

Spatial Planning and Spatial Development in Europe - Parallel or Converging Tracks?

**Report of the conference held in London
on 1 December 2000,
organised by the European Council of Town
Planners with the support of the UK
Department of Environment, Transport and
the Regions**

[Executive Summary](#) (English)

[Résumé](#) (French)

[Contents](#)

**Report prepared by Olivier Sykes and published by the
European Council of Town Planners**

Spatial Planning and Spatial Development in Europe - Parallel or Converging Tracks?

European Council of Town Planners Conference,
London 1 December 2000

Executive Summary

There is a movement towards a spatial planning approach in Europe which still needs champions. Planners are equipped to take on this role and to work at all levels of government, as well as with the private sector, other professions and European Union (EU) institutions. The new territorial policy dimension - confirmed by the Treaty of Amsterdam - offers opportunities for new networks and linkages between governments, cities, agencies and regions. Whether or not it adopts a formal competence in spatial planning, the European Union could now develop new instruments, as it has for environmental objectives, to enable existing national planning systems to deliver better spatial planning. The vocabulary of spatial planning is still open and flexible, allowing EU member states to sign up to the general principles and interpret it as appropriate locally.

Presentations

[Vincent Nadin](#) identifies three concepts: *spatial structure*, *spatial development* and *spatial planning*. A fourth concept is 'spatial policy', or the spatial impacts of sectoral policies. Spatial planning - a wider concept than regional planning - is intervention in the spatial development process to create a more sustainable structure. It is a political and a technical activity which incorporates both regional policy and land-use organisation. He suggested two models: *Spatial planning #1* is land-use management and regional planning; *Spatial Planning #2* includes sectoral co-ordination through territorial strategy - an 'umbrella' activity embracing the interests of various sectors with spatial policy impacts. In discussion, **Andreas Faludi** contrasted this dichotomy with that between the spatial strategy approach and the legally binding master plan.

For [Klaus Kunzmann](#), the terminology used to discuss spatial planning is constantly evolving. At this stage, it would be better not to coin new terms: *town and country planning* or *urban and regional planning* are still familiar. To play a co-ordinating role, planners would need the status to direct other agencies and sectors, but they currently lack that status. The European Spatial Development Perspective is an interim statement of thirty years of national and regional spatial planning and a reference paper for regional, national spatial planning. It identifies common problems in Europe and contributes to raising the political profile of planning in many European countries. It brings planners in Europe together to discuss planning issues of joint interest and informs planning students of what is happening in planning across Europe. However, the ESDP can also be seen as a fig leaf covering negative aspects of non-spatial European policies such as competition policy. Many European policies are doing the opposite of what the ESDP advocates. The ESDP needs to be

simplified and given graphic spatial images to promote the whole of the public sector in guiding spatial development in the regions of Europe.

[Nicky Gavron](#) spoke of the evolving spatial development strategy (SDS) for London as an overarching strategy, a spatial development framework for topic-based strategies such as transport, economic development and waste. It is a visionary, integrative document charting London's future for fifteen to twenty years, as well as a planning document focusing on narrow land-use matters. The origins of the SDS lie partly in the British tradition of town and country planning, but it is also an attempt to interpret the ESDP. Dialogue with stakeholders is important; innovative methods will be used to engage the public's interest.

[Frank d'Hondt](#) warned of the danger of the ESDP being too closely linked to allocation of European funds. It should be more than this: a common framework for spatial planning at different spatial scales. One way forward would be the development of spatial scenarios and visions on the European scale. INTERREG is also of great importance for the construction of the European planning community; the European Council of Town Planners has a role in encouraging its member organisations to involve their individual members in INTERREG projects. National and regional planning agencies and associations must be convinced by the ESDP if it is to be effective at the most important levels of planning: the local and regional. The transposition of ESDP principles into national, regional and local planning and also European sectoral policy should be monitored with a follow-up report every two to three years. It is important to build bridges between the senders of the messages and professional planners, policy makers and the public.

[Athena Baibas Wallace](#) stressed the need for the involvement of planners and the wider spatial planning community to ensure a bottom-up, integrated spatial approach in adopting ESDP policy options. There is a need to work for trans-sectoral implementation involving public and private actors and planners at different administrative and governmental levels. The process has already led to the development of a more spatial approach to planning in European countries.

[Flemming Thornæs](#) described the development of the North Sea Spatial Vision and how the strategy was taken from a vision down to individual proposals for action. He highlighted the importance of ownership of this process by stakeholders such as regional authorities.

[Hans Mastop](#) looked at the implications of the ESDP for education at a time when ESDP and spatial planning issues generally were not widely debated. For most planners, local issues will continue to be the prime concern. Planners working on the European level will need to work hard to ensure that what they are developing becomes part of the reference material for planners working at the local level. European integration on a political, economic and institutional level has occurred; the new challenge is to translate this into a spatial or territorial dimension. A profession trained in integrated thinking is well placed to aid this process. "Thinking European" means adding another level to the multi-

level thinking that should be part of the basic knowledge and values of a planning education.

Summary

[Robin Thompson](#) observed that '*Something is going on in planning across Europe*' which includes strengthening the idea of planning. At the same time, spatial planning is coming from quite different traditions and is being applied to different contexts in different countries; there seems to be uncertainty as to the exact nature of spatial planning. Those present at the conference had tended to favour Vincent Nadin's *Spatial Planning #2*, but there was perhaps a danger of defining spatial planning too strictly. What had also emerged was that spatial planning is moving down the spatial scales. It is strong at the cross-regional level; through the mechanism of INTERREG, it is permeating down to the local level. There is a danger in accepting a difference between land-use planning and spatial planning with the potential for a gap to open within the planning profession. ECTP should be aware of this, show leadership and promote spatial planning.

Planning is a small profession and the mechanisms available to planners are relatively weak in most governmental systems. In promoting spatial planning there is therefore a need to try to influence the wider world of public policy-making - perhaps by aligning with particular politicians - and to engage in a positive way with the market. There is also a need to reach out to a wider public and to use current events and concerns to highlight key issues relating to spatial planning and its importance. There is also a need for the ECTP to widen its cultural base and to encourage more involvement from countries and associations outside North West Europe. Finally, there is a need to evaluate the capacity and skills of planning systems and planners to develop the kinds of political linkages, and linkages with the development sector, that are necessary for the effective promotion of spatial planning.

Key questions and issues for the future:

How can land-use planning systems in Europe evolve into spatial planning systems?

Should there be a European Union competence for spatial planning, what should its role be, if any, and how would such a competence square with subsidiarity?

Can “transnational” be defined so that co-operation is structured around critical issues which truly require two or more countries to work together? What is it in spatial development that requires a response at the transnational or European level?

Planning education must include a European component

There is a need for indicators, good maps and other reliable factual information; the formation of the European Spatial Planning Observatory Network (ESPON/ORATE) is essential

A glossary could help to clarify some vagueness in new terminology.

For ECTP:

Should the Council change its name? Suggestions include *European Council of Spatial Planners* and *European Council of Territorial Planners*

ECTP should lead a study of the capacity of European planning systems and planners to implement spatial planning

ECTP member organisations should continue to monitor the impact of the ESDP within and outside the planning community in their respective countries.

ECTP should update the New Charter of Athens taking into account the ESDP Action Programme and continue its work on communication with non-planners about strategic ways of thinking

The judging criteria in future European planning awards should be linked with the ESDP.

ECTP should have its own working group on enlargement/accession issues

Aménagement du territoire et développement spatial en Europe – des voies parallèles ou convergentes ?

Conférence du Conseil Européen des Urbanistes,
Londres, le 1er décembre 2000

Résumé

L'approche de l'aménagement du territoire en Europe recherche encore ses champions. Les urbanistes ont les compétences et le savoir-faire pour assumer ce rôle et travailler à tous les niveaux de gouvernement, des secteurs privés, d'autres professions et des institutions de l'Union européenne (UE). Confirmée par le traité d'Amsterdam, la nouvelle dimension politique des territoires offre de nouvelles possibilités de réseaux et de relations entre les gouvernements, les villes, les agences et les régions. Qu'elle adopte ou non une compétence formelle en aménagement du territoire, l'Union européenne ne pourrait pas actuellement développer de nouveaux instruments, comme elle l'a fait pour les objectifs environnementaux, et permettre aux systèmes d'urbanisme nationaux d'assurer un meilleur aménagement du territoire. Le vocabulaire de l'aménagement du territoire est encore ouvert et évolutif, permettant aux pays membres de l'UE d'adopter les principes généraux et de les interpréter selon leurs besoins au niveau local.

Présentations

[Vincent Nadin](#) identifie trois concepts : *structure spatiale*, *développement spatial* et *aménagement du territoire*. Un quatrième concept intervient sous le nom de *politique spatiale*, pour désigner les conséquences spatiales des politiques sectorielles. L'aménagement du territoire – un concept plus étendu que celui de l'aménagement régional – consiste à intervenir dans le processus du développement spatial pour créer une structure plus durable. Il s'agit d'une activité politique et technique qui intègre la politique régionale et l'organisation de l'occupation des sols. Il propose deux modèles : *Aménagement du territoire No.1* comme gestion de l'occupation des sols et de l'aménagement régional ; *Aménagement du territoire No.2* incluant la coordination sectorielle par une stratégie territoriale – une activité générique qui réunit les intérêts de différents secteurs ayant un impact sur la politique de l'aménagement du territoire. Pendant le débat, **Andreas Faludi** a fait contraster cette dichotomie avec celle qui oppose l'approche de la stratégie spatiale à un plan maître contractuel.

Pour [Klaus Kunzmann](#), la terminologie utilisée pour traiter les questions d'aménagement du territoire évolue constamment. Actuellement, il serait préférable de formaliser de nouveaux termes : *urbanisme des villes et des campagnes* ou *aménagement urbain ou régional* sont encore des termes facilement compréhensibles par tous. Pour jouer un rôle de coordinateur, les urbanistes ont besoin d'un statut qui leur permettrait de diriger d'autres agences et d'autres secteurs. Mais aujourd'hui, ce statut fait défaut. Le Schéma du Développement de l'Espace Communautaire (SDEC) est une formulation intérimaire résultant de trente années d'aménagement du territoire national et

régional et un document de référence pour l'aménagement du territoire régional et national. Il identifie des problèmes courants en Europe et contribue à renforcer le profil politique de l'urbanisme dans un grand nombre de pays européens. Il réunit les urbanistes européens pour faciliter des discussions sur des problèmes d'urbanisme porteurs d'intérêts communs. Il informe les étudiants en urbanisme sur une évolution qui affecte l'Europe entière. Cependant, le SDEC peut également être considéré comme le voile qui masque les aspects négatifs des politiques non-spatiales européennes, comme la politique de la concurrence. Les conséquences d'un grand nombre de politiques européennes sont parfaitement contraires aux recommandations du SDEC. Le SDEC a besoin d'être simplifié. Il a besoin de représentations spatiales graphiques pour promouvoir l'ensemble du secteur public afin d'orienter le développement spatial dans les différentes régions de l'Europe.

Nicky Gavron *parle de la stratégie du développement spatial (SDS) de Londres comme d'une stratégie fondatrice, véritable infrastructure de développement spatial capable de soutenir des stratégies spécifiques comme le transport, le développement économique et les déchets. Ce document visionnaire et intégrateur, portant sur l'avenir de Londres à l'horizon 15 – 20 ans est également un document d'urbanisme qui s'intéresse à des questions d'occupation des sols très précises. Les origines de la SDS s'appuient en partie sur la tradition britannique de l'urbanisme des villes et des campagnes, mais elle est aussi une importante tentative d'interprétation du SDEC. Le dialogue avec les principaux acteurs est essentiel. Les méthodes nouvelles seront utilisées pour susciter l'intérêt du public.*

Frank d'Hondt met en garde contre les risques du SDEC qui est trop étroitement lié à l'attribution des fonds européens. Il devrait être beaucoup plus que cela, pour servir d'infrastructure commune à l'aménagement du territoire à des échelles spatiales différentes. Une voie de progrès serait de développer des visions et des scénarios d'aménagement au niveau européen. INTERREG est essentiel à la construction de la communauté urbaniste en Europe. Le Conseil Européen des Urbanistes doit aussi assumer son rôle et encourager ses organisations membres pour qu'elles aident leurs propres membres à participer aux projets INTERREG. S'il ne convainc pas les agences et les associations d'urbanisme nationales et régionales, le SDEC ne peut pas être efficace aux plus importants niveaux de l'urbanisme qui sont le local et le régional. Comme la politique sectorielle européenne, la transposition des principes du SDEC en urbanisme national, régional et local doit être accompagnée d'un rapport de suivi tous les deux ou trois ans. Il est important d'établir des passerelles entre les expéditeurs des messages et les urbanistes professionnels, les décideurs politiques et le public.

Athena Baibas Wallace insiste sur la nécessité de l'engagement des urbanistes et de la communauté de l'aménagement du territoire au sens large pour assurer une approche spatiale, intégrée, consultative et ascendante pour adopter les options politiques du SDEC. Il serait utile de favoriser une mise en œuvre trans-sectorielle en impliquant les secteurs privés et publics, ainsi que les urbanistes, aux différents niveaux administratifs et gouvernementaux. Ce

processus a déjà abouti au développement d'une approche plus spatiale de l'urbanisme dans les pays européens.

[Flemming Thornæs](#) décrit le développement de la Vision Spatiale de la Mer du Nord et comment la stratégie s'est transformée en propositions individuelles de travail à partir d'une vision. Il insiste sur le fait que les acteurs, comme les collectivités territoriales, doivent se rendre propriétaire de ce processus.

[Hans Mastop](#) examine les conséquences du SDEC pour l'éducation à une époque où les questions du SDEC et d'aménagement du territoire ne faisaient pas partie des grands débats. Pour la plupart des urbanistes, les questions locales continueront d'être prioritaires. Les urbanistes actifs au niveau européen devront faire des efforts importants pour s'assurer que leurs travaux de développement seront intégrés aux matériaux de référence mis à la disposition des urbanistes au niveau local. L'intégration européenne au niveau politique, économique et institutionnel est aujourd'hui une réalité. Le nouveau challenge consiste à traduire cette réalité dans une dimension spatiale ou territoriale. Une profession formée à réfléchir par intégration est bien placée pour soutenir ce processus. "Penser européen" signifie ajouter une autre strate à une réflexion multi-niveau qui devrait faire partir des connaissances et des valeurs de base de l'éducation en urbanisme.

Résumé

[Robin Thompson](#) remarque que « dans toute l'Europe, l'urbanisme est en mouvement », et cela contribue à renforcer l'idée d'aménagement. Simultanément, l'aménagement du territoire est issu de traditions tout à fait différentes. Il est appliqué à des contextes différents, selon les pays. La nature exacte de l'aménagement du territoire n'est pas encore clairement définie. Les participants de la conférence ont eu tendance à favoriser l'*Aménagement du territoire No.2* de Vincent Nadin. Mais une définition trop stricte de l'aménagement du territoire peut présenter des risques. Il est également apparu que l'aménagement du territoire descend les niveaux organisationnels : il est fort au niveau interrégional, et grâce au mécanisme d'INTERREG, il pénètre au niveau local. Il pourrait être dangereux d'accepter de différencier la gestion de l'occupation des sols et l'aménagement du territoire, et donc de créer un fossé susceptible de scinder la profession d'urbaniste. Le CEU doit être très conscient de cette possibilité, faire preuve de leadership et défendre l'aménagement du territoire.

L'urbanisme est une petite profession et les mécanismes dont disposent ses membres sont relativement faibles dans la plupart des systèmes gouvernementaux. Pour défendre l'aménagement du territoire, il est donc nécessaire de tenter d'influencer le vaste monde des décideurs des politiques publiques, peut-être en s'alignant avec des politiciens sélectionnés, et de s'engager de façon concrète sur le marché. Il est en outre nécessaire de communiquer avec le grand public et d'utiliser ses préoccupations et l'actualité pour valoriser les questions essentielles propres à l'aménagement du territoire et à son importance. Le CEU devrait élargir sa base culturelle et encourager un engagement plus grand des pays et des associations extérieures à l'Europe du nord-ouest. Finalement, il faut évaluer la capacité et les compétences des

systèmes d'aménagement et des urbanistes à développer des relations politiques, des relations avec le secteur du développement, qui seront nécessaires pour assurer le bon développement de l'aménagement du territoire.

Questions principales pour l'avenir :

Comment les systèmes de gestion de l'occupation des sols en Europe peuvent-ils évoluer vers des systèmes d'aménagement du territoire ?

Si une compétence en aménagement du territoire existait au niveau de l'Union européenne, quel serait son rôle, le cas échéant, comment une telle compétence pourrait s'accorder avec la subsidiarité ?

Peut-on définir "transnational" de façon à ce que la coopération soit structurée sur des questions critiques exigeant réellement la collaboration réelle de deux ou plusieurs pays ? Quels sont les aspects du développement spatial qui nécessitent une réponse au niveau transnational ou européen ?

L'éducation en urbanisme doit inclure un composant européen.

Nous avons besoin d'indicateurs, de bonnes cartes, d'autres types d'informations factuelles fiables. La création du Réseau des Observatoires de l'Aménagement du Territoire Européen (ESPON/ORATE) est essentielle.

Un glossaire pourrait faciliter la compréhension et dissiper le manque de précision de la nouvelle terminologie.

Pour le CEU :

Le Conseil doit-il changer de nom ? Les suggestions incluent Conseil Européen de l'Aménagement Spatial et Conseil Européen de l'Aménagement du Territoire.

Le CEU doit mener une étude sur la capacité des systèmes d'aménagement européens et des urbanistes à mettre en œuvre l'aménagement du territoire.

Les organisations membres du CEU doivent continuer à contrôler l'impact du SDEC à l'intérieur comme à l'extérieur de la communauté des urbanistes dans leur pays respectif.

Le CEU doit mettre à jour la Nouvelle Charte d'Athènes en tenant compte du programme d'action du SDEC et continuer son travail sur la communication avec les non urbanistes sur les méthodes de réflexion stratégiques.

Les critères d'attribution du futur Grand Prix Européen de l'Urbanisme devraient intégrer le SDEC.

Le CEU doit avoir son propre groupe de travail sur les questions d'extension et d'accession à l'Union européenne.

Part 1 – Conference Presentations

- 1.1 [Introduction to Conference Presentations](#)
Robin Thompson.
- 1.2 [Spatial planning and spatial development in Europe](#)
Vincent Nadin
- 1.3 [European spatial planning unity or difference?](#)
Klaus Kunzmann
- 1.4 [The Spatial Development Strategy for London](#)
Nicky Gavron
- 1.5
 - 1.5.1 [The implications of the ESDP for the European planning community: ECTP's strategy to promote European spatial planning in general and to apply ESDP principles in particular](#)
Frank D'hondt
 - 1.5.2 [An overview of development of the ESDP](#)
Athena Baibas Wallace
- 1.6 [A vision for the North Sea Area:](#)
Flemming Thornæs
- 1.7 [Educating European spatial Planners](#)
Hans Mastop

Part II – Afternoon Discussion

- 2.1 [Afternoon discussion](#)
- 2.2 [Summary:](#) *Robin Thompson*

PART I - Conference Presentations

1.1 *Introduction to Conference Presentations: Robin Thompson, President of the European Council of Town Planners.*

- Yesterday at our main assembly session we had reports from each of the nineteen countries of ECTP and I was extremely heartened by the overall message. Whilst there are ebbs and flows and no one is pretending that in terms of implementation we have a perfect world, there is no doubting that in many, many countries there is a strong movement towards the development of some of the ideas of spatial planning, in terms of governmental activity, in terms of institutional change, and in terms of demand for spatial planning skills and experience, and that this is extremely welcome.
- However, I think that we are all very aware that this is still a very fragile state of affairs and it is an area in which there is not a lot of wider understanding. As one of our contributors Klaus Kunzmann noted in a recent article, spatial planning and spatial development are inherently complex concepts and we do not always help ourselves by using obscure and difficult terminology in which to debate them. The danger is that we lose audiences in our own professions not to mention amongst the wider public. It is also an area in which it is very difficult to proceed because it is essentially a cross-sectoral concept looking at space across different sectors. In an environment where Government and business is very largely organised around very powerful sectors it is always going to be difficult to make headway.
- ECTP believes that spatial planning needs champions. The ESDP has been a rather top-down process and DG Regio and the Committee for Spatial Development (CSD) have handed down the ESDP and a lot of other good work. The baton has now been passed to others and it is very important that it is picked up and run with very hard. It also seems that this is a process driven by funding programmes such as INTERREG and others. Whilst that is very welcome, there is perhaps a danger that in driving through funding one may lose some of the distinctive strategic and spatial direction, which is what spatial planning and development is all about.
- We want to be champions of spatial planning and we have no illusions about the size of the task, or thinking that planners themselves have all the answers. Planning is a small profession and the truth is that many of our number could arguably be said to be inhibiting spatial planning whether they know it or not. We know from our own efforts and DETR's very excellent efforts to spread understanding in the UK that there is a long way to go.

However, planners have been defined as specialists in interaction and I do think that we have those natural cross-cutting skills and interests that ought to make us central to the effort.

- This conference is very important to ECTP and we are actually considering at present whether we should change our name, certainly our English name, to become the European Council of Spatial Planners. I think what happens today will be significant in determining that rather important decision for us. We would also like to see, indeed we would like to lead, a study of the capacity of European planners and European planning systems to implement spatial planning. We think that there is a gap there and see today as a way of developing a brief for such a study in which we would like to involve others.
- In spring 2001 we have a meeting in Warsaw focusing on the role of the accession countries and I think that the relationship between the spatial planning agenda and the accession countries is one we want to explore and today will be an input to this. Finally, the deliberations today will be fed back into twenty-one professional organisations and that is a very powerful piece of dissemination and 'baton passing'.
- Speaking of passing the baton, I am going to first pass to Vince Nadin from the University of the West of England known to very many of you. The ECTP asked Vince to do some thinking for us on spatial planning and spatial development and we liked what he wrote so much that we built a conference around it!* Vince is going to set an agenda for the day and I am delighted to hand over to him.

* (Available on the ECTP website www.ceu-ectp.org)

1.2 Vincent Nadin: **University of the West of England.**

Introduction

- The purpose of this talk is to explore the notion of European spatial planning and to set out an agenda for the ECTP. I shall review the key terms and the European dimension of planning and will also refer to recent work undertaken to prepare a vision for North West Europe.

The meaning of spatial planning, spatial development, and spatial policy

- Spatial planning is a complex issue and it is useful to ask '*What really do we mean by spatial planning?*' There is a need to start with two other familiar concepts, spatial structure and spatial development. Spatial structure is the distribution of built and natural features and this is altered through a process called spatial development. It does not need to be more complex. The forces by which spatial development occurs are very complicated, a mix of both market processes and state intervention. Spatial structure and development embrace not only physical change but changes in social activities and access to opportunities.

- With that very simple start, it is possible to start to define spatial planning in relation to structure and development. Spatial planning really is how we intervene in the processes of spatial development in order to create a different and hopefully more sustainable structure. Spatial planning operates at different scales: local, regional and increasingly at the transnational and cross-border level. Therefore it is a wider concept than regional planning; it embraces this, but is a wider concept. It is a political as well as technical process. It is political not only in the sense of the politics in the process, but the concepts and ideas that we use in spatial planning are also political. We need to accept that when we use terms such as 'polycentricity' or talk about a core-periphery model, corridors, and other similar concepts, these are inherently political concepts and in fact they can be very powerful political concepts that we can use to address issues and to stimulate action. The discourse therefore of spatial planning is critically important. The idea of spatial planning is very much in vogue at the moment and the importance of spatial structure for political goals such as sustainable development and economic competitiveness and also more obscure goals like spatial welfare and spatial cohesion, is very significant. As Robin Thompson mentioned in his introduction, there is a renaissance going on in spatial planning across the world, not only in Europe but also in certain states in North America and in South East Asia.
- So I have given a very simple definition of spatial planning in relation to spatial structure and spatial development. Most of the formal definitions of spatial planning that we have are based on that simple relationship. Here are a couple of examples and you will perhaps be familiar with these. The first is from 1983 from the *Council of Europe Regional Spatial Planning Charter*, which talks about spatial planning being '*...balanced regional development and the organisation of space according to an overall strategy*'. The second definition is from the *EU Compendium of Spatial Planning Systems and Policies* and although it came almost fifteen years later, it makes the same point that spatial planning incorporates both a regional policy dimension and a land-use organisation dimension. I have introduced in a very simple way spatial structure, spatial development, and spatial planning. There is another issue that I am not going to address yet because it complicates matters even further, but people are now beginning to use the word territorial in place of spatial. So there is the interesting question of whether the ECTP ought to become the European Council of Territorial Planners or Spatial Planners.
- I want now to add a fourth concept in understanding spatial planning, which is spatial policy. When I use the word spatial policy I am following to some extent Richard Williams in his use of the term, and I am talking about the spatial impacts of sectoral policies (Williams 1996). Robin Thompson mentioned this in his introduction and that spatial planners are trying to get involved in this job. Richard Williams talks about spatial policy as being any policy that is spatially specific. I think there are different sorts of spatial policy and I have set out three categories. Firstly, there are those policies that are very spatially specific like the Trans European Transport Networks

and aspects of regional policy. Secondly, there are policies which are not necessarily spatially specific but which nevertheless have an important spatial impact. Perhaps the most important of these at the European scale has been the Common Agricultural Policy, which although providing price support to farmers has actually had enormous implications for spatial development patterns. There is a third category; where certain policies are pursued through the planning system, for example in relation to environmental assessment and again this of course has implications for spatial development and the operation of spatial planning. I have included examples from transport, agriculture and environment, but we should also be thinking about other fields like health (a very important one), education and others.

- It is the recognition of the importance of these sectoral policies for spatial development that has given rise to what I would call a second model of spatial planning. I have termed this 'Spatial Planning 2' and Robin Thompson referred to both Model 1 and Model 2 in his introduction. I think that it is worth making a distinction between the two, in fact I think that it is important that we try to make a distinction between these two ideal types or models of what spatial planning might be. Robin Thompson mentioned the other sectors and their spatial policy and we have a sort of spatial planning which is trying to co-ordinate these different sectors. Land-use planning, or our spatial planning 1 (land-use and regional planning), is part of that co-ordination job. Some planners claim to have been doing both spatial planning Model 1 and spatial planning Model 2 all along. In the UK a number of planners claim that spatial planning is not new and that '*We have always done this*'. It depends on which country a planner is from as to whether they are justified in saying that they have been involved in spatial planning all along. I think that generally I would be sceptical at the extent to which we have actually been involved in this model of spatial planning 2. Some years ago, and again more recently, I was involved in comparing planning systems in Europe and we also started to compare planning systems in Europe with those in other countries and some states in the US. I am still very much of the general view that we are locked as planners into the mindset of planning as the management of land-use and perhaps at a higher level regional planning. We really have not embraced the idea of this spatial planning 2, sectoral co-ordination through a territorial strategy. So I think that there is value in making the distinction, and I will draw this a little sharper now by contrasting the two models.
- I shall first consider spatial planning as the land-use planning system. Of course, our land-use planning puts out co-ordinating mechanisms; we put out our arms to other sectors and we try to co-ordinate those from our sectoral position. The way that planning does this varies dramatically depending on which country it is in. There are different traditions of planning, all of which I think are represented in planning systems in the EU. Some systems lean more towards one tradition than another and some of those traditions may be better placed to address the issue of the co-ordinating role than others. I would contrast that with the second model of spatial planning. My feeling is that having spoken to many planners over the

years, when many people talk about spatial planning, they are not thinking of spatial planning as land-use and regional planning. Rather they see it as some sort of umbrella activity that embraces the interests of all the different sectors that have spatial policy impacts.

- Land-use planning is still there as one of the sectors in spatial planning Model 2 because I would argue that in Spatial Planning 2, the 'sectoral co-ordination' role is required to co-ordinate land-use with environment and transport, as much as with any other sectors. I think in particular that this is the model of planning that has arisen at the European level. I think that the ESDP and some of the work on spatial visions are actually trying to address this model more than the former model. That is understandable, because at that very much higher spatial scale this is obviously the job that needs to be done.
- I have in some ways drawn an abstract distinction here as of course all planning systems incorporate both sorts of planning. I think it is valuable to separate them out because one of the questions for the ECTP, if there is a possibility of changing the name to the European Council of Spatial Planners, is *how can our systems evolve from land-use planning systems into spatial planning systems?* I am not altogether convinced that the best approach is in fact to evolve from land-use into this broader spatial planning role and I think that there are important reasons why that would be very difficult indeed. Not least the fact that, as Robin hinted, the land-use planning role is relatively weak in most governmental systems. I think that there is a question there for the ECTP.

The European dimension to spatial development and planning – and Community competence

- I want to turn now to the discussion of the European and transnational dimensions and again, since we have lots of obscure terminology, I will just clarify a few terms to start off with. There has been a rapid expansion of work and collaboration at the transnational and cross-border level and an equally rapid development of special terms to describe this. Box 1.1 below shows some of the Commission's formal definitions for these sorts of activity. There is a rather confusing issue here in that the Commission have chosen to use transnational also as the generic term to describe all three sorts of activity. It was suggested a little while ago that they should instead use the word trans-boundary perhaps as a collective term. However, under INTERREG III they have decided to continue with the transnational as the collective term.

Box 1.1 The European transnational dimensions

Cross-border - co-operation between geographically contiguous border regions – including maritime

Inter-regional - co-operation amongst non-contiguous regions

Transnational - co-operation across large multinational regions

- This proliferation of terms is a result of the increasing significance of trans-boundary spatial development issues. What are they? Are there trans-boundary spatial development issues significant enough for us to worry about? Some of the issues are self-evident, if you want to construct a trans-national high-speed transport network then that obviously raises issues for spatial development that cross borders. There are many other areas where it is more difficult to decide whether there is a need for a transnational response or not. I think that we need to explore the meaning of transnational spatial development more thoroughly. It is possible to have strong interpretation of transnational, which might be one where we simply consider those issues which require two countries to work together in order to resolve the problem. At the other end of the scale it is possible to have a very weak or wide definition of transnationality which simply says that there are issues of common concern - urban sprawl, access to services in rural areas, where it is worth sharing experience. There are many issues in between those two extremes.
- In the final analysis perhaps *'What constitutes transnational spatial development?'* is a political rather than a scientific question. The question of *'What is the transnational?'* is another question that ECTP might address, together with *'What is it in spatial development that requires a response at the transnational level?'* I think that we are very confused about it at the moment. You only have to look at the lists of projects funded under the INTERREG initiative to realise this. Some are clearly, self-evidently, transnational projects, whilst others are much weaker in that sense, and one has to ask; *'Why does this need a response at the transnational or European level?'* Of course there are different opinions about what constitutes the transnational, but perhaps the ECTP might spend some time thinking about what its view is on this.
- Given that there is now a transnational dimension to spatial development how should that be addressed? There are more questions, which I think ECTP should consider, for example, *'Should there be more harmonisation of planning systems and policies?'*, *'Should there be more joint or transnational planning?'* and if so, *'What forms and what aspects of planning should these developments embrace?'* Because I think the short answer to the questions of should there be more harmonisation and is there a need for more co-operation is yes. Of course there needs to be. We know very well that we cannot address sustainable development unless we co-operate more effectively across boundaries whether they are regional boundaries or national boundaries. We are not going to address environmental issues and competitiveness issues unless we co-operate. In fact because of the shared agenda of sustainable development and economic competitiveness there has already been a measure of convergence amongst planning systems. We are all in our different countries now working to similar agendas. We have also had the impact of various Community actions, and many member states have responded to these through their planning systems, so we have all been to some extent drawn into line in relation for instance to environmental assessment. The ESDP, with its policy options and recommendations, is suggesting some sort of further convergence on the

policy side. In addition, sometime next year the OECD, which has a much wider membership than the EU, will publish a document on sustainable development which will include firm policy recommendations for what they call territorial planning and for the planning systems of its member states.

- In view of the issues discussed above, another question for the ECTP is: "*What sort of role might there be for the community in all this - the European Union?*" Perhaps if there is little interest in spatial planning from DG REGIO now that the Committee on Spatial Development has delivered the ESDP, this answers this question. We have a situation at the moment where there is supposedly no Community competence in spatial planning, but is there a need for one? The intergovernmental conference in December 2000 is going to discuss the removal of the requirement for unanimous decisions on town and country planning when environmental legislation is brought forward. Certainly, the environment directorate at the Commission would like to see a bit more flexibility there, because they see town and country planning/spatial planning as one of the principle tools for achieving their objectives of environmental protection. The Treaty of Amsterdam requires social and territorial cohesion, so the Commission will have to consider how to address the territorial issue. It could be argued that there should be a further competence or objective in the treaty on spatial planning just to reflect what the Commission are already doing, because they are very active on the spatial planning front, or have been, not least through the INTERREG initiative but also through those other spatial policy impacts where they have strong competences, in transport, in environment and other fields. The Commission and some Member States have come forward before with ideas for an increased Community competence for planning. However, this has always been found to be very difficult because of the ambiguity of the Treaty and the difficulty of defining a limited competence for the Commission, which could meet the subsidiarity criteria that will be the measures of whether in fact there should be further activity at the transnational and European level.
- My own feeling, having looked at this in some detail over the last couple of years, is that we are inevitably going to see a competence in spatial planning. Spatial planning seems to be following the same route as other spheres where initially there was lots of informal activity but no direct competence. For example, in the case of environment where at one time there was no competence, environmental legislation was introduced through general provisions and single market provisions and eventually this was legitimised through environment articles in the treaty. So I think that in some ways it is inevitable. The other reason why it is inevitable and why we should be promoting it is because there is a dire need for better co-ordination at the territorial level of the Community's sectoral policies. So that is a positive way of looking at that. If it is inevitable, we ought to be thinking about what sort of competence the planning experts, the ECTP, would like to see.

The example of the *Vision for North West Europe*

- I do have a set of conclusions, which I shall perhaps return to in discussion, but I want to conclude in a different way with a personal note on some of

these questions. I think perhaps my draft paper was a little sceptical of our abilities on spatial planning and if you have seen it you will perhaps agree, but I want to end with a different note. Actually I just want to use this opportunity to bring to your attention the work I have been involved in for the Vision for North West Europe. This is too good an opportunity to miss so I will conclude with this instead of a long list going back over my ideas about spatial planning! Working on a vision for North West Europe has been an interesting experience and these are personal notes. I would say that we definitely tried to address in this piece of work the idea of spatial planning as cross-sectoral co-ordination, but I feel on reflection that all the way through we had our land-use planning hats very firmly on. Looking back we have reflected on the fact that we have not engaged enough with some of the other key players in other sectors and the fact that we have been working in our traditional ways. Having looked at the other spatial visions and other transnational work I think that that is reflected in those too. We adopted a strict definition of transnational and looked for those issues that really required two countries to work together and I think that that was very helpful. It meant that we were able to focus down on what were the critical issues and as a result I think that the points we have raised will have credibility because it is much easier to argue that these do require some further transnational co-operation. In fact we have generated our agenda of transnational issues and we have built what are described as co-operation zones around that agenda rather than starting with the idea of *'Let's do some transnational planning in the Atlantic Area'* or in this particular administrative area. We asked *'What are the issues?'* then defined the areas for co-operation and the groups and networks for co-operation around those issues, and I think that that has been a positive outcome from the project.

Conclusion

- There is a lot more that I could say, but I have to say my experience has convinced me of the added value of a transnational perspective. I started as a sceptic, I have to admit, but now I do think that there is great value in standing back and looking at spatial development issues at this scale. In fact, although we could not do a quantitative analysis of this, I think that ultimately more benefit will probably come from co-operation like this than would come from direct investment in infrastructure from the Structural Funds. Of course people in Ireland, Spain and Greece would have difficulty in agreeing with that, but certainly in this part of the world where there is incredible fragmentation of national and regional boundaries and an enormously complex spatial development pattern, co-operation has the potential to be of great value. Finally, I would say that what has most struck during this process is the capacity issue, and it was interesting that Robin Thompson mentioned this at the beginning and the fact that the ECTP are considering some sort of project on capacity. There is in fact great variation in the capacity of countries and regions both to contribute to and to learn from transnational co-operation. Some are better than others. In general I would say that our capacity is very limited for this sort of activity. It is not just about resources although that is an issue, it is not just about people, but

it is also about understanding and about shifting mindsets from the sorts of planning that we have been involved in so far to a new sort of European spatial planning Mark 2. So if capacity is a problem there is obviously great value in holding meetings such as this and I think that there is great scope and potential for us to spend more time learning from each other. Thank you.

A copy of Vincent Nadin's slide presentation is available on application to the ECTP Secretariat (email online@rtpi.org.uk, specifying ECTP conference on ESDP).

1.3 Klaus Kunzmann: *Jean Monnet Professor of European Spatial Planning, University of Dortmund.*

- I am amazed to hear how the ideology of spatial planning is creeping into Britain, and I have an explanation for that. I think that it is a result of thirty years of New Town development, land-use control and zoning focus in urban and regional development, and it is still a reaction to Margaret Thatcher who said she did not need planners! It seems to be fashionable to refer to spatial planning at the moment. I remember the conference in Torremolinos where it was decided to have a European Charter of Regional Planning. The Germans wanted to have 'Raumplanung' and there was a big discussion with the translators about how to translate 'Raumplanung' into English, because there is no 'Raumplanung' in England (or there was no 'Raumplanung' - now it seems there is). In the end, a compromise was reached after two days of discussion amongst Ministers, and it was decided to call the agreement the 'European Charter of Regional/Spatial Planning'. To my knowledge that was the first time that this term spatial planning came into the wider debate.
- It is interesting that reference has been made today to territorial planning, because 'Territorialplanung' was the term used to describe spatial planning in East Germany before re-unification. After re-unification, the first word that was abolished was 'Territorialplanung', and I still remember that the students of the university in Weimar asked me support them in order to establish a planning school in Weimar at the former Bauhaus. After two years of fights the education ministry said they did not want to have a planning programme in East Germany on territorial/spatial planning because they had had fifty years of planning and did not want to have planning any more. So territorial planning was abolished and planning was abolished, and last year when we got a new Minister for 'Transport, Planning and Construction' the first thing they did was to remove planning from the title of the Ministry! Now the Ministry is of 'Transport and Construction' and there is still a sub-division that deals with spatial planning and urban policy.
- Twenty years ago when I spoke about spatial planning outside Germany, especially in Britain, everybody was very sceptical. Now it seems that this term has been recovered and now I am sceptical and I apologise for that from the very beginning. I will tell you now why I am sceptical and it is not because the new German Ministry does not have the term in its name or that the school in

Weimar does not exist. Rather it is because the ambitions of planners in Germany have contributed to the failure of planning because they used one word: co-ordination, to describe what they were trying to achieve, and all political scientists would tell you immediately that this was the wrong catchword. Co-ordination means that there is someone in the hierarchy who says; *you should do that Transport Minister, you should do that Agriculture Minister*, and so on, and that is the often first thing they do not want to do. Whether it is at the national level, the Länder level, or the local level there is so much institutional jealousy that the term co-ordination is for me a non-word.

- I really support planning. I am not sceptical of planning but I am sceptical of the way that planning is sold in the political and the public arena. I will talk today a little bit about the importance of the ESDP; the target groups of the ESDP; and who will really use or apply the ESDP. In the very early drafts the word 'implementation' was used, but as many have written since the word 'implementation' for this European spatial concept is another non-word, and we should not use it any more. I have been asked to talk about 'European spatial planning: unity or difference'. I will do that and then present some ideas of what we should do, in order to end on a positive note. So I shall start positive, I shall end positive, and in-between I shall be very sceptical!

European spatial planning: 'unity or difference?'

- There is no doubt that the ESDP document is important. It is an interim statement of thirty years of national regional spatial planning - more, in some countries: in France, Germany and especially in the Netherlands; less in some countries: Italy, Greece, Spain or Portugal. I like this document very much and would like to congratulate those who prepared it because, having been involved in *Europe 2000*, I can imagine what kind of co-ordination efforts were behind this document, and I know that Derek Martin is among us and I really appreciate the work which has been done.
- This document will certainly serve as a reference paper for regional national spatial planning, and everybody will quote it when they want to write something about planning or spatial planning, or urban and regional planning. To be frank I prefer not to change the words too much because the public will be confused. If you go out of this building and ask a taxi driver what spatial planning is he will not know that. If you look at German newspapers, the word *Raumplanung* does not exist. Town and country planning, or urban and regional planning, are still familiar, and we could say they have a spatial component. I would not really place too much stress on definitions. I would use the definition which has the most appeal for the target group; academics at the moment seem to favour spatial planning.
- The ESDP is a well-formulated 'catalytic' paper identifying common spatial problems in Europe in a concise way, and that is the importance of the paper: no other planning book in Europe is available in nine languages. The ESDP raises the low political profile of spatial planning in many European countries. I think that that is true in the Mediterranean and in Britain, so it has had a tremendous impact and it will continue to have a tremendous impact in the

future. It contributes to the revival of spatial planning in the member countries of the EU; for example, it was only because the European Commission started this process with *Europe 2000* and *Europe 2000+* that the German government started to think about a *Nationalorientierungsrahmen*. Spatial planning at the national level - '*Raumordnung*' - was dead in Germany for twenty years because the Bavarians said '*we don't want Bonn ruling over us*' and so nobody really apart from a few academics in the country dared to talk about spatial planning in the political arena. However, with *Europe 2000* and *Europe 2000+* and reunification it started to be discussed again just in order to define what could be the German position as against the European position. So the ESDP process contributed to the revival of spatial planning in Germany.

- The ESDP is also a document, which says in times of deregulation; *the public sector still has some importance*. I think that that is a very important argument and we should not hide this argument behind others. It is the public sector that is doing spatial planning, PPP [spell out] is not doing spatial planning, PPP is earning money and is trying to develop projects, but it is not doing spatial planning. The document also sets normative codes and standards for spatial planning at regional and national level through its sixty objectives and presents the 'state of the art' in terms of what you do in spatial regional planning, planning at the higher geographical scale. It tries to be a bit more precise than the normal rhetoric in planning. It stresses the importance of the spatial dimension of sectoral planning, not as much as I would like to see, and that is one of the key problems and issues.
- The ESDP will bring planners in Europe together to discuss planning issues of joint interest. It is not just supporting the travel industry but it is bringing us together and giving us reasons for talking to each other! It will certainly 'brainwash' planning students all over Europe, and I mean that in a positive way of course, so they will all know that this is the state of the art, and if you know that, you know a bit of what is the main tendency of planning in other European countries. Of course, this document and the activities around it are also an enormous employment initiative for planners! Planners will find jobs again because every region will say '*we have to do some European things*'. Planning schools are starting to offer special courses and our graduates find jobs. Similarly, consultancies and trans-European consultancies will find work and look for more planners. So the whole process can be seen as a machine for planning jobs, for research projects, for observatories and trans-national conferences.
- All these effects are good, and I am not sceptical. It is good that we have so to say more allies in our battle for a better quality of life, which is what is behind planning. However, now my scepticism starts, I think that the ESDP serves as a perfect fig leaf to cover the negative spatial effects of non-spatial European policies such as competition policy. For example, in the utilities sector, a big energy corporation in the Ruhr has recently bought up 'Thames Water', which means that the water supply of London will be controlled by the board of a company in Germany. We know how effective the French utility companies have been at expanding into markets in other countries. So if in the end water and energy and everything else is private, eventually becoming globally private,

then all these local impacts will have to be negotiated with some anonymous board. I feel therefore that EU competition policy is doing much more harm to the European spatial arena than the ESDP can improve things. That is why I say that it is a fig leaf because there are many policies at the European level, which are doing just what the ESDP states we must avoid. Concentration and agglomeration - all these effects which go against the policy of balanced development of the territory will be a result of present European policies. That is why I do not believe in this co-ordination effort because the only institution co-ordinating planning in Europe is this one: the Dow Jones index. Shareholder value, that is important everybody talks about it look how much the *Financial Times* talks about spatial planning, nothing, they talk about shareholder value. We must be realistic enough not to stay in our little garden fenced community thinking that planning is the greatest and that the outside world is just the enemy, because the outside world is setting the terms.

[“EUROPE/DOW JONES LOGO” CARTOON]

- This outside world, this ‘tanker’ of Europe is very difficult to move as we all know. I do not know where the planners sit in this tanker, but maybe in the galley because they like life! I do not know whether the cook in the galley of this tanker has a chance to change the course of the tanker but I have some doubts about that, and that is why I am a little bit sceptical. The ESDP is a kind of samizdat paper of the planning undercurrent: an excellent paper but an insider document, which I would say is not widely known outside of spatial planning and the spatial planning Mafia! I bet that not more than 250 planners in Europe have really read it from the first page to last to the last page. Even if they quote it, maybe they have not read it. Outside the planning world, if you go to a Chamber of Commerce in Dortmund and you ask ‘*Do you know that document?*’ they will say ‘*Which document? I have never seen it*’. Many other institutions which we want to influence will never have had access to it and they will not have the time to read it.
- So we should be very realistic and very modest. This document is not a plan for Europe, it is not a programme, it is not a law. It is just - and I think it is very important - a report; it is a good report, an excellent report, a report which does not need to be implemented. And it is not a land-use plan for Europe, as has been said many times. However, we have a European Commission which has a certain amount of money and to accompany the structural funds they have invented machinery to feed the application process: INTERREG. I do not know whether INTERREG could have been invented without the ESDP, and this linking of the ESDP and INTERREG is very clever. But as we have INTERREG, would it really matter if we did not have the ESDP? I think that it would not matter. We would have INTERREG and nobody would miss the ESDP. In contrast everybody would miss the financial means of INTERREG if it did not exist. So as long as the Commission keeps the INTERREG programmes at full steam, the ESDP will survive. If there is no money left, the ESDP will probably die and become a perfect document for the history of spatial planning in Europe while the Dow Jones Index will continue to go up as planning ideology goes down!

- So who will really use and apply the ESDP? Of course the European Commission will use it. As a soft reference paper and as a paper checking regional development it will make a good check list for saying *'Did you do this? Did you do that?'* or *'If you want to have money from us then please write at least in your document that you want to have balanced spatial development'*. So the ESDP will be used for reference and it will marginally change mindsets around Europe. National governments will use it if they want to strengthen their arguments and to demonstrate their interest in international spatial development. On 30 November 2000 we had a conference in Dortmund about the future of the Rhine-Ruhr metropolis in Germany. We invited all kinds of practitioners and they all said *"This metropolis does not exist"*. However, we know from the European level that it does exist; it is a bit like the Randstad, and Andreas Faludi has written a lot about this doctrine. So sometimes we have different layers of argument. National governments will use the ESDP, although certainly not the Ministries of Economy or of Transport: they will not use it; they will say it does not matter. Regional governments will use it as a means to get more money, in preparing for negotiations with the European Commission, and to demonstrate their 'globalness'. I feel that now everybody is saying *'We have to be international, we have to be global'* and if we use these catch words from the European level then we will be global even if we are very parochial in our little projects. In academia the ESDP will provide an escapist theme for researchers who do not wish to deal with the nitty-gritty things of daily planning; they say if we talk about spatial planning we can talk about definitions and so on, but we do not need to deal with the problems of how to reduce mobility, how to stop urban sprawl, these kinds of things. So it is an excellent document for students and researchers.
- European spatial planning: unity or difference? One of the questions I was given was *'is the ESDP just a new effort to revive the Christaller theory of central places in Europe?'* I do not know whether all of you are aware that Christaller did in fact produce a European spatial development perspective in 1950 with a hierarchy of urban centres in Europe. I do not know if there is anybody here from Slovakia; one of the world cities in Europe in the hierarchy is Bratislava - higher than Vienna, much higher than Brussels of course, and at the same level as Rome, Berlin, Moscow, Leningrad and Stockholm, which is also a global city. So you see it has been done, but of course the ESDP is not a new effort to revive the central places we all know. The well-known European study by the RECLUS team (reference at end) again developed a kind of new hierarchy, but all these things are analytical. Who should influence the hierarchy of cities?
- Should the European Commission say *'No, we no longer invest in London or Paris. We'll only invest in Reading and Dinkelsbühl'* in order to get a balanced spatial development in Europe? No. This would not work and the real power, as you know, lies with the airport authorities in Europe and the really important hierarchy is that of airports in Europe. So there is this very famous image of the 'blue banana', which influenced everybody in Europe and tried to convince developers that they should invest in this banana. The banana was invented before the fall of the Berlin wall. If it had been drawn after this I am quite convinced that it would have been a Paris-Moscow banana, which was not

possible before the fall of the Wall. However, it is nonsense, and that is why I, and some know that already, say that the banana is not the appropriate fruity image of Europe. It should really be the grape. The future of Europe is a Europe of the powerful city regions, not even the regions, I think, but the city regions, and a city region's airport is significant. It is not a homogenous Europe, as each of the grapes will have a different cultural background; a different history; maybe even a different ideology; a different interest in planning; a different interest in the economy; and very much will depend on personalities and traditions and on many other things.

[“EUROPE/BUNCH OF GRAPES” CARTOON]

Conclusion

- Coming to my conclusion, after this sceptical view of the ESDP I am getting more positive again. I have said, "OK, this is a good document." Politically maybe it is difficult and from an economic point of view it is marginal, it is irrelevant, nevertheless we should not give up, we should continue. However, I think the first thing is to reduce the complexity of this document. Some of you may know that a 'Pan-European Framework Strategy for Spatial Development' is also being developed on behalf of the Council of Europe, which will be a document for the whole of Europe.
- So things will become even more complex and I think that it could make sense to reduce the complexity in a second stage by not trying to cover the whole territory, but thinking about different policy fields, or what I have called European spatial profiles, for example, one for old industrial regions or for conservation of water resources. So the approach could be to take a horizontal issue and develop ESDP 2, 3 and 4, not for the whole territory but on certain issues. I think that that is easier to communicate to the public and in the political arena, and your target group is clearer. The French Government next week will propose an ESDP at two speeds, which will permit some countries to advance more quickly than others and prepare an ESDP 2 together. I do not think this is a good proposal. My approach would rather be to reduce the complexity by going to smaller European spatial profiles. I also think there should be a biennial spatial development report. The fifth, sixth and seventh periodic reports are not quite spatial, so I think we should add a spatial dimension. As to whether we should add it or have a separate report I think we should have a separate report, which monitors particularly the spatial impacts of non-spatial policies of the European Commission. I think thirdly that the ESDP should be much more outspoken in its ecological and cultural agendas. It is there all right, but much of it is rhetoric. It argues for all four dimensions of sustainable development and I think it may be too early to compromise. If you focus on the environmental and cultural agenda, it is easier to fight against economic things than if economy and environment are already together. I think the spatial planners should say *“We are for sustainable development and we mean it and we do not just use sustainable development as a word, which replaces comprehensive development.”*

- The next point – and this has already started - is that spatial planning requires spatial images. The ESDP does not offer these images. I remember the meeting of the Ministers in Noordwijk. The first thing the Spanish delegate said when he was offered the floor was *'I agree fully with this document, perfect I like it, but you have to remove the maps because the maps are dangerous'*. We know that maps are dangerous; they are the mental things. Nobody reads the text but they remember the images. No one read the RECLUS study (reference below), but the banana was quoted all over Europe. So even if the banana is made up of one-third underdeveloped regions, everyone said *'in the banana that is where the engine is'*. Parts of Switzerland, the southern part of Belgium, all these are in the banana, yet these are not economically dynamic regions. So I think for the public, images are indispensable. Maybe this is another argument for reducing complexity because it maybe easier to draw it. If we just draw the typical planning figures and maps, the public will not quite understand that. They will say *'OK, it is polycentric, but does it have any effect on my life? No.'* The question is really *'What is Europe?'* as the *Economist* asked one day. I think that is the big issue when we start developing these images, and I think the American elections give us a good chance to think European now. Finally, the ESDP has to go public. It should serve as a document to promote the whole of the public sector in guiding spatial development in the regions of Europe but we have to make it public otherwise it will just be a little chapter in the history of planning in Europe. Thank you very much.

RECLUS Study: RECLUS Economic Interest Group, directed by R. Brunet: in Les Villes Européennes, June 1989, La Documentation Française

1.4 Nicky Gavron: **Deputy Mayor of the London Greater London Authority.**

- First, I am going to put the spatial development strategy for London (SDS) in context. The Greater London Assembly (GLA) is unique because it has been given its principal purposes. No other tier of government has been given purposes in the same way. It is interesting to ask *'What is government?'* what is local government, what is regional government for, as you enter the 21st century? What is the common good, what is in the public interest? Well we have been given purposes and these can be summarised as:

To promote the economic and social development of London and Londoners and the environmental improvement of Greater London.

- These three purposes are set in the Act. They have to be developed over time and pursued in a balanced and integrated way; integration is a key word for the GLA. They have to be exercised in a way to demonstrate that they contribute to sustainable development in the UK. Beverly Hughes, the junior Minister for Planning, called *'promoting the economic and social development of London and Londoners and the environmental improvement of Greater London'* the three pillars of sustainable development. The UK Government uses economic, social and environmental goals that reflect the UN definition of sustainable

development, which is *'to provide economic security while increasing social equity and protecting the environment'*.

- The three principal purposes developed in an integrated way provide a very important framework for any vision for what sort of London we want in the future. We also have to have regard to two other cross-cutting themes: *public health of London and Londoners* (we do not have any responsibility for health in the narrow sense, but public health of course covers poverty, environment, and pollution, and housing), and we also have responsibility for ensuring *equality of opportunity*. I will now turn to the main vehicles for expressing these three purposes and themes.
- There are a number of main strategies: *Spatial Development, Transport, Economic Development, Bio-diversity, Waste, Air Quality, Ambient Noise, Culture* and the London Development Agency's *Economic Strategy*. These must be consistent with each other, and they must form an integrated package of policies that flow from the purposes. The Mayor must consult the Assembly and the functional bodies in a wide consultation as required by the Act. We have some powers in the following areas: housing (which is very important for Londoners and which is going to be the heart of what I talk about); promoting public health (so we ought to be producing a public health strategy), and tourism, which is very important. We can also influence other policies, although it is very difficult because we do not have education and we are not allowed to duplicate the powers of Boroughs or other public bodies.
- There is an overarching vision and objectives that are common to all the strategies, and the SDS's spatial development framework, which encompasses the planning strategy implemented by the Boroughs. We also run all transport in the city through a very small, unequivocally strategic, body with 400 staff, and we control more or less everything except rail, which is actually quite a problem. The London Development Agency's economic development strategy and the other strategies, which I have mentioned, must also be consistent with the vision. We have other functional bodies accountable to us such as the Police and the Fire Authority, which is important. All the other strategies are topic based, and all different from the SDS. The Mayor calls the SDS London's new Strategic Plan, which I am very pleased about, and he sees it as the overarching one. Prior to that the civil servants were saying that it was absolutely equal to the other strategies, so it is really good that the Mayor sees this is important because it sets the long term direction for London whereas all the other strategies will be regularly updated. Many of the strategies are being consulted on at the moment. The Mayor sees the other strategies as being updated as part of a rolling process very regularly, whereas the SDS (although there will be lots of supplementary planning guidance) will set a long-term direction in a way that none of the other strategies do.
- The origins of the SDS are partly in the long British tradition of town and country planning but it is our first serious attempt to interpret the ESDP, and its primary role may be described as synthesising the physical and geographical expressions of all the other strategies. What we see it as doing is showing the logic that underpins all the other strategies and it holds them together and

presents a coherent integrated picture of London's future. It must, in my opinion, tell us not just what the policies are but how they will be realised, with whom, and where. So it must include and be linked to mechanisms and investment. Mechanisms can be regulatory, fiscal, and financial. It must look at how it is going to be delivered, the delivery mechanisms, partnerships, public-interest companies, and of course, it will target policies on different parts of London.

- While this integrating role is one function of the SDS, it has another, more specific, function, which is that it replaces regional planning guidance as the guidance for London Boroughs, the local planning authorities. That means every Borough and there are thirty-two in London with the City. When reviewing their development plans (now called Unitary Development Plans), the Boroughs must submit their plans to the Mayor and they must be in general conformity with SDS. If the Mayor thinks that a UDP is not in general conformity he can lodge an objection and be represented at the public inquiry to argue his case.
- The SDS when published will be the basis for the Mayor's own decisions. The Mayor has very little 'hands-on' power, but probably the greatest power he has is that he can direct refusal on all strategic planning applications. This covers all big infrastructure and in some cases quite small things such as the height of buildings and the mass, and housing over a certain threshold. What constitutes a strategic planning application can be changed and reviewed by the mayor. So the Mayor can direct a Borough to refuse planning permission. I am personally not interested in negative, controlling, planning; I am interested in positive planning. I am looking at how we can be a resource to the Boroughs. I do not want us to be looking at planning applications at the last minute, I want us to be working with Boroughs on masterplanning in a three dimensional spatial way, areas of Boroughs, areas of London, across boroughs, and looking at generating planning applications working with all the partners so that when they come to us we will already have been heavily involved. If a Borough decides to refuse planning permission, then the Mayor can decide that he would like to be represented at the appeal but the Mayor can have costs awarded against him.
- So, on the one hand what we have is a visionary, integrating document charting London's future for at least fifteen years to twenty years, a coherent view of the sort of London we would like to have for our children and grandchildren, and on the other a planning document focusing on what English law defines as very narrow land use matters. Uniquely amongst the Mayor's strategies the SDS will be the subject of an examination in public (EIP) before a panel appointed by the Secretary of State. This is much less adversarial than a public inquiry and I think it is a good way of doing it. That will focus inevitably on the visionary and integration issues, and it will be very important for us as way of testing how the Mayor's strategies relate to one another. Do they mutually reinforce and support one another, are they consistent, do they really join up? Where there are gaps either in policy or, more likely, in resources, the SDS and EIP will highlight that. The SDS is also subject to a sustainability appraisal.

Process

- In January we have to produce a document of about 40 pages, that sets out some of the issues, the overall direction, and some of the drivers and the challenges, and the policy directions for London. That first document is called a proposals document. This is not like any of the other strategies, where there is one document a consultation then you have the final document. Here we have a first document, next summer we bring out the first draft of the SDS, and then that is heavily consulted on and then there is another version of it, which is ready by Spring 2002, which then goes to an EIP. So we will not have our plan for two years. That is very difficult, impossible with some things, impossible with tall buildings, and very difficult in terms of housing in London, as I will explain. So we have to produce some supplementary documents, which are our policies. Meanwhile the Mayor has decided to adopt almost without exception the London Planning Advisory Committee's (LPAC) planning policies as interim planning policies. This is good, because they were very heavily consulted on with all the stakeholder groups and the Boroughs, so there is a broad consensus around them.
- We have to get ownership of where we are going, and there are some big challenges. I am already beginning a dialogue now with all the stakeholders. We need a dialogue; this time London has to own the sense of direction. For fourteen years, we have had no government and perhaps the worst aspect of that has been that although London has been buoyant economically, there has not been a sense of direction that everyone can sign up to. That is absolutely crucial. We need it to be signed up to not just by the landowners, the mortgage lenders, the property people, the developers, the transport people, the voluntary sector, you also need it signed up to on the street. I come from a community development, neighbourhood background and one of the worst things in the last fourteen years has been the erosion of the 'local', the erosion of place and identity, and some kind of civic pride. We have to get that back. It is a bit of a trick: how can you be strategic government at regional level covering over seven million people and do that? I am looking at the best examples. Seattle did it rather nicely and had a rather far-sighted Mayor but they spent a lot of money. I am looking at how you do it in every single way, not planners speaking, but maybe actors speaking, pop-up books, videos, interactive videos!
- So we are starting with a vision of the kind of London we want. With my encouragement, the Mayor has stated that the vision, which of course flows from the three principal purposes, is to make London an exemplary, sustainable city by 2012. That is three Mayoral terms and the Mayor is absolutely focussed on two terms. So we are looking at that and the Mayor is sometimes a bit populist and says by 2010 because it has a bit of a ring! So what does this mean practically? First, I have to tell you a little bit about London because I want to talk about the drivers of change and the challenges. I cannot do them all, but the most important thing about London is its position in the global economy that is our starting point, we consider London to be one of only three genuine world cities - the other two being Tokyo and New York, in the different time zones. London is unique in so far as it combines global business and financial services, world-class heritage arts, culture and entertainment and

media, fantastic telecommunications, with national government, and it also has the higher education, the medical excellence, and it is amongst the finest business locations in the world. That does not mean that Paris or Berlin and Barcelona are not world class. London's population is as big as Denmark's, its GDP is almost as big as Switzerland's, and it is now the greatest concentration of languages and cultures in the world with over 300 languages, and has been dubbed '*cosmopolis*' by the National Geographic magazine. So we are rich, we are big, we are cosmopolitan - and we are divided, we are very, very divided. We have a city of contrasts, because we have astounding wealth in the Corporation of London, which is the city, called the "Square Mile" because it is so small, and yet its reach is colossal internationally. However, surrounding it are the poorest Boroughs; there is a concentration of local authorities which are the poorest in the UK and probably in Europe. I am going to talk a bit more about local economies. So we have a lot of problems arising partly from the success of the city as a whole competing on a world stage and the fact that it has all this burgeoning wealth creating activity not just in the corporation but in its central area.

- The central area is very buoyant indeed. One problem which is arising from this huge concentration of activities and wealth and a booming economy, the relative decline of local economies and the absolute decline of some areas; one of the big challenges for us, is the huge disparities between wealth and opportunity in London. Another one would be the whole revolution in information technology, which is incredibly important. Then there is an issue that is very pressing now. Because the central world city activities are here, people of ambition and ability from all over the world are coming here in droves to get good jobs, earn lots of money, contribute to our booming economy and to enjoy the exciting and rather eclectic lifestyle here. Because of this economic migration, London's population is growing again after decades of decline. In 1939 there were eight million people and very few cars in London, by 2016 we are projected to have 8.2 million people with almost all of the growth occurring by 2010. So we will have eight million people, not to mention all their cars, by 2010. In 1939 we began a process of decentralisation of people and economic activity out of London. It was absolutely planned, we distributed people into New Towns and this went on right through until the end of the 1970s: in 1977, the New Towns programme was stopped. Even since then of course it has gone on, but now I think one of our main policy assumptions is we want to *re-centralise* London.
- London's population increase then, is a potent driver for change. I do not however, like trend-led visions and scenarios. I want something that is actually scenario-led,. Trends can guide us, but they cannot facilitate change. What we have to do is look at the trends, bend some of them, and see the gap between where we want to be and where the trends are taking us. This trend of population growth is an important one because we are supposed to be contributing to UK sustainable development and cities are seen; although of course in many ways they are the most unsustainable ways of living, as being potentially the most sustainable way of living. This is worth thinking about given the intense pressure on us in the South East and I will talk a bit more about that.

- In terms of housing, what has happened is that more people on high incomes are looking for homes in London but the supply is relatively static. In fact it is worse than that, because for about two decades we have not been building many houses and the population has been going up. But before that, in the decades from 1939, we had a declining population and we were putting a lot of money into subsidised housing. That has all been reversed in the last two decades and we now have a relatively static supply and spiralling house prices. There has always been a recurrent crisis in the relationship between where people live and work and how they travel between them but things are now at crisis point in London. We now cannot recruit bus drivers, nurses or teachers. Most Policemen do not live in London: they travel in. It is not just public service workers. We cannot recruit junior accountants, junior computer specialists. The economy of London and its booming world city role is at risk because of recruitment, because the very success is driving house prices up. You now cannot get a house in London if you earn under £28,000; there is no such thing as an affordable house in London. We have a crisis in housing markets, not just for people on low incomes, but also for people on modest-to-good incomes. We have also not been helping it because of policies at the affordable rented end of the market. We do not have the European apartment living culture in cities. We still have not got the rental business right. It is all about ownership here. What we do have is a lot of social rented housing but this has been going down because of the right-to-buy. We have also been doing estate improvements and building at a lower density, so we have been losing stock all the while.
- The third driver is the state of London's local economies. London is divided, East-West, South of the river - North of the river. Berlin has done a better job of integrating its transport East and West than we have North and South - and we have not had a Wall! There is Inner London and then there are the suburbs and outer London, and it is in this ring where most people live. In the inner ring you have a ring of town centres; in fact all over London you have town centres. These have been plagued by out-of-town retail and out-of-town leisure development right through the 1980s and 1990s due to very laissez-faire planning. Many of the town centres are declining, with some notable exceptions. There has also been no office development worth talking about except down in Croydon a bit along the Great West Road, but it has been back office space, not really prime office space - all that happens in the centre, and there has been one new nucleus of activity at Canary Wharf. Many of our offices have been turned into residential accommodation. So there has been a big issue about town centres, and where you get a declining town centre you generally get the suburbs around declining, too. Where suburbs are going up or booming, you have a booming town centre and that is very interesting. There is also something much, much more serious. I represent Edmonton in Enfield where the average income is £5,000 per household per annum, if you come down a bit to Haringey it has the highest rate of unemployment. It is the most ethnically mixed area in London apart from Brent and you have the highest rate of unemployment in the UK and the highest proportionate number of unemployed people.

- Around the Lee valley and Thames Gateway are what we call regeneration corridors but they are packed with the most deprived communities. They are multiply deprived: early death, poor health, poor housing. They used to be where all the heavy industry was and they have lost their economic raison d'être. There is a lot of thinking going into these areas and a lot of help from European funding because we have to do something. There are also pockets of deprivation all over London. The East-West issue may be exacerbated with Heathrow's Terminal 5. Klaus Kunzmann talked about airports ruling the world, and when T5 comes on stream it will give signals to business that maybe West is still much better than East although there is not much land and there is overheating in the labour market. This may result in some urban sprawl to the West. I am not saying that we should not relate to our hinterland. Stansted Airport, too, will soon reach critical mass as the third international airport, and this is very important as it faces the Channel Tunnel rail link and Europe. So all this has to be looked at.
- The fourth driver of change is transport. We all know that London is a pretty easy city to get to but paradoxically it is pretty difficult to get around. It is really a paradox and it has been made much worse by the growth of employment in the central area and what is happening is that you have got more and more people travelling to work there from the suburbs, but enormous numbers travel from outside London. Now about 20 per cent of the labour market lives about thirty miles outside London – where they can get housing. You still have 80 per cent of people travelling by public transport even though it is overloaded, but the 20 per cent who do not are causing total congestion, and the Mayor is bringing in congestion charging. I would prefer to see this rolled out right across London but one cannot say that now! Since this Labour government came in, traffic growth has halved because of the fuel duty escalator, signals from government, all sorts of things. LPAC worked really hard to show how we could reduce that growth. We could reduce traffic by 15%, but only by using congestion charging along with a raft of other measures. That is now not going to happen. So I am very worried about eight million people and the cars question.
- We are going to enhance and maintain the world city role so London continues to compete with other cities. We want to reinvigorate our local economies increasing opportunity, wealth, tackling social exclusion and we are going to address the acute need for affordable housing. We are also going to try to do something about intra-London transport. All this has the ultimate objective of accommodating eight million people in a sustainable pattern of development. We want to also encourage people out of their cars, giving them much more public transport, to improve the look and feel of London streets and to give the same status to pedestrians that you currently have in the car; that sense of well being, pleasure, security. Why should you not have it when you walk around the streets of London? You have it in many European cities; you definitely do not get it in London. We want to look at a new industrial sector around resource productivity, zero waste; waste always being made into products and new jobs. There are five paper mills in the Bronx in New York. I want five paper mills in London, and to clean up our air and improve access to open spaces.

- Now, just some of the key issues. We are going to have three RER-type rail lines, *Thameslink 2000*, followed by *Crossrail* and we must make sure it takes city workers to Heathrow but does not bring in too many people from Essex, because I do not want to have all these marvellous rail links and just bring more and more people in to London to take the jobs. Then we are going to do something which is very interesting, around the edge of inner London are town centres and there are stations and there is something called the North, West, South, East, line and another line called the Barking Gospel Oak. We are going to call it the *Orbirail*, the orbital rail link, because it is currently difficult to get around London, as the transport links are all radial. It will be possible to hop from one line to another to make it easier to get around. We are also going to try and make parts of the rail network into a metro network to match the tube, so that without having a timetable you can turn up and know you are going to have a train, at worst every quarter of an hour, at most every five minutes. We are also going to rethink the bus network. We are going to copy from Europe! I want buses that behave like trams and have been inspired by Curitiba. I want the next generation of buses. Buses that go down the middle of the roads, completely rethought buses, bendy buses.
- Housing and transport must be brought together and the LPAC has done a lot of work about housing capacity and about sustainable residential quality, which has been taken up by the Urban Task Force and Richard Rogers, and the recent Urban White Paper. We need to look at higher densities, not necessarily tall buildings, although the Mayor likes tall buildings! I am trying to constrain him to transport interchanges for tall buildings. I do not think he minds standing in Hyde Park thinking he is in Central Park! We are looking at higher densities around public transport interchanges, and space normally allocated for cars been given to people instead. If you look at central London you have seven or eight stories, but as you move out of central London you have much lower density development and so we are looking at that. If we do not follow this approach, we are at the apocalyptic vision of a ring of New Towns around the edge of London that suck the economically active out and we can forget about the world city economy. The Green Belt, which is what is so important for London and is what keeps us compact, will be built on and urban sprawl will develop causing big problems with the rest of the South East, and it is always the economically active who leave. Of these eight million people in London, we have to keep a greater proportion economically active. Towns have always been built up around rivers or they are built up around crossroads. I see transport interchanges as the new crossroads so we are looking at some new stations and new town centres they are not yet identified. We have unparalleled opportunities for regeneration because we have so many brownfield sites.
- So we are looking at new settlements as well as higher density, and I think higher density should be virtually wherever you can do it even in some of these suburban town centres, although of course we are not going to mess up beautiful interwar estates. We are talking about where the high streets are, where the transport is accessible, and building around that. We are looking at these settlements combining shops, restaurants, bars, cinemas, health centres, hotels (we want to decentralise tourism) schools, colleges, health facilities, and

a variety of workspaces. People are beginning to ring us up and say *'We are dispersing our offices. I want multifunctional workspaces near stations'*. Multifunctional workspaces for people who do not have space at home to work; there is a lot of interest in that.

- We are looking of course particularly at residential development. The Mayor wants to up the proportion of residential accommodation, which is affordable to 50 per cent of every development of more than 10 units. It is very contentious, but when I have talked at business breakfasts recently, landowners have recognised that if we want to keep the buoyancy of this central area we have got to do this. Therefore I hope that the landowners will work with us and we can use land values as a tool, and not a barrier, to doing this. We need all kinds of intermediate housing markets things have got to be very different. We are looking at new kinds of urban living; we are looking at what you do in Europe; people have come to us now with ideas for co-housing in London based on Scandinavian and Dutch models.
- We are looking at three-dimensional comprehensive master plans, including looking at positive planning in the public realm, and we are trying to work with urban designers and architects so that we get a very high quality. We have strategic planning powers, transport investment, regeneration funds, the power to acquire and dispose of land, and, in some cases, land. So we have quite a combination of levers that we could use. The big issues really are; are the institutions going to have the confidence to work with us around this? Another thing is that the city, which is fringed by these very poor areas, is now pushing out into areas like Brick Lane and Spitalfields. How do we deal with these areas of transition? What to we do about them? Do we try to hang on, or do we just accept that the City will push out, and in another millennium it will get to the English Channel? How do we make things work for people in these poor areas?

Conclusion

- Much was done to undermine the GLA before it was set up because the concept of a strong Mayor, the US-style strong Mayor, worried the Boroughs, so there was quite a lot of chipping away. Now we have to build trust. There will always some difficult Boroughs, but in terms of planning, because I have spent so much time on planning and transport and waste and other environmental issues, I am really quite optimistic that if we go about it the right way and work very closely offering resources to the Boroughs who are very strapped for cash, things could be alright. Thank you.

Robin Thompson

A lot of strategic work is on the GLA website, the emerging policies from the GLA can be accessed from the web.

1.5 Frank D'hondt and Athena Baibas Wallace

1.5.1 Frank D'hondt

Introduction

- A practitioner's view, the view of the European Spatial planning community / ECTP view. The presentation will focus on the role of spatial planners in European spatial planning policy and practice in general, and in the ESDP process in particular. Athena Baibas Wallace, speaking next, will raise points relating to the ESDP process. Two topics, first the meaning of the ESDP document for the European planning community, and second, ECTP's strategy to promote European spatial planning in general and to apply the ESDP principles in particular through bottom-up actions.

The implications of the ESDP for the European planning community

- In terms of the meaning of the ESDP document for the European spatial planning community, the first point is about the spatialisation of European regional policy. From the viewpoint of professional planners, the least favourite implication of the ESDP is probably its role as an allocation instrument for Euro money. Of course, it is important, indispensable even, that the ESDP document influences the restructuring of the structural funds. But if spatial criteria or planning visions coming out of the current INTERREG programmes will only be used for allocating Euro money, many planners fear that the 'Greenfield' of European spatial planning will become in no time a red battlefield!
- The integration of the ESDP into the heart of European development policy may marginalise the implementation of the ESDP in national, regional and local planning. Putting spatial development in the middle of the picture could push spatial planning and spatial planners out of the picture. There must be an equal emphasis on the ESDP as a common framework for spatial planning on the European, transnational, national, crossborder, regional, and local levels as a transboundary-planning tool for spatial planners on all policy scales. The way to put planning and planners in the middle of the picture could be by developing spatial scenarios and visions on the European scale, as for political reasons the ESDP has not developed prospective planning in terms of planning visions and scenarios. The experiences of previous presidencies show that cartographic representation, because it lacks territorial vision and because it is loaded with meanings and great powers of persuasion, is perceived as a sensitive subject in relation to which the Member States feel strongly tempted to adopt a prudent, reserved, and ultimately reluctant attitude. Klaus Kunzmann has already raised that point.
- Nevertheless, according to the current French presidency, it is important to define a spatial vision, presenting trends and proactive scenarios, especially scenarios that illustrate either of the following: the lack of integration of the ESDP options, and the effects of the implementation of the ESDP concepts. The CSD will use pre-existing material which is legitimate in the eyes of the European Commission and the member states such as *Europe 2000+* studies, work by SPON (Spatial Planning Observatory Network), some spatial visions

developed as part of INTERREG IIc, and spatial plans and visions produced in member states and the regions. The French Presidency document shows the ESDP as a document which should include spatial scenarios and visions, and indicates that these could be an element for the follow-up, so there is a lot to implement. This action is a real challenge for the follow-up and the credibility of the ESDP among planners. We consider this action also as a lever for the unification of our planning languages in Europe. The planning community should be involved directly in preparing those scenarios and spatial visions on the European scale, so we look forward to the outcome of this CSD action.

- The third implication of the ESDP is in terms of work on transnational and crossborder planning. The current set of European initiatives such as URBAN and INTERREG are important to experience co-regional and transnational co-operation. INTERREG IIc and its follow up INTERREG IIIB are of extreme importance for the construction of the European planning community. All planners in Europe should participate in at least one project under Interreg IIIB, as by doing this the ESDP principles will be applied into practice instead of being only concepts that are read and criticised. Here, ECTP has a role in encouraging its member organisations to involve their individual members in different kinds of INTERREG projects.
- The fourth implication is the internationalisation of national, regional, and local spatial policy. The ESDP document has no binding status and will probably never achieve it. As we all know, spatial problems are very complex and always dependent on local situations and conditions. General European measures or directives in the field spatial planning could destroy the spatial diversity, which is a unique selling point of Europe. The way out of the dilemma between the top-down and bottom-up approach is probably the internationalisation of local, regional, and national spatial planning policies. It is only if the ESDP convinces the national and regional planning agencies and planners associations, that European planning policy can be effective at the most important levels of planning which are the local and regional level.
- The on-going process of top-down searching for the right planning objectives and desires and unifying concepts must go hand in hand with the new bottom-up strategies of communication, co-operation and networking. A sort of monitoring process on the European level should regularly evaluate the transposition of the ESDP principles into national and regional planning on the one hand, and into European sectoral policies on the other hand. In that perspective we look forward to the Belgian EU presidency and in particular to the meeting of spatial planning Ministers on the 13th and 14th of July 2001, with the implementation of ESDP principles in national planning as the central issue. We hope that spatial planners from all planning levels will be invited to exchange their experiences with the integration of the European dimension into the heart of planning at national, regional, and local level.
- The last important implication is for information, education, and training. By informing the planning community as well as the general public there will be an educational spin-off. Education is more effective than information as it really influences the thinking and behaviour of the planning actors. I have a feeling

that the Commission's *Europe 2000+* document was more effective than the ESDP document in terms of information and education. It is recommended to follow up the *Europe 2000+* report every two years as Klaus Kunzmann also mentioned, or maybe once every two to three years. The planned European spatial planning observatory network should provide important building bricks for the diagnostic spatial planning reports of the European Commission and also those of other European networks such as AESOP and ECTP. I think that the role of these independent organisations is rather to build communication bridges between the senders of the messages: the Commission, the informal council of spatial planning Ministers, and the potential receivers of the message: the professional planners, policy makers, and the public. Creating a European planning community will nevertheless need more than information and education, training in universities and other schools will also be important and last but not least training on the job is indispensable to think European and develop a common language. In the ESDP preparation process the absence of a common language and the different interpretations of the same words, and the same words used in different planning cultures, was a major problem. It is therefore strongly recommended to develop a sort of ESDP glossary with a common definition of planning terms used in the ESDP document.

The ECTP's strategy to promote European spatial planning in general and to apply the ESDP principles in particular

- During the ECTP Spring Meeting in Brussels in May 2000 as well as yesterday's autumn meeting, we discussed in our working group the setting up of a strategy towards the ESDP process. The input for this strategy must come from the member associations and their state of engagement. Yesterday the presidents of our member associations reported for the first time in their annual reports about the follow up in their country of the ESDP. We will repeat this every year. Besides exchanging ideas and debating on ESDP matters within ECTP, it is extremely important to foster debate among the individual planners hosted by the member associations. It is also important to discuss with other interest groups in society and with many institutions. One of the institutions is the European Commission, and we want to keep in close contact with DG Regio and more than before with the CSD. Today could be a sort of new starting point and yesterday we decided to propose to the CSD and the Belgian presidency that ECTP could send a questionnaire to our member associations to analyse the impact of the ESDP within and outside the planning community. I hope that CSD will support this idea.
- A third action is focused on the ECTP planning charter, the *New Charter of Athens*, which was adopted in 1998. The time has come to revise or to update the charter with better links to the ESDP and we hope that our charter will be taken into account in some actions of the ESDP Action Programme especially those dealing with urban matters. We also want to continue the organisation of the European planning awards and by connecting the selection criteria with the ESDP principles, discover examples of good practice that deal with real people and real places.

- The ECTP working group dealing with spatial planning policy will also work out a glossary of European planning terms and Vince Nadin's paper was an excellent kick-off for further discussion. The working group will produce a statement of the possible roles and attitudes of spatial planners towards the ESDP and its follow up. For this we need the study on the capacity of planners in Europe referred to in Robin Thompson's introduction.
- In conclusion, ECTP is not a very powerful organisation, as we all know. ECTP is perhaps a sort of sheep dog that has to bring together and hold together a lot of sheep: European planners. The sheep dog is faithful to the shepherd and perhaps the shepherd is the European Commission, the CSD, the European Parliament or the Committee of the Regions. We have a lot of shepherds, and sometimes in order to succeed in his mission the sheepdog has to bite legs and not only the legs of the sheep!

1.5.2 Athena Baibas Wallace: Member of the ECTP working group on the application of European spatial policy, member of the CSD. Planner in the Greek Ministry of Environment Spatial planning and Public Works.

Introduction

- The involvement of both professional planners and the enlarged spatial planning community is essential to ensure a bottom-up and integrated spatial approach in adopting ESDP policy options. There is a need to work for trans-sectoral implementation, which involves public and private actors, and planners at different governmental and administrative levels. We should try to take advantage of the momentum that the ESDP has created, and a historical perspective is helpful if we want to look back and assess the situation today.

The development of the ESDP

- The ESDP process followed the publication of the European Commission's *Europe 2000* (1989) and was at the time considered to be a bottom-up approach since it included not only the European level but also the member states. The idea was to produce a reference framework that would increase the effectiveness of community policies.
- The ESDP was drafted by the member states and the European Commission during successive EU presidencies between 1994 and 1999. The Committee on Spatial Development (CSD) did the drafting work while the informal meetings of Ministers endorsed it and provided guidelines for the future advancement of the perspective. The ESDP text agreed in Potsdam consists of two parts:

Part A presents the contribution of spatial development policy in achieving the balanced and sustainable development of the territory of the European Union. It sets the goals and status of the ESDP, discusses the influence of Community policies on spatial development, presents policy aims and options, and considers the application of the ESDP and the enlargement of the EU.

Part B presents the analysis that informs the ESDP document.

- A number of factors contributed to the perceived need to address spatial planning at a European level: *the evolution and dynamics of economic and political relations in Europe, the increase in the community's area with the inclusion of new members and the prospect of further enlargement, the demand for a better distribution of resources under the new conditions, and the lack of spatial co-ordination of community policies*. The intensifying internal relations in the European Union, following the creation of the large European economic space and establishment of a single market, were also significant.
- The process of European integration raises issues relating to the unequal distribution of growth in different areas, new competitive situations, and the emergence of new geographical entities followed by changing demographic, productive, and economic hierarchies amongst the cities of Europe. These issues and the danger of marginalisation necessitate co-operation initiatives.
- Social and economic cohesion but also effective support of international competitiveness for the whole of the European territory has to be based on a balanced development and the valorisation of Europe's diversity and the richness of its particular characteristics. The ESDP's basic goals of economic and social cohesion and sustainable development formulated in Corfu in 1994 reflect this, as does the third goal of balanced competitiveness of the European territory added in Noordwijk in 1997. In Leipzig the three action areas that later became the general categories of the policy options were selected: *C1, 'A balanced and polycentric urban system', C2, 'Ensuring parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge' and C3, 'Protection and prudent management of the natural and cultural heritage'*.
- Maps were produced showing the implications of C1, C2 and C3 to which successive presidencies contributed. These were originally produced by the French Presidency, with reluctance on the part of the Member States who were afraid of the political implications, and published after the Spanish presidency during the Italian presidency. All member states had an input into the maps and attempts were made to try to have the varying positions of each country taken into account.
- The need to take account of geographical and economic diversity in Europe led to the adoption of the seven Madrid and Venice criteria, which reflected: *Geographic Position, Economic Strength, Social Integration, Spatial Integration, Land-use pressures, Natural Assets, Cultural Assets*. These criteria were used in the study programme on European spatial planning set up under Article 10 of the structural funds. Following this, a first official draft of the ESDP was presented in Noordwijk – a very important stage in the ESDP process because it included the policy aims and options.
- A public debate was launched on the basis of the Noordwijk text at a European and national level, and for the first time the regions and local authorities were informed about the process. Transnational seminars were also held all over

Europe and the results of this dialogue, which took place mainly during the British presidency, were incorporated in the final text.

- In addition, at this time two actions were launched for the implementation of the ESDP. One was the study programme on European spatial planning, as a test phase for the long-term objective of a European Spatial Planning Observatory network (ESPON), and the second was action for transnational and trans-regional co-operation in spatial planning (Box 1.5.1 and Box 1.5.2).

Box 1.5.1 Study Programme on European Spatial Planning

The study programme on European spatial planning, the results of which have recently been published, aimed to provide a scientific basis for policy making. The programme involved the participation of 200 researchers from 15 selected national focal points, forming 12 transnational working groups. Extensive use of electronic media made it possible to meet the tight time schedule. The study programme consisted of three elements: a strategic study towards a new rural urban relationship in Europe, the development of indicators reflecting the seven criteria of Madrid and Venice on geographic and socio-economic differentiation, and the development of cartographic illustrations.

Box 1.5.2 Action for transnational and trans-regional co-operation in spatial planning

Apart from the transnational co-operation areas of INTERREG IIc, this also included the Article 10 pilot projects, which are now becoming the INTERREG IIIB transnational co-operation zones. These are the Article 10 pilot action zones that are becoming the economic development zones under INTERREG III. There was also the TERRA programme financed by Article 10, which applied to networks of local and regional authorities with common geographical features. The co-operation encouraged the exchange of knowledge to develop common solutions to problems facing such areas mountainous, coastal, islands, rural or river.

- The actions undertaken as part of ESPON and INTERREG III projects were incorporated after Potsdam into the ESDP Action Programme during the last Ministerial meeting at Tampere in Finland October 1999. The Action Programme consists of a list of actions with associated lead partners (usually a member state is a lead partner but other states are also involved), and there is a timetable to finalise these actions during successive presidencies.
- ECTP was very keen on the Action Programme and made proposals to connect with it and the Portuguese and French presidencies, although they did not host a Ministerial meeting (except for the URBAN Ministerial meeting in Lille by the French presidency), and supported the implementation of the ESDP action programme. After Tampere, the Commission seemed to have a change of heart. DG Regio warned that, partly due to internal problems, it could no longer support an informal procedure and an informal committee since spatial planning is not an adopted European policy. Instead of the CSD it proposed to bring spatial and urban questions before the CDCR (Committee for the Development and Convergence of the Regions), ensuring a better consideration in structural fund and cohesion fund programming of the ESDP policy options and the

recommendations laid down in the framework for action for sustainable urban development. The guidelines for the INTERREG and URBAN community initiatives should also be taken into consideration.

- The incorporation of ESDP options into the guidelines by the Commission was a very important step forward. However, whilst most member states favour the linking of action to apply the ESDP with structural funding, there is a fear that the absorption of CSD by CDCR will be followed by a more financial approach instead of the integrated spatial planning approach promoted previously. The discussion as to the future of the CSD is still going on, with one proposal being that there should be a transition period of a year with the possibility of CSD becoming a sub-group of CDCR.
- The purpose of this historical presentation has been to show that we have reached a turning point where opportunities are provided, and a momentum is increasing for, a more spatial approach to planning and European policy. However, a sectoral managerial view is threatening the integrated, horizontal and long-term spatial vision that is imperative to assess, amongst other things, the perspective of the enlargement of the European Union.
- In terms of what has been gained up until now, it can be argued that apart from a reference framework agreed to a large degree by all member states and discussed by the enlargement countries, there has been a development of a more spatial approach to planning. The ESDP provided arguments for national states to take account of the spatial dimension and more importantly to recognise the necessity for strategic spatial development. In Greece for example the regional support frameworks were influenced and the proceedings to establish a national spatial planning observatory were taken forward.
- Despite some problems on the European level at the transnational level, INTERREG and Art. 10 pilot projects and TERRA co-operation have motivated actors at national, regional and local level to co-operate in different countries either in common geographic development zones or in non-neighbouring countries sharing similar thematic interests. A European dialogue is developing and an exchange of knowledge, methods, and practices are taking place but also a continuous flow of people, ideas, and inspiration. Finally a common language, common structures, and networks are formed that can support future actions. Nevertheless, we should not be over-optimistic since, as noted by the Greek Planners Association, it is very easy to fall back on a sectoral logic since all the administrative structures are tuned into a financial managerial outlook.
- An integrated approach with a vision is difficult, but there are some good examples that promote strategic planning based on agreed priorities and supported by political bodies such examples exist in the Vasa area, the Baltic Sea INTERREG II programme, and the North Sea region that Flemming Thornæs will present. So there is also a role for planners in formulating long-term plans in a bottom-up approach for these transnational economic zones. The ESDP options and visions must be adapted to the real situation and strategies and visions cannot be implemented, or even formulated, without the active participation of all actors involved, whether in the private or public sector,

at local, regional, national and transnational levels so there is a real challenge for planners to play a mediating role.

- In conclusion I would like to stress the need for us to join forces whether we are consultants, in research, or in public service to ensure the application of the ESDP, not only because we are planners, but also to help secure the added value spatial planning can provide for a polycentric balanced and sustainable development of the European territory. Thank you.

Robin Thompson

DG Regio as the father of European spatial planning and CSD as the mother have been fond and proud parents, but it seems it is now time for the child to fend for itself without too much more parental support. CSD is being wooed by a large and powerful suitor and the implications of this are not yet clear. Energy seems to be passing to the transnational exercises. Flemming Thornæs will now talk about one of these to us.

1.6 Flemming Thornæs, North Sea Territory.

Introduction

- Why was there a need for a Spatial Vision for the North Sea area? It provides potential for gaining added value through transnational co-operation, it is for contributing to the operation and realisation of the ESDP, it provides an input into the new INTERREG III programme, and finally it promotes cross-sector co-ordination at international and national level by providing sector planners with an integrated view of the future development of the North Sea region. The vision is an advisory document, which it is hoped will influence spatial planning in the North Sea region. It is a reference and inspiration for regional planners as regards overall spatial policies and may have an impact on regional development, and it is not a masterplan to substitute or bind national or regional plans. That was the first decision to be taken and preliminary discussion decided that it should be just as informal as the ESDP.

Issues and 'basic values' of the vision

- The work process first looked at the basic values that were perceived to constitute the situation today, on this basis it then considered what should be the basic values in the future. These were transformed into spatial development principles. The current situation and global trends in relation to that situation were also considered and on the basis of this analysis, future challenges were identified. From this, the visions and aims were formulated. The visions are verbal visions there are no maps except for those showing the present situation, and no maps showing the future situation, there are only verbal broad-brush visions. A set of aims was developed for each vision, with around 24 aims in total, and a strategy was formulated to support each of the aims. In developing these regard was to the experience gained in other INTERREG IIc projects, and EU programmes. Finally, a set of proposals for

action was formulated, to be looked at as ideas for actions. There is a line of reasoning running down through the vision statement, the strategies, the aims down to what kind of actions should be implemented in order to come to realise the vision.

- The basic values that were transformed into spatial development principles were:

Freedom and Democracy
Equality, Justice and Solidarity
Diversity
Welfare
Natural and Cultural Landscape

- These values were reflected by spatial development principles: *participation, subsidiarity, co-operation, spatial balance, cohesion, competitiveness, identity, development orientation, market efficiency and flexibility*, and finally *ecological orientated spatial planning integrating and safeguarding natural assets*.
- The analysis of the current situation dealt with the North Sea itself, the urban system, rural areas, nature areas, cultural heritage and tourism, transport infrastructure and finally energy. Global trends were looked at and the future challenges were perceived to be globalisation and economic growth, which will increase interregional dependencies and transport volumes. There are already 420,000 shipping movements per year in the area with 150 movements per day through the straits of Dover. This kind of information is an example of the “aha”-effect the analysis delivered.
- Advances in IT have accelerated the economic restructuring process and changed the rules for interregional competitiveness. The transition to a knowledge society reduces the transport cost disadvantages of peripheral regions, but on the other hand, it increases the importance of a high education and information communication levels for interregional competitiveness.
- The mobile society creates conflicts between individuals and society’s strategies for a better quality of life due to ever increasing traffic volumes. On the other hand, it improves the accessibility to services, education and culture. Changing lifestyles tend to increase the demand for urban land use in valuable natural and cultural landscapes. Progress towards gender equality requires time-flexible jobs, short distances and good public transport links from residences. Environmental degradation calls for longer term cross-sector approaches towards quality of life and efficient supra-regional management of environmental disasters. There are many oil and gas pipelines in the North Sea region. There are also a number of UNESCO cultural heritage sites and natural parks, and other protected areas, often in tourist areas, and there is a need to be careful not to destroy these when developing. There is potential for conflict between short and long-term objectives that stress sustainability. Changing relationships between governments and individuals call for more participation of those affected and bottom-up approaches in planning processes without losing track of interpretative considerations.

- The issues discussed above formed the background material for the vision. This context has been concentrated into key themes for sustainable development (Box 1.6.1). These key themes for sustainable development have been the basic input into the INTERREG IIB operational programme for the North Sea region.

Box 1.4

North Sea Spatial Vision Key Themes for Sustainable Development

Integrated town-hinterland and inter-city development
Strengthening of rural-urban centres
Development of peripheral regions
Promotion of sustainable mobility
Regional communication infrastructure development embedded in regional development promotion
Controlled protection and use of valuable, natural, and cultural heritage landscapes
Integrated management of the North Sea
Planning for water
Integrated coastal zone management and planning

- The vision describes the future change and direction of spatial structures it does not show a final situation and this is important to note. It sets a direction and it is very much up to the politicians in the different regions to give this life. It specifies the attributes of spatial quality which spatial development policy intends to achieve it serves as a basis on which to build strategies and action proposals and set priorities. The strategies identify feasible ways how to implement the desired changes, and finally the actions include proposed projects for transnational co-operation towards joint actions and exchange of experiences.
- The vision statements are the heart of the project. There are ten interconnected vision statements divided into three categories, four deal with the North Sea region as a whole (see Box 1.6.2), four deal with urban regions, and two deal with rural areas.

Box 1.5

1- The North Sea region is an area well integrated into the development of European space and the world economy
2 - The North Sea region is a region with a balanced spatial structure
3 - The North Sea is a model for democratic and co-operative planning
4 - The North Sea region is a region that takes care of its natural resources and ecological equilibrium and its cultural heritage
5 - Urban regions developing in an environmentally friendly way
6 - Urban regions as motors of regional economic development
7 - Urban regions, which promote social cohesion
8 - Urban regions which are attractive for their population and visitors
9 - Human activity, which is in harmony with nature
10 - Rural population which participates fully in economic and social progress of society

- For all the visions it is interesting to ask how the situation today compares to the vision. For example, in the case of Vision 5, can it be said that urban regions develop in an environmentally friendly way today? Similarly, for Vision 9, can it be claimed that human activity in rural areas is in harmony with nature? In the case of Vision 10, does the rural population participate fully in economic and social progress of society? The answer to such questions in the present context is clearly in many cases no.

Aims, strategies and proposals for action

- The ten visions or pictures of the future situation presented above are the heart of the North Sea Vision. I will now present some of the aims, strategies and proposals for action linked with the visions.
- If we consider the first vision of a North Sea region that is well integrated into the development of European space and the world economy, one of the aims is a high quality transport infrastructure and service links between the North Sea region and other regions. One strategy to support this could be to promote and improve the integration of North Sea regional infrastructure into the TEN network. Another strategy could be to co-operate to take a leading role in developing international or inter-modal junctions. The third one could be that the port regions develop their lobbying power towards the promotion of short sea shipping.
- In terms of the second vision of a North Sea region with a balanced spatial structure, one of the aims is sustainable accessibility for the population in all parts of the North Sea region. One strategy to achieve this is to set up a priority programme for improved accessibility to and from peripheral regions. One project could be to identify priorities for regional transport links to bind North Sea region development poles together. Another project could be to develop urban and rural re-cycling and ecological circles in the cities and projects for the exchange of experience that could look for example, into economically viable ways to promote sustainable rural-urban and rural-rural mobility.
- The fourth vision for the North Sea region takes care of its natural resources and ecological equilibrium, and cultural heritage. One of the aims is that spatial policy tools should contribute to the protection of the North Sea's ecology. One strategy for doing that could be to agree on spatial policy principles for protection of the North Sea's ecology. Actions could include identifying the implications of spatial policies for the ecology of the North Sea and suggesting improvements. Another action could be to designate administrative procedures for protected areas of the seabed, and exchange experience on issues such as the practice of sustainable tourism and links to economic development.

- The fifth vision is of 'Urban regions developing in an environmentally friendly way'. One of the aims is to limit the use of Greenfield land for urban expansion and to re-use Brownfield areas, and a strategy to reach this is to promote the re-cycling and restructuring of underused and derelict urban sites. Projects could look into issues such as: compact cities, making use of vacant buildings and sites in Brownfield areas, evaluating and classing green spaces for protection or for urban development, and exchanging experience on ways to promote inward urban growth.
- The seventh vision is of 'Urban regions, which promote social integration'. One aim is to ensure that urban-regional development is sensitive to social diversity and social inclusion; one strategy is to strengthen local capacities to respond to the needs of communities in deprived urban areas. Actions could be for instance to develop user groups to act as communication groups for public administrations, to promote cross-sector approaches for urban regeneration social integration, and to exchange experience, for example, on youth parliaments and other target groups and their involvement.
- The eighth vision is of 'Urban regions, which are attractive places for their populations and visitors'. One aim is to have urban structures that respond increasingly to the needs of quality of life. One strategy is to promote urban ecology and bio-diversity. One action could be to develop spatial plans, which give priority to recreation, urban nature and a clean environment. Another could be to reduce the overall level of transport through the re-location of stations or workplaces, the development of mixed-use functions, and a change of transport modes. There could also be an exchange of experience on the conversion of Brownfield areas and derelict military sites.
- To respond to the ninth vision of 'Human activities, which are in harmony with nature', one aim is for a wider introduction of more environmentally friendly forms of tourism. One strategy could be to protect and use cultural heritage through projects such as the development of thematic tourist routes, which minimise negative environmental impacts. One of the projects in the North Sea region is a North Sea cycle route of 6,000 km around the whole area, which is due to open next year. Another project could be the restoration of cultural heritage sites with a common North Sea region identity for tourist development. There could also be an exchange of experience, for instance on the sustainable management of tourism including mass tourism.
- The tenth vision is of 'A rural population that participates fully in economic and social progress'. The aim is to promote rural economies, and one strategy could be to promote a new urban-rural relationship with help to maintain local identity. One idea is to examine a new mechanism for rural-urban co-operation and another is to identify a concept for sustainable and bio-diversity oriented agriculture. Another action could be to promote endogenous economic potential for regional development.

Process

- So that is how we have been going from vision, to aims, to strategy down to the different actions. In terms of the working process, the vision working group has consisted of one national and one regional representative from each of the countries. Regions, institutions and planning bodies were the stakeholders and they are important because, as Nicky Gavron, said ownership is very important. If the ESDP is to be implemented everybody needs to be able to see their 'fingerprints'. The INTERREG IIc North Sea secretariat has supported the work with information about the 45 projects in the North Sea region, and 'Planco' a consultancy firm in Germany have taken care of drafting the reports and moderating the workshops. A consultation, based on the first draft, went out to all the 57 regions covered by this area. Rather critical comments were received, among others from some of the Danish regions, and all these comments were debated. A seminar was also held with specially selected INTERREG IIC projects where many different issues were debated. All these comments were taken in as feedback for internal discussions and that resulted in amendments to the first draft. On the basis of this the final draft was prepared and the second consultation undertaken. This time as an example Danish regions were happy with it and one administrative director said '*Well, this is actually not that bad*' as he could see his own comments reflected in the new draft. This again demonstrates the importance of ownership by the stakeholders.

Conclusion

- One area that perhaps needs more work is the North Sea itself. The Norwegians did propose closer co-operation in the North Sea area but this did not result in action. This issue is now being debated. We already have the Council of Ministers in this area, meeting as the North Sea Conference so perhaps the agenda could be enlarged to deal with regional development too. This is a current issue, which is as yet undecided, and national authorities are trying to work out if that could happen in the future. In terms of the North Sea itself key issues are the quality of the seawater, habitats and all the biological and marine issues. There is certainly a need for a holistic approach to this area. Finally, more information is available at www.northsea-norvision.org, from which both the whole document and a 25-page résumé in six languages may be downloaded.

Robin Thompson

There are some very big themes coming out of today, perhaps the biggest being how can 'the young David' of spatial planning hope to take on the Goliath that Klaus Kunzmann characterises as the Dow Jones approach to planning? We have heard a lot about capacity this morning, and here to talk to us about educating spatial planners, and the president of AESOP our sister organisation.

1.7 Hans Mastop, President of AESOP

Introduction

- This presentation considers the question “*What does the ESDP mean for the education of planners?*” What is happening here today where we are all very enthusiastic about spatial planning might perhaps mean very little for most of the planners working in Europe. This will be one of the bottom lines of what I have to say. At the same time, I will try to convince the ECTP – and also AESOP - that in view of developments in the next five or ten years in education in general in Europe there is a role for us to play to promote both the planning profession and planning education as such.
- Recently I received an e-mail from Bulgaria asking for help from AESOP in starting up a new BA in Planning. We talk about planning, but we often do not realise that in many parts of Europe planning is really no big deal in terms of education, perhaps not even in terms of the profession. My Bulgarian correspondent was working on the first BA programme in planning in Bulgaria, she used what is happening in Europe at the moment as an important argument for help, she used friends from the UK to help build up the curriculum, got money from the EU so the EU played a role, but she met with all kinds of bureaucracy. Now she is starting again. Today we are talking about planning on a European level and I am asked to think about what that will mean for planning education in general in Europe.

The current state of planning education

- The consideration of issues such as the ESDP and spatial planning is perhaps an elite discussion of a few planners involved in the supra level of planning. Over the next 10, 15, or 30 years most of the planners who are educated in planning schools will be dealing with very local issues and for them Europe will be far, far away. In terms of the state of planning education in general, and what Europe and the ESDP will mean for the future of planning education, both ECTP and AESOP have a role to play in view of what is happening in the aftermath of the Bologna declaration signed by 70 Ministers of Education in 1999.
- Across the world, there are 500 schools presenting themselves as giving a planning education and give an academic degree, with 56 offering postgraduate studies. But many planners working in practice are not trained as planners, with this being more the case in continental Europe than in the UK. In the USA there are perhaps 20 planning schools for a population of 280 million people, in Europe there are something like 120 planning schools offering an education in planning. Some countries really stand out. The UK has something like 60 or 70 planning schools, Italy has 7 or 8, France has 10, but there are countries in Europe that hardly have any planning education (that is programmes that are presented as planning courses). There are of course courses in geography, in landscape architecture, architecture in general, urban design, sociology, administrative sciences, but those presenting themselves as planning schools are very unevenly spread over Europe and over the world.
- There is a large Anglo-Saxon influence on what we consider planning and planning education to be all about and it also seems to be more or less linked

to the Western urbanised world. In terms of educating planners for Europe in the future, we need to think about developing the infrastructure to be able to educate them. If we are pleading for a very special role of planners in Europe because of the process of integration, we should remind ourselves that we really have to educate them. So the figures above show the number of schools presenting themselves as planning schools. Not every planning professional is educated as a planner at a planning school, and I am not sure whether they should be. Although I am representing AESOP and feel that it is very important to have planning schools, I also feel that because there are all kinds of developments in the curriculum, you could develop perhaps a bit of a closed shop model and it might be good for the development of Europe in general to have other disciplines involved in the process of European integration.

What does European integration mean for the education of planners in Europe?

- In terms of the 'state of the art' of planning education, Europe plays a very important role, perhaps even more than the other continents, and within Europe it is more or less the Western European countries with the UK in the lead. So what could Europe mean for educating planners in Europe? Many here today have claimed that in the process of Europeanisation planners have to play a role. We have been reminded today that planning is still quite a small profession and really has to fight. The argument for planners playing a role in Europe might be quite simple. When you look at what has happened in Europe in the past 20-40 years, it is a process of integration on a political, economic, and institutional level. At the moment the issue is to see if it is possible to translate that process into a spatial or territorial dimension, and planners, if they are well trained and well educated, are the people most equipped to work on such a job.
- If we really train our students the way they should work in practice they are trained in integrated thinking and they should be able to work in an integrated way on various dimensions. They are trained to understand how developments in one place are linked to developments in other places; trained to think in integrative terms about influences of various functions and activities in relation to each other; trained to think and to work on how in the longer run all kinds of solutions for present spatial problems will influence the future course of events; trained to take care of the historical roots of developments and places, and also trained to do this at and between the various spatial levels, local, regional, national and European. So a very simple argument as to why planners can and should play a role in what is happening in Europe at the moment, and why the ECTP should play a role in Europe at the moment, is that we are representing a profession which is trained in integrated thinking. Planners are trained to develop solutions which reflect influences from all sides of our society and which have a profound influence on the spatial development of our spaces, and they should play a role in developing the kinds of policies which in the long term will have a bearing on what is happening on the ground. In short, planners have to play a role, and ECTP and AESOP have a role to play in developing the opportunity for that.

- There is perhaps not much new in what has been said so far, when one considers what this means in terms of curriculum. The ECTP developed its common core in 1985 stating what kind of curriculum was expected from planning schools, and AESOP did a similar exercise in the early 1990s. The elements that it was felt should be in the curriculum of a planning education were a knowledge of planning theory, planning history, the context of planning, developments in planning, and problem definition skills. The education should also cover the ability to think in conceptual terms, data handling skills, and the ability to evaluate projects. Planners should also develop an attitude that should help in exploring the needs of society, the needs of the people, and in taking account of cultural differences within Europe. The curriculum should also give an awareness that planning is a value- laden political activity, planners should have a high level of ethics, and when they develop proposals for the future development of places or areas, they are serving the community.
- So in a way Europe does not mean very much. If planning educators are doing their job in the right way, Europe means that we are just adding another level of planning, another institutional level, another level of thinking on spatial developments, another level of trying to define what is happening in that bigger territory which we call Europe. A level of its own with its own spatial dimensions, with its own important activities and developments, with its own history and politics, with its own prospects for the future, and with its own institutional characteristics. Nothing more and nothing less. Europe, if planning educators are really good at their jobs and in training their students in what can be called 'multi-level thinking', is just adding another level to the basic knowledge that has to be given to planning students for when they leave academia.
- So what will Europe mean? Very little for most planners graduating in Europe working on a day-to- day level in adapting places, making good solutions for present problems, and I think that planning educators should be aware that most of our planners will be active in a very localised way. Whilst one should have a broad mind to what is happening in the world outside, planning basically deals with how we can deal with the problems of cities, regions, and some times bigger regions, one should always have both feet very firmly on the ground. For most planners that are being trained, have been trained, and will be trained in our courses, Europe will not mean that much in their day-to-day activities. They will have to know about it and know what is happening. It is one of those levels of planning which is emerging and which a group of people like us really believe in, but for most planners we educate, Europe will not mean very much. Europe will mean something for some planners, for instance those working on the use of INTERREG for cross-border activity, working on the ESDP, and especially those working on the regional level. It gives new instruments and new frames of reference, and they will have to translate that to the locality, or region for which they are responsible. They will work on Europe, and perhaps by developing regional strategies they will make a bottom-up contribution to that idea of Europe as a Europe of the regions. Europe will mean a lot for a few, those here in the room or developing the ESDP, and perhaps for them it might also mean a kind of vocation, something they really believe in, and they really have to develop that. In the long run they will

influence the many planners who are still working in local activities trying to solve local problems.

- In the long run, if Europe really develops as an important level of planning, it will have a real influence on what is happening in various regions, cities, small towns, and small areas in our countries. It will have a bearing on the work of those locally organised planners, planners working on local problems, but at the moment, Europe is still a long way ahead. In the mean time Europe will mean much for those who have to work on the ESDP, have to develop a spatial image for the new Europe, have to create new areas for active policy, have to create mechanisms for co-ordination, or to perhaps invent new instruments. However, this will still mean very few planners who are really working on that very upper level, and they really have to work hard to make sure that what they are developing on the European level becomes part of the reference material for those planners working on the ground, for that is where things are happening. At present the discussion here is more or less an elite kind of discussion, but a very important one.

The future of planning education

- A year ago, seventy Ministers of Education signed the Bologna declaration for the European higher education sector. This states, first, that there should be a transparent European higher education sector for all kinds of academic education, which includes planning education. Second, in order to reach that goal, it is advisable that we adapt our curricula, which are different in all countries in Europe, to a Bachelor model such as the American or English model (three years of Bachelor training, two years of Masters training and perhaps two or three years of PhD training). This was done to stimulate mobility of students and of staff. Countries such as Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and France are now starting to transform their curricula into a two-step model, and it seems likely that the Bachelor / Masters model will be the model used in Europe within the next five or ten years.
- The changes are not only a matter of opening up European higher education area and promoting greater mobility of students and staff. They will also lead to greater competition between universities as is the case in the USA. There will also be changes in the accreditation of programmes. For instance in the Netherlands until now there was a four year programme. As long as a programme was part of a university, it was seen as an academic programme. Now the Education Minister is saying that there should be Bachelor programmes and Masters programmes to be accredited separately by a national body which is part of a European body on accreditation of all education in Europe. It does not matter if that programme is part of a university or a polytechnic - the content itself is what decides if it is academic. So the accreditation of programmes is becoming very important and what you see already happening in Europe between universities is that they are looking for preferred partner strategies. They are trying to develop networks of universities with the same kind of set-up, infrastructure and educational programmes, so that they can really be linked together when competition between universities in Europe really starts. It is already starting; for instance many universities in the

North West of Europe want to be partners with Leuven. No doubt there are prime universities in Germany and the UK too which are looking for all kind of strategies to make networks of universities and that are thus playing an important role in the future spatial landscape of higher education in Europe.

- ECTP and AESOP have two important roles to play. They do not have a role to play in the networking activity, but they do have a role to play, for instance, in the ERASMUS project and all kinds of networks between countries and between universities working on planning research, for example in trying to find out the kinds of research topics that PhD students really work on and whether they are dealing with the same kinds of subjects. Networks may also arise from the group on education and professional links, and perhaps these networks and links between universities might be the stepping-stones towards what I will talk about now.
- In view of what was discussed today, it seems that ECTP and AESOP should have a role to play in developing what I have called Masters in European Planning. Yesterday I was presented with a paper from the Bartlett School of Planning (University College London) which is developing such a programme. Looking back at the uneven distribution of planning education across Europe that I described earlier, with most schools at the moment being in the UK, I think that it is very important that in all countries of Europe there are courses, perhaps special Masters courses, on European planning. Whether one looks at what is happening in Europe from the Dutch side, the German side, the Italian side, or from the Greek side, Europe is always different. We should remember the cultural diversity within Europe, and we should study, and help students in studying and looking at Europe from their own institutional and cultural background.

Conclusion

- If we really feel that our profession and our education have a role to play in developing Europe and an open European higher education sector, and we really think that planners have a role to play in that development of Europe, our organisations should promote linkages and try to influence decision makers. For example, although neither of our organisations have the money, we have the influence to encourage the development of chairs in European Planning. Admittedly we have Klaus Kunzmann and Andreas Faludi and a few courses in European Planning, but I think that if you really want Europe to play a role in thinking in Greece, or in Italy, or in Denmark, or in Scandinavia for example, I think that you should work on developing chairs as natural focal points for the background of that specific country. ECTP has a role to play in promoting that idea and the members of ECTP have a role to play in doing that kind of work in their own countries.
- ECTP and AESOP also have a role to play in the future system of accreditation. What is happening at the moment in the Netherlands is that the Minister has given the order to a small group outside academia to develop the future standards of Bachelors programmes and of Masters programmes. ECTP, who developed the Common Core of Education and Training, and AESOP, have a

role to play in developing those final terms. What should a Bachelor or Master of Planning in Europe degree have in its curriculum? What should a Bachelor or Master of Planning in Europe have been taught to be able to play a role, not only on a very local level, but everywhere in Europe? Because the borders will be open and our students will try to find work not only in their home countries. The bottom line in all this is that I am not pleading for a central education, a central course for planners in Europe, I am pleading for courses within the various countries because the cultural differences are most important for all of us. Thank you very much.

PART II - Afternoon discussion

2.1 Afternoon discussion

- **Robin Thompson** opened the discussion by giving two “simple-minded” models of what had been described. Different sectors which include land-use and transport and cross-sectoral policy that is transforming the “Dow Jones” market economy into an economy which is spatially planned. That is the crude idealised model. There were suggestions from a number of speakers that the real model is with the market economy dominant, with a small number of usually land-use planners trying to deal with it, and then with a little elite (most of whom seem to be in this room) of enthusiasts for spatial planning and who do not even have a connection with the mainstream of their own professions let alone a position of dominance there. A little exaggerated I think you will agree, but I wonder if the discussion may consider whether these really are the two models. And if that is the case, how do we move a bit closer to the aspirational model and away from that model?

- **Andreas Faludi** raised the issue of territorial planning to start the discussion. Klaus Kunzmann mentioned that this was the term used in the former GDR, and that it was rapidly dropped. It was resurrected at the same time by the Italian presidency in 1990, which produced two papers on territorial planning, has been lurking in the background ever since, and it is always there in *aménagement du territoire*. Interesting discussion about the comparison between “space” and “territoire”. Recently “territorial” has come up as a new discourse in the Commission, talk of territorial management in particular in relation to integrated coastal zone management. They say clearly that that is the new discourse which they are going to apply to other areas. Uses it as an introduction and to illustrate how terms have different meanings in different languages. Refers to Vincent’s discussion of Spatial Planning 1 and 2. Puts gloss on it. Acknowledges the difference but is unsure if this is the difference between land use management and something broader. The difference is actually something else. The origin of the ESDP exercise is French, French ideas of *aménagement du territoire* which is intensively strategic thinking with a spatial dimension imported into the Commission. Individuals moved from France to Brussels and brought with them and developed this approach. The EC never had anything but spatial strategy in mind. Later this was perceived by Germany looking through a different conceptual lens, through a conceptual lens of a “masterplan”, a masterplan with legal consequences with designations of

land implied in it. And that is the real difference because I think obviously a spatial strategy is also about the management of land in the sense that, at the end of the day, the management of land comes into it. So that to my mind is not the real difference. The real difference is about the nature of planning, whether it is about producing a masterplan that decides everything in one go, or whether it is a spatial strategy which as the ESDP puts it is a framework an input into subsequent decision making processes. Probably a more fruitful distinction than that between the management of land and strategic planning. Why? Because land and land use is implied in both. Relates it to something else in Klaus's paper. Klaus "was doing injustice to the banana" (Roger Brunet formulated this but never used this phrase which was coined by a journalist). Actually said that there is a European urban network which becomes dense in the area of the "dorsal" and wanted to get this idea across so drew the shape to conceptualise space, still calling it the dorsal. Many others in the process have done this and reduced Europe to one dimension (Italians did it saying that the core of Europe is within a 500 km radius of Luxembourg). Pentagon in the ESDP is described verbally as the core of Europe and is a conceptual lens, not a reality, put on to understand space. Klaus Kunzmann's work makes the point that there is also a diverse and multi-nodal Europe (the grapes image). Both lenses have been used in the ESDP process and have interacted with one another. In the ESDP this happens as there is mention of the pentagon, but also of the polycentric system of cities idea. Both conceptual lenses are needed: neither is wrong and neither is right.

- **Vincent Nadin** accepts criticism; was trying to find a way of thinking about spatial planning conceptually making a case that we need to think more carefully about what is that we are trying to do. Accepts that both model I and model II have a territorial interest. Perhaps type II is more strategic. The issue is the place in government, the institutional relationships. The traditional mindset of the planner is to be one of the sectors of Government but the spatial planning that we aspire (current discussions) to is quite different. Whether we achieve it or not is another question, but we need to think, as Robin Thompson said, about how we transform our current mindset and ideology about planning into a new one. Has reservations about whether that is possible.

- **Ulla Blomberg** feels the academic perspective on the process is useful as when involved closely in it can get submerged with papers and lose sight of the job in hand. Agrees with most of what has been said. Raises an issue with something Vincent Nadin said about the fact that inter-governmental co-operation has slowly developed and become also the mandate of the Union and Commission. Feels that spatial development issues are different in this context to a certain extent this is happening right now. The Commission has proposed that spatial development issues or territorial issues and urban development issues should be integrated into the work of the structural fund committee the Committee on Development and Conversion of the Regions. Feels this is a good development, and it is good for these issues that they are connected with structural fund programming such as INTERREG and also the larger Objective programmes. Because then the ideas are carried out and implemented. But the Commission can only work on territorial issues as far as they are connected to the structural fund programming work and outside that

they do not have any mandate. Does not think that land-use planning or physical planning will ever be a mandate of the Commission because these rights go right to the core of the member states, land ownership the right to use the land, how they decide and the right to plan it, and they will never, never give it to any union. Feels that whilst planners may see it as a positive trend, the politicians would never accept it. As an example, the Finnish Parliament was immediately alarmed when they saw any maps connected with ESDP work and for instance any map which showed half the country as tundra (a concept usually associated with Siberia). Politicians were therefore unwilling to see maps in the ESDP. This demonstrates the power of maps and as Athena Baibas commented, that “maps are always dangerous”. Feels that the mandate issue is a very difficult issue.

Charles Lambert Proposes a fourth model. The role of planners is to promote Europe as a new territory by itself deserving strategic planning. A model based on 4 characteristics. First: It is necessary to exchange ideas, not to stay in the old hierarchy of countries, ministries, professions, even cities because of the weight of their elected mayors. Second: We are now once again in a period where cities could create new leagues such as the former Hanseatic league. Third: Cities should know where things are happening and what kind of relations other cities create with their populations. That could become another force for Europe: experimentation for the inhabitants in cities of a way to live with a clear participation in community life. With this purpose, we can invest in experimental ways of governance for people to feel good, to feel respected, to find others with the same inclination. Fourth: To use the fact that the European territory is a *new territory*. A territory large enough for creativity – in the same way in the private sector a merger comes about not just to become bigger but to release creativity inside. We will miss a very rare opportunity if we are not willing to find creativity in the experience of grouping the planning resources of all these different countries. This model gives the definition for the new planner.

Here I have to differ from the President of AESOP, Hans Mastop: I cannot agree with the principle made that Europe is of no interest for most planners. We must all be aware of Europe – we shall have to work on small pieces but these pieces belong to something bigger, and we should create that kind of synergy.

Derek Martin Interested by Vince Nadin’s talk of a shift from land-use planning to spatial strategic planning. This is a crucial point in the further evolution of planning, as evidenced by Nicky Gavron’s talk, which showed that the new strategic approach can be applied even at the level of a world city. With respect to EU policy, the idea of applying the more strategic spatial development approach can be taken a step further to actual policy implementation by introducing the concept of strategic spatial investments into Community regional policy. At the present moment, this policy is determined by simplistic regional economic criteria (e.g. 75 per cent of Community GDP for any region), whereas a strategic spatial development approach, using more “territorial” criteria or indicators for determining a new range of strategic spatial

investments would greatly improve policy effectiveness. The Interreg III programme could provide inspiration for applying this approach..

Kevin Murray There is a danger of talking *as* planners *to* planners within a closed system. I can relate to Klaus Kunzmann's and Hans Mastop's scepticism from experience with real communities, local authorities, citizens and businesses. The "Dow Jones" *economic driver* is a major player but there is also the *political market*: various levels of "democracy", often working against what we are trying to do as planners. We have to accept that as a reality because we want the democracy. These influences are pulling in different directions however, challenging sustainable development as we know it.

On the economic side, advances in information technology and globalisation mean a move away from spatially contiguous fixes - many activities are international, connecting London to Frankfurt to New York to Hong Kong in electronic financial services and many other sectors too. In that shifting economy much of the development is driven by the private sector including, in some countries, former publicly-held organisations (power utilities, transport, telecommunications) which are increasingly privately-funded international bodies.

To reconcile the problems set up in the two models, we need to get spatial planners and their educators to move away from exclusively public sector regulation to training people in the private sector too. This involves "infiltrating" a range of agencies and bodies in sectors of the wider world economy with people who have the kinds of skills and culture that we need. We cannot challenge that weight and that might externally. A new generation of spatial planners - who can operate on the investment side as well as the regulatory side - is the *big culture shift* that we have to try to deliver.

- **Simin Davoudi** feels that lot has been said about the general and very vague nature of some of the concepts that are been presented in the ESDP. It resembles the concept of sustainable development, popularised after Brundtland deliberately left at a very general level and it is from this that it derives its power it enables the creation of a political coalition around the concept. In the same way could be a positive thing for the ESDP, it stays at a very general level, all the maps have been taken out of it, detail removed, some tangible issues are not there, because of its general nature it allow that a lot of people and politicians from different governments and member states, allows them to sign up to it without necessarily committing themselves to any implementation of the details of it. So something which might be seen as a negative aspect of the ESDP could in fact become a positive one in the same way as sustainable development concept, although it is very vague and means different things to different people, although it is very flexible and allows you to interpret it in different ways, irrespective of all that it sort of created a powerful concept which responds to some people's aspirations and ideals, something like the ESDP and its progress could in fact create the same sort of powerful agenda. People could take it and try and find out what it means for their own locality.

- **Andreas Faludi** returns to the competence issue raised by Ulla Blomberg and Derek Martin. The distinction between spatial planning I and II or between the masterplan and strategic planning is very relevant in addressing the competence issue. In 1989 when the Ministers first got together Bruce Milan said “we don’t want a masterplan” in 1999 commissioner Michel Barnier at his nomination hearings before the European Parliament and said “we don’t want a masterplan”. Consistent Commission position of not wanting a masterplan. Must be careful not to attack windmills, no-one has ever suggested a masterplan for Europe, that Brussels should blanket Europe with land use designations, this has never been the intention. The intention has been to develop a spatial strategy to underpin some of the policies with a spatial impact in particular regional policy. Second piece of information to confirm what Derek Martin had said at the meeting in Nantes in 1989 M. Jacques Delors gave a speech (transcript of that speech) on of the things he complained bitterly about was the imposition of quantitative criteria by the council of Ministers on regional policy, wanted (was very interested in spatial strategy at this time), to be able to operate regional policy on the basis of qualitative i.e. spatial criteria. That is the thinking of the Commission. As a planning community should try and understand that thinking, and make up mind in these terms and against the background of this understanding. During course of AF’s studies of the ESDP process has become sympathetic to the position of the Commission and a little impatient much like the people at the Commission with the position of member states who almost nothing but say “there is no spatial planning competence” as if the Commission had ever asked for a spatial planning competence in the sense of a master plan. All they want to do is to develop a spatial strategy, deserve the support of planners in this, deserved support for a joined up strategy linking DG XVI with the Environmental Directorate, for that they need the support of the planning community. There has been a lot of misunderstanding in these terms some of the historic facts have to be put right.

Christabel Myers Identifies with Vince Nadin’s second model of spatial planning, the one promoted by the ESDP seminars in England in 2000 attended by 500 people, planners and non-planners. Those who attended were enthusiastic and readily accepted the concept, but there was perplexity about how to take it forward. People said they did not have the tools in terms of the formal land-use planning system and integration of other plans with the planning system. In the UK, this is happening in London and in Regional Planning Guidance. However, there is an issue of how far planners can go in adopting spatial planning without changes in legislation or in administrative systems. One way forward is to demonstrate the spatial planning approach to those who might introduce such changes. Student education is important in the longer term. More immediately, INTERREG offers an opportunity though there is a long way to go in demonstrating the added value of spatial planning through INTERREG. There are also the intergovernmental discussions in the CSD and EU Ministerial meetings which allow the Ministers to pick up on examples of spatial planning in other countries.

- **Robin Thompson** raises the issue of whether Europe is just another spatial level, as Hans Mastop suggested; Charles Lambert did not like that suggestion. The competence issue pursued by Andreas Faludi: what actually is the nature

of this European effort? The proposition emerging from the model is that if you cannot beat them, then join them. Kevin Murray is saying – and in my experience this can work - that maybe the place to put the spatial planners is in the big corporations, the big development companies. Ulla Blomberg seemed to be saying that the real effectiveness at the European level is through the structural funds and maybe that is the way you attack it if there is no “competence”. In terms of political interface, Nicky Gavron demonstrates what happens if you can persuade a politician of the importance of this issue: it becomes far more powerful than we could ever be. Chistabel Myers reminds us that the CSD at the political level can be a very powerful influence, and is also stating that there are problems about tools. We have heard about legislative change, notably in Ireland where legislation is moving forward to enable this, but where legislation does not enable implementation, what are the instruments that are supposed to be available?

- **Frank D'hondt** says planners cannot change the world but can try to influence the spatial development by persuasion, should move in two directions, have to work in the political and institutional system which is lagging behind on certain developments is not following and cannot follow directly the global economy developments that are running so fast. Planners should involve themselves in the ‘Dow Jones’ system doing both. Move to an ideas society and planners have ideas. If planners involve themselves in the political and institutional system or in the economical system we should bring out those ideas, this is planners’ “added value”. Stresses that the ESDP should not become a pure bureaucratic set of criteria for the allocation of Euro money. It is nevertheless important to have that aim at the political level. Need for a clearer vision on the future of Europe especially related to the development of other continents. Returns to Ulla Blomberg’s point, we need to make maps but good maps. Regrets the postponement of ESPON lagging behind, it will hinder the ability to respond in the correct way and to make correct maps, cannot make these from the national agencies alone, should build them together. Could be a clear statement from the conference. Linked to competence issue.

- **Flemming Thornæs** says that the ESDP is certainly a political document, stated in transnational seminars that European diversity is very important. Therefore cannot envisage a masterplan for Europe. ESDP gives opportunity for different regions to form their own area and this is what it is all about. 60 policy options are a kind of pallet not to be used all of them in all areas. In the North some are needed and in the South others. Political character of the document was illustrated by the Dutch Presidency when in preparing the draft of the draft there was a very good critique of the Trans European Networks (TEN). Was taken out as too scientific and not political enough, was squeezed out, text softened as such. That was the character of the ESDP. The Norvision has implemented about 50 of the policy options of the ESDP, has been out to public debate among politicians at the regional level. Norvision is a combination of top down and bottom up approach. Adopted by the North Sea Commission of the Conference Peripherique Maritime Region. Just as informal as the ESDP but still an important contribution at the political level, the regional level, recommended that the regions take note and implement it as far as possible in regional planning. So the starting point for action is at the

regional level. Approach that should be adopted in all major co-operation areas to have a look at the ESDP, a regional bottom up understanding of the ESDP, and implement it through that. The concept of the ESDP was implemented in the Danish National Plan Report 1997, is disseminating into regional plans and county plans in the current period of revision. Can see the references to ESDP it is disseminating and coming down through the layers. May come down to the municipality level of planners. Daily work is very local and Europe seems far away, but in the end the European question has just as much to do with the situation at local level, to implement the concepts of the ESDP require action at the local level. When it comes to the education of planners they should be acquainted with the ESDP with the European concept already in planning schools.

- **Klaus Kunzmann** mentions case studies all over Europe in different regions, in Italy and East Germany etc. Report will stress the necessity of territorial development in Europe, the name spatial development or planning is not used is not used. They have the same thing that we have in mind spatial planning, strategic planning.

- Second, issue of an Anglo-Saxon, Germanic debate, would appreciate more French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish input. Feels that France, and others who know France much better than him, is doing what we are suggesting we should do in many regions they have the contract between the Government and the regions, changing and experimenting, interesting milieu of spatial, territorial development going on in city regions in France which, because the French never publish in English, we just do not know about it and as we do not speak enough French we do not read enough so there is a mismatch between what is being done there and what we know, and what I feel we should know.

- Third point: Education. Very critical, Bologna declaration is a disaster for Europe. Started from a concept which in the end is just to reduce the costs of higher education in universities and to cut off in countries like Germany, France, Italy, and Spain, five and six year and seven year study programmes. In order to solve problems of *polytechniques* and *Fachhochschulen*, move to the triple system BA, Masters etc.. May lead to a giving up of the European educational system and following the American system which is totally misunderstood here because they have ten elite universities that do certain things and we do not know what the others do (nine month Master's degree courses even MIT,). If we give up our five year planning education, or civil engineering education compare that with the "nine month" master's degree then we will lose out. In Germany was a move to Bologna but has now stopped; will retain BA, Masters and Diploma Engineer (six semesters, two or three semesters then another two or three semesters). Danger of differentials in age e.g. American Masters student may be 22, and a European masters student may be 26. Everyone needs to know European information through their planning education even if they are not working at the national, or transnational level. Even if working at the local level it is important. Indispensable for planning education to have a European component in the curriculum, just introduced in the first year at Dortmund.

- Third point responding to Kevin Murray. Dortmund (probably largest planning school in Europe 1,200 planning students 160 graduates every year) started as a school explicitly for the public sector (planners in the public sector); today 20% of graduates end up with developers, to the development industry the private sector. Cannot supply as many planners for the private sector as we have amongst our students because we still have a public sector ideology and some of the students say “I do not want to work with enemy”. But 20% and more and more work with European developers and they come to the school looking for planners generalists who know about space and know about projects they have so to say the whole horizontal and vertical map of what is happening. Teaches at the European business school, teaches developers planning interested in how much they have an interest in planning, much more than the economists and sociologists. This sector has more interest in planning than many others that should have an interest and that is why I think that there are maybe some strategic alliances between this sector and the planners even if we occasionally have different values systems.

- **Hans Mastop** reports that the Nijmegen University School of Planning will join the School of Management next year. Trying to find links with business administration. Clarifies position on Europe and planning education: Europe is important, but most planning graduates will not work on a European level. For them Europe will only be one of the issues they have to deal with. In terms of joining to the private sector the same development is also happening in the Netherlands, now 40% of Nijmegen students go into the private sector, same thing as happened in the 1970s when sectoral government departments started to hire planners to be able to be on speaking terms with the planning departments in the Netherlands more and more the development that planners are employed by private development and consultancy firms which work quite a lot for the private sector.

- As regards Klaus Kunzmann and the Anglo-Saxon/Dutch/German debate. Mentions the semantics of spatial development spatial planning. Could live with spatial planning Mark II model presented by Vince Nadin. Exactly the reframing of the goals of spatial planning as decided in the Netherlands in the 1960s. The debate of what is spatial planning and what is land-use planning perhaps it is just about finding a world that can be used everywhere in Europe. The concept is familiar to the Dutch, Germans, it is not new for the French, is it just because we have to develop a new phrased at the European level? Agrees with Simin Davoudi that we can leave the concept to be ambiguous, do not try an pin it down, let it be a concept we can use in our very different institutional backgrounds. The question more or less.

Paulo Correia Regional systems and simple indicators are important: synthetic indicators of development which are totally opposite to a more rhetorical approach that is now becoming more fashionable. Discussion should focus on the *qualities* rather than the *quantities* of what is at stake. A model is always a simplification of reality: we construct it to represent knowledge that has to be communicated among professionals and between professionals and decision-makers, but there is always a risk of over-simplification and then sub-optimal decisions. We need to use strategic *thinking* rather than strategic *planning*,

and, after strategic thinking, to be able to deal with complexity at different levels. Do not over simplify, or try to quantify things that cannot be subjected to that process.

Lars Nyberg There is much to be gained from closer contact between the ECTP and the European Federation of Landscape Architecture. One area that could be a growth point in spatial planning is sustainable development - ecological, social and economic. There is a basic difference in approach to these three aspects. Ecological sustainability is primarily a matter of protection and economy of resources (there are already methods to handle these things); social sustainability is the weakest of these three pillars. Anyway, in Sweden this is an area where we find very few people are able to deal with the issues from a planning aspect. We tend to approach social matters in another way than means of planning. The economic aspect differs from the others in being concerned not with protection but rather with development of activities and even expansion, and it usually works within a shorter time perspective than the other ones.

A fourth dimension is cultural sustainability. Nicky Gavron noted that civic pride would be necessary to re-establish certain parts of the city, showing that these historic dimensions are an important part of cultural sustainability. In the media age this is no longer a dispensable luxury; for the young generation, the cultural dimension is a part of life, a resource in an intricate relationship with social sustainability.

The danger of speaking of sustainability in planning is that it send out some restrictive signals. We try to do the right thing by avoiding doing the wrong things. That could be a challenge for planners to try to identify and visualise the potentials and also to identify the interrelations between different aspects and make them work together. This is also a challenge for the EU which is not always a model as regards integrated thinking in the various sectors in which the EU works.

- **Henrik W. Jensen** showed three slides made by the Danish Ministry for Energy and the Environment. The Minister has to give recommendations every fourth year for national planning and regional planning. First, a map from 1992: "Preparing for Europe", showing how Denmark should prepare itself for European integration. Emphasis on cities, infrastructure, green areas, agricultural areas. Next, a map from 1996: "Preparing ESDP" shows links to Sweden, links to Germany which have grown. Could have links to Berlin, but not yet. Emphasis on a balanced urban system, more Europe-orientated centres. Øresund region as an international city region which can compete with Berlin. Qualified by knowledge, education, capacity and value. The Year 2000 map: "Preparing balanced development as part of Europe", showing an ESDP map of Denmark almost as part of the Northern region of Europe showing a new region in the boundary area and two new regions in Jutland. Emphasis on a polycentric city system linked together by traffic corridors and the new bridges. When you talk about visions and mapping - it depends on how you use it. Need to use strategic thinking as well as mapping to give visions and inspiration to the local level.

- **Bogdan Wyporek** In Poland the term “spatial planning” has been used since the 1950s, but at that time it referred mainly to large-scale planning i.e. regional and national planning. Over the last two decades this denotation has been changed. Nowadays spatial planning comprises planning at all levels: local, regional and national. Now this term is commonly used by politicians, journalists and, of course, planners. It is therefore a different situation from that in some other countries where the term “spatial planning” is rather unknown

In the presentation on Educating Spatial Planners, Hans Mastop, probably due to time limitations, presented a simplified picture of the planning education system. We should be aware that nowadays in European countries there are three different models of spatial planning education: integration of planning education as a specialisation, within a curriculum devoted to another field such as architecture (mostly), civil engineering, geography etc; specialisation curriculum in planning at postgraduate level, and the continuous curriculum fully devoted to spatial planning from undergraduate to postgraduate levels.

In talking about the planning profession it should be stressed that a range of different specialists in planning are needed, including planners who know how to design the project (urban designers), town planners, regional planners, landscape planners etc. etc. We should be careful in saying that only planning schools with a continuous curriculum in spatial planning can educate good planners. Today the question of which model of planning education is the best in meeting the various aims of planning demands remains open.

- **Miran Gajsek** raises three points, two of which are very important for Slovenia and the third one is also important for Slovenia and the other accession countries. A problem in spatial planning practice in Slovenia and also in the other accession countries. Spatial planning practice on the level of the state and inside the state it at a quite high level in Slovenia, Hungary and Poland but that is the problem in the co-operation between bordering regions between Slovenia and Hungary, Slovenia and Austria and Slovenia and Italy. INTERREG IIIB it is a very good initiative but it is in the very beginning so we have to stress the work of our association (the ECTP) to help the planners and the EU DG Regio with seminars with working groups. Because the sectoral planning is very strong for example, TENS, the new motorways and railways lines, are the result of the sectoral planning in Brussels in the DG for transport. Second point is that in the application of the ESDP, there is a chapter on enlargement and I think that it is important for the ECTP to establish a working group on enlargement as Charles Lambert said yesterday.

- Third point mentions the CEMAT (the Council of Europe standing conference of ministers of “aménagement du territoire”) and that Slovenia has the presidency from 2001-2003, (Ljubljana Conference 2003 “Application of the Guiding Principles of Sustainable Spatial Development on the European Continent” material from a group headed by Jacques Robert). Same problem of applying one quite good document on the regional and local level.

Charles Lambert If the town planner wants to be back in the middle of the picture - as Robin Thompson suggested earlier - it is important that the people understand our role in this world, our role in society. We have heard Bogdan Wyporek say that everybody in Poland knows what town planning, spatial planning is. If we continue to keep the image that we have when local politics exercises a real discretionary policy on the use of land, we would have merely a regulatory role to play for years, but in a world where "planification" - meaning discretionary policy - is completely out of fashion, perceived as the opposite way of the modern future. With such perspectives we would be out of step with most of the present governments, which (for most people) are now both more democratic and more liberal. The public at large should have a much bigger part in all this. The evolution of politics and the evolution of politicians forces us to once more to redefine this image. We should do this in another way. The way we tried to define when, as ECTP we produced the New Charter of Athens, the Charter for European Cities in the 21st century. It is not just one single message of participation of the public, the supreme idea of legitimacy.

More than receiving their blessing from the local inhabitants, we must find words that the general public understand, and new forms of expression, not a map. We must change our systems when they fail to communicate. The texts are boring and they are legalistic, incomprehensible; when we make maps we dare not put in some types of contentious information or there are certain questions that are still being debated so we dare not allow ourselves to draw up these maps. So practitioners say we have to carry out research; we have not got enough research in this particular domain on the European territory; we must look at that as well.

- **Vincent Nadin** returns to his theme of the morning of the mark I and mark II spatial planning perhaps a mark III. The reason for distinguishing between two sorts of spatial planning is because over that last seven or eight years working around Europe in different countries, working in the Commission has sensed that there is some confusion about this. People working in the member states, people interested in planning in countries, feel threatened in some cases by this interest in European spatial planning. Feels we are talking about two different things and need to work on explaining what it is that we are trying to achieve through European spatial planning. The idea of leaving it ambiguous does not appeal to Vince Nadin at all. Feels we should leave that to the politicians. The same would go for sustainability, it is a vague concept as far as politicians are concerned but as academics and practitioners in planning we ought to be quite clear about what we mean by it and I think we can be.

- Andreas Faludi was saying during the break that the confusion over what spatial planning means is getting in the way of just doing some sensible things in relation to, for instance putting together mechanisms which ensure that the actions we are taking at the transnational level are better co-ordinated. They are not well co-ordinated currently and ensuring that we work more effectively at the transnational level. Commission have been very creative in the way that they have been able to get around the competence issue but I think that it is now obviously beginning to get in the way (for example in relation to the future of the CSD). Takes us to competences issue. Accepts what people have said

about competences but reiterates that the central objectives of the European Union all have a spatial dimension to them (sustainable development / economic competitiveness/social cohesion) and now we also have territorial cohesion through the Amsterdam treaty too. Context has change over recent years so it is perhaps true to say that spatial planning will not go the same way as environment it is now much more difficult for the Commission to engage in new areas they are more openly discussed and a better rationale has to be put forward before they can engage in new fields. Should look at this in a positive way as well, the potential for a competence at community level if we can specify the objectives well enough will bring with it some opportunities. Christabel Myers talked about planners saying they did not have the tools to engage in spatial planning perhaps the EU can help us to establish some tools as they have certainly done in the environment field, and have ensured that good tools are applied more widely across the whole of the EU. OECD Environment Directorate have their eyes on the land question at the moment especially in relation to brownfield land and contaminated land. The OECD are now looking very closely at spatial development issues and land issues with a very strong economic perspective built into that. It would perhaps be better if the planning professions were able to take the initiative on this and come forward with some positive ideas about how we might move forward at the European level rather than waiting for it to be usurped on us by others.

- **Athena Baibas Wallace** makes three points. First is a personal view on the competences issue. Coming to what Andreas Faludi said, the Commission asked for a direct mention that although they would not interfere with land-use planning; that would always remain a member state competence. They could have a partial power for strategic planning on the impact of community policies and a perspective for the future. They asked for a clear mandate on that and the member states did not give a clear answer, they were a bit evasive - even countries that were for spatial planning, Greece was not one of those countries but other countries were even more negative, saying that the Commission already has this competence since community policies have spatial impacts so they come under the same umbrella. Would facilitate the bringing up of European issues and solutions at a overall level although there are differences and we should keep this variety there are some things that should be seen in the European picture to have a relative evaluation of them.

- Second point relates back to Kevin Murray's comment about infiltrating the power sectors that now are not so much the old sectoral public parts but international private sectors. What came out of the transnational seminars is that planners should start having a common language with other sectors it is a bit difficult for them to understand our long term planning we have to learn to speak their language to be able to convince them. From AESOP we heard that that is true that the planners are equipped to do such a thing.

- Third thing is that at the local level, the transnational level it was said from the Eastern Southern European countries that there is a confusion on notions, ideas and concepts of the ESDP but I think that there is a different situation in Greece probably because we are in a geographical position of the central and eastern Mediterranean and the South Eastern European (the CADSES area).

Where the political situation is still unbalanced and although structures for co-operation do not exist as much as in other regions it is very important for us to have these connections and to have a permanent basis for them. I think that there is a growing aspiration in the regions and the local authorities or actors to connect either with the European counterparts or third countries and the ESDP gives them a basis to discuss and find things that unite them and they can ask for in common.

- **Frank D'hondt** talks of the role of the cyberdog. Maybe we are becoming old fashioned to talk about spatial planning and all the terms and so on. If there were 50% younger people in the room they would speak another language maybe the language of the cyber-geography , cyber-cartography and probably cyber-planning, planning in cyber-worlds. It is not to accuse you but maybe ourselves that we should be open for many other languages, new visions, insights and I hope that our language will be very rich. We have heard many interesting things, and next time maybe we should invite more younger people to enrich the debate about the content of our work and practice.

2.2 Robin Thompson - Summing Up.

- I want to make seven points. The first is that *Something is going on. I don't what it is, but it's big*". Athena Baibas Wallace showed us there is an evolution and a progression. It was very clear sitting through the reports from the different countries yesterday that there is a force here, a development which is very important and which we all think is positive. Andreas Faludi and others were very helpful in reminding us that spatial planning is coming from quite different traditions and is being applied to very different contexts. That is something we always need to remember.
- The second thing that has emerged for me is that there does seem to be some comfort around what one might call Model 2. In so far as there was comfort around anything, there was comfort around that model. Perhaps ambiguity, as Vince Nadin said, is something we should avoid, but we do not want to nail this thing down and define it out of existence.
- The third point is that the influence of this force of spatial planning is moving steadily down the spatial levels. The work of Flemming Thornæs and his colleagues demonstrates this, as do the other transnational studies. Listening to some of the projects that have been developed through INTERREG IIc - whatever one thinks of them - those projects have made people in all sorts of localities aware of spatial planning in a way that they never would otherwise have been. Although the products may not have added a lot of value to our understanding of spatial planning they have raised awareness. For example, groups of New Towns getting together across Europe; groups of towns that have large railway stations; groups of relatively rural areas. So we are moving down to the local level and I'm certainly with those that believe that the European influence needs to be -

and will be - felt locally. I don't accept that we should accept a difference between spatial planning and land-use planning, and I detect a real danger in the United Kingdom that there is almost a bifurcation now between the land-use regulators and the rest. I don't think that the ECTP should go at the pace of the slowest. I was interested that Rudolf Niessler of DG Regio (who did as much as anyone, perhaps more, to develop the ESDP), tended to characterise planners as "empêcheurs". They were people who got in the way of spatial planning. I think that our different associations elect us to represent them and to lead, and I think that we should show leadership. If we feel that this is the way forward, we should be willing to take a lead but, of course, be willing to bring our colleagues with us.

- The fourth point for me is the "elephant and the flea". It is Klaus Kunzmann's point that spatial planning is a flea and it cannot eat the elephant. One might characterise the "Dow Jones" world of the market and the development sector as the powerful world within which, as has been said, political decisions are enormously influential. There is also the world of the structural funds and there is a wider world of public policy making and maybe this is the place that spatial planning tries to sneak in. It is still really rather small but maybe it can just infiltrate its way into that position through engagement with the market sector, through playing the structural funds game wisely, through aligning with individual politicians like Nicky Gavron but also with the EU Committee of the Regions and bodies like that. You may or may not support that proposition but it is more attractive than the model where the market just sits on us.
- My next point is one very much in line with Klaus Kunzmann. If we are a flea, then what we need is a magnifying glass. As an example, at the moment in the UK and in other places, people are very bothered about flooding. The national news is dominated by flooding; you see people rowing to work. It is possible to pin all sorts of big messages about spatial planning around the flooding issue. There are lots of other contentious, high-profile issues such as poor train services, and I am absolutely with Klaus on this: we need to get smart and start "surfing" on the issues where people are interested.
- I very much also take the point that we need to widen our cultural base. I'm uncomfortably aware that for example, on the executive committee of our own association five of the seven members are from the North West of Europe. That is something that will evolve and change over time and the centre of gravity of the ECTP is changing. It needs to continue to change. That is one of the reasons why we are going to Warsaw in the spring.
- Finally, I go back to the issue of capacity. Capacity in terms of skills, capacity in terms of our ability to make these kinds of political linkages, linkages with the development sector and so on. I am reinforced in my feeling that there is a gap there that we should seek to fill in our understanding of the present capacity to implement spatial planning and how one might fill some of the gaps.

European Council of Town Planners

Liaison committee of the national associations and institutes of town planners in the member countries of the European Union

Conseil Européen des Urbanistes

Comité de liaison entre les associations et les instituts nationaux d'urbanistes dans les pays membres de l'Union Européenne

ESDPConference

London 1 December 2000

ATTENDANCE LIST

Ash	Mike	<i>Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions UK</i>
Baden	Tony	<i>Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions UK</i>
Baibas Wallace	Athena	<i>Ministry of Environment, Greece & Greek Planners Association</i>
Balaban	Osman	<i>Chamber of City Planners of Turkey</i>
Bassin	Peter	<i>Drustvo Urbanistov in Prostorskih Planerjev Slovenije</i>
Blomberg	Ulla	<i>Ministry of the Interior, Finland</i>
Bussadori	Virna	<i>Associazione Nazionale degli Urbanisti</i>
Caramondan i	Anna	<i>Cyprus Association of Town Planners</i>
Correia	Paulo	<i>Associação de Urbanistas Portuguesas</i>
Crawford	Hugh	<i>President d'Honneur & Royal Town Planning Institute</i>
Cremaschi	Marco	<i>Istituto Nazionale di Urbanistica</i>
D'hondt	Frank	<i>Netherlands Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment & Vlaamse Vereniging voor Ruimte en Planning</i>
Davoudi	Prof Simin	<i>Leeds Metropolitan University</i>
de Boe	Philippe	<i>DGATLP (Walloon Region of Belgium)</i>
Demirdizen	Erhan	<i>Chamber of City Planners of Turkey</i>
Doehler	Marta	<i>Vereinigung für Stadt-, Regional- und Landesplanung</i>
Eversley	Judith	<i>Royal Town Planning Institute & ECTP Secretariat</i>
Faherty	Maureen	<i>Royal Town Planning Institute</i>
Faludi	Andreas	<i>University of Amsterdam</i>
Gajsek	Miran	<i>Drustvo Urbanistov in Prostorskih Planerjev Slovenije</i>
Gavron	Nicky	<i>Deputy Mayor of London</i>
Golletz	Detlef H	<i>Government Office for London</i>
Jacobs	Jeff	<i>Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions UK</i>
Janssens	Peter	<i>Vlaamse Vereniging voor Ruimte en Planning</i>
Jensen	Henrik W.	<i>Foreningen af Byplanlæggere</i>
Jones	Philip	<i>Irish Planning Institute</i>
Kunzmann	Professor Klaus	<i>Universität Dortmund</i>
Lambert	Charles	<i>Société Française des Urbanistes</i>

Lancrenon	Dominique	<i>Société Française des Urbanistes</i>
Leonardi	Rosario	<i>Associazione Nazionale degli Urbanisti</i>
Martin	Derek	<i>Rijksplanologische Dienst, Netherlands</i>
Mastop	Professor J. M. (Hans)	Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen
McGill	Colin	<i>Royal Town Planning Institute</i>
Murray	Kevin	<i>Royal Town Planning Institute</i>
Myers	Christabel	<i>Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions UK</i>
Nadin	Professor Vince	<i>University of the West of England, Bristol</i>
Nicolaou	Anna	<i>Greek Planners Association</i>
Nyberg	Lars	<i>European Foundation for Landscape Architecture</i>
Pemán Gavín	Ignacio	<i>Asociación Española de Técnicos Urbanistas</i>
Pillen	Peter	<i>Chambre des Urbanistes de Belgique</i>
Purves	Graeme	<i>Planning Services Division, Scottish Executive</i>
Queiroz do Vale	Ana	<i>Associação de Urbanistas Portuguesas</i>
Richardson	Tim	University of Sheffield
Shannon	Bob	<i>Highland Region of Scotland</i>
Shaw	David	<i>University of Liverpool</i>
Slanina	Jan	<i>Asociace pro urbanismus a územní plánování České republiky</i>
Smits	Otto	<i>Bond van Nederlandse Stedebouwkundigen en Planologen</i>
Smook	Roger	<i>ECTP President d'Honneur & Bond van Nederlandse Stedebouwkundigen en Planologen</i>
Thompson	Robin	<i>ECTP President & Royal Town Planning Institute</i>
Thornæs	Flemming	<i>Ministry of Energy and Environment, Denmark</i>
Tóth	Zoltán	<i>Magyar Urbanisztikai Társaság</i>
Tracey	Ciarán	<i>Irish Planning Institute</i>
Upton	Robert	<i>ECTP Secretary General & Royal Town Planning Institute</i>
Uyar	Necati	<i>Chamber of City Planners of Turkey</i>
Vogelij	Jan	<i>Bond van Nederlandse Stedebouwkundigen en Planologen</i>
Wyporek	Bogdan	<i>Towarzystwo Urbanistow Polskich</i>
Zimmermann	Herbert	<i>Vereinigung für Stadt-, Regional- und Landesplanung</i>

Contact details for the organisations mentioned in this list are obtainable from
the ECTP Secretariat
c/o RTPI, 41 Botolph Lane, London EC3R 8DL
email secretariat@ceu-ectp.org
tel +44 20 7929 9494
fax +44 20 7929 9490