable energy investment strategies of Nottingham City Council and Thurrock Council, echoing their experiences within the broader context of austerity and the evolving landscape of local government finance in the UK. Through the detailed exploration of these two case studies, it has become apparent that the pursuit of ambitious investment in the energy sector by local authorities, driven by the dual imperatives of financial sustainability and public welfare, entails significant risks that are frequently underestimated or insufficiently mitigated.

The evidence presented reveals that, while both councils sought to leverage debt-financed investment as a mechanism to offset the effects of diminishing central government funding, their efforts were ultimately undermined by optimistic financial assumptions, inadequate risk assessment, and considerable deficiencies in governance and oversight. The collapse of Robin Hood Energy and the financial crisis precipitated by Thurrock Council's renewable energy investments each serve as cautionary examples of the pitfalls inherent in speculative, debt-driven development under austerity. These cases highlight the limitations of entrepreneurial urbanism when detached from robust systems of accountability and risk management.

A key contribution of this research lies in the articulation and application of the debt-driven development model, which provides a more nuanced framework for interpreting the hybridised governance practices emergent in the post-crisis era. This model, reflecting the confluence of entrepreneurial ambition and austerity-induced fiscal constraint, encapsulates the strategic dilemmas now facing many local authorities: how to reconcile social and political missions with the imperative to safeguard public assets and maintain long-term fiscal stability.

The findings of this dissertation underscore the pressing need for local authorities to adopt more sophisticated approaches to investment decision-making, embedding rigorous risk management and transparency at every stage. Policy interventions at both the local and national levels should focus on strengthening governance frameworks and enhancing the financial literacy and scrutiny capacities of elected members.

Looking ahead, future research should continue to interrogate the implications of debt-driven municipalism, particularly as new forms of urban governance emerge in response to continuing fiscal pressures and the sustainable transition. Comparative studies across different local authorities and policy domains would further elucidate the conditions under which debt-financed strategies might succeed or fail, thereby contributing to the development of more resilient, equitable, and sustainable models of local government in the UK.

Acknowledgments
This article is adapted and substantially revised from my MSc dissertation submitted to the University of Manchester in 2024. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Seth Schindler, for his unwavering guidance, insightful feedback, and continuous support throughout the course of this dissertation. His expertise and encouragement have been invaluable in shaping the direction of my research and helping me navigate the complexities of this project.
Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

[1]Dagdeviren, H. Austerity urbanism, local government debt-drive, and post COVID predicaments in Britain. Journal of Economic Geography 2024, 24, 79-94, doi:10.1093/jegad031.
[2]Donald, B.; Glasmeier, A.; Gray, M.; Lobao, L. Austerity in the city: economic crisis and urban service decline? Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society 2014, 7, 3-15, doi:10.1093res/rst040.
[3]Tabb, W.K. The wider context of austerity urbanism. City 2014, 18, 87-100, doi:10.1080/13604813.2014.896645.
[4]Harvey, D. From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: The transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography 1989, 71, 3-17, doi:10.1080/04353684.1989.11879583.
[5]Peck, J. Entrepreneurial urbanism: Between uncommon sense and dull compulsion. Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography 2014, 96, 396-401, doi:10.1111/geob.12061.
[6]Peck, J. Austerity urbanism: American cities under extreme economy. City 2012, 16, 626-655, doi:10.1080/13604813.2012.734071.
[7]Davidson, M.; Ward, K. 'Picking up the pieces': Austerity urbanism, California and fiscal crisis. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society 2013, 7, 81-97, doi:10.1093res/rst030.
[8]Davies, J.S.; Blanco, I. Austerity urbanism: Patterns of neo-liberalisation and resistance in six cities of Spain and the UK. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space 2017, 49, 1517-1536, doi:10.1177/0308518x17701729.
[9]NAO. Local authority investment in commercial property; National Audit Office: London, 2020.
[10]Thompson, M.; Nowak, V.; Southern, A.; Davies, J.; Furmedge, P. Re-grounding the city with Polanyi: From urban entrepreneurialism to entrepreneurial municipalism. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space 2020, 52, 1171-1194, doi:10.1177/0308518x19899698.
[11]Lauermann, J. Municipal statecraft: Revisiting the geographies of the entrepreneurial city. Progress in Human Geography 2018, 42, 205-224, doi:10.1177/0309132516673240.
[12]Wood, A. Making sense of urban entrepreneurialism. Scottish Geographical Magazine 1998, 114, 120-123, doi:10.1080/00369229818737040.
[13]Harvey, D. The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change; Basil Blackwell: Cambridge, Mass, 1989.
[14]Joppke, C. The crisis of the welfare state, collective consumption, and the rise of new social actors. Berkeley Journal of Sociology 1987, 32, 237-260.
[15]While, A.; Jonas, A.E.G.; Gibbs, D. The environment and the entrepreneurial city: Searching for the urban 'sustainability fix' in Manchester and Leeds. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 2004, 28, 549-569, doi:10.1111/j.0309-1317.2004.00535.x.
[16]Fuller, C. Entrepreneurial urbanism, austerity and economic governance. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society 2018, 11, 565-585, doi:10.1093res/rsy023.
[17]Hackworth, J. The public-private partnership. In The neoliberal city; Governance, Ideology, and Development in American Urbanism; Cornell University Press: 2007; pp. 61-76.
[18]Swyngedouw, E.; Moulaert, F.; Rodriguez, A. Neoliberal Urbanization in Europe: Large–Scale Urban Development Projects and the New Urban Policy. Antipode 2002, 34, 542-577,

doi:10.1111/1467-8330.00254.
[19]Hodge, G.A. The risky business of public–private partnerships. Australian Journal of Public Administration 2004, 63, 37-49, doi:10.1111/j.1467-8500.2004.00400.x.
[20]Jomo, K.S.; Chowdhury, A. PPPs: Public Costs and Risks for Private Profits. Development 2018, 61, 89-93, doi:10.1057/s41301-018-0188-z.
[21]Davidson, M.; Ward, K. Post-great recession municipal budgeting and governance: A mixed methods analysis of budget stress and reform. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space 2022, 54, 634-652, doi:10.1177/0308518x211068051.
[22]Hastings, A.; Bailey, N.; Bramley, G.; Gannon, M. Austerity urbanism in England: The ‘regressive redistribution’ of local government services and the impact on the poor and marginalised. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space 2017, 49, 2007-2024, doi:10.1177/0308518x17714797.
[23]Gray, M.; Barford, A. The depths of the cuts: the uneven geography of local government austerity. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society 2018, 11, 541-563, doi:10.1093res/rsy019.
[24]Fitzgerald, A.; Lupton, R. The Limits to Resilience? The Impact of Local Government Spending Cuts in London. Local Government Studies 2015, 41, 582-600, doi:10.1080/03003930.2015.1040154.
[25]Kitson, M.; Martin, R.; Tyler, P. The geographies of austerity. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society 2011, 4, 289-302, doi:10.1093res/rsr030.
[26]Lobao, L.M.; Adua, L. State rescaling and local governments' austerity policies across the USA, 2001–2008. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society 2011, 4, 419-435, doi:10.1093res/rsr022.
[27]Meegan, R.; Kennett, P.; Jones, G.; Croft, J. Global economic crisis, austerity and neoliberal urban governance in England. Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society 2014, 7, 137-153, doi:10.1093res/rst033.
[28]Schindler, S. Detroit after bankruptcy: A case of degrowth machine politics. Urban Studies 2016, 53, 818-836, doi:10.1177/0042098014563485.
[29]Parés, M.; Boada, J.; Canal, R.; Hernando, E.; Martínez, R. Challenging collaborative urban governance under austerity: How local governments and social organizations deal with housing policy in Catalonia (Spain). Journal of Urban Affairs 2017, 39, 1066-1084, doi:10.1080/07352166.2017.1310531.
[30]Kim, Y.; Warner, M.E. Pragmatic municipalism or austerity urbanism? Understanding local government responses to fiscal stress. Local Government Studies 2021, 47, 234-252, doi:10.1080/03003930.2020.1729751.
[31]Davidson, M.; Lukens, D.; Ward, K. The Post–Great Recession Geographies of U.S. Municipal Borrowing and Indebtedness. The Professional Geographer 2021, 73, 240-253, doi:10.1080/00330124.2020.1858886.
[32]Kenyon, M.; Clarke-Ezzidio, H. Council bankruptcy tracker: authorities under increasing financial strain. 2024.
[33]Sandford, M. Local authority financial resilience; House of Commons Library: London, 2024.
[34]Yin, R.K. Case study research: design and methods, 5th ed.; SAGE: Los Angeles, 2014.
[35]Flyvbjerg, B. Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. Qualitative Inquiry 2006, 12, 219-245, doi:10.1177/1077800405284363.
[36]Braun, V.; Clarke, V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology 2006, 3, 77-101, doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.