



**The EU Wants Territorial Cohesion:
Can spatial planners make it happen?**

Mark Tewdwr-Jones

Abstract

This paper stems from a symposium entitled “The EU Wants Territorial Cohesion: Can spatial planners make it happen?”, arranged by the European Council of Spatial Planners (ECTP), the Royal Town Planning Institute and the UK Communities & Local Government Department, and held at Eland House, London, on 8 February 2008. The purpose of the event was to consider territorial cohesion as an objective of the EU Territorial Agenda, as agreed in Leipzig, and its Implementation Programme agreed in Lisbon. This European agenda calls for an integrative territorial approach to resolve problems and provides challenges for spatial planning practitioners. These challenges arise from environmental problems, climate change, transport and mobility, integrated water and coastal zone management, suburbanization, loss of biodiversity and fragmentation of natural and cultural heritage. This paper provides a summary of the presentations given during the day and attempts to develop some key themes on the concepts relating to territorial cohesion that emerged from the day.

Introduction

Paul Hudson, Chief Planner in UK Government, began by welcoming delegates, and outlined how the UK Government provided a strong presence at Leipzig and in the Azores where ministers were committed to taking the cohesion agenda forward. The next year would prove to be difficult to define territorial cohesion and develop it further. Within the UK, a number of illustrations of current practice provide useful examples of how a response is being shaped and how the territorial agenda is being kept alive practically within one member state. These illustrations comprise:

1. The reform of the planning system. A planning Bill is currently progressing through the UK Parliament, to deal with the determination of major infrastructure projects that have not only UK but EU implications. The Bill is intended to provide a common framework to analyse and plan for large projects in the future, that may provide lessons for the rest of Europe.
2. The development of strategies at the regional level. A balance has to be found between national, regional and democratic institutions in respect of planning and infrastructure. A key question is whether regions are the optimum scale to deal with spatial strategies. Some regions possess imperfect regional boundaries, based on history and previous growth that may not now conform to new patterns of development. The development of regional strategies at this scale and between different institutions may not be appropriate and there is a need to simplify the process. The UK Government is currently proposing Integrated Regional Strategies that bring together the existing regional economic strategies of the Regional Development Agencies with the regional spatial strategies of the regional assemblies, with the intention of creating an integrated comprehensive regional economic development and spatial planning framework in England. Work on this is already occurring in the other UK countries, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.
3. The relationship between planning and climate change. Most people may recognise the problem but not many know how to deal with it, and spatial planning may be able to assist us in this task. A Climate Change Bill is currently before Parliament and provides an opportunity to deal with this issue practically on a day to day basis, allowing mitigation through development proposals at all policy-making scales. Climate change is the big issue for territorial cohesion and will prove to be a test of both spatial planning and the territorial agenda.
4. The challenges of demography and migration. A significant issue for the UK is how to deal with housing supply while meeting diverse interests and pressures. The Government is committed to ensuring million new homes are provided by 2020, million of these within the next eight years. The Government is looking to planning to deal with and resolve these issues.

5. The provision of pan-regional development approaches. These approaches, which stretch beyond the boundaries of individual local and regional authorities, provide unique challenges and opportunities. One example of these is the Thames Gateway development, east of London, covering 100,000 hectares, one of the largest development projects in Europe. 1.5 million people already reside in the Gateway area and it is in many ways a region in itself, even if it does not conform to traditional regional boundaries. Integration is important, with the need to bring together housing, transport, and infrastructure provision. People will harness their activities through programmes known as Multi Area Agreements in a coherent and integrated way that makes sense on the ground.

These examples illustrate spatial planning at a large scale, against the backdrop of the territorial agenda. They demonstrate commitment to action but also how to translate the agenda into practical realities. Several issues need to be addressed across Europe in order to ensure the territorial agenda is realised further. These encompass:

- a) The need to address European issues in a coherent way through maps and plans, and the contribution of ESPON outputs. This is a challenge, to map different comparative data, but is essential and a central part of carrying through the territorial agenda throughout Europe with a robust evidence base.
- b) The need to work with a range of groups across Europe, such as ECTP, since the professional contribution is essential.
- c) The need to continue with the Interreg programme, and achieve cross-border working and promote results.

The territorial agenda provides an opportunity to embark on an exciting journey. With the territorial agenda in place, a work programme for the next year can take place. The challenge will be to question what this means practically and politically for ministers within their own constituencies, and show how the EU is making a difference.

Virna Bussadori, ECTP president, set an introduction for the day's events, and stated that this would be the first of three conferences in 2008 to address territorial cohesion and its spatial implications. Planners wanted to know about territorial cohesion and these conferences would be important to flesh out the meaning and practical implications. ECTP would provide a central role in Europe, representing planners and at the same time providing guidance to them, and would assist the institutions of the EU as they progressed their work. There are over 27,000 planners in Europe and the ECTP, extant since 1985, is playing an increasingly important role in the emerging spatial policy debate across the continent. The objectives of ECTP are:

1. To promote spatial planning as a relevant public interest in the quality of urban places and spatial development.
2. To promote planning practitioners as experts in territorial cohesion and competitiveness.
3. To enhance the position of planners in Europe, defining professional responsibilities and exchanging ideas, knowledge and practice.
4. To contribute towards best education of planners and of standards, by encouraging training and educational exchanges, and facilitate the free circulation of planners across Europe.
5. To support the planners of Europe without prejudice to different cultures, and to represent the different associations of planning in Europe.

ECTP cooperates with EU wide institutions, and the New Charter of Athens 2003 provides its agreed vision for cities of the new millennium. The intention is to help planners, politicians and others in the future development of Europe, through the 'connected cities' concept functionally, economically and physically in different networks.

The Territorial Agenda: Background and Definition

Andreas Faludi provided a background to territorial cohesion as an academic observer, rather than a participant. The EU has always possessed an implicit territorial agenda although the EU did not necessarily refer to it as an agenda. We may view the ESDP as the 'mother' document, since it articulated a territorial agenda. But the concept of territorial cohesion has taken hold and is relevant in consideration of developments after 2009 when the Lisbon Treaty comes in to force and a territorial agenda of the EU commences.

The 1999 publication of the ESDP was the culmination of a long process of discussion about the EU territory that first commenced in the period 1989-93. These discussions have been bedevilled by the competence issue continuously: namely, does the EU have any right to talk about this? Member states have denied the EU the right to discuss this which has been frustrating for the Commission. As developments have proceeded and since the EU has no formal right to discuss spatial planning, the EU has jumped on territorial cohesion and viewed it as an opportunity. Territory is implicit in economic and social cohesion. The Constitution had included a clause on territorial cohesion and stipulated that it would be an objective of the EU and a shared competence with member states. After 2000, the Lisbon agenda put cohesion policy in the service of the Lisbon strategy. But debate has continued about its merits. The Sapir Report of

2003/4 which set an agenda for growing Europe, stressed the need for flexibility in industry and the importance of growth, and proposed new economic policies and new delivery mechanisms around the existing Trans-European Networks, and simultaneously criticised cohesion policy. This occurred at the same time as the 2007-13 EU financial regime was being discussed, where member states embarked on a heated debate about the switch in allocation of funding from older to newer member states. The EU placed cohesion policy in the Lisbon strategy and emphasised the importance of increased competitiveness of the EU as an aspect of territorial cohesion. This also emphasised the importance of national and regional frameworks within the EU, and the community programmes, which would provide an implicit territorial cohesion policy – implicit because the Constitution is not yet ratified.

The period of May and June 2005 is significant because evidence-based documents assumed territorial cohesion would be a shared competence. This evidence stemmed from ESPON research work and pointed to the member states and the Commission taking major initiatives. But what was needed was to convince the policy sector specialists that territory was an important consideration. The Rotterdam summit of 2004 confirmed the role of the member states and affirmed territory as a sector specialist matter. The white paper on territorial cohesion of 2005 pointed towards new forthcoming legislation on the matter, but all this was dashed when the Constitution did not come about. The member states have since recognised the need for territorial cohesion.

At this time, the Dutch and French regained the initiative, and commenced reconvening ministerial meetings, assisted by Luxembourg. The UK has been a reluctant player but has nevertheless been professional in her activities. Professionals have met to discuss this with Austria organising a seminar as a means by which Germany and other countries could be brought together for discussions. Subsequent meetings in the Azores in 2007 proposed territorial cohesion and regional policy but the task now lies with Slovenia to place the territorial agenda before the Council in April 2008. Key issues emerging at this time and requiring attention have included climate change and energy prices, globalisation, enlargement, the exploitation of ecological and cultural resources, and demographic decline. The policy priorities emerging from these key issues include polycentric development, innovation, governance between urban and rural areas, promoting clusters across borders, extension of the TENs, risk management, ecological structures, and culture. Some of these themes are new, but really they are an update of the ESDP in a slightly different form, although there remain mismatches between some challenges and priorities (e.g. climate change).

For the future, the Lisbon treaty will come into operation on 1 January 2009. The EC is currently working on a green paper, based on questionnaires and other information, setting out a role for European territorial cooperation and a requirement for territorial cohesion in national strategic reference frameworks

and in community programmes. The fundamental issues that lie ahead concern: 1. The nature of Europeanisation, what this actually means and the concepts in use, and what role do nation states possess in this process; 2. The role of territoriality under Europeanisation, and whether this is a prerogative of nation states or not; and 3. The role of spatial planning in all of this.

Exploring Territorial cohesion

Roberto Camagni's paper, delivered by Virna Bussadori, set out to define and explore territorial cohesion. The Third Cohesion Report of 2004 presented territorial cohesion as a synonym of balanced development and avoiding territorial imbalances, avoiding growth solely in the pentagon area, emphasising metropolitan and hinterland functionality, counteracting social exclusion, urban sprawl and other geographical handicaps. The report of the informal ministerial meeting in Rotterdam outlined the issues in the following way: "territorial cohesion adds to the concept of economic and social cohesion by translating the fundamental EU goal of balanced and sustainable development into a territorial setting". At the Luxembourg meeting in 2005, this definition of territorial development remains the same but acquires a new practical meaning: "In practical terms territorial cohesion implies: focusing regional and national territorial development policies on better exploiting regional potentials and territorial capital – Europe's territorial and cultural diversity; better positioning of regions in Europe... facilitating their connectivity and territorial integration; and promoting the coherence of EU policies with a territorial impact...". The definition of territorial cohesion has therefore been extended: spatial development policy aiming at territorial cohesion should include regional competition and sustainability issues. Territorial cohesion can be explained in four dimensions:

- a) The technological dimension, governing production processes;
- b) The behavioural dimension, determining lifestyles, consumption habits and also organizational models of production
- c) The diplomatic dimension, referring to the international strategies to assure cooperation among countries at different development levels, with different development expectations, and
- d) The territorial dimension, residing in an ordered, resource efficient and environmental friendly spatial distribution of human activities.

Taking into consideration these dimensions, it is possible to envisage three main components of the definition of territorial cohesion, namely:

1. Territorial quality, the quality of the living and working environment; comparable living standards across territories; similar access to services of general interest and to knowledge;

2. Territorial efficiency, resource efficiency with respect to energy, land and natural resources; competitiveness of the economic fabric and attractiveness of the local territory; internal and external accessibility; and
3. Territorial identity, presence of social capital; capability of developing shared visions of the future; local know-how and specificities, productive vocations and competitive advantage of each territory.

What counts is the overall result, not any single dimension. It also applies to all kinds of territories, and therefore to all cities. Territorial identities: are incorporated in local culture, know-how, social capital and landscape, and represent the ultimate glue of local societies; they are linked with the spatial division of labour and in many cases determine its evolution; and facilitate processes of collective learning and consequently boost the efficiency of the local production fabric. Identities evolve but may be easily destroyed by spatial processes such as those of economic decline and desertification, peripheralisation and lack of accessibility, destruction of the natural heritage, and trivialization of the territorial landscape through sprawling settlements. Two figures were then presented outlining the components of territorial cohesion, and an integrated strategy for territorial cohesion, objectives and assessment criteria.

New opportunities are arising for the implementation of more robust territorial policies in the EU. There remains work to be done, but the final step must be taken by the member states and the regions. The European scientific community has a significant responsibility and also a great opportunity to contribute towards the development of a European planning culture, based on the best national policy traditions and the best scientific theorizations, and sensitive to the new challenges of the third millennium.

Strategic Planning Towards Territorial Cohesion

Jan Vogelij outlined his paper on the relationship between strategic spatial planning and territorial cohesion, and commenced by asking whether spatial planning and spatial planners can make territorial cohesion happen.

The answer is, yes – in theory. It can happen but there are presently obstacles for its development and involvement. Spatial planners can make territorial cohesion happen if there is a focus on comprehensive spatial development informed by analytical evidence, design, and comprehensive proposals to achieve balanced sustainable solutions across interconnecting scales. It is also possible if planning education combines scientific research, analytical facts and creative designs into a synthesizing solution. There presently exists experience in national planning and in the development of spatial visions and in the formulation of regional strategies and plans. There are over 27,000 planners in

the EU and these professionals have the skills and competence to work on territorial agendas. But there are tensions ahead.

There is a tension, for example, between long term sustainability and short term horizons, as measured through the need to deliver results politically between elections. Private sector partners also need to see a return on their investments in a just a few years. These two issues put strategic visioning and development at the mercy of short term gains. There is also a tension in the form of administrative organisations where planning is often divided between sectors and specialists, with ongoing concerns over power-play and the necessity to coordinate continually, making spatial planning relatively weak and prone to breakdowns in communication and agreement between actors. Finally, there is also a tension with the image of planners and of the planning discipline, which makes portraying the potential of planning problematic. Research in planning only tends to reveal further questions, not answers, with abstract designs and an overt regulatory focus which can be limiting. The defence of cultural and natural values by planners, confronted with economic forces, seems to be backward looking.

Further obstacles concern a lack of unity in national and regional legislation, which differ in each member state. Different planning schools focus on different planning subjects, or specialise in research or design, analysis versus synthesis, facts versus values, process versus project, and reports versus maps, making a coherent discipline and argument for coherent planning difficult. Sustainable planning processes can deliver fast results and demonstrable successes, in long term processes, regularly providing the evidence needed to continue support of politicians and private sector partners. Education needs to improve especially in the fields of economics, ecology, decision making, training and consultation, synthesising, integration, and design. More coherence within the discipline is required, especially the name we give ourselves. Are we spatial planners, urban planners, territorial planners, urbanists, or architects (even though the latter is a misnomer)? There is also confusion over the role of a spatial planner because of prevalent negative image of a regulatory planner. On the other hand, in some countries, the spatial planner is not even allowed to sign off spatial plans – a right accorded only to architects. And there is a concern that planning schools do not all teach and train according to the current requirements. Official recognition for their curriculum and training would help. The discipline of spatial planners needs to be recognised by the EU and by national governments. Professional organisations like the ECTP can only support this.

The way forward to achieve territorial cohesion is to build on a common vision for the future development of a region. The core tasks are to define territory and territorial interests, undertake a SWOT analysis by stakeholders, prepare scenarios, make planning accessible to stakeholders, and agree as much as possible. It may not be necessary to redefine administrative territorial boundaries, but rather to look at other relevant issues such as networks across

and between existing boundaries, and how to involve both public and private actors to develop a more open minded approach. The SWOT analysis should result from discussions by stakeholders and be informed by professional experts, with a focus on the opportunities rather than on problems, and should generate agreements on ways forward. Discussions will reveal objectives and criteria for progress. The next step is from analysis towards synthesis. At that point, planning interventions must focus on territorial cohesion.

Here, the six components of the practical definition for territorial cohesion as proposed in the ECTP paper *Strategic Planning towards Territorial Cohesion* are at stake. These components are related to the three aspects of territorial cohesion identified by Roberto Camagni (territorial efficiency, quality and identity)

Key planning interventions - location of activities, densities and networks - should then concentrate on achieving and improving these six components of territorial cohesion:

1. Wholeness of functional systems (territorial efficiency/accountability)
2. Synergies between systems (territorial quality/accessibility)
3. The fit of nature and culture (territorial identity/quality)
4. Travel-time to main centres (territorial efficiency/accessibility)
5. Role in functional networks (territorial quality/competitiveness)
6. Position in natural and cultural networks (territorial identity/quality).

By scenario-building, different combinations on maps show the possibilities beyond prejudices or predetermined solutions. The assessment can then occur through applying the objectives resulting from the previous SWOT discussions as criteria for testing the scenarios. This leads to more specific discussions, unexpected synergies, new scenarios, and formalised agreements. These items can then be reviewed leading to specific projects. This will have emerged from a transparent process which stimulates respect for the interests of others, and social cohesion.

Patrick Salez, commenting on Andreas Faludi's remark that the Sapir Report caused a shift in meaning of territorial cohesion to competitiveness, stated that this was not the case. Six countries had pushed for a reduced budget for EU policies. The policy focused on lagging regions, with a consequent increase in the budget from € 76m to € 82m. The consequence was to preserve regional policy for the richer areas, and to link regional policy to competitiveness. The result was that more money would be allocated to the poorer regions, while the existing richer regions were protected. The EU was not reluctant at the 2004

Rotterdam process, but was frustrated with the lack of progress since there had been no ministerial meeting on territorial cohesion in the period 2001-4 but there was a need for synergy. The May 2005 White Paper had disappeared because the Constitution had not been ratified.

Andreas Faludi replied by stating that the discourse of finance was now based on competitiveness. You could look at Rotterdam from both sides of the argument, the EU was sceptical in the eyes of the participants, and there was a need to look over time. Member States had pressurised the Commission into publishing the White Paper, rather than the EU withholding publication.

Cliff Hague questioned the relationship between territorial cohesion, competitiveness and spatial planning. The Sapir Report was an incursion and intervention is needed to make connections and add value. The institutional blockages are within planning itself, often caused by a backward looking mirror. The key decisions revolve around the future location of activities.

The new ESPON programme was discussed taking forward the 2002-6 exercise. The results of the first programme had already been used in the Third and Fourth Cohesion Reports and in the development of the territorial agenda. Results show that many practitioners found the ESPON results hard to understand or useful for their day to day practices. The scale tended to be too broad for most planners. In ESPON 2008-13, more money is available and the programme covers 31 countries. It employs a similar structure, with target analysis based on user demand. The first round of projects is now open to tender. Tenders must show stakeholder involvement with planners identifying projects to be taken forward, assisting in team composition, and disseminating research results. Priority has been given to issues reflecting EU objectives, including demography, climate change, the economy, energy, transport, and geographies of regions. The types of projects to be considered encompass integrated and thematic themes, knowledge support to experimental action, and joint actions linked to other EU programmes. The deadline for the first round of projects is 22 March 2008.

Workshops on Territorial Cohesion

Five workshops were arranged, and facilitators reported on the discussions to conference delegates after lunch.

The London Plan and Climate Change

Robin Thompson reported on discussion of the spatial development strategy for London, the London Plan, and specifically discussion about how to tackle climate change through spatial planning. There were some synergies, reflected by

territorial efficiency, the use of natural resources, the introduction of transport policies, territorial identity, and the importance of civic leadership recognising and believing in tackling climate change as a subject. There were problems of interface in the plan, particularly on economic competitiveness for London as a global city, on journey times to work, and on the urban heat island effect. The role of planners in these processes was often problematic, since the complex and technical subjects required skills and knowledge that were often beyond the capabilities of planners. But planners were also the group of experts that understood how all these processes fitted together. Planners are specialists in interaction and integration that make them ideal for the job. The regional tier was viewed as the best scale to reconcile territorial cohesion and climate change but often other tiers by necessity had to become involved too, e.g. airport expansion. The EU encompasses a very different set of places. ECTP had to look at practices across the territory. A great deal of what we do already relates to territorial cohesion and climate change but we may not have recognised it as such. All processes – tackling climate change, spatial planning, territorial cohesion – are similar; they are ‘the three graces’. The more we argue as planners that these are compatible, the more people will come to accept them.

EU Decision Making Processes

Philippe Doucet reported on discussions of EU decision making processes and territorial cohesion. We are moving towards making the dream of cohesion a reality but there remain conflicts in interest around the cohesion debate. The influence of some players is disproportionate compared to their EU budget contribution. Other member states are attempting to renationalise cohesion policy at the expense of regional policy. But the regional level needs to be stressed for its importance. The key actors in the EU decision making process arena: the Commission, the Council of Ministers, the European Parliament, and the Economic and Social Committee. The parliament is in favour of Europeanisation of territorial cohesion and will not object to more formal commitments to cohesion, or to spatial planning and integration. The council has kept quiet about both territorial cohesion and spatial planning, but set up a committee on cohesion and bestowed certain legitimacy on territorial cohesion pending the ratification of the Lisbon Treaty. The Commission is a cohesion enthusiast but possesses few mechanisms to coordinate or integrate policies within the administration. There are some task forces and inter service groups but these are rarely utilised. There is no real official department responsible for integration of policies. The preparation of a green paper on territorial cohesion provides new opportunities for consultation across all 12 DGs, on the territorial dimension of policy, and on the territorial impact of policy. Territorial Impact Assessment is also an opportunity for more consistency in EU policies but there is reluctance to embark on this exercise since it is regarded as too heavy and akin to SEA and EA. The nature of discussion is as important as the formality of the decision. With a positive attitude, planning becomes not the art of saying no, but the art of showing the way forward.

Urban Sprawl and Territorial Cohesion

Luc Maréchal outlined discussion on urban sprawl and its manifestations. The economic dimension of sprawl comes about from economic tourism policies and by allowing the free market to develop over the countryside. There is a geographical dimension which also relates to the ghettoisation of the city, and processes of urbanisation and suburbanisation. Issues such as migration, demographic change, and an aging population are all relevant factors, and growth and prosperity are positive aspects of change but cause problems for planners through urbanisation, even though the participants in these processes welcome the improvements to their conditions and lifestyles. The image of sprawl is one of negativity but this is not true for every type of sprawl since it also releases pressure on the urban and allows for the employment of specific planning tools such as urbanisation boundaries, protected area designations, and urban territories by effect. Options for the future management of sprawl include urban plans, the use of quotas for urban development, and the demolition of suburban development and illegal structures. The lessons for territorial cohesion are a big challenge, because of the diversity of situations. It is necessary to work out the objectives and form of urban sprawl, and consider all tools according to area and setting, applying them locally and regionally.

Territorial Cohesion and Capital

Arnold van Vuuren outlined the discussion on territorial cohesion and capital and discussed the Dutch waterline as an illustration and example of new spatial planning and territorial development. It is possible to use capital from history and culture while still attaining strategic objectives, and served to raise issues and involve as many different actors and groups as possible. Three key questions were outlined. First, how do you get people to know what the capital of a territory might be? Would it be evident, or not, and who would lead that discussion? The task for spatial planners here would be to enter dialogue with the people in the area, to identify the capital. Secondly, what to do with the capital which has no obvious spatial manifestation? There is a need for an initiator to make a vision and a need to find owners of the concept and partners in the process. There is also a need for a champion to ensure the successful implementation of the concept. Thirdly, the art of saying no should become the art of saying there are alternative ways ahead. This requires very different sets of skills and creative processes than may exist at the present time, by bringing together and implementing vision, with agents of change, and action. Should planners ensure this process was linear and be present at each stage, or should alternative actors to planners deliver on the implementation? The different stages of realisation should be viewed like a Russian doll, by translating a clear vision at each stage and at each scale, with freedom and innovation, but still true to the original concept.

Regional Planning and Territorial Cohesion

Vincent Goodstadt discussed regional planning cooperation as central to territorial cohesion. Cross-border cooperation is required but is often undermined by competition between regions, and can be questioned as genuine and real or superficial. Does it bring additionality and what is the width of cooperation across countries? The challenges that exist relate to the variety of regimes and administrative structures that exist, the scope of cooperation and whether it covers specific policy areas such as transport, growth, social issues, and labour market issues, and degree of inter-regional cooperation at a high scale and how it affects local scales, and vice versa. These complex issues raise political sensitivities between regions that can be difficult to resolve. The tools are there to deal with these issues but also it's important to advance a reactive approach which is more pragmatic. There is a belief that the usual suspects cooperate as they always have, centred on physical issues. But the challenge is for cooperation to occur on social issues, more business orientations, and educationally. More concrete views are required where cooperation could take place, and the EU could incentivise this. ESPON could also play a role. A further consideration is how inter-regional cooperation would work from the bottom-up to influence sector policies. The EU would then have to recognise that policies affect regions in different ways.

Questions and Discussion

Patrick Salez. Luc Maréchal presented various tools to counteract urban sprawl. One, the extension of urban planning to non-built up areas will require a completely different governmental approach.

Luc Maréchal. We should refer to such areas as rural regions rather than non-built up areas, since there is a physical connection between the cities and the countryside. There is a need to rethink the city within the wider city region and consider different types of governance. At the regional level, we need to deal with urban-rural differentiation, and competition between the two types of spaces.

Virna Bussadori. We have to move away from the mental dominance of the city over rural areas, using territorial capital and spatial scenarios to take a positive view of the attributes of both.

Vincent Goodstadt. There should be no distinction between town and country, since one is affected by the other. If there is conflict between competitiveness and cohesion, that is the nature of planning itself. Expansion of the perception of the city and its hinterland in planning terms is appropriate, since administrative boundaries compound the problem.

Miran GAJŠEK. We seem to be in danger of overdosing on EU-speak. We need to start the implementation of the documents, identify those fitting into the Lisbon Agenda, and to develop ideas into workable solutions.

Vitor Campos. In Portugal, new plans cover both urban and rural areas. But there are difficult tasks of competitiveness, and municipalities' competences. There are different sets of rules for each type of area. Additionally, other levels of government may be responsible for projects within the territory. Problems need to be dealt with at the sub regional level within the framework of regional plans. The need for multi-level governance and cooperation must be acknowledged.

Nicolas Buchoud. We need action. Discussion of models is not a waste of time, but one or two models for the future development of territorial cohesion is not appropriate because of the diversity of space and problems. Nevertheless they are useful to stimulate thinking. We should not think of city versus rural interests or choose between urban planning and urban design. The metropolitan functional region offers a useful framework.

Margarita Jančič. ECTP needs to lead the approach. Spatial planners need to be cross-sectoral and integrative. The Commission, the member states and the regions are all important but the member states are not present or evident in discussions at the present time. Spatial planners need to be more evident and prepare the best compromises. There is a problem of utilising new technology because the phrases tend to replicate the latest fetishes from the theorists. We should consider the impact on territorial values.

Gianluca Spinaci. Territorial cohesion will be addressed through particular institutional perspectives, but a series of important stages lie ahead in EU decision making. At the moment, however, there is no clear definition of the concept and the development financially. The financial review of sectoral policies makes no mention of territorial cohesion.

Patrick Salez. It is open to practitioners to work up territorial cohesion, through ECTP and through ESPON. The challenge is to make it practical. There is currently a favourable context for territorial cohesion within DG Regio. An appropriate way forward is for the territorial agenda to be better linked to stakeholder involvement and interests. The shared competence to the Commission and member states is intended to be able to manage these sorts of issues. The green paper in 2008 will be based on consultation. It is hoped to define specific questions about the territorial agenda and avoid fragmentation of both sectors and geographies. Among these questions will be:

1. Analysis, complementing regional level disparities in the Fourth Cohesion Report, and at the local level, and the interpretation of dynamics such as

urbanisation, suburbanisation, sprawl, and scale. It is intended to promote developments which provide benefits across scales.

2. Territorial cohesion questionnaires sent to the member states, to enable fine tuning, fiscal equalization, and linking regional spatial policy to sectoral policy at different levels.

3. Putting clearance in sectoral policy and territorial policy, which will be challenging and potentially conflictual.

How territorial cohesion and urban development is currently practiced through projects and programmes will require desk based analysis. This will raise a series of questions: at the regional level, alongside economic and social cohesion; the added value provided by other scales such as cross-boundary and transnational; the link between territorial cohesion and spatial development strategies, and with the urban agenda. There will be a target approach to certain territories, based on capital, specificities, and thereby generate a more place-based approach while maintaining the integrity of Commission policies. Finally, there will be a need to consider multi-level governance and the influence on this of territorial cohesion. With regards to implementation, it will be a question of what's possible with the appropriate tools, ranging from soft methods to integrative options, including TIA, indicators, and cooperation. Demand and quality will be the aspects that will shape the process and decide future directions. The green paper may be followed by an Action Programme, a White Paper, or communiqué from the Commission with specific strategic proposals.

Conclusions by the Chair

Jan Vogelij concluded the day by making some general comments.

Through a network of professional organisations, planning seems to be being reinvented. Spatial planning has to address a range of problems in all different spaces, including the rural areas and the economic zones. This is not new but the challenges and contexts are different. How serious are we to real integrative approaches when faced with financial and development projects, or rural and natural areas? Do we concentrate too much on investments in urban areas?

We need to market aspects of the planning profession much better, report the achievements of spatial planning as they occur, especially in relation to topical issues such as climate change. There are many examples of contributions to solutions by planners in the past for problems that are not necessarily recognised by the planners themselves as being part of a current hot topic.

The territorial dimension of planning activities and how they affect the development of the territory needs to be examined. Planning provides options for the way forward through innovation, experimentation and learning.

Regulatory planning remains however an integral part of planners' work but causes a loss of recognition towards the other, more positive, aspects of planning for spatial developments.

Tools may already be there and available but are perhaps not utilised sufficiently or well at the present time.

The economic bases of regions have to be considered as a starting point for all strategic planning processes, and scenarios should include the region-specific opportunities for innovation and the spread of prosperity in the region.

Planners can contribute positively towards revealing territorial identity assets and the territorial capital of an area. In so doing, planners need to assess their own roles in spreading ownership of visions and spatial plans, and in creating champions of territories and places.

Editor:

Mark Tewdwr-Jones is Professor of Spatial Planning and Governance, and Director of Research, at Bartlett School of Planning, University College London. He is an expert on spatial planning, regional development, multi-level governance, and place and identity. He has published over ten books including *The European Dimension of British Planning* (2001), *The Planning Polity* (2002), *Planning Futures* (2002), *Second Homes* (2005), *Territory, Identity and Spatial Planning* (2006), and *Decent Homes for All* (2007). He has advised ministers in the UK government and in the devolved administrations, and serves on the RTPI General Assembly as an elected member.

m.tewdwr-jones@ucl.ac.uk

<http://www.bartlett.ucl.ac.uk/planning>