

**European Council of Town Planners  
Conseil Européen des Urbanistes**



**Symposium 18 May 2001  
Palace of Culture, Warsaw, Poland**

**Spatial planning in Accession Countries  
&  
Implications of EU enlargement for spatial planning**

*Proceedings*

# Content

## 1. Introduction and opening statements.

- |            |                        |  |
|------------|------------------------|--|
| <b>1.1</b> | <b>Opening address</b> | Robin Thompson, President of the ECTP; moderator of the discussion.    |
| <b>1.2</b> | <b>Welcome address</b> | Janusz Korzen, President of the TUP (Polish Society of Town Planners). |
| <b>1.3</b> | <b>Welcome address</b> | Jacek Zdrojewski, Deputy Mayor of Warsaw.                              |

## 2. Problems and issues of spatial planning in accession countries.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2.1 Presentation.</b><br><i>Review of spatial planning systems in candidate countries – similarities and differences, based on reports prepared by delegates from Accession Countries (Part 1).</i> | Bogdan Wyporek, TUP, Poland.  |
| <b>2.2 Presentation.</b><br><i>Review of spatial planning systems in candidate countries – similarities and differences (part 2).</i>  | Jacek Malasek, TUP, Poland, Director IGPIK.   |
| <b>2.3 Questions, comments and discussion.</b>   | Robin Thompson, President ECTP.<br>Dušan Kostkovski, Association of Urban Planners of Slovakia.   |
| <b>2.4 Presentation.</b><br><i>A brief overview of the spatial planning system in Bulgaria.</i>  | Vesselina Troeva, Bulgaria.   |
| <b>2.5 Presentation.</b><br><i>Recent spatial changes in the Czech Republic, accession and spatial planning.</i>   | Karel Maier, Czech Republic.  |
| <b>2.6 Questions, comments and discussion.</b>   | Frank d'Hondt, VRP, The Netherlands.<br>Adam Kowalewski, TUP, Poland.<br>Karl Maier, Czech Republic.<br>Bogdan Wyporek, TUP, Poland.<br>Karel Maier, Czech Republic.<br>Stanislaw Furman, Poland. |
| <b>2.7 Presentation.</b><br><i>Spatial planning in the</i>   | Adam Kowalewski, TUP, Poland.   |

*candidate countries on the eve of accession.*

**2.8 Questions, comments and discussion.**

Jan Vogelij, BNSP, Netherlands.  
Adam Kowalewski, Poland.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Adam Kowalewski, Poland.  
Maro Evangelidou, Greece.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Adam Kowalewski, Poland.  
Charles Lambert, France.  
Paulo Correia, Portugal.  
Adam Kowalewski, Poland.

**2.9 Presentation.**

*From 'creative destruction' to successful adaptation – challenges for planners in transforming city structures in candidate countries.*

Stanislaw Furman, Urban researcher, Poland

**2.10 Questions, comments and discussion.**

Nick Davies, President of the RTPI, UK.  
Stanislaw Furman, Poland.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Adam Kowalewski, Poland.

### **3. The implications of EU enlargement for Spatial Planning.**

**3.1 Presentation**

*The Community Initiative INTERREG IIIB "CADSES" – Spatial Planning and development as a challenge in the enlargement of Europe.*

Virna Bussadori, Italy.

**3.2 Questions, comments and discussion.**

Karel Maier, Czech Republic.  
Virna Bussadori, Italy.  
Miran Gajšek, Town and Spatial Planning Association of Slovenia.  
Adam Kowalewski, Poland.  
Jan Vogelij, BNSP, Netherlands.  
Virna Bussadori, Italy.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.

**3.3 Address.**

Stanislaw Wyganowski, former Mayor of Warsaw.

**3.4 Presentation.**

*The EU spatial planning agenda and enlargement.*

Olle Lundgren, Sweden, Chair of the EU Committee on Spatial Development.

**3.5 Questions, comments and discussion.**

Hugh Crawford, RTPI.  
Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Charles Lambert, France.  
Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.  
Peter Pillen, Belgium.

Stanislaw Furman, Poland.  
Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.  
Ayman Hashem, Egypt.  
Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Dušan Kostovski, Slovakia.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Zygmunt Ziobrowski, Krakow, Poland.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Ciarán Tracey, Irish Planning Institute.  
Paulo Correia, Portugal.  
Virna Bussadori, Italy.  
Frank d'Hondt, The Netherlands.  
Iwona Ludwiczak, Poland TUP  
Charles Lambert, France.  
Olle Lundgren, Chair CSD.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Robert Upton, UK, ECTP General Secretary.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Karel Maier, Czech Republic.  
Ciarán Tracey, IPI, Ireland.  
Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Maro Evangelidou, Greece.  
Frank d'Hondt, The Netherlands.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Marco Cremaschi, Italy.  
Robin Thompson, President ECTP.  
Miran Gajšek, DUPPS, Slovenia.  
Vesselina Troeva, Bulgaria.  
Adam Kowalewski, Poland.

## 4. Conclusion and proposals for future action.

**Summing up, concluding  
comments and proposals for  
future action.**

Robin Thompson, President ECTP.

## 1. Introduction and opening statements.

### 1.1 Opening address by Robin Thompson, President of the ECTP and moderator of the Symposium.

I would like to welcome you to this historic symposium on enlargement and spatial planning. We are delighted to be here and to see people from so many countries joining us.

We feel that the ECTP is well equipped to discuss the subject of enlargement. The first reason is that we have actually enlarged ourselves. The Council started 16 years ago, with a focus then on the countries of the European Union; 16 years later, with 25,000 members, we have enlarged ourselves greatly. We have had the representation from the Polish Association, the TUP, for many years; but over the years we have been joined by representative associations

and institutes from Hungary, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Turkey, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Estonia and Slovakia. So we can say that we have already achieved enlargement and are well equipped to look at how the European Union and the Accession Countries might seek to do the same.

The second reason is that one of our core purposes is to promote the concept and the practice of spatial planning. This requires us to understand that we are dealing in our development with forces which go well beyond national or even European Union boundaries: the global economy, exploding information technologies, increasingly rapid and often increasingly cheap transport, global environmental effects such as global warming, the large implications of demographic change, of migration and so on. Coming up in the lift this morning, I noticed that the background music was 'Little Eva' - doing the locomotive in the lift of the Palace of Culture shows that we are now truly in a world society and a multicultural society. A few years ago we had an assembly in Berlin where we could literally see the spatial implications of a city developing into the first rank of European cities, and the impact that this would have not just on Berlin and Germany but on Europe as a whole. Over these few days we are seeing the same thing in Warsaw. We have been immensely impressed by the dynamism and the development of Warsaw, the commitment to spatial planning here.

There are three themes that we want to look at today, perhaps more. The first is focusing on the accession countries themselves: what is the state of spatial planning there? What is the condition of spatial planners? We have several speakers to help us understand more about that. Secondly, there are powerful interactions between the accession / candidate countries and the countries of the EU. We have heard yesterday, for example, about the corridors of development which span across boundaries and have big developmental implications. And thirdly, we want to reflect on the implications of enlargement for the whole of the widened European territory, in particular in terms of its spatial planning.

In December last year we had an assembly in London on the subject of spatial planning, a very well attended and very successful conference. At that conference, we came to the clear conclusion that we should be committed to spatial planning as a major endeavour, but we also understood that planners and urbanists, our members, cannot themselves presume to control the processes of planning an urban development. These processes are simply too multiple, too powerful for us to presume that through development plans or any other vehicle, we, our own profession, can control them. But we do think that at their best, spatial planning and spatial planners have skills of interaction, of co-ordination, of mediation, facilitation and orchestration. And these are skills that can help us bring the different sectors together and reconcile them with needs of development. We are delighted to have the chairman of the Committee on Spatial Development here today, and it is a message we certainly would like to deliver to his Committee. It is this spatial planning and its relationship to enlargement that forms the theme of our discussions today.

## **1.2 Welcome address by Janusz Korzen, President of the TUP (Polish Society of Town Planners).**

Ladies and Gentlemen, in the name of the Polish Society of Town Planners, welcome to Warsaw. I am glad to see you on our seminar. We are gathering here to exchange our ideas about the influence of the European Union and enlargement on the physical planning process. Such an exchange of views is very important for the participants of our meeting,

representatives of European Union countries and of candidate countries which will join the European Union in the future. This exchange has already existed for many years, partially through the forum of the ECTP. A good example can be the dissemination of the output of the work of the ECTP, the New Charter of Athens, as well as of the European Spatial Development Perspective, among many professional societies in our countries. Within these documents we should consider the elements which are, at a local scale, useful for politicians, local authorities, NGOs, town planners and other bodies which will implement our future ideas.

I do believe that we will be able to approach the challenges of our profession during the discussions. We will not be able to consider all the dilemmas during this one seminar, but I am sure that the outcome of it will become the subject of many future meetings, and I consequently believe that our Warsaw seminar will be important to us.

### **1.3 Welcome address by Jacek Zdrojewski, Deputy Mayor of Warsaw**

Good morning Ladies and Gentlemen. I welcome you cordially on behalf of the city's local authority. It is a great honour for us to receive you in our city, especially since we know that this is the first congress organised by the ECTP outside the member states of the European Union. For the authorities of the city as well as for Polish planners, it is a very important moment: we are one of the accession countries and we expect to be very soon one of the members of the European Union, and there are a lot of problems that should be known and studied before.

We have to answer many questions concerning our activities at the local level as well as co-operation between our local authorities and central planning / central government. I hope that this seminar will help us to understand better the problems which should be brought closer to our attention and to know how to deal with such problems in the future. I have in mind, in particular, the education/training of urban planners and the preparation of civil servants for the activities of the city's local government. The city's authorities have quite an extensive experience in this field which we will try to show you tomorrow in the presentation of the plans and studies for the city of Warsaw.

I am particularly glad that we participate in the discussion on the future of the unified Europe, and that our voice is listened to by other participants. Such meetings, such discussions serve to foster a better understanding of common problems which should be dealt with by all parties concerned. We have to remember that many groups have a big influence on the formation of the space in which we are living: specialists, experts, environmental movements and the general public, whose participation is facilitated by modern technologies and Internet connections.

Finally, I would like to stress that we do recognise the problems of physical and spatial planning and the role of spatial planning as the means which should guide and protect the good development and organisation of space. To end this brief speech, I would like to wish you fruitful discussions and deliberations and I wish more of such meetings in the future and the possibility of further discussion with you.

## Robin Thompson

It is an opportunity for us to thank again the Deputy Mayor and the City of Warsaw for their hospitality throughout our event here.

We do not have a representative from the European Commission and this is a pity, since we owe a great debt to the Commission for its major role in the birth and early development of [European] spatial planning, and we certainly would not want to feel that it is abandoning the child at an early age. A logical start of the day for us is to ask our colleagues Bogdan Wyporek and Jacek Malasek from TUP to talk about spatial planning systems in the candidate countries and give us an overview of the issues which we shall be discussing.

## 1. Problems and issues of spatial planning in accession countries.

### 2.1 Presentation by Bogdan Wyporek: *Review of spatial planning systems in candidate countries – similarities and differences, based on reports prepared by delegates from Accession Countries (Part 1).*

I have the pleasure to present you the first part of the Report on spatial planning in accession countries which was prepared by Jacek Malasek and myself. This report on planning issues in accession countries was prepared on the basis on country reports which we received from 10 countries: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia, Turkey and Yugoslavia. I would like to express our thanks to all authors of these reports who contributed in an essential way to the preparation of this summary report. Unfortunately, we failed to get any answer and information from other candidate countries, i.e. the Baltic Countries (Latvia and Lithuania) as well as Romania. But the representative of the Association of Lithuanian Architects and Urban Planners (a joint organisation), Mr M. Pakalnis, is with us today.

The materials received cover a broad review of spatial planning problems in countries aspiring to join the European Union – ‘aspiring’ because we have also included within this group of countries Turkey and Yugoslavia, which have not formally started the process of accession yet. Although not all answers were complete (i.e. composed of a both country report and a filled questionnaire), it was possible to prepare a comparative review of the state of planning in the analysed countries. This report consists of two parts. In the first part, issues relating to the characteristic features of particular countries, current planning problems and common attributes are presented. This part will be presented by myself. In the second part, synthesis tables and diagrams on the spatial planning system, planning legislation, the planning profession and planning levels illustrate the comparison of planning in the different countries in its present state. This second part will be presented by Jacek Malacek.

To begin with, it has to be stressed that the candidate countries differ considerably in many aspects, such as size of the territory and population, regional structure and regional character, economic development potential, the environment, major resources, networks of settlements, living standards, cultural heritage and cultural identity, social habits, and finally traditions of spatial and urban planning. On the other hand, the legacy of the prior system present in all

Central and Eastern European Countries (CEECs) has left a lot of similar deficiencies and problems in the spatial economy and spatial development. Similar measures and actions have thus been initiated and carried out to tackle and improve such problems as: shortcomings in social and technical infrastructure, dramatic social and housing situation in many settlements, low level of environmental protection, uneconomical urban structures developed in the last forty years in many cities, poor quality of buildings, devastated and obsolete industrial zones and so on. To achieve positive results in this improvement process of urban and rural structures, long term and continuous efforts are still needed. It has to be noted that in the last decade, all countries of our region have been going through the same transformation process of the spatial planning system and spatial legislation. This is one of the important attributes of the present state of spatial planning in candidate countries. In all countries reports, current spatial planning problems have been enumerated and in general relate to three spheres: spatial planning system and law; planning practice; and planning education and the state of profession. In several cases, the same issues have been mentioned in two or more reports. This is a clear indication that certain problems in a transition period have a general, common nature.

I will now present you some of the current problems of spatial planning extracted from the country reports received. The first group of problems refers to *spatial planning systems and planning law*. The reports mentioned, among others, the following issues:

- In the Czech Republic and Slovenia: lack of integrated regional policy and co-ordinating mechanisms at the national level; extended period of the revision of the Planning Act.
- In Yugoslavia: need for reconstruction and rebuilding of institutions, planning regulations and planning practice.
- In Cyprus and Poland : needs for simplification and shortening of lengthy procedures.

The second group of problems concerns *planning practice*. The reports stressed the following points:

- In Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, Yugoslavia: underdeveloped policy for urban regeneration and urban renewal.
- In Bulgaria: absence of efficient policy for environmental protection.
- In Bulgaria, Cyprus and Yugoslavia: lack of effective development control, in particular over sensitive and attractive urban, rural and natural areas.
- In the Czech Republic: overwhelming pressure for location of shopping centres and large commercial investments in the outskirts of cities.
- In Cyprus: land speculation resulting in the dispersal of development outside urbanised areas.
- In Estonia and Poland: need for major restructuring of obsolete industrial areas.
- In Estonia: unbalanced settlement structure with economic activity concentrated in the capital city.
- In the Czech Republic and Poland: tolerance of spatial anarchy for the benefit of immediate economic profits and in Poland, lack of public respect for spatial order.
- In Yugoslavia: uncontrolled, illegal development; inadequate protection of cultural and natural heritage.
- In Estonia and Yugoslavia: lack of coastal management and coastal protection.

The third group of problems refers to *planning education, research and profession*. The reports mentioned the following problems:

- In Bulgaria and Poland: limited funds for scientific studies; low number of research programmes and projects and insufficient staff involved in planning research.



- In the Czech Republic, Estonia and Poland: limited or non-existent relationships between planning practice and academic disciplines and programmes.

More issues concerning planning education and the planning profession will be presented in the diagrams. This was a brief review of specific spatial planning and development problems which fill planners' minds and hearts in accession countries. On the basis of the information gathered in the review, the following summarising observations seem to be justified.

The political, economic and social changes of the last decade have had enormous impact on spatial planning patterns in most accession countries. The democratisation of public life, the restitution and protection of private property, the emergence of new actors in economic and spatial planning processes have produced a transformation of previous planning models and planning legislation. The revision and adjustment of planning law to the new economic and political patterns has been initiated and carried out in all candidate countries besides Turkey and Yugoslavia, which have not started to revise planning laws yet. However, nowhere has the modification and adoption of revised planning law been successfully and entirely completed and further revisions are envisaged or have been initiated.

Positive changes in the political and economic sphere are however accompanied by negative effects. The rapid transformation from one system to another has created new problems and negative effects in spatial planning and development. Important differences still exist in the position and situation of the planning profession in specific countries. Planning is not yet formally acknowledged as a distinct profession in Bulgaria, the Czech Republic and Estonia. The present diversity of planning systems, planning practice and planning profession in individual countries largely finds its roots in the history, regional features and cultural traditions of each country. This difference in traditions is a very important point.

Finally, it could be said that, acknowledging the changes in the planning systems which have already been adopted in candidate countries, it seems that the formal accession to the European Union will not have a dramatic impact on spatial planning in most of the candidate countries (this remark should be discussed further).

## **2.2 Presentation by Jacek Malasek: *Review of spatial planning systems in candidate countries – similarities and differences (Part 2).***

I will quickly show you some slides presenting the comparative tables which you can find in your conference papers. All first four slides are built in the same manner. The ten countries which have been surveyed are in alphabetical order: Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey and Yugoslavia. All categories in the tables are filled with the following symbols:

- + , meaning “yes”;
- , meaning “no”;
- + - meaning “yes with some problems/limitations”;
- +, meaning “rather no”.

Nearly all countries have fully answered our questionnaire except Hungary and Slovakia - which explains the presence of empty boxes. However, Hungary and Slovakia sent us a short description of the situation of spatial planning in their countries.

*See table on “Planning system characteristics” on next page*

**Spatial Planning Systems Review**  
 – similarities and differences in candidate countries –  
 J. Malasek, B. Wyporek; ECTP, Warsaw 18 May 2001

PLANNING SYSTEMS CHARACTERISTIC	BG	CY	CZ	EST	H	PL	SK	SLO	TR	YU
Centralized planning system	–	+	+	–		–	+		+	+
Mainly regulatory planning system	+	+	–	–	+	+	+		–	+
The State in spatial planning concentrates on:										
formulation of national planning policy	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		–	+
regulation and coordination of regional policies	+	+	+	+		+	+		–	
control of regional and local authorities			+			–	+		+	+
The responsibility of policy formulation rest with:										
national government	+	+	–	+		+	+		+	+
regional authorities			+			+	+		–	
local authorities	+		+	+		+	+			+
Is the European dimension taken into account in:										
national planning policy?	+	+	–	+		+	+		–	–
national planning strategy?		+	+	+		+			–	–
Cross-border planning has started	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		–	+
Proactive planning system	–	–	+	–		–	+		–	
Changes of planning system:										
not started yet									+	+
have been initiated		+	+					+		
are well advanced	+			+	+	+	+			

YES     
  YES/NO, but...     
  NO

Let us start with *planning system characteristics*.

- Answering the question “Do you have a centralised planning system in your country?”, Cyprus and Czech Republic answered “yes”; Yugoslavia “rather yes”, Slovakia and Turkey “rather no”. The other three countries answered “no” because they have a decentralised planning system.
- A “mainly regulatory planning system” exists in 6 countries.
- In all countries except Turkey, the role of the State in spatial planning concentrates on the formulation of national planning policy. It seems that in Turkey, the State mainly concentrates on the supervision of local authorities' planning activity (the answer is “+”, probably because there is no regional level in Turkey).
- The responsibility for policy formulation rests with national government in 7 countries. However there are two countries where this policy formulation function is shared between three levels - national, regional and local level - according to the competence of each of these levels: Poland and Slovakia.
- Most accession countries declare that the European dimension is taken into account in national planning policy as well as in national planning strategy.
- Cross-border planning activity has started in 8 countries.
- In 5 countries the implementation of planning policy depends primarily on private sector actions (answer “no” to “proactive planning system”).
- Changes of planning system have not started yet in two countries (Turkey and Yugoslavia), have been initiated in three countries and are well advanced in other five countries.

See table “*Spatial Planning Legislation*” on next page.

- According to spatial planning legislation, the oldest spatial planning act in operation in the countries surveyed was adopted in Turkey in 1985. It has not been reviewed up to now, although there seems to be plans for its review. The most recent Planning Acts are found in Bulgaria and Slovakia, where they were adopted/updated in 2000.
- 6 countries are considering revising their Planning Act in the near future.
- In nearly all countries, other laws concerning environmental protection, land management, agriculture and so on significantly affect spatial planning as well as spatial development.

See table “*Spatial Planning Profession*” on next page.

- In this category we can find the biggest number of positive answers. In most countries, the planning profession is recognised and associations exist as an independent body.
- Spatial planning education exists in 6 countries. In Hungary, the answer is +- since up to present, planning education exists only at Bachelor’s level but MSc courses are due to start soon in Budapest and Pécs. Only in Cyprus there is no planning education at all in the university curriculum (even as a component of another field of study).
- Academic programmes fully answer the demand from the planning profession in three countries only and students' planning practice is declared sufficient by Turkey only.

**Spatial Planning Systems Review**  
 – similarities and differences in candidate countries –  
 J. Malasek, B. Wyporek; ECTP, Warsaw 18 May 2001

SPATIAL PLANNING LEGISLATION	BG	CY	CZ	EST	H	PL	SK	SLO	TR	YU
the Spatial Planning Act was adopted in	2000	1990	1998	1995		1994	2000		1985	1995
Does the planning legislation meet present requirements and standards?	+	+	±	±		+	+		-	-
Is the revision of the planning law considered?		+	+	+		+			+	+
has started?	+	+	+	+		+			-	+
is expected in			2004	2000		2001	2001/ /2002			2001/ /2002
Other laws affect significantly:										
spatial planning	+	+	+	+		+	+		+	+
spatial development	+	+		+		+	+		±	-

SPATIAL PLANNING PROFESSION	BG	CY	CZ	EST	H	PL	SK	SLO	TR	YU
Spatial planning profession is recognized	-	±	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
Association as an independent body	±	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Spatial planning education exist	-	-	-	-	±	+	+	+	+	+
is a component to another field	+		+	+	+	+		+	-	+
Academic programmes answer to the demand	+	-	+	-	±	±	+	±	±	-
Students planning practice is sufficient	±	-	-	-		-	-	-	+	-

+ YES    
 ±    
 ± YES/NO, but...    
 - NO

### PLANNING LEVELS

	NATIONAL	REGIONAL	COUNTY	LOCAL
BG	comprehensive scheme for spatial development of the country	regional schemes		comprehensive general plans detailed plans
CY	statement of policy for the countryside			action area plans development plans
CZ	state programme of regional development	programme of regional development		land use plan regulatory plan
EST	national planning guidelines "Estonia 2010"	regional development strategies	county plans	comprehensive plans detailed plans
H	national development plan	comprehensive development plans	development plans	development concepts development programmes
	national spatial regulation	development programmes		structural plans control plans
PL	national spatial development policy	regional spatial development policies		spatial development (structural) plan local plans
SLO	state planning			commune plans
YU	spatial plan of the Republic of Serbia	spatial plans	spatial plans for specific activities	master plan
			spatial plans for infrastructure corridors	regulatory plans detailed plans

### ADMINISTRATIVE LOCATION of SPATIAL PLANNING

BG	Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works
CY	Ministry of the Interior
CZ	Ministry for Regional Development
EST	Ministry of Environment (national level) Ministry of Internal Affairs (regional level)
PL	Ministry of Regional Development and Construction (national and regional level) State Office for Housing and Urban Development (regional and local level)
SLO	Ministry for Environment and Space
YU	Ministry of Urban Planning and Construction

For the next topic – Planning Levels (see table on previous page) we have received answers from eight countries. Based on their description of the organisation of spatial planning, I have tried to find what types of plans exist at which level – national, regional, county and local level.

- All countries have some kind of national planning guidelines. The denomination of these plans or guidelines is obviously different in each country.
- Regional planning schemes do not exist in two countries only, Cyprus and Slovenia (this may be connected to the small size of both countries).
- Planning schemes at the county level exist in three countries only: Estonia, Hungary and Yugoslavia.
- The richest level, in terms of planning schemes, is of course the local level. In most countries there are two kinds of local plans: general plans and detailed plans. But in Hungary and in Yugoslavia, the local plan system is more complicated: in Hungary there seems to be four types of local planning documents.

See table “Administrative Location of Spatial Planning” on previous page

On that subject we have received information from seven countries.

- In three countries, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic and Poland, spatial planning is under supervision of the Ministry of Regional Development. In Cyprus, it is the Ministry of the Interior; in Slovenia, the Ministry for Environment and Space and in Yugoslavia, the Ministry of Urban Planning and Construction.
- The situation is slightly more complicated in two countries, Estonia and Poland. In Estonia, the national level of planning belongs to the Ministry of Environment and the regional level of planning to the Ministry of Internal Affairs. In Poland, the Ministry of Regional Development and Construction governs the national and regional levels of planning and the State Office for Housing and Urban Development supervises the regional and local levels. There is an overlap of responsibilities at the regional level, which creates problems from time to time in our planning practice...

## 2.3 Questions, comments and discussion.

### **Robin Thompson.**

Thank you very much indeed to both speakers. Bogdan Wyporek painted in some ways a dispiriting picture. The only word of consolation which we could give is that some professional associations from within the EU could have said many of the worrying things you mentioned.

Interestingly, one or two people were suggesting that perhaps *the Compendium of European Planning Systems* that has been produced by the European Commission could be extended to cover the accession countries, and we discover that you have already taken it a long way down that track. Perhaps we should not spend too much time on the details but could spend a few minutes discussing the overall findings. We have for the first time a representative from Bulgaria and we shall be pleased to hear briefly from Bulgaria, after hearing from Lithuania, Estonia and Slovakia yesterday.

## **Dušan Kostkovski, Association of Urban Planners of Slovakia.**

I would like to complement the last two tables that were presented since we omitted to fill them. As regards 'Planning levels', planning at the national level in Slovakia is composed of a 'National development perspective'. At the regional level, there are spatial plans covering all the territory of Slovakia. We do not have county plans. At the local level, there are master or comprehensive plans and detailed or regulatory plans. Regarding the 'Administrative location of spatial planning', the Ministry of the Environment is responsible for planning up to now.

I would also like to say that the European dimension is taken into account not only in the national planning policy, but also in the 'national planning strategy'. As for spatial planning legislation, 95% of it is new in comparison with the previous Building Act from 1976 that was made together with the Czech Republic in the former Czechoslovakia. There have been amendments almost each year, so the complete version of the plan will be prepared at the end of this year or the next one.

## **2.4 Presentation by Vesselina Troeva, Bulgaria: *A brief overview of the spatial planning system in Bulgaria.***

I would like to say a few more words about the spatial planning system in Bulgaria. It has well-established traditions: the first independent Ministry of Civil Buildings, Roads and Communications was established in 1893 and four years later we had the first law in that area, the 'Urbanisation Law'. In December last year, the spatial planning law was updated and has been effective since the end of March. Since then, we have already started to make some changes in the law and to establish a better link between the spatial development processes and the planning process. Planning legislation was developed with the idea to better organise this activity according to EU standards and legislation. In addition to this Law, twelve Regulations and Acts will be developed and some of them are already under discussion. Our Parliament has thus been quite busy over the past four years.

We have three levels in planning which were established in March 1977. A 'national development plan', a comprehensive plan for the whole country was developed then but was not adopted by the Parliament and was abolished after the changes in 1989. Today we have again three levels of planning - national, regional and local, starting with general schemes for the development of the whole country and going down to detailed plans at a local level.

In the field of planning practice, an important issue has been the closing down, after the changes, of the large research institutions dealing with problems of spatial planning, because 'planning' was connected with 'centrally planned economy'. At the moment we only have one efficient working institution, the National Institute for Regional Development and Housing Policy, which is under the responsibility of the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works and is responsible mainly for national level activities in the area of planning reform, administrative restructuring and legislation.

Among some of the important initiatives in the area of planning in the last couple of years, I would like to mention the World Bank Administrative Regional Development Initiative for Integrated Coastal Zone Management and the development of the plans of 14 coastal

municipalities with Geographical Information Systems, as well systems for environmental impact assessment. The Ministry of Regional Development also initiated the preparation of plans for major resorts because of the problems created by private initiatives and the privatisation of agricultural land, forests and properties. Another major event has been the national competition for the General Plan of Sofia.

As regards the state of the planning profession, I regret to say that this profession is not recognised yet in the country. The idea to establish recognition goes back to more than 20 years. Five years ago however, we managed to win a PHARE-TEMPUS grant and, with partners from Edinburgh and Dublin, we developed a Bachelor's programme in Planning according to the recommendations of the ECTP and AESOP. Unfortunately this programme has been awaiting accreditation since and is still on the waiting list of the National Agency of Accreditation due to some administrative and legislative changes...

Other major problems of planning are common for most candidate countries at this time, and we already heard about some of them in the presentation of Bogdan Wyporek and Jacek Malasek. The main problems come from insufficient resources - insufficient human resources (lack of planning professionals), insufficient information resources and insufficient financial resources not only for research but also for large-scale developments.

## **Robin Thompson.**

Thank you very much. Some of those things, particularly the association which is tending to be made between spatial planning and the centrally planned economies, are likely to emerge as a common problem throughout the discussion.

## **2.5 Presentation by Karel Maier, Czech Republic: *Recent spatial changes in the Czech Republic, accession and spatial planning.***

My topic will be recent spatial changes in Central and Eastern European Countries (CEECs), the accession to the European Union and the impact on spatial planning. The accession of CEECs to the European Union is definitely one of the major issues on the EU agenda, together with other themes like agriculture, the voting system, and global competition. In the accession countries, accession is also central on the international agenda. But from the point of view of spatial planning, I think that accession is just a moment in history, as planning is typically a long-term activity. My opinion is that for planning, accession is probably not a key issue on the agenda. The key issue on the agenda for planning is integration - what integration to the EU really means. We heard a couple of minutes ago that probably the systems of spatial planning in CEECs are not very integrated. The question is whether they should be. I fully support what Bogdan Wyporek mentioned earlier: that probably the accession to the EU will not have a huge impact on the spatial planning systems of the accession countries.

I will use the example of the Czech Republic since this is the country with which I am familiar, but you can find many similarities with other countries of the region. I will try to concentrate on two questions: first, whether the spatial pattern of CEECs is different from the one of their European Union neighbours, and if it is different, in which respect? Secondly, what can - or what should - planning do for the accession and integration to the EU?



The spatial pattern is definitely not the result of a couple of years, but has been developing for a long time. Therefore, probably the most important factor is the legacy of the previous period of forty or fifty years of central planning. Because of this legacy, we have small and highly self-contained centres evenly spread throughout the country. This map [slide] shows the commuting patterns in some parts of the Czech Republic and parts of Austria. In the Czech Republic, you can see small but quite strong regional centres with very intensive commuting links. On the other hand, in Austria, the regional or sub-regional centres which have more or less the same size have very little influence on their neighbours, and most commuters commute to Vienna, which is about 100 or 120 kilometres away – a pattern which would not be found in the Czech part. There are no commuting links between the two countries despite the fact that the border town of Gmünd is divided between both countries. On the other hand, this pattern had an impact on supra-regional and inter-regional links. We have a rather poor infrastructure in terms of linkage between regional centres and long-distance connections.

In the transition period of the 1990s, this established pattern was exposed to dramatic changes. In terms of economic growth and increase in prosperity, some regions did extremely well (in the national context) and some remained extremely poor. This chart [slide] shows the average rate of unemployment in the Czech Republic. Unemployment is currently between less than 3% in some regions and more than 15% and even 20% in some other parts of the country. These disparities are very dramatic and I believe that the same pattern occurs in all post-Communist countries. In the future, this could bring a pattern of ‘islands of prosperity’ which are surrounded by a sea of peripheral, not very prosperous, even deteriorating regions.

What is the impact of this situation on EU accession and EU integration? There are definitely some threats. With poor accessibility and poor infrastructure linking to neighbouring countries, the accession countries would probably have less ability to compete within the already integrated existing EU. And if accessibility is improved, it can paradoxically exhaust the neighbouring poor areas of their workforce and increase the impact of those rich regions on those relatively poor regions. A gap may occur between gateway centres, islands of prosperity and a sea of peripheral declining areas. This would lead us to a scenario of dual development with gateways like Warsaw, Prague, and Budapest which would be ‘westernised’, and the rest of the countries which would not change very much.

On the other hand, we can also identify some opportunities, because this pattern of small-size regions [regional centres] can be compared with the sustainable settlement structure presented in *Europe 2000+*<sup>1</sup>: a pattern of ‘deconcentrated concentration’ with enhanced regional centres located outside the existing concentration areas. As with many other things in planning, you can say that the threats can be turned into opportunities.

Let us move to the second question. What can - or what should - planning do for the accession and integration to the EU? We should be careful about what planning can really do, because there will be a gap between good, nice plans and their real implementation - the gap between ‘Dichtung und Wahrheit’<sup>2</sup> - since decisions will be made by investors and politicians who are probably more influenced by the real rationality of politics and business. I would argue that there will be two areas of influence which could be divided into ‘spatial hardware’ (i.e. infrastructure, which is a typical field of spatial planning) and a sort of ‘spatial software’

---

<sup>1</sup> Commission of the European Communities (1994), *Europe 2000+: Co-operation for European territorial development*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

<sup>2</sup> ‘Dichtung und Wahrheit’ = ‘fiction and fact’.

which consists of intelligence and information. I would like to illustrate these comments with cases from the Czech Republic at the European, national, regional and also local level.

If we look at the Czech Republic in its international [European] context, it is integrated in international corridors of different levels. But if we look for instance at communication systems – which are one component of the TENS<sup>3</sup> in the EU and TINA networks in Central and Southern European countries - we can see that these international links do not match quite well across the borders, that many proposed TINA communications have no counterparts on the TENS' side and vice-versa (some TENS links have no counterparts in the TINA network). Unfortunately this lack of co-ordination between [planned] links also exist between the Czech Republic and Poland: this is a proposed TINA communication from Prague to Warsaw via Wroclaw [slide]. It will probably take some time to change this heritage of poor linkages between particular parts of this 'central European region'. Poland is probably better co-ordinated with Germany but you can still find some rail links on the German part which have no counterpart in Poland.

If we move to the regional level, I can show the example of specific regions. Here, if we look at borders from the point of view of the settlement structure and natural barriers, we cannot identify where the national borders really are [slide]. These are the borders between the Czech Republic, Germany and Poland. But if we look at these borders from the pattern of the movement of people, these borders are still very clear. Without stimulus for more frequent and intensive patterns of communication within these border regions, there will be no economic reasons for projects which are planned, such as this highway linkage which would link Germany to Poland through part of the Czech Republic. So we should be aware that political and economic decisions will influence the way of planning very deeply, despite the fact that we have some cross-border cities like Zgorzelec/Görlitz (Poland/Germany) and also some smaller agglomerations which are divided between the three countries.

If we move on the local level, we can recognise that cross-border contacts work pretty well in cross-border regions but only in those immediate parts of the border crossing. The main reason for cross-border contacts on the local level typically stems from flows of the shadow economy, which are based on the economic gap between neighbouring countries rather than economic similarities. The question is: what happens if these gaps in wealth and economic conditions diminish? This may reduce the reasons for contacts across the border. If we look at the behaviour of governments in those thriving border crossing areas, the most apparent activity of governments is probably the building of new customs and new offices. These are huge investments and we may then wonder: what kind of integration are we facing?

Let us move to the last point, that is 'spatial software'. I think that what we need very much - the preceding analysis (comparison of Central-Eastern European planning systems) is a good case for that - is to understand our languages, because we use different languages, different professional languages. If a deeper analysis was conducted within the research which was made, then we would probably recognise that the national systems are not so different from each other. Each of us probably uses the same terms for different things and also different terms for the same thing. Unfortunately, our data sources are much more limited that they are in the EU and this would be a great asset if the EU could help us to be more precise in our data. It is unfortunately currently very difficult to get data from one nation to another. I used to work on the national GIS data system in the Czech Republic and it was very difficult to get

---

<sup>3</sup> Trans-European Networks.

data from neighbouring countries - Slovaks were the best partners for obvious historical reasons. Planners should thus be much more effective in disseminating the information they have, which leads me to conclude that what we probably need to be integrated into the EU is first of all communication. Thank you.

## **1.6 Questions, comments and discussion.**

### **Frank d'Hondt, VRP, The Netherlands.**

I have worked a long time for the National Ministry of Spatial Planning in Holland but I am Belgian and am now working in Antwerp, so I know something about cross-border / transnational planning and all its difficulties, even in integrated countries such as Belgium and the Netherlands. So I wish you good luck for your efforts of cross-border planning and do not give up.

I wanted to ask about 'spatial monitoring', about which you said some interesting things - I already had that question in mind after the former speakers' excellent presentations. This is a question for the Czech Republic and all accession countries: what about spatial monitoring, GIS systems, but also the 'software data'? It is very important to collect information on this, which is of course not possible in a very rapid inventory of planning systems. What is behind the systems, what is in the practice, is very important. The key questions about spatial monitoring are: who is carrying it out? Are there spatial agencies - national spatial agencies - in charge of it in all accession countries, or should it be done or is it done now by independent research institutes?

Another question, which may be too complicated to answer at once, relates to the position and the power of spatial planning in the political system and in society: what is the image of planning in society nowadays?

### **Adam Kowalewski, Poland.**

May I add one question? You presented the problem of regional disparities, which is a constant problem in Poland since the 1960s (when we started a strong regional planning). Do you think that in the last decade, disparities have been growing?

### **Karl Maier, Czech Republic.**

Definitely yes. They have been increasing very dramatically, mainly since 1994 when economic reform actually started in the country. I showed it with the growing rates of unemployment which were the immediate consequence of the lifting of regional support by government at the beginning of the 1990s. As the disparities were increasing very dramatically, this actually made our government return to regional planning and partly re-establish it in 1998. We now have a new law on regional development.

### **Bogdan Wyporek, Poland.**

I am answering your question about data collection and the monitoring of spatial development and planning in Poland. We tried to select some information from the

reports received, but unfortunately, from these reports, we did not manage to know how the situation is in other countries. It probably is similar to the Polish situation.

I can say that our general activity of collecting information and basic data is an absolutely, extremely weak point. That is due to various reasons. The [political and economic] system changed, and these changes have had quite negative impacts on some activities. Monitoring is one of the fields which was, during all these changes, almost forgotten. It will need a lot of time to rebuild and reconstruct the [data and information] system which existed before. As you know, it is very easy to stop something, but then to rebuild a system is quite difficult. Taking this opportunity, I would like to ask all the authors of reports and other colleagues who did not send reports to look at these materials which we prepared on the basis of your answers, and to correct them and send them back to us. We do plan to make a publication out of this work after this conference. As Robin said, that is just a first step in collecting much more information about planning systems in the whole of Europe, including our countries. So please, send us the revised and corrected data within a few weeks. Thank you.

### **Karel Maier, Czech Republic.**

Data is definitely a central problem. As Bogdan Wyporek said, the amount and the quality of data which is now available is much less than it used to be before the changes, because the private sector is sometimes reluctant to provide any data and they have some legal grounds for not providing it. Paradoxically enough we had a census this year and there was a huge discussion on whether people should provide data on themselves to the commissars. But there is a clear awareness of this problem in the Ministry of Regional Development which is responsible for planning in my country. We have worked on developing legal data for development, which we have now partly collected. A new law is prepared which would establish an obligatory information duty on this data, and a working system at national and regional level is being established to provide it.

### **Stanislaw Furman, Poland.**

I want to stick to the discussion on the topic of information. It is a major problem in Poland. The government and regional levels defined under EU regulation NUTS II and NUTS III (a consistent system all over Europe) do not necessarily provide the right framework for the information we need on the local planning level. If we want to know about what is going on in Warsaw, in Krakow and in other cities, we have to go to London or to Paris because it is Healey and Baker or Jones Lang<sup>4</sup> and others who really know. These firms put a hundred times more money [into activities of information and data gathering] than any public authority in Poland because they do business there. Planners lost their position because they do not know anything... If one acknowledges the fact that we are in a knowledge-based information era, the decline of the position of planners in my country is due to the fact that [planning] is the last place in which you might get information...

---

<sup>4</sup> Real-estate consultancies.

## **2.7 Presentation by Adam Kowalewski: *Spatial planning in the candidate countries on the eve of accession.***

I will present my personal view on a few general and important problems of Polish physical planning today. I know that the majority of these problems also exist in other countries of our region. The Polish physical planning and land use control system has since 1989 been undergoing difficult and not always advantageous transformations. These transformations were gravely impeded by various obstacles and barriers: the legacy of our past; the very difficult conditions of the transformation era; the scarcity of means; and above all the lack of public support and political will since the problems of physical planning and land use control do not belong to the priorities in Poland.

The legacy of the past is probably the most important factor of all those which shape the context of our reform. The Polish physical planning system, which creation was completed in the 1960s, played an important role in the socialist economy. Plans served as a tool for sectoral and spatial distribution, a principle which was at the core of the socialist economy. Plans created an operational basis for urban development policy. Plans were also a tool of ideology and propaganda. The nationalisation of land and the prioritisation of the so-called 'public interest' had an enormous impact upon urban doctrine and planning methodology. Legally, the rights of citizens in Polish physical planning were protected. But in planning practice, land ownership was not recognised and its value was not taken into account. Moreover, despite the existence of some rhetorical elements of public participation, society was deprived of effective access to planning procedures.

When political transformation started in Poland, the critics of planning, quite rightly, accused the system of being too restrictive, too rigid, too comprehensive, and finally inhuman and despotic. Planning was also blamed (unjustly) for a variety of evils: land vacancy, urban sprawl, loss of good farm land and decline of neglected city centres. I say 'unjustly', because the real power of the planning system and its resources to direct urban development were always very limited. These are the reasons why Polish citizens and politicians do not understand today the importance of physical planning, its meanings and its consequences. On the contrary, quite often, planning is perceived as a barrier to freedom, to democracy and to principles of market economy. Our difficulties were amplified by the general distrust towards public institutions. This has delayed the creation of a strong, transparent and effective planning administration up to now.

The weakness of local governments now responsible for physical planning also affects in many ways the context of our reform. In May 1999, for the first time in the history of our country, we started a new experience of authentic local self-government. The decade of the 1990s brought many very positive developments in this field, but also brought inefficiency, bureaucracy, political divisions and growing corruption. This results today in the lack of ability of local authorities and in the weakness of the physical planning system at that level.

New parliamentary legislation on physical planning and land use controls was adopted in 1994, after four years of debates and preparation with strong professional support of experts from Western Europe. I am still grateful for advice given to us by John Zetter, Vincent Renard from Paris as well as by the Directors of [planning] departments from Bonn, Stockholm and Amsterdam. In fact, it was actually at that time that we started our accession to the EU. This legislation introduced several important changes: private land ownership received a strong protection; the planning process went under public and legal control; public

participation became a factual part of the planning procedures. The 1994 law vested responsibility for physical planning in local governments' councils. But the planning system became fully operational when the next reform created two additional levels of local governments: regional and district councils. Consequently, planning responsibilities were split between three tiers, which resulted in a spatial and functional redistribution of power. This furthered the creation of a properly working physical planning system.

The new laws established two types of physical planning: governmental planning, as instrument of the national spatial development policy, and regional/local planning, led independently by regional and local councils. Governmental physical planning and land use control, delegated to the responsibility of the state administration and its territorial branches, executes two sets of goals: the first is the protection of the legally defined civil rights of property owners, developers and investors, against adverse impacts of decisions taken by other actors of urban development. The main tasks of local physical planning include: the implementation of the interests of local society; the protection of the national interest imposed by obligatory instructions from governmental planning, the creation of advantageous conditions for urban development, and the resolution of various conflicts arising in urban areas. Local physical plans identify principles and set up restrictions and regulations for planned areas, but the scope and the number of decisions included in the plan is limited. Since the aim of the plan is to create preferable conditions for economic activities, it cannot present too detailed planning instructions as it did before. However, in selected areas of special value or special interest, plans can establish specific, even very detailed regulations for land use, urban texture or architecture.

Since 1994, planning activities aim at covering [not] only intensely developed areas or areas designated for future development. This puts an end to the absurd situation where most of the Polish territory was not covered by physical plans although planning was obligatory for 40 years. For the areas where there is no valid plan, the local authority cannot make an independent decision with regard to planning permission. It has to consult and draft its decision with the governmental administration. A new principle of financial responsibility of planning administration for the decision was introduced. The law of 1994 also formally introduced development charges and betterment levy, but they are very seldom present in planning practice since neither the requisite legal procedures nor the expertise to implement economic regulations in physical planning system exist. But in general, the main functions of physical plans, after the 1994 reform, are similar to these which rule existing planning systems in the current EU countries.

In my opinion, the reform of physical planning in Poland is blocked or slowed down by six barriers today.

- (i) The first is public awareness. The necessity of having local planning regulations and governmental planning, as well as the idea of planning intervention, are not fully comprehended and cannot gain general support. There is a lack of public support for physical planning and urban development reform. We are witnessing now, as a shocking example of Polish understanding of what free market and democracy means, a destruction of priceless systems of 'green climatic corridors' in Warsaw. The concept of these corridors was created 70 years ago by the then Mayor of Warsaw. This system was developed and protected under the Communist regime. Today, under the banner of liberal economy and democracy, with a little help from corrupted politicians, the city is selling out these green lands and we are losing the most

important part of the public domain in Warsaw and its environmental protection resources.

- (ii) The second obstacle is lack of political will. Polish politicians are not able to comprehend the scale or severity of the problem. Fundamental questions such as problems of civil rights, private ownership protection, compulsory purchase procedures, or public intervention, very seldom arise on the public agenda. When they do, the debate is usually distorted by confusions, populist slogans and demagoguery.
- (iii) The third limitation to reform is planners themselves. The conservatism of an ageing class of Polish urban planners effectively halted reforms of planning institutions and methodology, even when the weakness of the planning system was becoming apparent. Even today, Polish planners seldom understand both the size and the nature of the challenges with which our profession is confronted. This results in a very low position for our profession and also in a general shortage of well-educated planners. In the 1970s, the city of Warsaw employed, in its planning administration, 1,200 officials, planners and experts. Today, when the multitude of planning problems and the complexity of urban practice is incomparable to that of the 1970s, a few small offices deal with all the urban and land economy problems of the Warsaw agglomeration. But the defencelessness of the planning administration is a great advantage for developers, land speculators and policy-makers. They can enjoy a real freedom in our city and therefore the status quo is so strongly protected.
- (iv) The fourth barrier is technical instruments. We are facing many technical problems regarding land *cadasters* [i.e. land registers], ownership registers, mapping, and environmental records, since many archives have been deliberately destroyed after World War II.
- (v) Fifth are financial barriers. The transformation of the public sphere is usually an expensive venture. But the scarcity of public funds is, and will remain, an impediment to our reform.
- (vi) The last obstacle is the complexity of the reform. The adoption of the main parliamentary acts mentioned above was only the beginning of the reform of our planning institutions. We must continue this reform by enhancing procedures and methods of planning, developing public participation formulas, rebuilding land registers, extending training programmes and modernising the curricula of Polish universities and polytechnics. We cannot neglect any single of these objectives.

My concluding remarks are based on forty years of experience, first as an architect, next as a planner and researcher in European urban economics who turned a politician to return finally to his first profession. I am convinced that the adjustment of the Polish physical planning system to EU requirements is not a great issue. The principles of our planning model are well established. We also have to remember that planning systems in current EU countries are very varied, and unification in this field is a matter of a very, very distant future. Therefore, regardless of the accession problems, our priority today is the completion of the reform which we began ten years ago. Our law still has many gaps and discrepancies: for example we do not have a modern and comprehensive legislation for urban renewal projects, which is a great issue in Polish cities. The whole economic aspect of planning is very weak. We need to build a solid legal and institutional basis for public-private partnerships in urban development. We need a strong planning administration, competent and transparent, to construct effective system of planning and enforce adopted planning policy.

But the greatest precondition for our reform stems from the most general and banal observation. The years of transformation have proved, once again, that physical planning

belongs to the sphere of politics. We must therefore reconstruct public confidence and build political consensus on planning objectives, on the concept of public interest, on the issue of public intervention, on long-term planning policy goals and finally, on the capacity, statutory power and institutions of the planning system. Without general agreement on these issues, the progress of our reform will be very slow. And we must be realistic: the reform of the physical planning system in Poland, illustrating the whole journey of our country to a land of good governing, living and working, will be very long and will remain difficult, despite all achievements of the last decade. Ten years ago, in my publications and public statements as the person then responsible for the reform of the physical planning system, I argued that, working very hard and having a lot of luck, we would need two decades to build a responsible, effective, transparent and competent system of physical planning. We are currently in the middle of this process and I hope that my forecast was not too optimistic. Thank you.

## 2.8 Questions, comments and discussion.

### **Robin Thompson.**

Thank you very much. You had some very strong things to say. I know there is a number of other Polish colleagues in the audience as well. Would anyone like to respond or react to that very powerful set of messages?

### **Jan Vogelij, BNSP, Netherlands.**

What struck me, in your very precise, emotional and personal analysis, were two things. The first one is that a lot of the experiences that you mentioned are, in a way, like everywhere. Maybe that gives you some confidence for the future: we all face the same kind of problems. What is very clear here though is that the problems are more severe, more extreme and that what you are talking about is a cultural change which may need a long time and several generations.

When you are talking about the lack of public confidence, it might be due to the fact that so much attention is going to all the legal system procedures (without which you cannot go on), but one of the main things through which public confidence can be gained is public participation. You did not speak about public participation. Maybe you could elaborate on that question a little bit.

### **Adam Kowalewski, Poland.**

If I may comment on the comment... Maybe corruption in Nigeria is greater than in Poland, maybe corruption in the Netherlands is smaller. I cannot judge on this. I just wanted to present the problems which, in my opinion, are the most acute today. You mentioned public participation. But public participation needs training, needs special literature, needs information, needs expertise among planners, needs a lot of money - it is a very costly procedure. I know this for a fact from England and from the Netherlands. We ran a comparative study with Nijmegen University and Harry Decker, in which I made a contribution on the comparison of political systems in both countries. The amount of money you spend on planning in the Netherlands is absolutely incomparable to anything which we can imagine in Poland. I described general



problems since I only had twenty minutes to speak. There is also a very long list of precise and detailed problems. I had to make a selection about what I was going to say.

**Robin Thompson.**

It seems to me that there are times when the primacy of the market economy and what you call that 'selling out' to developers almost seems to be a necessary cultural stage. I know it is a very different context but in our own country, we went through several years under Mrs Thatcher in which planning became much weaker and the market economy became much stronger. Now we see our government showing a very strong interest in spatial planning; one can witness the revival of spatial planning, in many ways as a reaction to see what the problems were when you did not have it. So I suppose my question for you and for everyone else is: are you optimistic that this is a process of transition, and that the problems that will be perceived as a result of the current phenomenon will inevitable mean that there will be a move back towards the ideas we have about spatial planning? Or are you more pessimistic?

**Adam Kowalewski, Poland.**

It is an extremely difficult question, because we are having many debates on whether we are going back, for instance, to the type of economies of Latin America, or whether we are making a real progress. I am generally optimistic. But I believe that we can only be optimistic while fighting very hard for what we want. And I am getting sick sometimes when I listen to speeches such as this morning: Warsaw is a really corrupted and destroyed city, and as long as the public and people in this country do not understand this, we will not progress. My optimism is because of the people of Poland, not because of the developments of the situation.

**Maro Evangelidou, Greece.**

Je me sens en quelque sorte obligée d'intervenir sur cette discussion parce qu'en grande partie, les pays de l'élargissement sont balkaniques, et la Grèce aussi est un pays balkanique où le 'planning' rencontre des problèmes tels que ceux qui ont été exposés ce matin. Pourtant la Grèce est à l'intérieur de l'Union Européenne depuis des années. Je dois forcément dire que je ne suis pas très optimiste moi aussi, sur l'effet que l'UE peut avoir sur la mentalité et les structures du 'planning' dans des pays qui rencontrent de tels problèmes. Je me demande alors dans quelle mesure le CEU ne pourrait pas intervenir pour rendre nécessaire la prise en compte du SDEC et la problématique de l'Europe dans les structures de planification et les méthodes appliquées par chaque pays.

J'ai vu que lors de votre conférence à Londres, il y a eu un document très intéressant de Vincent Nadin sur le langage - si l'on va au-delà de cela, je pense qu'on arrive aux systèmes de 'planning' du point de vue politico-administratif. Et je me demande si cela rentre dans le 'software' ou le 'hardware of our job'. Je crois que c'est un domaine 'soft', c'est un domaine où en tenant compte de l'histoire de chaque pays et des racines historiques, on peut quand même intervenir. En Grèce, on n'a pas autant de corruption que celle exposée en Pologne, mais on a un clientélisme très fort lié à la petite propriété - des problèmes reoncontrés aussi dans d'autres pays méditerranéens - et c'est un

obstacle majeur. Et si cela n'est pas posé, on en reste un peu à une discussion théorique intéressante mais pas politiquement significative.

### **Robin Thompson.**

We very much want by the end of this afternoon to be thinking about an agenda that the ECTP can take forward. So the purpose of today is not just to hear of these problems, but then to say: we represent 26 countries, 25,000 spatial planners, what can we do to help address some of the issues that we are hearing about?

### **Adam Kowalewski, Poland.**

During the accession negotiations, we have had very strange debates on how many bacterias can be in one gram of cheese and we are talking a lot about several areas of law, but we do not discuss the problems of physical planning and land use control. If we could try to impose on all countries of EU, old and new ones, some basic legal requirements of land use control, it would be a great success.

### **Charles Lambert, France.**

J'interviens à la suite de notre collègue grecque pour dire que si le CEU est là aujourd'hui, c'est bien justement pour prendre conscience et éventuellement intervenir, parce que c'est le positionnement particulier de notre Conseil que d'être d'une part complètement indépendant, et par ailleurs, complètement impliqué dans la chose publique, mais sans être lié par les autres obligations diplomatiques et les obligations de temporalité. Et c'est ce qui introduit mon deuxième propos : je crois que nous ne devons pas rentrer dans la manière avec laquelle les gouvernements dirigent nos pays. Parce que l'urbanisme est composé de deux parties, et notre Charte pour l'Urbanisme des Villes, la Nouvelle Charte d'Athènes, l'a bien montré, il y a des fondamentaux et en tant que professionnels, nous sommes garants de ces fondamentaux. Nous devons veiller à ce que la structure foncière évolue, soit enregistrée ; nous devons veiller à ce que les populations aient la compréhension des phénomènes ; nous devons veiller à un certain nombre de choses fondamentales. Et puis ensuite, nous devons apporter des solutions à disposition de la société telle qu'elle est, et la corruption dont on parle, dans d'autres systèmes c'est un clientélisme excessif, cela a été dit, mais dans d'autres systèmes, c'est une généralisation provisoire et trop grande des phénomènes de marché. Donc on doit les analyser et apporter des solutions mais notre garantie, c'est sur les fondamentaux. Et c'est là où troisièmement, je crois que nous avons à prendre position pour les pays en accession, et j'instruit mon propos à partir de ce qui se fait à Genève dans le Comité des Etablissements Humains de l'ONU, dans la Commission Economique pour l'Europe dans laquelle je siège. On voit que on ne s'occupe que du logement pendant deux ans, puis ensuite on ne s'occupe que de 'land administration', le foncier, pendant deux ans.

Nous, nous devons apporter justement cette continuité dans la culture européenne, et c'est cela qui deviendra le projet européen. Donc quand nous avons introduit dans la Charte pour l'Urbanisme des Villes, la Nouvelle Charte d'Athènes, que nous révisons, la notion de 'culture of cities', incontestablement nous sommes sur une piste qui devrait intéresser la population, et c'est par ce biais-là qu'on rejoindra cette ouverture vers les gens, vers ceux qui pour l'instant ne se rendent pas compte des marges de manoeuvres, c'est-à-dire, de ce que l'on pourrait faire et qu'ils n'aperçoivent pas. Voilà une première

intervention ce matin, mais surtout ne rentrons pas trop dans la manière avec laquelle nos pays, les nôtres et les autres, sont gouvernés.

### **Paulo Correia, Portugal.**

I listened very carefully not only to this presentation but also to the one before and I think they complement each other very well. They are very centred on the 'gaps', in the widest sense that you can give to the word 'gap', meaning that these problems are shared not only among the accession countries, but also in the current EU regions that have not yet reached the average level of development of the EU. Because they have not yet reached that level, these regions are extremely attractive to foreign investment for making very good surplus value, especially if the economic, administrative, and legal framework has not accompanied the changes from a highly centralised or socially-controlled system to a free market system.

So if, for instance, there are gaps in the fiscal system, it will be very difficult to really control speculation without an efficient fiscal system designed to recapture the surplus value [capital gains] on land. Speculation will be the business itself because you can make much more money in a much shorter time than through normal investment, with a big negative side-effect in the economy: there will be a huge amount of capital frozen in land that has no correspondence in the production of income in that region. But because the market is not stupid, it will only invest where the multiplying effects will be bigger, that is why we saw that map of the Czech Republic where only certain areas are selected by foreign investment. And a political option is being taken almost everywhere to induce this foreign investment, because it is thought that it is good to have money coming from abroad. However, in order to attract foreign investment, a lot of incentives allowing capital gains not to be taxed at all or being taxed at a lower tax level are designed, which is encouraging these effects in a negative way.

So even if there was no corruption at all, the system would not been able to re-adapt itself, to match the role of planning which has to be led by the public sector in a free-market and global economy in which capital moves within the continent and within the world with great ease, taking the surplus value out of the places where it should be in order to be reinvested in producing more returns. This means that we are having more and more countries and regions developing at two or even three speeds, depending on where the money is, where the accessibility and the opportunities to create new jobs are. One of the things that enables this to develop further is the issue of the secrecy of data that Frank has raised earlier on: the land market is secret by nature, and there are people who live by selling the information of that relatively secret market. So the final question is: what can we do, as planners, in order to enable planning, by providing it with adequate instruments that are not 'traditional' planning tools, if you like, but belong to related areas such as taxation, data management, and influencing policy options within new political frameworks?

### **Adam Kowalewski, Poland.**

There is one more important element which I would like to add. The problem of our situation is that we have to fight on many fronts at the same time, against every single problem which I mentioned, such as corruption, or planning administration or law. With a strong functioning planning administration and good law, it is easy to fight corruption.

With very honest people, we can maybe live without law. You can imagine many combinations such as these... But when at the same time, we have reforms in the administration of the country, a badly organised planning system, laws with gaps, and corruption, it is very difficult to deal with all these problems at once. This is a very important point to understand our situation. Maybe corruption in Poland is smaller than in Italy... I spent some months studying what is going on the Italian system and I would take the risk to say that we have similar problems, but we do not have a planning administration and a law strong enough, which is the problem.

**Robin Thompson.**

Thank you very much for speaking to us with such experience, such passion and directness.

**2.9 Presentation by Stanislaw Furman: *From ‘creative destruction’ to successful adaptation – challenges for planners in transforming city structures in candidate countries.***

Poland opened the way to an expansion of the EU evolving around the EU-15 core. Today, the enlargement of the Union is high on the political agenda. It gives new democracies in Central and Eastern Europe a chance to diminish their distance to centres of civilisation and progress and live over time the promises of the global economy. However, the paths leading to a real convergence of CEECs with current EU countries are not yet clear. This also pertains to spatial integration. The ESDP pointed to the task of spatial planning at a trans-national level in order to facilitate the integration of accession countries, in parallel to EU pre-accession programmes such as SAPARD, PHARE, ISPA and through the INTERREG Community Initiative. The ECTP also aptly emphasised the need to strengthen the institutions responsible in the CEECs for spatial development and planning on the regional and local levels.

The accelerated economic development of CEECs is crucial for a real integration of the European space. The level of economic development measured in terms of GDP per head does not reach 50% of the EU average in most CEECs, even calculated at purchasing power parity. The accession countries need to change their economic profile and build their competitiveness on other factors than the low cost of labour by increasing innovation capacities and improving the quality of the business environment and infrastructure. Meeting these objectives is inseparably linked with a structural transformation of cities, which concentrate most of the development potential and constitute the nodes integrating countries and regions into global economic, social and cultural networks. The transformation of cities is therefore a must because, prior to the fall of the Berlin Wall, cities in accession countries were following a development track very different from that of cities in the EU, and with few exceptions, are not competitive in attracting investments and jobs. In 1997, all CEECs including Russia participated a meagre 4.6% in the world's total influx of foreign direct investment. When cities in the West of Europe were adjusting themselves to the requirements of a service and knowledge-based economy, a rapid urbanisation of CEECs was driven by forcible industrialisation. Due to a shortage of goods, poverty of people and lack of political freedom, cities were largely deprived of their function as market places of services, goods, ideas and information. Centrally planned economies, by definition, did not need business infrastructure and those institutions which were linked with a market economy.

State monopoly and the rejection of both property rights and market criteria in the use of land created a seemingly great freedom to shape cities in the CEECs according to town planning principles expressing a wide public interest. I often heard the opinion that we, in the CEECs, had lived in a planners' paradise. The prevailing town planning doctrine was derived from the Charter of Athens, the strong social flavour of which well suited the propaganda objectives of the ruling regimes. However, in reality, planners were only free to draw this vision of an egalitarian industrial society based on the primacy of common consumption and had limited opportunities to satisfy the diversified aspiration of urban dwellers. Actual development was even far from the official visions, due to the piecemeal implementation of plans. If there was any spatial order, as some planners in my country still want to believe, it existed only in drawings, but never in the real urban space.

The land use patterns stuck to the principles of strict segregation between areas of production, housing and recreation. The concentration of each of these functions in large spatial complexes led to a disintegration of the urban structure, deepened by the lack of good transportation links. The larger was the proportion of the new built-up areas in relation to the older parts of cities, the more this disintegration was felt. Given the rapid urbanisation and lavish management of land, many cities lost cohesion and functionality. While abandoned land was allocated to industry, and vast strips of land were kept undeveloped as a measure to protect residential areas against industrial detrimental effects, state investment policy minimised the [expenditure] on provision of housing and infrastructure often at the expense of the quality and efficiency of adopted solutions. Moreover, urban renewal programmes almost did not exist, thus large parts of built-up areas deteriorated. Poorly maintained buildings serving unimportant functions retained precious inner-city locations while new developments spread outside the cities on free arable land.

The transformation of a programmed collective society into a pluralist one, the shift from a centrally-planned to a market economy, and the incorporation of semi-closed CEECs into global development streams brought about profound changes to cities in these countries. These processes, reinforcing each other and condensed over a short period of time, have changed the basic factors and mechanisms which influence the function, the economic and social profile and in consequence, the shape of cities. The development of cities became the product of the actions of a mass of independent actors, while the role of the State was substantially reduced. Property rights regained respect and market forces started to shape spatial relationships. The real-estate market was reborn, yet often without the financial and institutional arrangements which are necessary to meet the housing needs in a market-based housing delivery system. The insistence on equalising the economic status of citizens has been replaced by the enhancement of enterprise and competition, so that an imposed conformity of social behaviours gave way to a diversification of consumption. Many local authorities, empowered and endowed with communal property, adopted an entrepreneurial style of governance. All this has given a new dynamic to urban development.

Yet, a disregard for planning and relaxed land use controls increased the proliferation of unsustainable patterns of consumption of land and energy. The opening of the economies of CEECs to international competition became the driving force for change in the economic profile of cities. Under the impact of globalisation, the production and consumption patterns as well as the comparative advantages of cities have been considerably changed. This has affected the basic elements of the urban structure, and at the national level has led to the growth of regional disparities and the polarisation of development around large cities. Foreign capital became a major and most welcome actor on the urban development scene in many

cities like Budapest and Warsaw. Yesterday I had the pleasure to listen to a report for the Rockefeller Foundation, in which it was argued the so-called 'Visegrad Countries' are in danger of being subject to a centralised planning from abroad much stronger than the planning of the Communist era...

The impact of economic transformation on the urban physical development structure is immense and it varies between cities. Changes that can be considered as positive are:

- The diversification of the urban fabric, linked to a dynamic growth of consumer and producer services which allowed the overcoming of the monofunctional character of large housing estates and decreased spatial disparities in the provision of services and job opportunities;
- Enrichment of substance and diversification of forms of development in larger cities, which was brought about by a rapid growth in business environment infrastructure;
- The diversification and improvement of the quality of new residential developments, accompanied by the abandonment of mass construction of prefabricated housing.
- A more economical use of the land enforced by market mechanisms and enabled by progress in environmental protection technology;
- Promising, although not yet numerous, examples of redevelopment of decayed industrial zones into modern business and service complexes.

Transformation has also affected the industrial developments that had been shaped in most cities in the post-war decades. This was caused by changes in the sectors of industry, services, transport and communication, accompanied by a decrease in the profitability of agriculture. Large industrial sectors did not match the increasing economic competition and the requirements of global technological progress. Many industrial zones which, prior to 1990, constituted key elements of the urban structure, have been left to decay with a lot of abandoned plants and deteriorated environments. Some towns almost lost their entire economic base and suffer a horrible plight due to structural unemployment. The recovery of industry was accompanied by a deep restructuring and long-delayed uncoupling of the size of production from the size of employment. Small and medium firms now dominate the industrial sector. Their preferences concerning the location and form of plants are quite different from those of old state enterprises, so they rarely settle in existing industrial zones, which leads them to decay.

Market economy created a big demand for producer services, more spectacular in the field of finance and business management. Cities in CEECs were totally unprepared to meet this demand which was never taken into consideration in old plans. In many cities, the lack of office space is a barrier to development. But in several large cities such as Warsaw, the mushrooming new office buildings boosted the existing downtown structure. Solely in the centre of the city of Warsaw, close to one million square metres of new office space was built in the last decade, six times more than what existed in 1989... Individual buildings and whole office parks have been injected, often forcibly, in the urban fabric of other districts, often encroaching on the green areas that were intended to serve as 'ecological corridors'.

The pre-1990 pattern of residential development was linked to a hierarchic system of 'service centres' which comprised neighbourhoods, settlements and urban districts. Although the construction of those centres was seldom accomplished, residential areas have been laid out and built up according to that concept of service centres. The rapid growth of consumer services after 1990 did not however result in the development of 'service centres' on the preserved sites. Small domestic businesses were too weak to do that and they spread all over

the city, while the big international retailers that came afterwards have developed chains of hypermarkets and shopping centres outside the residential development complexes, breaking the basic logic of structure and layout of residential areas. Progress in communication and the increasing level of car ownership facilitated the dispersal of economic activities and housing. At the same time, the new requirements of industry and trade together with the focus on 'in-time delivery' shifted the transport of goods from rail to road. New urban development is therefore less and less tied to mass transport corridors. Developments have been spreading beyond the outskirts of cities to surrounding villages, invading arable land. The difficulties in getting a competitive profit from agriculture have speeded up this chaotic suburbanisation trend.

Summing up, it is possible to say that the transformation of urban structures bears, at least in Poland, the features of a 'creative destruction'. The economic, social and cultural processes have created a new content and new values in urban development. At the same time, the existing structures disintegrate as they become inconsistent with urban function and the requirements of citizens and economy. Few cities were able to control and manage the spontaneous processes of change in the use of land and in the forms of development. The transformation seldom proceeds as a well-planned urban redevelopment process which, while responding to new needs, would at the same time keep balance existing structures and alleviate the harsh outcomes of change. So far, spatial disorder and deficiencies in development structures have increased in many cities. The natural resistance of physical development to rapid changes only partly explains this phenomena. The problems largely stem from the specificity of the transformation of cities in the CEECs, in particular from:

- the scope and complexity of the changes necessary in a short period of time;
- the lack of skill and efficient instruments to manage the changes;
- the weakening of the public interest and a neglect of long-range effects in current policies;
- the weakness of civic and societal institutions ;
- corruption;
- the shortage in public funds needed to harmonise the process and tackling increasing conflicts.

Faced with a fierce international competition, cities in CEECs are eager to modernise and adjust to new needs as quick as possible, grabbing all available opportunities: in many cities short of public funds, attracting and facilitating new investment but also getting immediate profit from selling or leasing land and buildings were given top priority. Much less attention was paid to influencing and managing the course of events so as to alleviate current conflicts about long-term effects. This creates an obvious threat whereby the transformation of cities might be associated with excessive social, environmental and economic costs, and the new urban structures will be totally unsustainable. For transformation to be successful, cities need to combine the attraction of external investment with the support to endogenous development factors and efficient use of their own resources.

EU enlargement and globalisation provide such opportunities, as they increase the flow of foreign direct investment and might create a demand enabling the activation of local resources. This is a chance which entrepreneurial cities in the CEECs might win, while passive ones will certainly lose. It is not true that at the time of globalisation, cities are helpless [recipients] of international capital. Yet, cities' spatial development policies can neither be demand-driven and passive, nor supply-oriented, expensive and inefficient. Spatial development policy should be an instrument to manage the demand and catalyse the

initiatives of various actors. This is a primary objective in the new strategy for the development of Budapest.

Urban planning should identify well-prioritised interventions and actions encouraging private capital to make decisions on type and location of investment that would activate resources and make use of existing infrastructure rather than call for new public investment. Urban planning should support city marketing, by indicating what are the city's comparative advantages, what public actions building on specific social, physical and cultural features are likely to attract investors. It is also the task of planning to facilitate developments which increase the ability of cities to deliver products wanted on global markets. The creation of innovation-fertile environments is here of utmost importance, and this means the need to ensure diversity and high quality in urban development. In the capital-hungry CEECs, planning should also be flexible and smooth for the necessary development of Public-Private Partnership which always involve negotiation. At the same time, planning must be explicit about the main directions of urban development and able to provide a just assessment of potential costs and benefits of partnership deals, otherwise there will always be a corrupted management system.

This concern with new development cannot overshadow the need for other actions:

- the renewal of the 19th and early 20th century housing stock which symbolises the cities' historic identity and continuity in a more and more unified urban landscape worldwide;
- the upgrading of the large housing estates inherited from the Communist era which are already losing social acceptance;
- the improvement of transport system, ensuring that new development is consistent with the availability of transport services;
- the prevention of the deterioration of social infrastructure.

Without undertaking these tasks, cities in the CEECs will neither be competitive in the united Europe nor contribute to the cohesion of European space. Moreover, they themselves will be lacking cohesion, social integration and efficiency. There are many similarities between the transformations going on in the cities of CEECs and the transformation which the cities of the EU have been through in the second half of the 20th century. The main difference is the shortage of means and time for an appropriate restructuring, the scope of necessary changes in relation to the strength of the economy, and the weakness of institutions involved in the transformation process. Planners in CEECs can however benefit from the experience of EU cities and the ECTP symposium could well serve this aim. Thank you for your attention.

## **2.10 Questions, comments and discussion.**

### **Nick Davies, President of the RTPI, UK.**

I must congratulate you for an excellent presentation which covered a whole range of urban problems. In the UK, we have been lobbying for some years and have now obtained a national planning policy or planning strategy which encourages the sequential development of our towns and cities. We have been suffering ourselves, as have other cities around the world, of depopulation from our town centres, our CBDs and of run-down, poor quality old housing in the inner ring. As a result now, in order to tackle these problems, we have a national policy which ripples through the whole UK urban planning system. This means that all new development, be it retail, office or housing, has to be allocated on sites in the centre, in the CBD first, before a developer



can claim to develop sites further out. The policy is a political policy introduced partially in order to prevent further suburban development on green fields around the towns and cities. But it is already beginning to work and the most recent statistics for out-of-town supermarket developments, for example, show that there are now virtually none being built in the UK on the edges of our towns and cities, and they are all being re-developed in our central areas. So it is possible to take directed actions to renew towns and cities that are running down in a sustainable way if you have the political will. The political will at a national level has to be driven from the grassroots, from the voters who do not want to see, in the UK at least, more and more green fields lost for housing, and do want to see their towns and cities renewed.

### **Stanislaw Furman, Poland.**

I do not know whether you recognise that you are in a country [Poland] which do not know the notion of 'building area' [*zone constructible*]. Our physical planning and law first distinguish meadows, agricultural land, and then... nothing. The first statement in the new revised law states that everybody is entitled to use their property rights if this is not contradictory to general planning regulation. But these general planning regulations are general regulations... Of course, that right to use your property rights might be regulated by local plans. But less than 1% of plans were actually prepared so far and nobody is willing to make these plans if they will limit the property rights of people. Unless we have that basic notion of building area/zone [*zone constructible*] which exists almost everywhere, I cannot agree with the statement made before that our planning system is very similar to Western European systems and that we will not need a big adjustment. I think it responds to your question about brown and green field development.

### **Robin Thompson.**

It is also interesting that in a way, the phenomenon which Nick Davies describes in the UK is a result of the failures of a system which did allow those out-of-town developments and a loss of brown-field sites. The reason there is now public acceptance and political will, in part, is because people experienced the problems that were created by the market economy. This goes back to this issue of: do you have to go through this pain and grief in order to persuade people that planning is actually good for them?

Any other comments, perhaps to ask whether people from the accession countries are recognising that portrait that was painted?

### **Adam Kowalewski, Poland.**

Yesterday I was afraid to say these strong words, but I had the pleasure to listen to the report which has been prepared for the Rockefeller Foundation by two Americans: one writer, Roberta Brandes Gratz (author of *Cities Back from the Edge* and other famous books), and the Director of the Hudson River Environmental, Development and Community Enhancement programme. They spent three years visiting Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland and had much more opportunities than I had to monitor what is going on in these countries. I experienced, as the Germans say, 'Schadenfreude': those foreigners coming from the other side of the Atlantic discovered and confirmed in five years of observation everything that I was thinking about.

## **Robin Thompson.**

Thank you very much indeed for that presentation. I would now like to turn to a presentation which looks at INTERREG as one of the most important instruments in the whole issue of inter-relationships between the EU and accession countries. One of our vice-presidents from Italy is going to make a presentation to us on that subject.

### **3. The implications of EU enlargement for Spatial Planning.**

#### **3.1 Presentation by Virna Bussadori, Italy: *The Community Initiative INTERREG IIIB “CADSES” – Spatial Planning and development as a challenge in the enlargement of Europe.***

I would like to give you a short overview of the Community Initiative INTERREG CADSES. I am responsible for CADSES on behalf of the local administration for which I work, the Autonomous Province of South Tyrol in the North of Italy. Let me first introduce very shortly the history of INTERREG. The awareness regarding the need for transnational co-operation in the field of spatial development policy actually emerged in the 1990s. In 1994, the Ministers responsible for spatial planning in the EU member states adopted the Leipzig principles which became the starting point for the further development of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP), the main political document in the field of European spatial development which was then adopted in Potsdam in May 1999. Another strategic framework is the *Guidelines for Sustainable Development* of the Council of Europe<sup>5</sup>, adopted at the CEMAT Conference in Hannover in September 2000. These *Guidelines* are of particular importance for CADSES because they have been developed jointly by EU member states and non-member states. The first Community Initiative launched by the European Commission for transnational co-operation in spatial development was INTERREG IIC in 1996. This Community Initiative could be seen as a first interim result of the ESDP process and at that time, seven transnational programme areas were identified, two of them already co-operating with countries outside the EU, the CADSES space and the Baltic Sea Region. After the successful implementation of INTERREG IIC (financed under the Structural Funds) between 1997 and 1999, the Commission published the guidelines for INTERREG III in April 2000.

Both the ESDP and the *Guidelines for Sustainable Development* emphasised the need for a more intense co-operation between the EU and the neighbouring non-member countries in the field of spatial development. This is especially true along the external border of the EU, in the ‘Central, Adriatic, Danubian and South-Eastern European Space’ (CADSES), at a period when Europe is preparing for the enlargement of the Union to the East. Several of the CADSES countries are aiming for accession to the EU within the 2000-2006 period. It is therefore the objective of the INTERREG IIIB CADSES programme to contribute strongly to

---

<sup>5</sup> CEMAT (1999), *Report of a meeting of CEMAT on the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent (the Draft Hannover Document)*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

this process, taking into account the specificity of spatial development in this large and difficult area.

INTERREG III is dedicated to trans-national co-operation in the period 2000-2006. Its Strand A is focusing on cross-border co-operation; Strand C is dedicated to inter-regional co-operation while Strand B is focusing on trans-national co-operation in the field of spatial planning. Transnational co-operation between national, regional and local authorities in the framework of INTERREG IIIB aims to promote a higher degree of territorial integration across large groupings of European regions, with the target to achieve a sustainable, harmonious and balanced development of the Community and of course, a better territorial integration with candidate countries and later on other neighbouring countries.

Let me shortly present the CADSES partners. The INTERREG IIC CADSES programme has been a first step to raise awareness concerning the specific objectives and possibilities of spatial development policy in that area. Another aim was to develop a more structured and thematically focused dialogue among the actors of 18 countries in that area. CADSES includes:

- EU member states: Austria, part of Germany, Greece and part of Italy;
- 7 accession countries: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia;
- 7 non-member states: Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia, the Republic of Moldova and part of Ukraine.



While in many respects the challenges, objectives, contents and methods of co-operation in the CADSES programme are similar to those in the other European trans-national areas defined under INTERREG IIC and IIIB, some others are completely different as a result of the specific composition of CADSES and of recent developments in the region. This means that new challenges will have to be taken up by INTERREG IIIB CADSES. The experience of INTERREG IIC has demonstrated a big interest from non-EU countries, especially the Accession Countries, not only to participate actively on the project level, but also to co-

operate as far as possible as equal partners within this programme. I suppose that it is the specific interest of the accession countries to prepare for their role as future EU partners from the very beginning and to act as such.

I would now like to introduce CADSES as a 'space in transition'. This notion of a space in transition has several meanings, and transition should not be only seen as the process of economic transformation within the accession and third countries. The processes and developments taking place in these countries, the expected changes in the role of borders, the future deepening and expansion of trade patterns, all these dynamic factors will influence the regional and economic position of the current EU member states with new implications for spatial development. The administrative delimitation of CADSES demonstrates the willingness of some EU member states to exceed the boundaries of the immediate enlargement area, also including countries which cannot be labelled at present as 'candidate countries'. To promote the integration of all these countries is obviously in line with the aim of territorial integration for the whole of CADSES.

During the 2000-2006 programming period, the institutional framework is likely to change a lot: the institutional and legal relations between certain non-member states and the EU are expected to change in so far as the integration process of these non-member states can speed up and they can become member states of the EU. Therefore, when establishing the framework of the programme and now deciding upon concrete projects, due flexibility should be ensured for the efficient management of these changes but also to guarantee a smooth transition within a stable and well-established programme structure as a whole. It is also important to note that the four member states, from the North of Germany to the very South of Greece, form an interesting North-South co-operation area but also a very strange one. The heterogeneity of the participating regions in EU member states might appear as an obstacle, but on the other hand, it is in line with the major strength of the CADSES area as a whole - its rich and diverse structure. We must take care of these differences and be aware of them.

The general objectives of spatial development policy in CADSES should contribute to spatial integration in the area. In addition to a trans-national co-operation programme and projects, CADSES should also promote the building of trans-national partnerships at different levels, in different fields of regional development policy and between actors - between national administrations, regional and local governments, economic, political and cultural institutions, and also among enterprises, stakeholders and professionals. But CADSES should also contribute to competitiveness, efficiency and growth in its respective regions. It should contribute to economic and social cohesion within the regions and between the countries, contribute to the promotion of equal opportunities between women and men, and ensure the conservation of the natural and cultural heritage, the protection of the environment and sustainable development. Finally, one should not forget that the main objective of this initiative is to contribute to territorial integration, hence emphasising a balance between various, and in many cases, even conflicting spatial development and development patterns. The protection of the environment and of natural resources, in particular water resources, the promotion of trans-national best practice in the management of the natural and cultural heritage and risk prevention will have an important position within this programme.

At the same time, the programme together with its measures opens up a platform to discuss an enormous range of specific spatial interests in a trans-national context. Within this context, the priorities for action are the following: drawing up regional development strategies at trans-national level including co-operation between cities, urban and rural areas; the

elaboration of spatial development strategies on a trans-national scale with a view to promoting polycentric and sustainable development; promoting efficient and sustainable transport systems together with a better access to the information society. The aim here is to facilitate communication between peripheral regions and promote the integrated co-operation of the outermost regions.

Spatial planning will therefore be the tool, or at least one of the most important tools, for comprehensive development. The current state of spatial planning systems in these countries will therefore need to be assessed, and we heard this morning about the difficulties of speaking different planning languages. What we have to do is not to come to one language only, but to understand ourselves as we speak different languages. Therefore the networks of cities and towns will be the steering force for development, and the role of local and regional levels in global processes will be enhanced. But the role of planners will also be of utmost importance in the whole process. It is a fact that spatial development is shaped by driving forces at regional and local levels. Bridging the gap between underdeveloped regions and successful economic centres means to promote initiatives based upon locally and regionally specific resources. The co-ordination between spatial and economic policies is a precondition in order to achieve sustainable development and economic growth. But due emphasis should also be placed upon social and cultural factors since these are an essential pre-requisite for sustainable development on the regional and local level. And planners will be there to play a key role both in the definition, in the implementation and in the management of the process as a whole. Let me give you a short overview on the process. This is what we did until now. We are still working on project generation and the next step will be project management [slides].

To conclude, I would like to say that despite the heterogeneous positions and interests of current EU member states as regards the enlargement of the EU, their participation in a joint programme such as CADSES highlights their interest in dealing with the future challenges opened up by enlargement and further integration in this part of Europe and to further intensifying the exchange of know-how and co-operative policy-making in the field of trans-national spatial development. In that respect, we might say that the specific role of the INTERREG IIIB CADSES programme must be seen as a crucial pre-accession instrument for spatial development policies and again that the role that we, as planners, are called to play, is of utmost importance. That is our challenge and it is a very difficult one. Thank you.

### **3.2 Questions, comments and discussion.**

#### **Robin Thompson.**

Having been myself involved for many years in trans-national collaboration between relatively small parts of the UK, France and Belgium, and knowing how difficult that can be, I find the ambition here is breathtaking. We wish you luck.

#### **Karel Maier, Czech Republic.**

My question is: what is the relation of this initiative to national governments in the area concerned? This is an initiative and there is no sort of representation of this 'CADSES region' in terms of government. So what is the relationship of this initiative to national governments in that area, the Polish, Czech and whatever national governments? Is there any link between this Initiative and national decision-making?

### **Virna Bussadori, Italy.**

There are national committees which are working strongly on the CADSES Initiative, at least in Italy and in the EU member states, as far as I know, and these are collaborating strongly with other national committees within the Accession Countries and non-member states. There are also regional committees, working deeply on projects and confronting themselves and these projects with the national and international committees. So it is a very complete and very structured network of committees at different levels. Of course, it is not easy to find a way through it: in Italy we are discussing nationally what we have to do and we have not yet started to compare ourselves with what others are doing. So we are elaborating our projects first, on the local level, on the regional level and then on the national level, giving them a national structure, and we will start in a short time to compare our initiatives with the other countries. I was attending a seminar in Slovenia, not on CADSES but on the Alpine Space, and these difficulties emerged very clearly. These meetings are very important because relations between different partners become clearer.

### **Miran Gajšek, Slovenia.**

I have three remarks. First, on this last presentation, I think that the idea and practice of CADSES, Alpine Space and other macro-regions in Europe is very good, because they represent one functional space, a space with similarities (geographically speaking) not so big as the whole of Europe which has some principles and perspectives. It is good that the ESDP principles can be implemented in those macro-regions. But the problem is the competence for planning, which is still in the hands of national states, regions and municipalities. The EU has no will to have a competence for spatial planning, only for regional development. All those good materials have no binding role and are only proposals for those who have power and competence for planning in the different states.

Secondly, I think that for the countries in transition, it is very important to understand and establish the so-called 'development circle', the circle between developers, policy-makers in the cities and the regions, town planners in the public administration and in the private sector, investors, and the people who want to own or to rent the investment. Understanding the development circle is very important because developers and the market in transition countries are now stronger than policy-makers, and planning practice is now a little bit behind.

The third remark concerns the issue of spatial monitoring. I think that the EU has no specific interest in developing spatial indicators because it has no competency for spatial planning, and EUROSTAT collects statistical data in accession countries only for indicators which are important to regional development, not for spatial planning or for spatial development itself. I think it may be the task of our group to determine a set of spatial indicators which are important not only for different states but also for the trans-national spatial planning areas like CADSES, Alpine Space and so on.

### **Adam Kowalewski, Poland.**

In my opinion, the [CADSES] idea is excellent. This presentation was very general, but how deep, how close to the real life and real details are you coming in your

programme? We know the slogans which have been presented here since decades - we all agree on this. What, in reality, are you going to show in this programme?

### **Jan Vogelij, The Netherlands.**

I was involved in the North-West European comparable programme (INTERREG IIC NWMA) and I would like to react on the last reactions. Of course, it is true that the constitution of the EU does not give the Union competence for spatial planning. You could stick to notice that and say that there is a gap in the legal base of the EU, but the important thing is the actual development of planning activities on the European level: despite the fact that there is no, there is an ESDP. Despite the fact that there is no EU competence for planning, there is a big programme on urban sustainable development in the European Commission's DG XI (Environment). In the DG for regional policy, there are also big activities related to the INTERREG Programme.

The relation to the day to day practice of planners and the meaning of programmes such as CADSES for local communities, lies here: where there has been several different Structural Funds helping communities to realise their plans and their aims in the regions of the EU, there is now a co-ordination between those Structural Funds, because these plans and these programmes (CADSES, NWE or Atlantic Arc) promote not only things that are important for planning and planning practice, but also subsidise the preparation of projects. So there is no stronger relation to local planning practice and communities than the investments in projects made at the local level. What such programmes are going to do is giving a programming and a long-term vision. This vision, of course, is at a large scale, far away from people, but it invites local communities to come up with projects to be funded and supported by the EU. So although there is no EU competence for planning, it is better to be pragmatic and take these opportunities and see them as a challenge for our profession. That is what the invitation from the EU is, at the moment, without the EU having a competence for spatial planning.

### **Virna Bussadori, Italy.**

I am very happy with Jan's answer. It is true that the European Commission has no binding competence in spatial planning as such, but the role of all of these programmes is that they stimulate the preparation of local projects which put together different actors from different regions and even from different countries. This is a big challenge, since people are starting to confront themselves with other situations. In Italy we were not even used to plan on an inter-regional level, now we are obliged, somehow, to cooperate and to plan on an inter-regional and international scale, which is really great. There are lots of difficulties, I can assure you, because we still do speak different languages and we have different goals. But this is the great challenge of this programme.

### **Robin Thompson.**

I would support that from my own experience. I can understand people saying: "look, there are these colossal problems in this enormous area, how on earth can a programme like this begin to address them?" I think one of the first steps on the journey is just starting these processes of meeting each other, recognising each other, understanding each other - beginning to understand some of the systems. There may not be a lot of

products initially, but in a way, you will not get the product until you have started these processes, so there is a value there in those programmes. Thank you very much for that presentation.

Mr Wyganowski, a former Mayor of Warsaw, is with us. He attended an important meeting involving accession countries very recently and would like to say a few words about that.

### **3.3 Address by Stanislaw Wyganowski, former Mayor of Warsaw.**

Monsieur Le Président, Mesdames et Messieurs, nous avons constaté, avec mon ami Bogdan, que cela pourrait être intéressant pour les participants de notre conférence de recevoir une courte information sur les événements qui ont eu lieu ces derniers jours à Varsovie. Le thème de ces événements concerne notre débat.

Le 20 avril, le Maire de Varsovie a organisé une conférence des maires des capitales des pays candidats à l'accession à l'Union Européenne. Après des débats concernant les implications du processus d'accès à l'Union pour les capitales des pays concernés, les maires ont signé une Déclaration. La déclaration évoque l'importance des grandes métropoles dans l'évolution de l'ossature urbaine de cette partie de l'Europe où sont situés les pays qui espèrent accéder à l'Union Européenne. On a souligné en particulier dans cette déclaration le rôle des capitales des pays candidats dans le processus accéléré de globalisation qui entraîne le phénomène de métropolisation.

Entre parenthèses, je pense qu'il faut poser une question qui n'a pas été éclaircie jusqu'à présent, justement à cause de la globalisation qui entraîne la métropolisation du monde entier. On prévoit qu'à la moitié du XXIème siècle, plus de la moitié de la population mondiale sera implantée dans les grandes métropoles ou plutôt les aires métropolitaines. Or, jusqu'à présent, on n'a pas parlé des aires métropolitaines, et je pense que c'est un sujet très important parce que pour le moment, en Pologne au moins, nous avons des problèmes de planification de ce type de territoire. Si on regarde Varsovie et tout ce qui se passe autour de Varsovie, on voit très bien qu'il n'y a pas de politique adéquate dans le domaine de la planification et de l'implantation des divers types d'investissements, justement hors de Varsovie. Je ne parle pas de Varsovie parce que j'en suis l'ancien maire, alors je suis un peu responsable de ce qui se passe à dans cette ville... Je ne suis pas tellement satisfait parce que je considère que Varsovie commence finalement à ressembler à une ville américaine pour les pauvres. Or nous sommes en Europe et je pense que cela nous oblige à voir les choses, s'il s'agit du développement d'une grande ville, d'une manière un peu différente.

Je pense que cette conférence des maires des capitales des pays candidats peut avoir une grande influence. On a parlé de co-opération permanente entre les maires des capitales de cette partie de l'Europe, proposant que chaque année, ou tous les six mois, il y ait une conférence de ce type dans chacun des pays intéressés. Récemment, entre le 7 et 11 mai, la Fondation Robert Schumann, qui a été fondée il y a 10 ans à Varsovie, a organisé un cycle de rencontres, manifestation qui était la huitième de ce type. Il y aura plusieurs séminaires et manifestations traitant des problèmes qui se posent au cours du processus d'accession de la Pologne à l'Union Européenne.



Ceci est très important parce qu'il y a eu enfin un dialogue entre les politiciens et le public qui assistait à ce type d'évènement. Comme participant à cette rencontre, je pense que c'est une réussite, car on a pas seulement assuré la participation de personnalités éminentes, comme par exemple le Président de la République et le Premier Ministre, mais il y avait aussi un nombre très important de jeunes gens de tout le pays qui s'intéressent beaucoup aux problèmes de l'intégration européenne. Dans ce type de débat ceci est très important, surtout qu'il y aura probablement en Pologne, à un moment donné, le problème de voter pour ou contre l'accès à l'Union Européenne. Alors il faut convaincre les jeunes gens que c'est une question très importante pour la Pologne. Il y a déjà 7 ans que le gouvernement polonais a demandé l'adhésion à l'Union, et depuis 3 ans on a commencé des négociations qui rentrent maintenant dans une période où les obstacles paraissent de plus en plus difficiles. La presse discute, un peu partout, de ce sujet-là. On peut justement se demander quelle est l'attitude de la société Polonaise et des sociétés des autres pays candidats à l'accès à l'Union. Nos expériences de sondages ne sont pas très encourageantes parce qu'en général, les sondages montrent que la proportion de personnes qui veulent accéder à l'Europe diminue. Actuellement, encore plus de la moitié de la société souhaite accéder à l'Union, mais ce chiffre diminue depuis quelques années, alors il faut un effort pour convaincre les gens que c'est vraiment nécessaire. Je pense qu'on peut paraphraser le bon mot de Churchill concernant la démocratie: l'Union Européenne n'est peut-être pas l'institution la plus idéale, mais on n'a apparemment pas inventé quelque chose de mieux sur notre continent pour le moment. Merci.

### **Robin Thompson.**

Thank you very much indeed, former Mayor, for that very important reminder that, at the end of the day, this is all about the perceptions of people.

The following speech is a very important one for us because we have spent the morning largely focusing on the issues of the accession countries and then, towards the end, looking at their interface with current EU countries. We are now going to look at the state of spatial planning in Europe and I think that will help us for the rest of the day. Thank you to all the contributors and to all of you for a very good morning. It is now a great pleasure for me to introduce Olle Lundgren, who is the President of the CSD.

### **3.4 Presentation by Olle Lundgren, Chair of the EU Committee on Spatial Development: *The EU spatial planning agenda and enlargement.***

It is a great honour and a great pleasure for me to be here as the President of the CSD, on behalf of the Swedish Presidency of that Committee. During that discussion, I would welcome comments on what I am going to say. Our meeting is an important one, since the task of looking at the implications of EU enlargement for spatial planning and spatial planning in accession countries is right at the core of the objectives of the Swedish Presidency of the European Union and of the work done by the CSD. It is thus a lucky coincidence that we can meet like this now. The current ambition of the CSD and of the European Commission is to broaden the co-operation on all aspects of the ESDP to a geographical area that is much larger than the present EU. The CSD intends to start a dialogue with all neighbouring countries of the EU, meaning of course the candidate countries, the EFTA countries but also the neighbouring countries in the North of Europe and around the Mediterranean. I will come back to that later in this intervention.

First of all, I would like to give a short summary of what the ESDP is - the European Spatial Development Perspective. The work on the ESDP started in the early 1990s as a co-operation between the EU member states - co-operation among themselves and co-operation with the European Commission. As it has been said earlier today, this co-operation activity has nothing to do with the Treaty of the EU. It is a voluntary co-operation between member states and the European Commission. This co-operation process took a remarkable step forward when the ESDP document was adopted and published at the end of the 1990s<sup>6</sup>. The main policy objectives that have guided the work through the 1990s were adopted quite early in the process: a balanced and polycentric urban system; the parity of access to infrastructure; and the prudent management of natural and cultural assets. These are the three basic principles laying down the foundations for the work on the ESDP. In the ESDP document, a lot of policy options are presented for each of these policy objectives [slide].

These policy options have been elaborated further in the ESDP document and there are actually more policy options than what can be used by national, regional or local authorities in their respective contexts. These policy options, as it has been said earlier today, are not binding for member states, because spatial planning is not part of the Treaty. They should be looked upon as a source of inspiration for policies at the Community level, at the national level and the regional level.

After the final ESDP document was adopted and published in 1999, work has continued. In Tampere, Finland, under the Finnish Presidency of the EU, a 12-point action programme was adopted, under the following headings:

- ESDP policy orientations in the Structural Funds
- Interreg III and ESDP demonstration projects
- ESDP policy orientations in national spatial planning
- Spatial impact of EU policies
- Territorial impact assessment
- Urban policy application
- Research observatory network co-operation
- ESDP in school geography books
- 'Future regions of Europe' award
- Integrated strategies for coastal regions
- Pan-European framework for spatial development
- Spatial impact of enlargement

As you can see, preparation work for enlargement is part of this. Another important question in the Tampere action programme was the urban question [the question of urban policy at the European level], an important and complex issue. As one usually does in such circumstances, one creates another committee to deal with the question. In Tampere, the CSD created an 'Urban Group' especially to look at the urban issues of European spatial development. That group has worked on its own to define new priorities on urban development issues. Some of them were adopted at a conference in Lille last autumn [slide].

---

<sup>6</sup> Committee on Spatial Development (1999), *ESDP: European Spatial Development Perspective : towards balanced and sustainable development of the territory of the European Union*, agreed at the Informal Council of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning in Potsdam, May 1999, Luxembourg : Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, available at [http://www.inforegio.cec.eu.int/wbdoc/docoffic/official/sdec/som\\_en.htm](http://www.inforegio.cec.eu.int/wbdoc/docoffic/official/sdec/som_en.htm)

The question underpinning these debates is: what kind of role will towns and cities play in the future of the EU as a whole? Behind that question one can detect, especially after reading the *Second Report on Economic and Social Cohesion*<sup>7</sup>, that the European Commission fears that Europe does not produce enough, does not perform good enough when compared to other parts of the globe. And if Europe is to achieve better results in promoting economic, spatial and environmental development, we cannot rely on rural areas since urban areas are the centres of growth. To illustrate this, I would like to show you a map extracted from a French report: it shows that from a European perspective, there is only one urban area of global significance - the central area including the metropolises of London, Paris and Brussels. One has identified this area as the only one that can compete with similar urban areas elsewhere on the globe. The Commission has argued that in the US, for instance, there are four or five such areas with much less population than in Europe. So if Europe is to enhance its competitive position on the global stage, we have to stimulate other areas of global significance in Europe and we have to take the European periphery into account, in one way or another. On this map, the French have identified some areas or macro-regions where such development could occur in the future - those new urban areas with a global significance. We have to go beyond the borders of today's EU.

This is what the CSD is working on at the moment. There is currently a shift within the EU and within the European Commission that will give new tasks to the CSD, and I can say with almost certainty that spatial questions - spatial planning and regional development questions, as they are dealt with within the ESPD report - will be brought closer to the decision-making within the Commission on the use of Structural Funds, for instance. The way the Commission intends to do this is to create a sub-committee of the Regional Funds Committee within the Commission that will probably be called 'Group for territorial and urban issues'. The purpose of that is to provide new knowledge and new ways of looking at things for the decision-makers within the Regional Funds Committee. And the hope is also that this new arrangement will produce a more effective use of European money in the future, and that this more effective use of European money will be based on knowledge produced by spatial planning and spatial development documents, and discussions between spatial planners and spatial developers. This is one orientation for the future: to bring knowledge and discussion on spatial planning and spatial development closer to decision-making within the Commission, on important questions [such as the Structural Funds].

The CSD will cease to work on these questions as they are dealt with by a new Committee within the Commission. The CSD will thus (and has already started to) take on two new important tasks:

- to be the monitoring committee for the work of the ESPON research network (European Spatial Planning Observatory Network). At the moment, the Commission and the member states, in particular Luxembourg, are producing a research programme on spatial planning issues covering the period from now up to 2006. It will be an important document which should be agreed upon before the summer so that it can be submitted to the Commission soon for funding. The main objective of this research programme is to provide new knowledge for policy-making and stimulate the discussion on how to develop Europe and

---

<sup>7</sup> Commission of the European Communities (1999), *Second Report on economic and social cohesion*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, available on: [http://info regio.cec.eu.int/wbdoc/docoffic/official/report2/contentpdf\\_en.htm](http://info regio.cec.eu.int/wbdoc/docoffic/official/report2/contentpdf_en.htm)

greater Europe in the future. Maybe there are one or two issues in the current ESDP document that could be discussed, but we do not have the necessary knowledge base to discuss about these. The main task for this research programme is to define and identify indicators for spatial planning and spatial development. It is a hard but fundamental task. This research programme is being written by the member states of the EU but there has been consultation with the candidate countries. All candidate countries are invited to participate in the ESPON research programme between now and 2006.

- The CSD should provide a forum to start, initiate or broaden the dialogue on spatial development and spatial planning with neighbouring countries. 'Neighbouring countries' in this respect are not limited to candidate countries or EFTA countries but include all neighbouring countries around the EU in a wider sense - more 50 countries. 'Europe' is not a proper expression anymore because Northern Africa and part of Asia are involved in this future dialogue. There has not been any such dialogue yet but the aim is to provide a forum to enable such a dialogue on spatial planning and regional development issues. The aim could be the exchange of information and experiences on spatial planning and spatial development, but in due course there can be discussions on how to develop [common] principles of spatial and regional development as well. A third objective could be to encourage cross-border co-operation.

The Swedish Presidency thought, during the first half of 2001, that in order to have a dialogue we first have to meet in one way or another. We have now invited all these 50 countries from Northern Africa up to the Polar Circle to a meeting in Brussels on 21<sup>st</sup> June. The purpose of this meeting will be to present the idea of and the need for discussion between the EU and its neighbouring countries on spatial development and spatial planning issues. We hope that the meeting in itself will provide some sort of guidance on approaches for future co-operation. It is not meant to be a single event but is supposed to open a dialogue going on for many years. It is quite obvious that all these 50 countries cannot meet regularly to work together. They could meet once a year or once every second year and exchange experience and information, and perhaps define guidelines for future co-operation.

There are several possible approaches to such co-operation. We have discussed two approaches in the preparation of this meeting: what we called a 'macro-region approach', and a 'horizontal approach'. The macro-region approach, as the name indicates, would very much rely on existing co-operation areas such as the CADSES area, the Baltic Sea Region or similar co-operation areas in the Mediterranean and other parts of Europe. One must build upon the co-operation that has already been going on in these areas. The horizontal approach would focus on various kinds of issues, one of which could be to discuss the spatial impacts of EU policies on the territory, within the EU and outside the EU. It is a difficult task to enter such new co-operation areas, since we do not really know what will come out of it, but we will try to establish contacts and a dialogue. I would very much appreciate your reactions to this effort from the Swedish Presidency and the EU, and your opinion on what should such co-operation be about. Thank you.

### 3.5 Questions, comments and discussion.

#### **Hugh Crawford, RTPI, UK**

In relation with the last matter you raised about holding wider discussions with those beyond Europe - what has been the reaction so far? Does this look a helpful or a fruitful field to follow?

#### **Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.**

In general, the reaction has been positive from at least the neighbouring countries with whom we have discussed it. When we prepared for that meeting, we set up a task force which included members from outside the EU to help us define the questions properly so that we are not totally 'off the road' when we discuss: should we have such a dialogue? If so, which issues should we discuss? In what way should we prepare future co-operation? There has been a positive reaction from the neighbouring countries, but I must admit also that there are many people who wonder what on earth we are doing...

#### **Robin Thompson.**

I would like to ask a similar question. One could interpret the map you showed us as saying that there is just one metropolitan region of world significance, that is in the core of the NWMA - a small number of cities like London, Paris and perhaps Brussels. That seems honest to be saying therefore that 90% of the European space could be seen as peripheral and that maybe a discussion about the EU and the accession/candidate countries is almost irrelevant, because that seems to be saying, "there is a world metropolitan area and the rest"... I wonder if first of all that is a correct interpretation, and secondly what reaction there has been from places like Spain, Germany and Italy who suddenly find that they are in the second division along with the accession countries. Perhaps I am exaggerating my reaction a little...

#### **Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.**

I am not actually aware of the reactions on that map but the situation [that it describes] is more or less a fact [laughs]. It is very clearly shown in the *Second Cohesion Report* of the European Commission that this small area in the middle of Europe which makes up 15% of the European territory contains 25% or 30% of the EU population and produces more than 50% of the EU GDP. You have to cope with such a situation.

#### **Robin Thompson.**

It would be very interesting to see your map again. This map may be very frightening, since I am now responsible for producing the *Spatial Development Strategy* for London: it turns out that I am really responsible for the future of Europe, so this is very nerve-wracking,

### **Charles Lambert, France.**

As a French planner, I would like to say something. First, thank you for your presentation and the fact that you came with us today. Second, Robin said something very important: we cannot support this kind of simplification, because we made that kind of mistake one century ago in our countries – France but the UK too, I think. It is no longer in this way that we would like to propose the future to the European population. We could try to ask our 24,700 planners in the ECTP to prepare that kind of map and to give a counterpart in order to open a discussion. I am working for Marseilles Metropolitan Region and I know that it is not at all the image that Marseilles has of Europe. It is the relationships of Marseilles to Mediterranean cities which is the founding structure and not [its relationships to] the continental structure. The Mediterranean Sea was the cradle of Europe. I am sure that in Central Europe where we are now, there are some links like this through culture, relationships, many things, including individuals' families. So we should try to make such proposals more 'cultural' and maybe more acceptable for the population, to produce a European Perspective for the population. Thank you.

### **Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.**

You are perfectly right about that. I think that is the reason why there are no maps at all within the ESDP document, because of the difficulties involved. But I would like to look at a map like this as a challenge for us not living in the core of Europe. The EU and the European Commission are more or less asking us to look after ourselves and start co-operating to achieve better results, and when co-operating on these issues, we will have to use the tools defined and put forward in the ESDP. We have to find some sort of balanced, polycentric urban system in all parts of Europe, not just in the core of Europe. This could be done at different levels, not just at the global or European level but also at the national and regional level as well.

### **Peter Pillen, Belgium.**

Je voudrais enchaîner sur ce qui vient d'être dit sur la carte. Je suis géographe et urbaniste et lorsque je regarde une carte comme celle-là, je suis un peu interloqué. Pourquoi est-ce que l'on doit représenter le centre - le soi-disant centre de l'Europe - par un hexagone, et pourquoi ne pas représenter cet espace comme les autres espaces ? Pourquoi faut-il donc absolument cette figure? Est-ce qu'il n'y a pas là quelque part de la publicité subliminale pour les deux mots que nous voyons au-dessus, c'est-à-dire « Présidence Française » ? Si vous regardez cet hexagone, il suffit de le glisser un tout petit peu vers le bas et de l'agrandir un peu et vous verrez quel pays on obtient. Je ne sais pas, Charles, si il y a quelque part de la publicité subliminale de la part de la Présidence Française... Mais de toute façon, je crois que présenter une carte comme celle-là, c'est contre l'esprit même de l'intégration et de la cohésion européenne.

### **Robin Thompson.**

Maybe we should not look at this map anymore. I think the hexagon looks very hard, which is actually what it is. Could we take one or two comments and then come back to Olle Lundgren?

### **Stanislaw Furman, Poland.**

This map does not look strange for me, because we have seen drawings or maps illustrating the European space like this since a long time. I would like to recall the study by the DATAR from France and the ARL<sup>8</sup> in Berlin in 1994 in which a similar idea was presented: instead of this green ball or hexagon, they rather created a 'blue banana' of European growth stretching from mid-West England to Northern Italy through the Rhine Valley. At that time, of course, there was nothing eastward... When Peter Nijkamp wrote about European space in 1992, he said that unhappily, looking eastward from the Elbe, it is an urban desert and nothing is likely to emerge there... Now we have to confront his vision with what has actually been happening in Budapest and in Warsaw and it is up to you to judge whether these two cities are able to appear on the European map as significant centres of this European periphery. Nevertheless, although that fact should be recognised, we have to agree, Germans, French and others, that this banana from North England to North Italy is the reality of Europe. Another activity zone seems to appear, of course of a much lower rank, linked to Berlin, Budapest, Prague and so on.

Of course, many maps like this can be drawn. I am not shocked by this one, but I would like to put forward a different question. We are talking about the future of Europe at a time of metropolisation, which is strongly linked to globalisation (globalisation goes through transnational corporations and through metropolises) [Interruption of Recording]. It means that there are links between nodes. I strongly believe that we are entering the era of networks in the organisation of space, networks of flows between centres of command and financial flows. It is important to note what Saskia Sassen has emphasised: the decrease in foreign direct investment and the sharp increase in flows of finance (which grew three times faster). So in this spaceless economy, in a sense, the importance of the territorial organisation decreases at the benefit of the importance of the network.

Here I would like to put forward a question which you might consider important for the work of the Committee: should we not think more about 'development trajectories' [development axes], in relation to the idea of networks of metropolises linked by corridors along which there are trajectories [axes] of potential or accelerated development? 'Trajectory' is a very important word which require some explanation. It is not only a line, it also means something that moves along a line and initiates a chain of development. Not only the ends of the trajectory are important, but also what happens alongside the axis. There is not enough time to elaborate on this more. The *Friedrich Ebert Stiftung* published a book about the trajectory [axis] Paris-Berlin-Warsaw-Moskow as a new potential trajectory [axis] for the development of the European space. I would like to emphasise a different approach in thinking about European space, not necessarily in terms of regions or macro-regions as you emphasised, but in terms of networks of metropolises, trajectories [axes] which link them, and the network organisation of space.

I emphasise this because I come from Eastern Europe, fully aware that a real cohesion between Western Europe and our countries will be difficult to obtain. Whatever we may say, our countries will first develop in a very polarised way, regardless of the national

---

<sup>8</sup> Akademie für Raum- und Landesforschung.

policy - polarisation is inevitable. Warsaw is already far ahead from other cities in Poland but what happens in Hungary is almost incredible: 60% of all businesses are concentrated in the capital city. [Concentration processes] in these gateways of global economy are inevitable. It is through these gateways, these entry points that the space of Central and Eastern Europe will become integrated with Western Europe. For this reason, network organisation and network thinking about the European space is very important.

**Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.**

Some reflections about Stanislaw Furman's comments. I will not argue about what you said since you are probably right. I am just wondering now whether I should have shown this map, most of all because it is not a map produced by me, by Sweden or by the CSD, but by France and in the context of the CSD. But nevertheless I think I did the right thing, because it proves that a map of this kind starts a debate and that it is difficult to produce maps that are acceptable to all parties.

**Ayman Hashem, Egypt.**

I would like to ask Olle Lundgren if there are some ideas to start such co-operation between European countries and the Middle-East, in particular since some Arabic countries have individually started to sign partnership agreements with the European Union. I also have another comment for Prof. Jacek Malasek: maybe some information should be collected from the other accession countries, for example the definition of plan types (such as comprehensive or detailed development plans); the procedure for approving development plans; and some information about the expectations of each country after accession in terms of investment opportunities, the economic and social changes expected. At the end of this research, urban growth trends that can be expected could maybe also be presented. Thank you very much.

**Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.**

On the question about co-operation with the countries around the Mediterranean area: among the countries that are already invited by the Swedish Minister for spatial and regional development to participate in this initial dialogue session in June are the countries around the Mediterranean which co-operate in the MEDA programme. This actually includes all countries around the Mediterranean except one: Tunisia, Egypt, Morocco, Palestine, Israel, Algeria among others...

**Robin Thompson.**

There is a big conference on urban development being held by the Arab countries in which I should be speaking on behalf of the ECTP. I think it is organised by the Arab Development Institute, in Rhyad, in November.



### **Dušan Kostovski, Slovakia.**

I know that the EU is very careful about drawing sketches for the future spatial development of the EU, especially as regards accession countries, for fear that this will create some sort of 'directionism' towards accession countries. We do not need to be so afraid: in Slovakia, we actually used one of the spatial concepts developed during the ESDP preparatory activities, before the final ESDP document. It was made in 1996 within the framework of the SCUPARD project (I do not remember what the acronym stands for) in Austria. In one of these seminars, under the Presidency of Mr Van den Meer [spelling?] from the Netherlands, a very nice concept of spatial development of Europe has been prepared. We allowed ourselves to use it as the basis for the international context of the Spatial Development Perspective of the Slovak Republic, which is currently being updated.

On this map you can see the 'blue banana' [slide]. There is a body of 'red octopuses' showing the axes of future linear developments, as was mentioned here. Of course, this does not represent something that cannot be changed, but it can serve as a basis for future ideas. This vision is particularly interesting for Slovakia because, as you can see, one of these octopus' arms touches the territory of Slovakia through a very interesting multi-modal corridor, the Danubian corridor. We based the development of the whole territory of Slovakia on that concept. This is a key axis, about one hundred kilometres long, where the Danube reaches the territory of Slovakia. And this is the axis Vienna-Bratislava, (with maybe Győr from Hungary), a crucial axis of development of all this territory, not only for Slovakia. Here you can see how it is connected with the proposed development of a polycentric system of Slovakian cities. Here you can see the arm of the red octopus. Here you can see the Vienna-Bratislava axis, as well as the agglomeration of Katowice in Poland, and Budapest – a triangular configuration - and the rest of the territory of Slovakia and its polycentric system of cities. So you can see that we integrated all the ideas of the ESDP and the three Leipzig principles in our national Spatial Development Perspective. We will continue until it is approved at the end of the year by the Slovak government. So maybe this is our contribution to co-operation with the EU.

### **Robin Thompson.**

There is something in common here, around the idea of 'development axes', and all of these maps we are seeing have that one element in common.

### **Zygmunt Ziobrowski, Krakow, Poland.**

First I would like to say that it is an excellent idea to organise such a symposium allowing us to discuss problems which arise in many European countries, and I do hope that ideas and initiatives of such kind will continue. I have two reflections on the presentations made until now. The first concerns co-operation at the European level. It is easy to say that we should encourage co-operation, but I think it is not necessary. It is first very important to recognise the differences between particular countries, because if we want to co-operate, we should first know what are the differences, which elements do not allow for co-operation because the differences are too strong. The differences in the level of urbanisation, of space order, in the institutional and territorial organisation

of land management needs to be identified and discussed. If we are fully aware of these differences, it will be easy to argue that some of them do not prevent us to co-operate, but other ones are very strong barriers for co-operation and should be reduced.

My second comment concerns the spatial schemes which we mentioned, such as the 'blue banana' and so on – all these concepts indicate, for me, that we do not know how to represent the international spatial system. We tried to base our attempts on regional and national plans, but we do not really know how it is possible. Probably a different kind of presentation is needed and we should look for a method of representing that system. We can fight on such drawings: each country will support a different kind of *schéma* [concept map], more or less hierarchical, but it is not a problem of concept. The problem is more how to construct a European model of spatial development, how to represent the spatial problems at the European scale. My observation of the VASAB<sup>9</sup> (the regional concept around the Baltic Sea) and the INTERREG programme in Central European countries shows that we mostly base our work on statistical data only, because other kinds of information cannot present the specificity of the countries, such as regional problems and so on... So we need to work over time to reduce the distances in these domains which do not allow us to co-operate and to construct successful concepts like VASAB or other trans-regional or Europe-wide concepts.

### **Robin Thompson.**

In many ways, you are touching on themes that Prof. Klaus Kunzmann was talking about to us in December<sup>10</sup>, saying that one of the great problems for spatial planning and spatial planners is legibility for the population. Can't people understand them?

### **Ciarán Tracey, Irish Planning Institute.**

What we have seen here proves the adage that 'there is nothing new under the sun'. I was immediately struck at the whole idea which mathematicians have taken to heart, the idea of the fractal, that everything is made up of smaller pieces that have exactly the same structure. So we have a world structure which is like the European structure, which is like a national structure, which is like a county structure... Therefore we do have concerns, for example, about globalisation and conglomeration and what they are doing on a global level, and the number of world centres that we have to deal with. Then when we look at the national level, we have [the same concerns about] large centres: in Ireland for example Dublin accounts for some 60% of economic activity in the country, and Denmark is in a similar position with Copenhagen. So we have these sorts of systems where globalisation and conglomeration are forcing us into these concentrations which give rise to problems in terms of quality of life, lack of opportunity for people in the periphery and so on.

What this really highlights is the question of the role of the planner. Is the planner out there to watch this globalisation and conglomeration going on, and predict which impacts it is going to have? Is the planner's work going to be a matter of 'predict and provide'? If that was our role, I would be working in the stock exchange because I

---

<sup>9</sup> VASAB (1994), *Vision and strategy around the Baltic Sea 2010: Towards a framework for Spatial Development in the Baltic Sea Region*, Tallin: VASAB. Available on [www.vasab.org.pl/tallinn.html](http://www.vasab.org.pl/tallinn.html)

<sup>10</sup> ECTP-CEU Conference on the ESDP, London, December 2000. Proceedings available on the Web Site of the ECTP.

would be able to make a killing. But the role of the planner is, in fact, to predict in which direction these trends are going and see how we need to influence them: how do we, for example, stop this major concentration happening in these locations? How do we make sure that what we allow to happen in these concentrations is what needs to be in those concentrations? I mean those sorts of activities which cannot actually survive anywhere else and maintain the European competitiveness within these concentration areas, but do not delimit the opportunities for the more peripheral areas to carry out those tasks which can equally well be carried out in these areas. So planning is about trying to organise ourselves at whatever level we are talking about so that we can retain the competitiveness that we need to work in this globalised world market, while still disseminating the benefits to as many people within our jurisdiction - be it European, national or local. That is what we should really be concentrating on, not worrying whether it is a 'red octopus' or a 'blue banana'. In one working scheme that we had in Ireland, we actually came up with a blue octopus for our own, so as I said, there is nothing new there. What we do have to do though is to start thinking whether this is a good trend. If the answer is no, how do we start to ensure that we move the market forces in a way that gives us the best of both worlds - the best in terms of quality of life, and yet retains the competitiveness on the world stage. I would look to hear some answers to that because I will apply them when I get home.

### **Paulo Correia, Portugal.**

What I am going to say complements what Ciaran just said, to some extent. I come from Portugal, a peripheral region in the European context, which has been skipped from the Slovakian point of view on Europe, maybe because we are on the other end of the continent. I was going to ask about what happened to the 'blue banana' and 'the bundles of grapes' around it, but this has been asked several times so I will skip that question. We need to keep in mind that we are discussing the European scale, so we cannot discuss sub-European or sub-regional scales since we would lose the European perspective very easily. Without maps or without a picture, could you provide us with some indications of what will probably be the main features of the polycentric network at the European scale (meaning not only the existing EU, but the accession countries as well), and what does this mean? I do not need a picture, I just need a concept if there are concepts already. If the co-operation and the dialogue is to carry on, it means that the European Commission has ideas which it would like to test together with the people with whom it is talking. It would be very interesting to make these ideas better known to this audience - not only professionals that will have a role in building up this polycentric network. These ideas will probably represent a change of concepts from what we have known so far.

### **Virna Bussadori, Italy.**

My question has nothing to do with the map we saw. You said today that the exchange of information is vital when dealing with common problems in spatial development, but these common problems are addressed from different angles. We are very different and we have to work together. So in that sense, I presume that the ESPON will be a very important tool to facilitate these exchanges of information and good practice. But if I remember well the 12 action points presented in the programme approved in Tempere, one of them deals with that problem of exchange of information on good practice: it was an action that was supposed to establish a new European competition on future

regions. As it was explained in the action programme, this competition was supposed not only to reward good practice but also to enable the exchange of information and encourage a bigger commitment among local actors. I would like to know how far the discussion is within the CSD about the potential launching of this competition.

**Frank d'Hondt, The Netherlands.**

I am very sorry to come back on your map, but it is my job - I love maps. I was pleased to see the map and I think it is a good one: it is a wrong map, but it is good to have a map, because we miss them, we do miss them in the ESDP. Now that we are shown a map everybody is criticising it and we are wrong to just criticise it: we should improve it.

We should make a distinction between an 'analysis map' and a 'vision map'. I do not know what kind of map that is. I have the impression that it is more an analysis map, because the questionnaire - the research of the French Presidency - was about polycentrality and related issues. If their purpose on that map was only to show what is actually happening, that could be the right picture. You could criticise it, but then you have a starting point for a vision map: it should be seen as an invitation to make something better than the existing situation. On the other hand, people who are saying that the hexagon is quite aggressive to the rest of Europe, could also be wrong, but it is a question of perspective. My perception, as a citizen of that hexagon, is that it could also be seen as a modest approach to the global metropolitan areas like London and Paris as parts of a bigger area, an integrated urban zone or urban delta. For me it is not aggressive, it could be a challenging concept, also for other areas.

**Iwona Ludwiczak, Poland.**

How strongly is the programme of the ECTP connected with the UN Declaration of Istanbul<sup>11</sup>?

**Robin Thompson.**

I cannot answer that, but anyone want to answer that question?

**Charles Lambert, France.**

Ce qui nous est montré aujourd'hui, à travers votre intervention, c'est que la question posée à Virna Bussadori sur la région CADSES ("oui mais tout ce que vous faites, ça n'a pas force légale") n'était pas une bonne question (cela n'est pas un manque de respect pour celui qui l'a posée) parce que la preuve est faite que les Etats n'ont pas les meilleurs idées pour l'organisation des territoires. Je crois qu' au contraire, nous avons la chance que dans le système européen, il y ait d'autres niveaux d'organisation, et en particulier le niveau INTERREG, qui permet des initiatives, qui permet de ne pas se limiter au 'bargaining', aux marchandages des Etats, parce que ce n'est pas le sujet.

---

<sup>11</sup> UN Conference on Human Settlements (Habitat II) in Istanbul.

Mon deuxième propos, bien que ne connaissant pas encore comme il faut les pays en accession : je sais - nous savons tous - que le problème majeur, c'est la différence de niveau de vie moyen entre les populations des pays en accession et les autres. Le risque monumental est que pour des raisons de politique monétaire en particulier, on exige comme on l'a fait pour certains pays de l'Union actuelle, qu'ils rejoignent les critères monétaires ou les critères économiques à n'importe quel prix au cours des six ou dix prochaines années. En Pologne par exemple, où il y a encore 50% de la population qui vit dans les zones rurales - pas de l'agriculture mais dans les zones rurales - si on les presse à développer des modèles qui ressemblent tellement au reste, toute cette population va être obligée de venir dans les villes, faisant à nouveau les mêmes erreurs qu'on a fait à la fin du 19ème siècle avec l'industrialisation dans l'ensemble des pays d'Europe. Et cela ne se traduit pas dans les cartes telles que nous les faisons.

Mon troisième propos est de penser que, justement, nous ne sommes pas bons, nous les urbanistes et les géographes, en cartographie. Bien sûr, Frank, tu as raison de dire que c'était une bonne carte puisqu'elle suscite le débat, mais en terme de communication à une période de l'histoire du monde où la communication est un élément majeur, nous n'avons pas fait le progrès qu'il faut, et nous devons trouver des modes d'expression. Je pense que nous pourrions lancer un jour un concours pour ces modes d'expression à cette échelle-là puisque par ailleurs, on se sent capable de travailler à ces échelles. Il faudrait vraiment qu'on les développe vite, qu'on trouve des systèmes de représentation, d'évocation qui évitent de mettre par défaut l'image d'un rameur sur une rivière quand on veut exprimer quelque chose du développement durable.

### **Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.**

I will not intervene in the discussion on whether we should have these kinds of maps. Regarding the question from Portugal, whether there is a [spatial] concept within the Commission or the EU, the straight answer is that there is nothing like this within the EU. We do have those studies however, some that certain countries have taken on, like for example the one you have seen here from France on 'balanced' and 'polycentric urban development', which seems to be the key word for the future. These aspects could be amended and developed in more depth within the ESPON programme, which is open to take up new questions.

As regards the question from Italy on the exchange of information, I am not fully aware of what has happened to the project of competition between regions that was, as you said, part of the Tempere activity programme. But to my surprise, as I visited Bonn a month ago, I saw on the wall of the BBR that there had been such a competition with a winner, but I do not actually know about the procedures that have led up to this competition. Perhaps more important is that the Action Programme also stated that there should be an exchange of experiences between INTERREG co-operation areas gained during the Interreg IIC programme period. I know that the Commission is now preparing for specific funding to be able to establish such exchanges of information in co-ordinated forms. Hopefully there will be possibilities for that in the near future.

### **Robin Thompson.**

There is a specific question which was asked on the issue of the Charter of Athens and the Habitat Declaration and whether there was a sort of synergy between them. Maybe you could talk to Charles in the tea break.

This morning we have discussed some of the issues and problems for the accession countries; this afternoon we discussed some of the issues and problems for all of us, and perhaps in our last session we could begin to focus on what are some of the things we could do, in particular what could ECTP do. We are not going to solve all of these problems but there are things we can do and we want to do. We would like by the end of this session to be in a position to be saying to all our members, to the CSD and to the outside world: here are some of the initiatives that we are going to be taking to help to deal with some of these issues of enlargement.

Just as a way of perhaps triggering off some ideas about our responses, one of the things we were hearing was the importance of the ESPON, and the imminence of some decisions on developments of this observatory network. One or two people were saying this morning very forcibly that there is an issue here of information and communication, and ESPON offers one of the most important prospects for collaboration. Robert Upton feels that there is an initiative we ought to be taking together in responding to ESPON.

### **Robert Upton, ECTP General Secretary.**

I am following on from this morning's discussion, taking the point that Olle Lundgren was making earlier on this afternoon and what Karel Meier was saying this morning. It seems to me that the formal extension of the ESPON network into the candidate countries would be a useful and constructive step to take, generating the sort of information on a comparable basis which would inform discussion about the development of spatial planning throughout Europe. As I understand it, the only way in which the ESPON network could extend would be if the National governments of the candidate countries were to apply for PHARE funding under the PHARE programme, which means that each of them would have to decide that this is what they wanted to do. That raises the question in my mind whether it would be a useful and legitimate role for ECTP to try to put together a sort of formal proposal, which collectively and through the individual organisations we could put to the governments of the candidate countries to encourage them to make this bid. We would have to move very fast indeed, because if I understood Olle Lundgren correctly, it really is something which needs to be sorted out in the next couple of months. and I would hope that this would be part of the preparation work for the review of the ESDP, which I hope will become a task of CSD in the not-too-distant future, one which will be fully informed and capable of extension to the accession countries. That is my modest proposal.

### **Robin Thompson.**

I suspect there would be a lot of support for that. I am conscious that not every one here is in or has access to national government, but most of you probably would be in a position to influence your governments. It does seem to me that it is a very tangible proposition which those of you from the accession countries might like to take away from today. We would certainly, as ECTP, be very pleased to support that proposition. We can probably write a letter making the proposition but it is going to need internal

pushing in order to mobilise that. But this concrete action would be a terribly valuable thing to happen.

**Karel Maier, Czech Republic.**

I fully support this idea and the idea that national governments should be somehow involved in this activity, because the EU is probably a good instrument to get the national governments of accession countries involved in this process and to make them feel responsible for that area and use the outcomes of these activities as a background for the decision-making.

**Ciarán Tracey, IPI, Ireland.**

Would it not also be worthwhile getting the existing national governments of the countries which are already represented on ESPON to also support the inclusion of the accession countries, and through our institute maybe lobby our own national governments to give support to such a move?

**Robin Thompson.**

That seems to me a very good suggestion.

**Olle Lundgren, Chair of the CSD.**

Just a quick response to the last intervention. It is quite clear that the present EU members are supporting the enlargement of the ESPON programme - there is no doubt about that. The task here is a technical task - where to obtain funding for that research to be done. Within the EU, funding will be found from the Structural Funds, but the Structural Funds cannot be used outside the EU. We have other instruments, among them PHARE funding for accession countries. To be able to use PHARE funding for ESPON, your national governments have to be willing and prepared for that.

**Robin Thompson.**

That is a specific set of actions that we ought to take away from today. I would like to raise another. Many of you but by no means everyone here were at the Assembly meeting yesterday. We did discuss before that the ECTP, which for the moment has three Working Groups, should form a fourth Working Group specifically to look at the issues of enlargement and the accession countries. This was a proposition from Slovenia and it seems to me that we could endorse that decision. The discussion today shows that it is something that the ECTP now very much should take on board.

I do not suppose anyone is going to dissent from that. The activities of our old Working Groups, which include the areas of education, professional development, practice and policy will all need to look at the implications of accession. But having a focus for the discussion on enlargement will be very important, and we will obviously get in touch with all our colleagues from the accession countries with the idea of developing that network.

It is important that we do agree one or two concrete actions. There has been some very stimulating debate but it is always good to be able to follow-up by saying “this is what we are going to do about it”. Can I now open up the discussion again on proposals as to what we should be doing.

### **Maro Evangelidou, Greece.**

Je croyais que la discussion précédente était déjà finie. Je voulais simplement souligner que cette fameuse carte n’était pas si mauvaise que cela, dans le sens suivant : je crois qu’elle est une constatation – « facts are facts », comme il a été dit. Mais je me réfère à l’observation de Frank – c’est déjà un pas en avant par rapport à la ‘banane’, dans le sens où elle illustre la constatation que le coeur de l’Europe, c’est ce fameux hexagone. Les espaces autour de cela doivent se trouver leur propre cohésion en tant qu’espaces compétitifs au niveau mondial et donc cela lance une nouvelle idée de la part de la Commission qui est entrée actuellement dans le project Interreg III.

En voyant cela du point de vue de la Méditerranée par exemple, à laquelle on appartient, le but de faire que la Méditerranée sorte de sa propre périphérie par rapport à l’hexagone est un but important du point de vue cohésion territoriale. Je n’ai donc pas aimé cette réaction un peu négative par rapport à une constatation et je crois que, comme le SDEC qui est un document qui peut être lu interprété selon plusieurs points de vue, cette carte aussi peut être lue de divers points de vue. Pour la Méditerranée, c’est une carte qui peut lancer une trajectoire positive parce que la Méditerranée, dans toutes les cartes précédentes, soit la banane, soit l’octopus, n’était pas considérée comme territoire. D’ailleurs, est-ce que la mer est un territoire ? Pourtant c’est le territoire historiquement le plus cohérent de l’Europe et cette histoire, cette constatation peuvent être utilisées avec les idées du SDEC pour lancer sa stratégie.

### **Frank d’Hondt, The Netherlands.**

You asked for concrete propositions to follow up the debate about enlargement and the ‘common future’: we have discovered that there is not only an issue about the impact in two ways of enlargement, but there is also a discussion on common future [visions] and maybe also common maps. As regards map-making, I am just wondering if we could not organise in one of the forthcoming general assemblies a sort of one-day seminar about producing, the ideas behind maps, the understanding of maps, the symbols and the concepts we use. A good technique which could possibly be used could be ‘group decision room’, whereby you make a map and give it to neighbour so that he can react on what you have done: you then have a sort of interactive map making, not only a discussion on a map that was made by one person, one authority or one ‘power of idea’. It is a collective making. Is there is a possibility for such a workshop.

### **Robin Thompson.**

That is obviously an idea we can pursue. I would link it to the contribution from our colleague from Krakow, which is the question of how do we translate that, how do we make that legible and understandable for the people for whom we are planning? A lot of what we heard this morning was about the marginalisation or unpopularity of planning



and planners. There is a complex set of reasons for that, but one is a sense that this very complex activity that we engage in is one we find great difficulty in communicating. So those two ideas are ones that could be brought together - not just thinking about spatial development and mapping that, but also about how we communicate that.

### **Marco Cremaschi, Italy.**

These maps are useful at least because they made us laugh. I have another point to make, which has been left aside a little bit in the presentation of Olle Lundgren, about the effectiveness of the ESDP for policy-making in the investment [allocation] of the European Structural Funds. It was the main conclusion of the Tampere meeting, and this is a critical point of action for us. I wonder, back to maps, whether the image of Europe may change, depending on it being seen from Brussels or from Slovakia, the South of Italy or Portugal... The strength of ECTP is that we produce an image from the periphery towards Brussels, so we can give information for the deepening and the increase in awareness of the ESDP. I also wonder whether we could imagine to see an active role [for the ECTP] in what Virna Bussadori has called 'project generation', which is actually the critical point for the implementation of a general scheme like the ESDP. We could be able to survey the project generation of Structural Funds across Europe and present a critical survey of best practice. That could be a strong contribution to the reflection on the ESDP and maybe the drawing of new maps, new 'visions' for Europe. Maybe this could be done in the form of databases of best practices like the one made by the United Nations<sup>12</sup>. If we are able to work, and I am sure that we are, with all our 40,000 planners spread across Europe to gather useful examples and ground information on what is going on, that would be an extremely useful contribution. Presumably this could part of the programme of Working Group No. 4, but that could be a good way to deal with the CSD and the ESDP achievements.

### **Robin Thompson.**

We did agree yesterday that as an assembly we would want to bring forward a programme of best practice, and we have already agreed that at our next meeting we will have one from Hungary. In that way, we can start building up a 'dossier'. Secondly we have been discussing the idea of the Award Scheme as a mechanism for doing that, and Virna Bussadori did actually have a word about that in the tea break.

Your comment also stimulated a thought in me that there has been virtually no discussion about the Structural Funds throughout the day, although the view from Ireland, Portugal or perhaps Greece, is that one of the bigger implications of enlargement is that they are going to lose very large amounts of Structural Funds. If you take the case of Ireland, Structural Funds have been an enormous contributor to a great revitalisation of the Irish economy. I do not think that any of our colleagues from the Accession Countries have once mentioned the Structural Funds. Two or three of them actually said that enlargement would make no difference to them. So I have a question: are you really writing off the Structural Funds? Are you actually saying to us that this market-driven anti-planning 'mood' is so profound that the Structural Funds will not make a difference? It is just a curiosity that this issue has never arisen throughout the day.

### **Miran Gajšek, Slovenia.**

I have one proposal. Next year may be the time for a common symposium or seminar of all European organisations related to planning. This year, for example, the World Planning Seminar takes place in Beijing, China. It is important to have a common symposium with ECTP, AESOP<sup>13</sup>, the Council of Europe and maybe the CSD or DG XVI, on the theme of [common spatial] strategies and policies in Europe. It is only by combining government administrations, associations and chambers and schools of planning that we can do something on this very strategic activity - how to find some good spatial strategies and good spatial policies for Europe.

### **Vesselina Troeva, Bulgaria.**

We heard a lot of colleagues talking about the exchange of information, but my modest opinion is that to exchange something we first have to have this information properly collected, updated by well-trained professionals and in the right format. It means not only [developing the] 'hardware' or 'software', it also means a new organisational culture. I am not familiar with the existing situation in accession and pre-accession countries, but we heard in a previous presentation that in Poland too, like in Bulgaria, the existing archives have been destroyed, and monopoly on information was established.

If we want to exchange information, we should probably do something for establishing an information network, first of all. In our country today, as well as in Romania and in Greece, a digital *cadastre* system has been established with links with the legislation and tax valuation system. There is some digital information on agricultural lands and on forests, but almost nothing adequate for protected areas although this information is of vital importance for spatial planning. What we need in this area is some support to establish regulations for access to information and use of information; well-developed systems for data collection, storage, and updating. We need to improve the training not only of professionals but also of local authority staff who have to deal with this information and to establish a Geographical Information network. This is going to be the first step for our countries towards the global information system.

### **Adam Kowalewski, Poland.**

Robin Thompson put forward a question regarding expectations about the Structural Funds. Our expectations are great. If Poland would get a share of the Structural Funds in 2003, according to the EU budget for 2000-2006, it would mean that the Polish Government would have 8 times more money to spend for regional policy than it has allocated up to now - eight times more than the whole allocation for regional policy in the country's budget. So you understand what it means. But it is not only a question of getting money or matching the Structural Funds: an even more difficult issue is to use these Funds efficiently and be able to prepare projects. I am not now talking about physical planning. But in Poland, in a country which is in a terrible need to increase its capacity for innovation, we [would] pay to the EU budget more for promoting scientific

---

<sup>13</sup> Association of European School of Planning.

research than we get from the Union, because we are unable to prepare the projects which would be accepted by the EU.

There are many opportunities in the areas of physical planning and local development, already now, to use the Funds provided by the EU from other funds. The problem is that local authorities lack skills, and that very complicated bureaucratic procedures make it difficult for people to prepare projects and to argue for projects. It would be a great field of action for the ECTP to provide assistance or support the exchange of know-how on how to get through that bureaucratic, very complicated and very demanding procedure to define and justify projects, in particular local projects in the framework of INTERREG. Because of these limitations we cannot properly use European funding at the moment. It would be possible to finance some projects in accession countries if it is a joint venture, if the project is prepared with two or three cities in the existing EU who would link to one project in accession countries. I am not expert in the system of [EU] financing but this could be a good opportunity. If the town planners, as members of the civil service who can influence people there, could initiate such an initiative – “fine, we are doing our project within the EU Structural Funds, let us join with one city in accession countries and give a help” - that would be a great thing.

### **Robin Thompson.**

This is a very serious issue, because I have had thirty years of management experience and I know that the most difficult thing of all is to spend a lot of new money. That is the most difficult management problem by far. Secondly, probably the biggest management failing of all is that you do not learn from your mistakes and especially from other people’s mistakes. We in the West, have had a lot of experience, a lot of it has been bad, some of it has been good, and there is a lot of learning. In countries like Ireland and other countries, some of that has been very good, some of it has been very bad, and I can think of one or two examples where it has been downright criminal.

It is very clear from what Olle Lundgren has told us that there is now a very strong linkage between regional development, the Regional Funds and spatial planning. So a very important task about which we could think is how we could assist the Accession Countries not by telling them “this is how you do it”, but just as much by saying “this is not to do it. Can we give examples of what has been done? How do you find your way through this jungle? If you are not careful, 80% of the effort goes into the [application and preparation] process. Some of us have scars because we have spent thirty years in the jungle. Maybe we can help you survive a little better. This is quite ambitious, but it seems to me that this is something we should think about very seriously (maybe there are other programmes already in place – I have not heard about them today).

Perhaps I could link this to another point, which is the Compendium idea. Many of you will know that a compendium of planning systems in Europe was produced, which is a very helpful learning tool<sup>14</sup>. We were going to propose today [that this work should be extended to accession countries]. What I did not know is that our Polish colleagues had

---

<sup>14</sup> Commission of the European Communities (1997), *The EU compendium of spatial planning systems and policies: Comparative review of systems and policies*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

go us so far along the road of starting a compendium. A bid to extend and enlarge the compendium could be very powerful now. We are not just saying “we would like to do this”, we are saying: “we have done some of this work; we have had a major international symposium where we discussed it; there is a solid basis of work which we want to carry on”. That seems to me a strong basis for funding. I repeat that this is not an idea of the ‘West’ telling how to do it, it’s a learning process.

## **4. Conclusion and proposals for future action.**

### **Summing up, concluding comments and proposals for future action, by Robin Thompson, President of the ECTP.**

I would now like to make 11 proposals. It might be too early and too many but I am going to make them anyway and you can vote them down. First of all, we have heard a great deal about how difficult the great task of enlargement is, especially for the accession countries. We heard immensely powerful contributions about the inherited problems - enormous, severe, economic, physical, social, environmental problems, governmental problems, problems of a loss of skills, problems of corruption, problems that the speakers felt very emotional and strongly about. We heard about the differential effects of the market economy, of some cities marching ahead and of other cities falling very badly behind. We heard about the understandable tendency for the reassertion of national identity, customs and borders and the risk that cross-border collaboration might be impeded by that. It is important to say that those are very difficult problems but that life does go in cycles. To go back to my own area, we have just gone through a cycle, perhaps at a different stage of evolution: the city of London has moved from not having any spatial/development planning for the city as a whole for twenty years, to a situation where there is now a statutory duty to produce a spatial strategy (not a development plan) for London. So these things do go in cycles and maybe they can change. There are things that we can do together, which of course cannot fundamentally alter some of the big forces that have been talked about, but can assist.

One of the conclusions of the December symposium was that there are two unhelpful positions for spatial planners: the first is the one sometimes adopted – that we are on ‘top of the world’, we are directing the world, we are telling the world what to do, we are drawing it on maps, and the world will go away and do what we tell them. We have all learned that this is unsuccessful because the world and its foolishness does not always listen to us. The second unhelpful position is where the world is sitting ‘on top of’ the spatial planner, and the spatial planner is squashed by the whole world. That is not a very good position either because the world is very heavy. What we were talking about in December is a position in which the spatial planner is in the middle of this world, not being very small, and not pulling all the strings neither, but being at the centre and using these skills of co-ordination, of pulling together. One of the thoughts we had is that we live in a market economy in which the private sector is very powerful, so let us just intrude ourselves more than we have done into the private sector. That is possible; there are actually many situations where the private sector itself values the co-ordinating, predictive and analytical forecasting skills of the planner. So there are strategies that we can adopt that might position us in better places. Let me come on to the eleven suggestions.

- The first, we already heard, is to encourage the accession countries and their governments to participate in an enlarged and renewed ESPON programme.
- The second proposition is that we should consider a bid, probably through the PHARE programme, for an extension of the Compendium of Planning Systems, developing the work that we heard about today.
- The third, which is agreed now, is that we ourselves will set up a working group on the accession countries. We have a group, we have a new chairman and we will now encourage all of the accession countries to engage in that activity.
- A fourth proposition is that we will hold another assembly meeting in another accession country. We do not want you to feel that we have come to Warsaw, we have done that and 'off we go', back to elsewhere. In fact we are committed to having an assembly in Cyprus, which is an accession country. That will give us next year an opportunity for that working group to come back and discuss again the progress.
- Fifthly, we are committed to take the proceedings from today: we intend to develop those as we did with the December Symposium and to publish them as a record of the discussion. We would naturally want our colleagues in the CSD and elsewhere as well to have the opportunity to consider those.
- Sixthly, we are committed to reconsider our membership policy and we need to think about ways in which membership of ECTP can be more readily available for the accession and candidate countries. It is clear to me that there is a very great deal of collaboration and learning that can be done within our own body.
- Seventhly, a theme was coming through the whole afternoon about learning and exchange. One of the great strengths that we have, with our 25,000 members, is that we can share. We want to develop the idea of best practice and those should be ideas that are valuable to the accession countries as well as to others. And there are other ideas around about future events of this kind, maybe involving other bodies.
- Eighthly, we are committed to continue and develop our award scheme for planning achievement. It is very important that this scheme is extended to accession countries. We actually found that one of the ways in which you can get people to be enthusiastic about planning is when you show them good examples, through photographs or walking tours. Good examples, for that matter, are a very powerful learning mechanism. We will continue our effort to find the appropriate format for the Award Scheme which should certainly include the accession countries.
- Ninthly, Frank d'Hondt proposed to us map [making]. We, planners, get very excited about maps: it only needed a very innocent map - just a little record of something - to be there and everyone's hand in the room went up. So we could think more about this. Maps are powerful instruments. I felt there were a common theme coming out, whether they were 'octopuses', 'bananas', 'grapes' or hexagons, around these ideas, as was explained, of axes of development, of development corridors.
- We then need to think about participating in the review of the ESDP itself. In an environment in which we do not have a competence, as we heard, for spatial planning, the

ESDP remains a very powerful instrument. Like all instruments it needs to be updated, and in this instance it very clearly needs to be developed. We all understand that it is not enough to have an ESDP with a chapter saying “by the way, the accession countries”. There now has to be a new ESDP which among other things looks at the accession countries. We very much want to collaborate in that endeavour.

- Finally, the issue that was coming through towards the end of our discussions is very important, i.e. about Structural Funds. No one minimises the problems that the accession and candidate countries face – they are enormous. Someone was mentioning that these countries had 50% or less of the GDP of the current EU countries. This is a vast difference and no one would pretend that the Structural Funds on their own will solve that problem. But they can be immensely powerful instruments of spatial planning and regional development. In that regard we can act as brokers, offering our experiences, showing our wounds, maybe showing some of our successes, because [the sudden availability of these Structural Funds] will be a shock. This figure mentioned before - eight times, suddenly you have eight times more money than you had - it is impossible [to manage]. We know in England that when anybody wins the football pools, they go insane because they do not know what to do with this money. It is a really serious issue that we should look at.

These are some thoughts. We cannot actually do everything at the same time since we have our own limitations, but we will want to do much of that. The last thing which I would like to say is that despite the severity of problems, one of the things that stroke me most about today was the passion with which people were speaking. This is something about which people feel passionately and it was particularly clear with our Polish colleagues. In all of the contributions there is a shared passion about these issues of spatial development and about achieving that in ways which are best for people, minimising some of the damage we see going on, and re-asserting the value of spatial planning.

Thank you very much to all of our speakers, to the translators, to Judith Eversley and to the city of Warsaw which has been very generous to us. Special thanks to the TUP, to Bogdan and all of his colleagues, for what was an immensely enjoyable event. Thank you all for attending.