



Strasbourg, 8 July 2010

15 CEMAT (2010) Final 4E

**15TH COUNCIL OF EUROPE CONFERENCE OF MINISTERS
RESPONSIBLE FOR SPATIAL/REGIONAL PLANNING**

CEMAT

Moscow, Russian Federation

8-9 July 2010

**CEMAT REPORT OF ACTIVITIES
OF THE COMMITTEE OF SENIOR OFFICIALS (CSO)**

RUSSIAN FEDERATION PRESIDENCY

*Document by the Secretariat General prepared by the Cultural heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning, Division
Directorate of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage*

*This document will not be distributed at the meeting. Please bring this copy.
Ce document ne sera plus distribué en réunion. Prière de vous munir de cet exemplaire.*

Introduction

Since 1970, CEMAT has promoted competitive and sustainable territorial development throughout the Member States of the Council of Europe. CEMAT activities reflect the fundamental orientations of the Council of Europe and devote therefore special attention to the social and cultural dimensions of territorial development. During the past decade, CEMAT has concentrated its efforts on the specific requirements of the new member countries of the Council of Europe. The Guiding Principles for the sustainable territorial development of the European continent, adopted in the year 2000 in Hanover and developed in the Recommendation Rec. (2002)1 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to Member States on the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent, have provided a common doctrine for East and West and have emphasized the continental dimension of territorial development in the wider Europe. The 13th Session of the European Ministerial Conference CEMAT held in Ljubljana in 2003 has demonstrated that integrated territorial development is one of the most powerful tools for ensuring global sustainability. The 14th Session of the European Ministerial Conference CEMAT held in Lisbon in 2006 has promoted territorial integration throughout Europe through a variety of networking activities.

In a spirit of continuity of efforts for promoting sustainable territorial development, the CEMAT activities for the period 2007-2010 focused on thematic issues corresponding to important changes in the global context with significant territorial impacts. As the need for integrated approaches remains an essential principle of sustainable territorial development policies, the activities are taking into account the requirements for integrated approaches raised by these thematic issues.

On the occasion of the 40th Anniversary of the CEMAT, the Conclusions of the CEMAT Seminars and Symposium held during these last ten years are presented.

The CEMAT Website was up-dated in order to present the CEMAT activities and activities of the Member States of the Council of Europe: <http://www.coe.int/CEMAT/> / <http://www.coe.int/CEMAT/fr> .

I. THEMATIC ISSUES OF THE WORKING PROGRAMME OF THE CEMAT COMMITTEE OF SENIOR OFFICIALS

The Council of Europe aims at promoting human rights, the rule of law and democracy. Territorial development policies, although being based on a legal and institutional framework, have in addition a softer character. The actions proposed and implemented in this context generally go further than the minimum standards required by regulations. CEMAT's doctrine could be considered as the promotion of "The right of European citizens to a sustainable territory".

The main purpose of CEMAT is the generation and transfer of ideas. Inspired by research outputs and foresight studies, CEMAT identifies, confronts and compares concrete experiences out of the Member Countries, opening the door to transfers of know-how and of efficient solutions.

The work programme proposed by the Russian Presidency of CEMAT comprised a series of thematic issues chosen according to their relevance for the coming decade in relation with the emergence of new territorial challenges.

a) Demography, migrations and their territorial impacts

Most countries of Europe are confronted with a trend of population ageing and growing pressure of external immigration, resulting in substantial challenges for cities and regions. Intra-European migration flows also play a significant part, for instance between East and West, but also within individual countries. Major impacts are expected on regional labour markets, with a shortage of qualified manpower, on housing needs in metropolitan areas where younger population groups and immigrants concentrate, on the maintain of public and private services in regions with strongly declining population, on tensions related to socio-cultural integration of immigrants in cities etc. CEMAT efforts will concentrate on the highlighting of emerging problems as well as on the joint development of strategies aiming at alleviating the problems and at drawing benefits from emerging opportunities such as those resulting from replacement immigration or from the development of the residential economy in specific regions.

Key issues:

- Population ageing in relation with the supply of services, regional labour markets, depopulation;
- Immigration and internal migrations in relation with regional labour markets, supply of housing and services;
- Regional opportunities generated by the residential economy.

b) Territorial impacts in Europe of the new energy paradigm (energy supply, conservation and security, new geography of energy systems)

The significant increase of energy prices resulting from a sustained imbalance between supply and demand at world scale, has generated the emergence of a new energy paradigm, especially in Europe, aiming at reducing the external dependence in energy supply. The new paradigm includes energy saving measures, the development of renewable energy sources and of other innovative energy supply technologies (such as the hydrogen technology), a more rational use of conventional energy sources available in Europe (such as oil, gas and coal). The territorial aspects of the new energy paradigm to be investigated by CEMAT are related to the highlighting of a new geography of energy supply in Europe (showing fossil energy reserves, main energy transport axes, the areas best suited for the production of renewable energy etc.), and to changes likely to occur in transport and mobility patterns, in settlements, in rural areas, in the location of productive activities etc.

Key issues:

- Territorial impacts of high energy prices, of saving measures and of possible scarcity on mobility, regional productive systems and settlement systems;
- Territorial and environmental impacts of the exploitation of renewable energy sources and of the emergence of new energy technologies;
- New geography of energy supply in Europe.

c) Territorial impacts of the accelerating globalisation process

The globalization process is on-going and it has fundamental impacts for Europe. Its evolution affects permanently new segments of the economy and therefore different types of regions. The globalization process has many ways of expression and concretization, such as increasing global competition on products and, recently on services, relocation of enterprises and activities, growing number of mergers and acquisitions and related changes in the property of enterprises at intercontinental scale, pressure on wages and salaries, acceleration of technological development etc. In this respect, it is important to pay also attention to foresight aspects, because the future evolution of the globalization process may differ substantially from the effects already observed up to now, with competition moving more and more from low-wage production segments to technology-intensive products. An additional dimension of the globalization process is the development of the information society which generates numerous new activities. CEMAT will concentrate its activities on those aspects of the globalization process which have the most important impacts on the European territory, especially on the development of regional labour markets, on the evolution of metropolitan and rural areas etc.

Key issues:

- Impacts of the globalisation process on regional productive systems, regional labour markets and settlement systems (metropolisation);
- Requirements in terms of territorial clustering and networking for increasing the critical mass and for ensuring enhanced competitiveness;
- Search of compatibility between the enhancement of competitiveness and the maintain of spatially-related values;
- Opportunities provided by the information society for organising the territorial competitiveness and maintaining territorial balance in a context of growing competition.

d) Creation of new transport and trading corridors and Europe-wide sustainable integration. Access to essential services

The main aspect of this thematic issue is related to the impacts of the development of major transport infrastructure on territorial integration and regional development. Territorial integration within the area covered by the member countries of the Council of Europe still has to achieve significant progress in future, in order to overcome its present fragmentation. At lower scales, modernization of transport infrastructure and services is needed to improve the accessibility of landlocked regions and has to contribute to the maintaining of access to essential services. In this field, CEMAT will first concentrate its activities on the identification and investigation of major corridors in development across Europe and on the requirements for a sustainable territorial development related to them. A second field of activity will be the investigation of conditions for improving the accessibility of landlocked regions in a sustainable way. Finally, CEMAT will also pay attention to strategies likely to ensure the maintaining and improvement of access to essential services.

Key issues:

- Sustainable territorial development related to the promotion of major corridors throughout the European continent: impacts on settlement systems and regional development; containment of environmental pressure and promotion of environmentally-friendly transport modes;
- Improvement of the accessibility of landlocked areas in order to ensure and promote their development potentialities;
- Maintain and improvement of access to essential services in less favoured areas.

e) Territorial impacts of climate change; adaptation, management and prevention measures, especially in relation with natural hazards

The acceleration of climate change is presently considered as a major factor with considerable impacts for the coming decades in a wide range of fields. Territorial development policies can hardly influence the intensity of climate change, but they can significantly modify the impacts of climate change on the territory, especially through adaptation and prevention measures. In this respect, CEMAT will investigate the most important impacts likely to be generated by climate change on the European territory, especially those on ecosystems (flora and fauna), production structures and services (agriculture and forestry, tourism etc.), on residential location and settlements etc. A differentiation will be made between impacts with structural character (like drought in southern Europe which affects lastingly large stretches of the territory) and impacts with more local and temporary character (like floods and other natural hazards) which may occasionally generate considerable damages, but on limited parts of the territory. CEMAT efforts will also concentrate on the types of territorial development measures most appropriate to limit the negative impacts of climate change and the damages related to natural hazards. Adequate measures are also needed to optimize a number of opportunities which may emerge from the changing climatic situation.

Key issues:

- Territorial impacts of climate change (negative as well as positive) on settlements, infrastructures, ecosystems, employment and regional productive systems;
- Prevention, management and adaptation measures to counteract the negative impacts of climate change, especially the damages likely to be caused by natural hazards and to enhance the positive impacts.

f) The role of spatial development policies for environmental sustainability and landscape protection and enhancement

Environmental protection is high on the agenda in most European countries. Not only the damages caused to ecosystems and to human health in the past have generated a wide awareness for the need to improve the environmental situation, but also the more recent recognition of the relationships between the emissions of greenhouse gas and climate change have reinforced this awareness. Due to their horizontal and cross-thematic character, spatial development policies have the possibility and the task to intervene in a variety of fields and to promote coherence in order to reach a higher degree of sustainability. CEMAT will deepen the resolutions adopted at the Ljubljana conference and elaborate joint proposals for a more substantial contribution of spatial development policies to environmental sustainability in Europe, including recommendations regarding transport, agriculture and forestry, tourism, energy, the development of settlements etc. CEMAT will also investigate the possibilities for spatial development policies to contribute to the conservation and enhancement of landscapes, and therefore to the implementation of the principles contained in the European Landscape Convention.

Key issues:

- Long-term character of territorial development policies, making possible structural activities in favour of the environment;
- Cross-thematic character of territorial development policies, contributing to ensure coherence and to contain conflicts and shortcomings with damaging impacts for the environment;
- Contribution of territorial development policies to the protection and enhancement of landscapes.

g) Transfrontier interactions and territorial integration in Europe

Although cross-border cooperation has a long tradition in Europe, territorial fragmentation along national borders still exists along a number of national borders, especially of those of eastern and south-eastern Europe, resulting from their shorter practice and experience in integration and cooperation policies. A number of areas with specific problems, such as the enclave of Kaliningrad, should be considered with particular attention. The task of CEMAT in this field will be to identify the border areas where territorial fragmentation is still significant and where transfrontier interactions are not harmoniously developed. Proposals and recommendations will have to be elaborated about the role of territorial development policies for enhancing territorial integration and cohesion along national borders.

Key issues:

- Identification of areas along national borders with significant territorial fragmentation and incoherent territorial development, requiring strengthened cross-border cooperation;
- Elaboration of principles and methods for coherent territorial development policies in transfrontier regions.

II. RETROSPECTIVE OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE CSO-CEMAT SEMINARS AND SYMPOSIUM 2000-2010

1. International CEMAT Seminar on “Integration of the greater European spaces”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the Greek Ministry of Environment, Spatial Planning and Public Works within the framework of the activities of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning of the Member States of the Council of Europe – CEMAT-Council of Europe.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe Series European Spatial Planning, 2002, No. 65]

Venue: Thessaloniki, Greece

Date: 25-26 June 2001

Objectives

The Thessaloniki Seminar dealt with the following topics:

- spatial organisation and the integrated planning of great European areas;
- experiments of transnational, transfrontier and interregional co-operation in spatial planning;
- role of towns in integrating great European areas;
- role of trans-European networks (transport, communication and energy) in integrating great European areas;
- approach for a sustainable spatial planning policy.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Dušan Blaganje, Council of Europe Expert

1. During the 1990s there were significant attempts in which various co-operation frameworks were established, aiming at European spatial integration. They were related to different spatial levels in, e.g.: the Atlantic macro-region, the Baltic Sea, the region of Cadises (Central, Adriatic, Danubian and South-Eastern European Space), the South-East European region, the region of European Space and Territorial Integration Alternatives (Estia), the Mediterranean region, the North Sea, Northern Europe, etc. Beside many positive experiences, the partnerships within these frameworks also showed some inherent difficulties. Among them problems of co-ordination, competition and organisation were reported. The most valuable contribution of these partnerships has probably been in overcoming the national and ethnic borders in dealing with the spatial development, spatial planning or environmental issues. On the other hand they underlined the importance of knowledge of different spatial planning systems in European countries and the role of different actors within them for understanding various aspects of the process of spatial integration.

2. The wider importance of the “European Spatial Development Perspective” (Esdp), agreed at the Informal Council of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning in Potsdam, May 1999, has been acknowledged, but at the same time it was pointed out that within and mainly outside of the European Union there are many other “European” spaces. Thus, spatial planning has to resolve the issues of spatial integration of the European Continent, i.e. not only with regard to the space of the European Union or the European Monetary Union, but also with regard to the countries of the Council of Europe.

3. Spatial planning in Europe went through various stages. It has evolved from the narrow perception of physical planning and the administrative approach of spatial planning to a wider developmental rationale that seeks to combine the objectives of sustainable development, protection of the environment and spatial integration. Initially, the environmental component (e.g. environmental impact assessment) and recently the spatial component (e.g. spatial impact assessment of actions) are important elements that have been introduced in the development process. Spatial planning and the environment should always be considered as integral dimensions in the formulation and planning of each sectoral policy (transportation, networks, industrial development, rural development, development of areas in crisis etc.). Spatial planning is one of the most important regulatory policies, prerequisite for achieving the spatial integration and coping with the forces of the enlarging and unifying European market.

4. However, it should be taken into account that the forces shaping the European territory are in many ways incompatible with the European spatial planning objectives. The spatial development is fragmented and unequal and the centre-periphery polarisation is aggravated. Research in many European regions has showed that the pre-existing inequalities are intensified. In spite of policy statements, which are different, the new inequalities create new exclusions and marginal social groupings with challenging dimensions: long-term unemployment, new poor, homeless people, and immigrants. New “grey” zones and new “black holes” are created in the wider European socio-economic space. Unfortunately, examples such as Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo are not quite unique. At the same time, new barriers have been created. Xenophobia, racism, nationalism and social exclusion have recovered through new forms in several parts of Europe. These problems are intensified by the needs of immigration flows, which are created in many European regions in crisis. CEMAT within the Council of Europe should seek its role in overcoming these serious issues.

5. European spatial planning has to move further and go beyond the level of outlining generally acceptable objectives, which might be reduced to “wishful thinking”, if not followed by clear priorities and supported by the introduction of appropriate operational tools, now lacking. These should be used for the implementation of specific policies for the mitigation of geographic inequalities, aiming at spatial development convergence and integration. The efforts undertaken so far to diffuse and share the relevant spatial information, to compare and agree upon the appropriateness of the spatial planning methods, should therefore be continued and the necessary specialised knowledge about the ongoing spatial changes should be developed.

6. The new system of territorial governance is related to the issues of macro-regions. Macro regional approach overcomes the “ethnocentric” planning approach and requires planning processes, involving institutions other than national (e.g. regions, cross-border areas, etc.). It also allows for greater engagement of endogenous economic and human resources and a macro-region’s institutional capacity to create co-operation networks based upon mutual trust. The macro-regions’ spatial integration and sustainable development should be set up as the main long-term goal for the whole of Europe, although this is not an easy task within the Council of Europe with its 43 Member States. The CEMAT of the members States of the Council of Europe does not have the financial tools for the promotion of spatial cohesion policies. However, it would be very useful if finance for essential pilot activities, e.g. studies and know-how, in order to understand the problems and the diversities of “European Space” as a whole, could be provided.

7. One of the most important actions related to the future development of CEMAT should be the dissemination of the “Guiding Principles”, not only in the 43 countries of the Council of Europe but also in other international organisations and national authorities. It should include the international organisations, which implement and/or support European spatial development policies, e.g. the European Union, the World Bank, OECD, EBRD, etc. It was noted that due to the importance the reports and other presentations at the Cemat Seminars have for regional and local spatial planning and development policies, the participation of representatives of regional and local authorities at the Seminars is highly desirable. Regional and local authorities have an important role in the implementation of the “Guiding Principles”.

8. Therefore ways and means should be developed in order to:

- enhance the active participation of local and regional representatives at the CEMAT Seminars;
- develop the dialogue with local and regional representatives within the Member States of the Council of Europe in order to facilitate their role in the implementation of the “Guiding Principles”;
- intensify the dialogue with the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe (CLRAE) of the Council of Europe with particular attention paid to the implementation of those decisions of the Congress, which support the implementation of the “Guiding Principles” at regional and local level.

9. The Conclusions of the Thessalonica Seminar and the following ones should be considered in the preparation of the 13th Ministers’ Session of CEMAT in Ljubljana in September 2003. In this regard it is desirable to give greater responsibilities for the implementation of the “Guiding Principles” to regions and municipalities.

10. CEMAT Seminars contribute to realise a synergy of various European schemes and programmes of transnational, crossborder and interregional cooperation. It would be neither economical, nor efficient if the Council of Europe countries, particularly those which at the same time are members of the European Union, participated in overlapping activities. Therefore the possibility should be considered, that the Seminars would include a session, conceived as a colloquium of European 15 and European 43, when appropriate including other (i.e. non-European) countries as well, thus paving the road for future spatial planning and development co-operation, extended over any borders still existing in Europe today.

2. International CEMAT Seminar on “Landscape heritage, spatial planning and sustainable development”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in cooperation with the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe Series European Spatial Planning, 2001, No. 66]

Venue: Lisbon, Portugal

Date: 26-27 November 2001

Objectives

The Seminar’s aim was to contribute to the implementation of the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent and to the preparation of the next European Conference of the Ministers responsible for Regional Planning, which will take place in Ljubljana on 16 and 17 September 2003 on “Implementation of Strategies and Perspectives for the Sustainable Territorial Development of the European Continent”. The objectives were in this respect:

- to identify spatial planning issues through the landscape dimension;
- to find concrete solutions to the problems, taking account of the characteristics of each landscape; and
- to make proposals in order to integrate the landscape dimension into spatial planning policies.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Dušan Blaganje, Council of Europe Expert

It was the second Seminar held since the adoption of the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent, by the 12th Session of the Ministers responsible for Regional Planning of the Members States of the Council of Europe, in Hanover, Germany, on 8 September 2000.

The Guiding Principles take special account of the issue of landscape and consider that “spatial development policy can contribute to protecting, managing and enhancing landscapes by adopting appropriate measures, in particular by organising better interactions between various sectoral policies with regard to their territorial impacts”. They list a series of appropriate measures.

The European Landscape Convention was moreover opened for signature on 20 October 2000, at a Ministerial Conference of the Council of Europe in Florence, Italy. The Convention’s aims are to promote protection, management and planning, and to organise European co-operation on landscape issues. It is the first international treaty exclusively concerned with protection, management and planning of European landscape.

As a key element of individual and community well-being and quality of life, landscape plays an important part in human fulfilment and in the reinforcement of European identity. It significantly shapes general interest economically, culturally, ecologically, environmentally and socially. However, changes in agricultural, forestry, industrial and mining technology, together with practices in planning, urban development, transport, network-building of various kinds, tourism and recreation and, at a more general level, changes in the world economy, are in many cases accelerating the transformation of landscapes.

It is undisputed that some landscapes, of outstanding beauty, need special protection. Landscapes are not however only a heritage to be protected, but at the same time they are resources, which need appropriate management so that they evolve without loss of quality, and even increase their quality. In this respect, the

natural resource role – particularly in agriculture and forestry – will have to be granted future advantage, without of course, diminishing the responsibility of any economic operator for prudent, sustained and respectful exploitation of landscapes. Finally, economic and social changes may create the need for the development of new landscapes, as for instance the construction of new transport infrastructures. These developments must be conceived and carried out in such a way as to produce a better quality of the ensuing landscapes.

No goals can justify deterioration of the quality of landscapes through adverse effects of settlement and economic operations. Controlled and intense use of urban land, particularly the promotion of introvert growth of cities, can reduce the natural or semi-natural landscape transformation to building land. And where this is inevitable, adequate grade of conservation should still be applied in order to allow reciprocal enhancement of urbanised space and green areas.

Agriculture and forestry should not be seen only as economic activities and land uses. They are indispensable tools for landscape management. Their operation methods should be held in line with the goals of prudent and rational land use and sustainable spatial development. Agricultural market uncertainties could in a greater scale be encountered by adaptive patterns of production for market niches, which increase in variety and extent along with economic and social development of our societies.

The landscapes of today reflect the population, economic, social and cultural history of regions. They require profound knowledge and complex and efficient planning and management instruments. In-depth study of landscapes indissociable from pertaining territories, of development possibilities, opportunities and constraints, potentials and capacities of space, vulnerability, cultures, public opinions and social values, in as much as a thorough study of change, are very important scientific tools for efficient landscape planning. Comprehensive spatial planning with a territorial impact assessment is essential, including long-term strategic environmental impact assessment of larger scale and detailed environmental impact assessment of any envisaged change of land use during the administrative procedures implied to permit such change.

Identification and assessment of landscapes and their systemisation according to their outstanding characteristics facilitate not only their protection, planning and management, but also renders them more comprehensible, as well as encouraging the building of favourable public opinion towards their importance. Development of guidelines and common principles, as well as granting continuous access to developing good practices would support sustainable landscape planning and management, ranging from controlling land use of great intensity and scale to the most vigorous conservation of the most valuable landscape heritage.

Landscape management is an integral part of spatial planning, but it should be borne in mind that the latter is much more than producing and adopting the spatial and detailed plans. Its main objective and its most important component are the implementation of planning decisions through a number of measures that have to be undertaken to achieve this. These comprise a variety of policies: financial, economic, spatial, agricultural, social, cultural and others.

In pursuing the public good, these policies should not ignore that managing landscapes involves important questions, which are derived from their asset, property or real estate attributes. The “normal” fiscal and other financial tools, often used to regulate urban development in pursuing public needs, might not work in landscape management.

In many cases the protective regulation and management of landscapes will thus require economic and financial stimulation to land owners in order to be feasible. Landscapes have a value of such an importance that they could be a reason for necessary exemptions in otherwise very restrictive European economic stimulation policies in this respect.

The European Landscape Convention represents a new and important tool. But it will take further efforts to develop efficient instruments for its implementation, whereby the messages conveyed by the Lisbon Seminar

will have to be considered. New methods will have to be invented as the existing ones do not seem to be sufficient.

Moreover, the role of local and regional authorities in the field of landscape management must still be developed. It has been stressed at the Seminar that the competence for landscape planning and management should be brought to that level of government which is closest to the people's concerns. It could be added that this refers not only to legal competence, but implies direct involvement of people through their participation in decision processes. This should raise greater effort in search of better ways of cooperation between various levels of government and is a challenge in itself for the future work of the CEMAT.

3. International CEMAT Seminar on “The role of local and regional authorities in transnational co-operation in the field of regional/spatial development”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in cooperation with the German Land of Saxony, with the support of the German Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, in the framework of the Council of Europe CEMAT – CEMAT-CoE.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe Series European spatial planning, 2002, No. 67]

Venue: Dresden, Germany

Date: 15-16 May 2002

Objectives

The Conference aimed at examining the projects hereafter:

- practical experiences in the implementation of the Guiding Principles at the local and regional level;
- examples of good practice in transnational co-operation in the field of spatial development in European regions and municipalities, for example in projects concerning the European transport corridors, the cultural routes and landscapes;
- examples of pilot projects that receive international financial support, such as the Interreg III B, PHARE, TACIS, MEDA and CARD programmes;
- the transnational co-operation support programmes which have an impact on local and regional authorities, such as the EU financial instruments or those of the Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB) and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), and the work done under the UNEP Mediterranean Action Plan and by the OECD, particularly concerning Central and East European countries;
- the “Model regions of CEMAT” projects conducted in the Oblasts of Moscow and Leningrad;

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Dušan Blaganje, Council of Europe Expert

The participants have adopted the following conclusions:

1. European spatial development policies must be designed to support sustainable development conducive to enhanced economic and social cohesion and greater consideration for the natural, cultural and landscape heritage, with a view to EU enlargement and, more generally, to European integration;
2. the quality of co-operation is closely linked to the quality of information available on territorial development, and efforts should be made to improve this;
3. more active use should be made of the two basic documents: the Council of Europe’s “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent” (GPSSEDEC-CEMAT) and the European Union’s “European Spatial Development Perspective” (Esdp), particularly when implementing European and international programmes to finance spatial development and transnational co-operation;
4. the effective implementation of the principles set out in these documents should be monitored and evaluated at regular intervals. Such evaluation could take the form of national contributions to general reports prepared for CEMAT sessions, reviewing the implementation of earlier decisions and subsequently

presented to the political bodies of the Council of Europe (Committee of Ministers, Parliamentary Assembly and CLRAE);

5. the Guiding Principles should also be applied by the regions and local authorities as they often play a central role in this field. The CLRAE should be invited to contribute to the evaluation process set up by CEMAT;

6. the evaluation process mentioned above should lead to increased co-operation in Europe between local and regional authorities; the pilot projects identified on this occasion could be organised into networks to foster exchanges of good practice;

7. the implementation of the Guiding Principles should be encouraged in model regions of CEMAT (regions of innovation), where these principles can be best put into practice;

8. it is recommended that the European Union, the European and international financial institutions (including the CEB), the member States and local and regional authorities contribute, as a matter of priority, to the active implementation of development programmes and projects that require transfrontier, transnational or interterritorial (interregional) cooperation;

9. it is also recommended that in the context of its future enlargement the European Union should continue to make the necessary funds available for spatial planning and transnational co-operation and provide for improved coordination of these funds, in the interest of its future member States and also of the other countries of Central and East Europe, particularly those along the future borders of the European Union, as well as the countries concerned by the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe;

10. it was noted with satisfaction that the Stability Pact has made transfrontier co-operation and the Euroregions one of its priority areas for future action, which will have a beneficial impact on border regions and Euroregions in that part of Europe;

11. partnerships of all kinds (transfer of know-how, training of national and local government staff, exchanges of experience and public servants or elected representatives, practical co-operation at local level, etc), between States but also between their respective regional and local authorities, should be strongly encouraged;

12. transnational co-operation should also be developed in Europe's larger regions, such as the Baltic, the Mediterranean, Central and South-East Europe, the Atlantic Arc, the Carpathian-Danube and the Black Sea areas, again with due regard for the "Guiding Principles". This co-operation provides an overall vision of the areas concerned, making it possible to address spatial planning and sustainable development issues in a broader perspective;

13. special attention should be given here to the development of the requisite transport infrastructure in the framework of a network of trans-European corridors covering all the Council of Europe's member States, with due regard to the environmental and landscape dimensions of sustainable development;

14. this co-operation between the regions of Europe is essential to the sustainable development of the areas concerned at a time when the effects of globalisation are an increasing threat to the environment and the balanced development of regions;

15. while taking into consideration the decisive role which States play in spatial planning, it is also important to encourage more consultation of local and regional elected representatives. The principles of subsidiarity, proximity and partnership enshrined in the European Charter of Local Self-Government, and the principle of reciprocity laid down in the Guiding Principles take on their full meaning here.

4. International CEMAT Seminar on “Spatial planning for the sustainable development of particular types of European areas: mountains, coastal zones, rural zones, flood-plains and alluvial valleys”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in cooperation with the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works of Bulgaria, and the support of the Integrated Project of the Council of Europe “Making democratic institutions work”.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe Series European spatial planning, 2002, No. 68]

Venue: Sofia, Bulgaria

Date: 23-24 October 2002

Objectives

The Seminar aimed at promoting the implementation of Recommendation Rec (2002) 1 of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers to the Member States on the “Guidelines Principles for Sustainable Development of the European Continent”, in view of the preparation of the 13th CEMAT to be held in Ljubljana, Slovenia (16-17 September 2003).

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Dušan Blaganje, Council of Europe Expert

The CEMAT Seminar in Sofia highlighted some of the themes faced by present-day spatial planning and development policies and projects. It pinpointed a variety of issues facing these large areas, presenting good examples of how to deal with them, and tried to propose holistic methods of solving them.

It was clear from many of the contributions – from the reports and during the discussions – that spatial planning is *the tool* for managing large areas and should play a key role, and that the solution to the problems facing these areas lies in measures to implement spatial planning, i.e. in spatial development policies.

Considerable progress has already been achieved through recent activities in the member States and as a result of European integration. Charters, Guiding Principles, conventions, framework conventions, model acts, national legislation and policies, regional and local initiatives, and transnational co-operation and projects all form an important framework for further progress with efficient spatial planning and spatial development in the form of a number of strategies applicable in various member States and regions.

Of particular importance are democratic policy-making and decision-making procedures and public participation in spatial planning. The role of the latter must be enhanced and fostered, as the point has been made that only spatial planning *for* the people can produce viable results. It should not be forgotten that sustainable spatial development is part of a future in which the young people and children of today will take over the current roles of their parents. It should also be borne in mind that the Brundtland definition of sustainability has to do with future generations. Young people and children should therefore have a special role in these democratic processes.

Some problem areas presented at the Seminar still require broader evaluation, although there is already a wide-ranging consensus not only as to their gravity, but also as to possible solutions. One should not rely too much on generally accepted values; however prevalent they seem and undisputed they are, monitoring is preferable to blind trust, and constant questioning of convention is a pillar of the scientific approach.

However ambiguous this might seem, the general consensus surrounding the prevailing values could even be a constraint when the management of large zones is incorporated into spatial planning. The latter affects and seeks to reconcile a number of opposing interests and arguments, and ultimately it largely determines how property is managed.

It should not be forgotten that spatial planning serves no purpose unless it is feasible and unless plans are implemented. In economic and fiscal terms, the implementation of spatial planning may allow land to be used profitably or bring net public benefits, or it may impose a cost on the public, which must be sustainable so that it can be borne by the taxpayer if it is financial or by the public in general if it is an inconvenience or a burden of some other kind.

The most important methodological problem to be overcome in the spatial planning of any sensitive area is the “*equal balance*” approach, i.e. an approach that weighs up development on the one hand and the need to conserve and protect specific areas on the other, in which it is assumed that one side can gain only as much as the other side loses. There is only one hypothesis to which the equal balance approach can lead. It is well known and is not always very productive: either we choose development at the expense of conservation, or we choose protection at the expense of development.

Instead of equal balance, a “*mutual added value*” approach should be the basis of spatial planning for a sustainable future. This requires a holistic approach to problems, but also a shift in attitudes. In seeking solutions which will lead to a general, long-term net increase in benefits or a net decrease in cost, inconvenience and other burdens, we should make more use of interdisciplinary methods and set up a multidisciplinary system for the evaluation of spatial phenomena.

To sum up, economic policies require social and environmental assessment, while environmental protection needs economic and social assessment, just as social measures need economic and environmental assessment. All these assessments should be integrated in spatial planning methods and procedures in accordance with the various countries' legislation and be part of a *territorial impact assessment* of spatial phenomena, i.e. of situations, problems and measures to deal with them.

A specific (economic, environmental, social *and spatial*) cost-benefit analysis should thus be the basis for the evaluation of any model, policy or measure with spatial development consequences, regardless of the scale of the territory it is to be applied to. Not only the model policy or measure itself but also its collateral implications should be assessed. Last but not least, such an analysis would help to enhance the holistic approach, which is still missing from spatial planning and spatial development.

5. International CEMAT Seminar on “Sustainable spatial development: strengthening intersectoral relations”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – , and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), in cooperation with the National Spatial Development Office of the Prime Minister’s Office of the Republic of Hungary and the European Youth Center of the Council of Europe in Budapest.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe Series European spatial planning, 2003, No. 69]

Venue: Budapest, Hungary

Date: 26-27 March 2003

Objectives

The aims of the Seminar were to promote the implementation of Recommendation (2002) 1 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe to member States on the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent (GPSSDEC-CEMAT) and the resolutions adopted at the 12th CEMAT Session, assist the preparation of proposals for the 13th CEMAT Session, contribute to the implementation of actions identified by the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg and enhance the integrated approach to spatial development planning.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Dušan Blaganje, Council of Europe Expert

The Seminar focused on strengthening interrelations and interdisciplinary and intersectoral co-operation and partnership in the spatial planning field. The issues discussed at the Seminar reflected the special emphasis in the Guiding Principles on promoting horizontal and vertical co-operation and interrelationships, and in particular intersectoral co-operation designed to “create a regionally balanced and sustainable Europe”, all of which are concerned with the common goal of sustainable development, including regional balance.

One of the reasons for strengthening horizontal and vertical co-operation and intersectoral relations has been the fragmentation of current planning practices: in European countries the sectoral/functional planning function, with its primarily economic content, has been traditionally separated from territorial planning focused on the development of the physical environment. The more fragmented the various approaches have become, the greater the need for integration, which is not an easy objective. There are noticeable differences between sectoral and spatial planning, with different theoretical roots and methods and divergent rationales, which complicates the process of integrating approaches and sometimes impede co-operation between the sectors.

The Seminar once again showed that spatial planning represents the most appropriate institutional, technical and policy context for managing the territorial dimension of sustainability. Thus sustainability is the main goal of spatial planning and spatial planning is the main tool for achieving sustainability. Sustainable development in itself is a comprehensive goal. Firstly, the fragmentation of decision-making powers in modern societies calls for vertical and horizontal co-operation between different sectors and tiers of authority. Secondly, problems and concerns within specific geographical areas increasingly require complex and multidimensional responses. Together they create a need for an integrated strategy of territorial sustainability, including territorial quality, identity and efficiency, and an integrated planning approach to settlements, infrastructure, environment and landscape.

Nevertheless the question arises as to whether spatial planning is the most appropriate arena for co-ordinating intersectoral relations or whether there are better frameworks for this, and also whether spatial planners are equipped to deal with the complex issues involved, spatial planning agencies can become overall co-ordinators and so on. Increasingly distinctive sectors have specific views of their problems and potential solutions, which makes co-ordination difficult, and there do not appear to be any generally acknowledged tools for reconciling distinctive standpoints. However if it is to fulfil its integrative role, spatial planning should almost certainly not attempt to act as a sector itself, but should provide:

- a framework for analysis and debate where agreement can be reached on sustainable policies;
- legally binding rules and standards, to ensure that agreed measures are implemented.

Modern integrated spatial planning should be founded on increased capacity for evaluation, genuine public participation, greater (vertical and horizontal) co-operation and new decision-making tools, and rely more on intersectoral co-operation, and contractual and consensual relations than on government authority and enforcement. Such planning requires not only clearer objectives but also better organisation and greater commitment and professional input from the relevant stakeholders. It must be based on properly scheduled and complex research. As good practical experience has already shown, integrated spatial planning of such a kind is feasible.

The most important tools for intersectoral cooperation seem to be contractualisation, the establishment of co-ordinating bodies and a matrix organisation of planning processes and bodies, and constant evaluation and assessment of the trans-sectoral territorial effects of sectoral measures. Although the environmental dimension of sustainability is undisputed and growing importance is ascribed to the role of biodiversity, territorial evaluation and assessment is taken to mean not the – normally final – environmental impact assessment but a guidance tool, particularly for identifying the best available variant or alternative solutions. Good territorial governance is necessary at all levels, but particularly at the local one. The same applies to a proper examination of public intervention in property rights and markets, and measures to promote equity and efficiency in land use, which are a limited resource but of great public importance.

An intersectoral approach would improve spatial planning without in any way diminishing the role of sectors. Improved sectoral participation would improve the outcome of planning and facilitate the search for sustainability. Intersectoral co-operation helps to achieve synergy. Every sector retains its own responsibility for achieving its goals, but is also responsible for ensuring that they are in accordance with other sectors' goals, as co-ordinated and agreed in the spatial planning process.

Integrated, i.e. intersectoral, spatial planning should pay greater attention to certain major challenges to sustainable spatial development in Europe. A number of existing spatial patterns and trends pose threats to Europe's balanced development and to the political goals of its economic, social and territorial cohesion, creating a need for spatial policies that are more vertically effective and coherent (at European, national, regional and local levels) and more horizontally integrated (coherence and integration of sectoral and spatial policies).

Universal access to essential services constitutes one of the objectives of territorial and social cohesion. Essential commodities and services are not only those which are indispensable for maintaining human lives, but also those necessary for preserving human dignity. They include, *inter alia*, food, clothing, housing, energy, medicines, communications, mass-media, health care, education, culture and so on. Physical access (availability) and economic access (affordability) to basic essential commodities and services should be granted to all, including those who cannot afford to pay the full price for them.

There should be no discrimination regarding this human right, meaning that social correctives should be applied to a much wider range of public services than is generally the case now. Solidarity and social correctives are not only applicable to services provided by the public sector. There is known to be a variety of efficient organisational and financial arrangements for providing public services and local communities have a key role in this sector, which is particularly suitable for setting up public-private partnerships. These often provide more efficient, better and hence more sustainable services, but require specific forms of organisation and management.

Public-private partnerships are not simply a recent phenomenon. They began well back in the 19th century when they were particularly associated with the development of public transport and production and distribution of electricity. Modern public-private partnership schemes have become very sophisticated. Normally, the initiators and principal stakeholders of projects managed in public-private partnerships are public operators, mostly at local and regional level. If they are to work properly, such schemes require specialist training, specific skills and appropriate operational tools, including particular forms of negotiation and agreements, control systems and public-private contractual obligations to ensure that a reliable and high standard of essential services takes precedence over other interests. These tools cannot simply be copied from standard business practice.

Using public-private partnerships to achieve access to essential services calls for a new training approach both with and for local authorities, their staff and users. It is important to encourage such training initiatives.

The necessity to evaluate their territorial impact and to ensure their integration into intersectoral spatial policy aiming at sustainability of development applies to projects, equally to public-private partnerships and purely public initiatives. The public and private sectors are not separable. A two-speed development of the two sectors is impossible, so it is logical for them to provide services in partnership rather than in competition. However the crucial issue revolves around what tariffs or charges to impose.

Public participation and the role of non-governmental organisations are of vital importance for sustainability through spatial planning and development. Participation in public decision-making should be treated as a fundamental collective and individual right in modern environmental and planning law, as confirmed, *inter alia*, in the Aarhus Convention and the European Landscape Convention. To ensure that this is an effective, rather than purely formal, process, it is necessary to identify the appropriate stages of the decision-making process where participation is necessary.

There is a long-established tradition of participation in local planning matters in nearly every European country, although the effectiveness of this participation has varied, ranging from a purely formal process to effective shared decision-making. But ensuring participation at national level has been a more difficult issue. It has been regulated in different ways, but has generally been informal and vague. It remains unclear how far it has allowed genuine public attitudes and community needs to be represented, as opposed to narrower and selective group interests. Depending on particular societies' culture and traditions, there have been varying degrees of administrative resistance to combining representative and participative democracy. But this difficult task, which requires education, opinion-forming activities, training and help for communities to enable them to fulfil their planning tasks accountably, is essential for integrated spatial planning for sustainable development.

Vertical co-operation between various levels of government has been one of the main threads of various reports and discussions. It has also been discussed the inclusion of the European level in vertical coordination, which would require a strengthening of the territorial component when European institutions' policies are revised, combined with national horizontal coordination of the standpoints of individual states in sectoral negotiations on new European policies, in order to enhance the territorial component's role at national level. An intersectoral approach at national level is a precondition for its European equivalent.

On the other hand it has been widely acknowledged that central governments alone cannot direct Europe's regional and spatial development and that in this field an important part has to be played by local and regional authorities. The latter openly call for an appropriate place in European decision-making, with responsibility shared by all tiers of government. Local and regional authorities can make a substantial contribution to national sustainable spatial development policies and offer good governance in their communities and are key partners in implementing the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent.

The main message of the Budapest Seminar can be summarised with reference to its most frequently quoted and meaningful key terms: sustainable development, spatial planning, horizontal and vertical co-operation, intersectoral approach, co-ordination, access to essential services, public-private partnership, participation, local and regional authorities and training. These should also be the key terms used at future CEMAT gatherings.

6. International CEMAT Seminar on “Natural disasters and sustainable spatial development: prevention of floods”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division –, in co-operation with the Polish Government Centre for Strategic Studies and the City of Wrocław.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe Series European spatial planning, 2003, No 70]

Venue: Wrocław, Poland

Date: Poland, 30 June 2003

Objectives

The aims of the Conference were to analyse the reasons for major disasters and the possibilities of the prevention of floods, to promote the implementation of the Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe Rec (2002) 1 on the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent (GPSSEDEC-CEMAT) and Resolutions adopted at the 12th CEMAT Session in Hanover in 2000, to assist the preparation of proposals for the 13th CEMAT Session, to contribute to the implementation of actions identified in 2002 by the World Summit on Sustainable Development held in Johannesburg and to enhance the integrated approach of spatial development planning and good governance.

Conclusions

Rapporteur : Dušan Blaganje, Council of Europe Expert

Although the Conference did not leave the other natural disasters aside, it concentrated mainly on the problem of floods. Floods are a natural phenomenon imposing a risk to people which is greater in the areas where the flood zones are settled. They are rare events, limited to restricted areas, and this fact has often led to the loss of awareness of the risk and damage which they cause. But recent flood events have raised public and political awareness to the fact that Europe is exposed to floods as natural disasters, that there is no absolute safety from floods, and that technical measures, however sophisticated and extensive they might be, do not at all grant complete safety.

In history the rivers attracted human settlement, mainly as resources of water and food and as axes of transport. Therefore considerable cultural heritage is concentrated along the rivers which make it particularly sensitive to floods and in need of special protection. In the 19th century most large rivers of Europe and many smaller ones were channelised for gaining development land, flood protection, shipping and reduction of wetlands and diseases related to them. Extensive construction works of this kind were carried out throughout Europe until the 1990's and they have significantly reduced the natural river space and the areas for their harmless inundation in flooding conditions.

People have been building channels, dikes and dams and regulating the natural river flow to prevent floods, following a much too simple idea of washing the flood waves downstream from the protected areas as swiftly as possible. This in turn caused accelerated river flow and higher floods with much greater damages, particularly in the unprotected areas, both up- and downstream from such works. But still this led to the construction of even higher dikes and dams and not to sustainable river and flood risk management.

The main causes of floods are natural water cycle, hydrological regime, topographical and geological conditions influencing river morphology, nowadays possibly influenced by changes in meteorology due to global warming. Rivers are dynamic systems and above all they need sufficient space to flow away all the water they catch from their basins, not only in normal hydrological conditions, but at times of extreme precipitations as well, when the order of magnitude of their discharge multiplies.

Alluvial plains have primary importance in river management and flood prevention. They are large areas where permeability of soil and retaining capacity of land profile significantly reduce the height and velocity of flood waves. But at the same time, as various examples in Europe show, they are enabling economically sustainable forestry, pasturing, tourism and some other compatible activities.

Development has significantly reduced natural flood plains and on the other hand it has increased water run-off due to decreased permeability and water retention which enhances the flood risk. But local flooding can appear well before the peak flow of rivers is reached, due to inadequate drainage infrastructure. Increased run-off of surface water at times of the extensive precipitations further increase the peak flow of rivers which are rapidly flowing downstream, increasing flood risk at unprotected areas.

Flood risk is inevitable but it can be managed and reduced. It has been widely agreed that flood prevention requires integrated approach. In an integrated approach not only the areas directly affected by floods, but also the entire river basin must be considered.

River basin and flood risk management, and flood damage mitigation strategies must be based on serious scientific research. The properties of entire ecosystems of rivers, alluvial plains and the remaining river catchment areas must be analysed. The relations between the natural and man-caused processes in areas adjacent to the rivers, and the peripheral ones, those upstream and the ones downstream should be investigated in depth. And not least the knowledge of meteorological and climatic patterns must be studied in depth. Scientific approach requires observation, quantification, forecasting and modelling, essentially on the basis of the natural science, which should be undertaken at an adequate scale. Important tasks are open in the field of information and data management. A standardised information system for these purposes is needed most of all.

As it is impossible to eliminate floods it is also impossible to fully avoid damages caused by them. Thus new approaches in river and flood risk management tend to allow more frequent flooding in the areas where they cause least damages. This is economically sustainable as it is less costly to pay occasional damages – predominantly on agricultural land or forest – than to invest into extensive water construction works or to cover much higher damages in the built environment.

This approach can be implemented either through the preservation and the enlargement of the existing natural water retention areas or through the restoration of natural river morphology and opening new retention areas. Both are ecologically sustainable. Rivers must get much larger space to expand, which can be achieved, through making the floodplains broader and if possible deeper. Working with and not against the natural processes should also include measures for the rehabilitation of the absorption capacity of the soil. But it should be remembered that such measures require a lot of time once they are agreed and adopted.

Spatial planning, including both of its more detailed executive components, i.e. landscape and urban planning, has a crucial role in sustainable river basin management and flood prevention. The primary task of spatial planning is to direct human settlement and sensitive land uses away from natural retention areas and zones with enhanced flood risk, and thus prevent greatest damages when flood occurs. This strategy should be applied wherever it is possible through historic settlement patterns which could not be changed or improved with reasonable cost.

Landscape planning should allow for preservation and restoration of natural river beds and water retention areas – wet and dry. It should also prevent the reduction of water absorption capacity throughout river catchments, regardless of whether it is caused by human activity or through natural change, for example by the use of sustainable drainage systems that control water as near to its source as possible. Urban planning

should allow for sufficient space for rivers in the cities, enabling the compensation of flood waves in enlarged river beds, and should provide safe design of coastlines in the cities at the seaside. The priority for urban development should be given to areas with the least risk. These too are not short-term measures and therefore other actions are equally important.

It has been suggested that development proposals should be accompanied by a flood-risk and drainage assessment, appropriate to the scale and nature of the development and the risks involved. The largely uncertain and possibly increasing flood risk requires a precautionary approach. The principles of sustainable development require that flood risk be avoided where possible and managed elsewhere.

The role of environmental, planning, water and construction law cannot be overestimated. It must provide legal instruments at European, national, regional and local level which will facilitate the management of natural disasters and effectively enforce the agreed and adopted measures. The sustainability of spatial development cannot be achieved without mitigation and management of risk, caused by floods and other natural disasters.

The regional and local authorities have a crucial role and primary responsibility for flood management and spatial planning policy within their areas and the respective planning authorities under assistance from central governments should steer the development in such a way that the risk in areas vulnerable to flooding will be reduced.

That does not mean that we should stop all development on flood plains. This would be an unrealistic aspiration and unsustainable in every aspect too. Equally unrealistic would be the expectations that we could relocate flood-endangered development. Too much has been already constructed there and lot of it is reasonably flood-protected. But wherever new development, or redevelopment is to take place in areas of high risk, it should be managed appropriately, which should not only be the case for flood protection but as well for prevention of hazards caused by other natural disasters, particularly earthquakes, eruptions, landslides, avalanches and fires.

River basins and floods, when they happen, extend beyond any administrative borders. Flood prevention and protection thus require interregional, transborder and international cooperation in order to be efficient and sustainable. The recent floods in Europe have broadened this awareness under which new structures of successful co-operations have been set up, noting that some of them already existed before.

The major issues of European co-operation in the field of flood prevention and protection are the questions of solidarity and sustainability which cannot be separated. Solidarity of people in the river basin means that everybody must be aware that one's flood protection should not be at the expense of the other's flood risk. Sustainability of flood protection should not at all be seen only in terms of environmental sustainability. More than in many other instances it has stressed components of social and economic sustainability due to the fact that it is very expensive and not easily a win-win activity with all benefits for everybody and no cost for anybody.

But there is another, extremely important aspect of solidarity and social sustainability of flood protection and particularly of flood damage relief, which must absolutely not be left out of sight – what could quite easily happen in the conditions of strongly expressed paradigm of ecological sustainability. The damages suffered by the less developed regions of Europe and the poorer inhabitants of our Continent when struck by floods, are much more difficult to mend than in the developed parts, due to lack of financial, material and human resources. Natural disasters in such areas as a rule increase, not decrease the development disparities. In such cases the solidarity of the well off Europeans with their less fortunate fellows is crucial. The social aspect should therefore be at the forefront of integral flood management, along with the primary concern of protecting human lives.

From various points of view – the social one not excluded – considerable attention in the flood management should be given to the basins of border rivers, particularly those connecting regions with considerable

development imbalances, whereby three types of European borders should be specially mentioned: the outer borders of the peripheral member states of the Council of Europe, the new outer borders of the enlarged European Union and the borders between the old and the new members of the European Union.

The Wrocław Conference called for a consistent pan-European action in the field of integrated flood management. Because of the role of spatial development policy in this respect, CEMAT is the most appropriate framework to set up such action. Therefore the Ministers at their 13th Session should consider taking the appropriate initiative.

7. International CEMAT Seminar on “Spatial development governance: institutional co-operation network”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Urban development of the Republic of Armenia.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe Series European spatial planning and landscape, 2004, No. 75]

Venue: Yerevan, Armenia

Date: 28-29 October 2004

Objectives

The Seminar aimed at promoting the implementation of Recommendation Rec. (2002) 1 of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers to the Member States on the “Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent, in view of preparing the 14th CEMAT Session in Lisbon (26-27 October 2006) on “Networks for the sustainable spatial development of the European continent: bridges over Europe”.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Claude Rougeau, Council of Europe Expert, Representative of the International Federation for Housing and Planning (IFHP) and of the NGO Liaison Committee of the Council of Europe

The following conclusions were reached during the Seminar.

1. Armenia is a country with an exceptionally rich heritage. Wide valleys, plateaux, mountains, ravines and gorges alternate with lakes and rivers over an area of 29,800 square kilometres. This dramatic and extremely beautiful scenery is brought to life by the rich biodiversity of the natural environment, the setting of an inestimable historical and cultural heritage.

The intangible heritage of customs, traditions, age-old knowledge and know-how has also contributed to shaping a unique landscape.

2. Being a country in transition, Armenia still has to cope with economic difficulties, resulting in a form of territorial development that must be controlled and monitored in order not to jeopardise this heritage.

It is therefore necessary to take care to avoid any disappearance of, or damage to, parts of the national heritage as well as any alteration of the landscape that would result in it being degraded or even losing its distinctive character.

3. Having signed the European Landscape Convention, the Armenian Government have expressed their intention to comply with its principles and ratify it soon¹.

4. It will therefore be necessary to ensure that all the provisions are introduced that will help to ensure the Convention’s proper implementation as regards both the distribution of responsibilities and the legal, scientific and technical aspects (articles 4, 5 and 6 of the Convention).

¹ Since the organisation of the Seminar, Armenia ratified the Convention on 23 March 2004.

5. The Convention provides in particular that each State Party shall undertake to include the landscape in regional planning policies. This approach could be facilitated through the work of the Committee of Senior Officials of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning (CEMAT). The landscape is to be seen in a wider territorial development context.

During its last session, on 17 September 2003, the Ministerial Conference adopted the Ljubljana Declaration on the territorial dimension of the sustainable development of the European continent. It details the numerous challenges shaping our future in Europe, including the transformation and disappearance of landscapes, and provides that states will in future have to submit reports (based on indicators) on how they implement the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent.

In connection to this, various countries have drawn up national regional planning strategies. Such a step could be taken in Armenia, which would thus make it easier to establish a national umbrella instrument to give landscape policies a stronger basis. This strategy could be accompanied by the passing or appropriate implementation of the necessary legislation.

It should be remembered that landscape is one of the key aspects of the Committee of Ministers' Recommendation Rec (2002) 1 on the Council of Europe's Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development (GPSSDEC-CEMAT).

The Recommendation underlines the importance of four methodological principles that need to be highlighted with respect to the European Landscape Convention:

- horizontal co-operation: it is necessary to encourage interministerial co-operation on the landscape and to set up, for example, a national landscape council;
- vertical co-operation: co-operation needs to be encouraged between national, regional and local levels;
- public participation: the European Landscape Convention underlines the importance of such participation and explicitly refers to the Aarhus Convention;
- the partnership of associations and NGOs.

Land must henceforth be seen as a limited and precious asset that must be developed with care and moderation, i.e. used sparingly instead of being developed in a detrimental manner.

Assets (biological diversity, cultural heritage, intangible assets) must henceforth be seen as an opportunity, as a source of enrichment and as a factor and driving force for development.

A few key phrases used during the Seminar should be called to mind: appointment of development officials; establishment of links with grass roots organisations, professional bodies and administrative authorities; contractual and consensual approach; taking account of the mythical and mystical value of specific sites; role of the collective imagination.

Moreover, on a more practical level, concrete action needs to be pursued at certain pilot sites (Lake Savan, the river Hrazdan and the Yerevan master plan were mentioned in this connection), perhaps through the CEMAT regions of innovation project. The European Rural Heritage Observation Guide – CEMAT also needs to be adapted to the situation in Armenia.

Finally, it is necessary to implement the provisions of the Ljubljana Declaration, which:

- calls on the European Union and the Council of Europe to enhance their co-operation on territorial development; and
- asks the European Commission to define tools that, on the basis of the experience of the Interreg, Phare, Tacis, Cards and Meda programmes, would facilitate co-operation between European and neighboring countries in the field of spatial development in order to prevent divisions caused by unbalanced development.

6. Finally, the exhibition on the landscape seen through the eyes of children in Armenia – a pilot scheme developed in Armenia in connection with the implementation of article 6 of the European Landscape Convention – should be presented at the 2nd meeting of the Workshops for the Implementation of the European Landscape Convention to be held in Strasbourg on 27 and 28 November 2003.

8. International CEMAT Seminar on “The role of training in the implementation of the policy of sustainable spatial development at local and regional levels in Europe”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the European Network of Training Organisations for Local and Regional Authorities (ENTO) and the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe, CEMAT and UDITE, Union of Local Authority Chief Executives of Europe.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe Series European spatial planning and landscape, 2004, No. 76]

Date: Strasbourg, France

Venue: 15 March 2004

Objectives

The aim of the Seminar was to discuss and highlight practical ways for the implementation of Resolution N° 2 on the training of authorities responsible for sustainable spatial development, adopted at the 14th Session of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning (CEMAT), in Lisbon (26-27 October 2006).

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Maria José Festas, President of the Committee of Senior Officials of the CEMAT

1. First of all, the issue of sustainable spatial development and spatial planning must be placed on the agenda of the Summit of Council of Europe Heads of State and Government to be held in Warsaw (Poland) on 16 and 17 May 2005. In this connection, particular emphasis must be placed on the “territorial dimension of sustainable development” as underlined in the September 2003 Ljubljana Declaration.
2. Secondly the members of the Committee of Senior Officials (CSO) of the CEMAT should join together with the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities and ENTO in considering arrangements for enhanced co-operation.
3. At the same time, there are some difficulties with the implementation of the provisions of Resolution No 2 adopted at CEMAT’s 13th Session in Ljubljana in 2003.

While we are already working on the list of training centres active in the field of sustainable spatial development, we must not forget that the list needs to be constantly updated. Sustainable spatial development is a dynamic process, where research and practice are producing new know-how which must be used and new skills which need to be taken into account through appropriate, up-to-date training.

9. International CEMAT Seminar on “Networking for sustainable spatial development of the European continent”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation within the framework of the activities of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional/Spatial Planning of the member states of the Council of Europe CEMAT-CoE.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe Series European spatial planning and landscape, 2005, No. 79]

Date: 26 September 2005

Venue: Moscow, Russian Federation

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Mr Günter Mudrich, First Secretary of the Chamber of Regions of the Council of Europe Congress of Local and regional Authorities of the Council of Europe

Spatial/Regional planning at national as at European level has to be considered as a political activity which influences and defines directly the future development of our society. The planning and management of our natural and constructed environment, the political decisions on organisation, transportation, infrastructures, environmental project, as well as decisions on the future of rural and urban regions, determine directly and indirectly the way of life of people living in the areas concerned. The decision to build a parking place or to plant a tree instead has an impact on the environment and on the living conditions of the citizen of which the politicians and the administrations concerned must be aware. Regional planning is thus an important part of the socio-economic development of our societies and has a long-term development dimension.

In this sense, the opening statements of Mr Vladimir Yakovlev, Russian Minister of Regional Development and Mrs Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni General Director of DGIV, Council of Europe, were presented.

The Russian Minister welcomed this Seminar as a first experience of international character being organised by his Ministry.

He underlined that regional development policies must reply to the needs of the citizens, that thus have to assure public and community services for them, contribute to social cohesion, assure a healthy environment and appropriate living and employment conditions. He pointed out the need to define guiding principles for sustainable development policies, especially for the national territorial planning concept of the Russian Federation. Mrs Battaini-Dragoni stressed the importance of exchange of experiences and training as driving forces to boost pan-European co-operation and network building especially with the new Council of Europe member countries. It is important to build bridges across Europe by network structures based on the concepts and value systems of the Council of Europe.

A certain number of values has to be applied when defining and implementing planning policies. The European Charter for Spatial/Regional Planning adopted in 1983 in Torremolinos defines in this respect that regional planning should be democratic, comprehensive, functional and long term oriented. As regional planning has to take into consideration the existence of a multitude of individual and institutional decision-makers which influence the organisation of space, it has to work with networks existing at different levels in a horizontal as in a vertical dimension. The European Regional/Spatial Planning Charter defines the following fundamental planning objectives:

- balanced socio-economic development of the regions;

- improvement of the quality of life;
- responsible management of natural resources and protection of the environment with a view for sustainable development;
- rational use of land.

These principles have to be applied in all sector policies, especially in urban areas, rural, frontier or mountain regions.

In the light of the Charter which represents the theoretical basis and the common political will of the Council of Europe member countries in the field of regional planning, it is important to support network building and identify the possible obstacles which hinder the creation of operational and efficient networks.

Regional planning is an administrative technique and a political activity and is – as defined by Claudius Petit, the father of French spatial territorial planning – the planning of our society by orienting the living and working conditions of the citizens in urban and rural life.

In the pluralistic, democratic society large numbers of different types of networks are active; they can have a political, administrative, technical, general or specific character. They can be built for special purposes or are created with long term objectives. They are abolished when their objectives are reached or they are created as soon as a new need is being felt.

During the seminar, a certain number of examples of network building and network functioning was presented by the delegates from different countries. When trying to structure these contributions it was possible to identify five types of networks with European or transnational character.

1. Geographic – territorial networks

- urban networks: examples were presented by Robert Kragt who referred to the Netherlands national planning strategy. Also mentioned were trans-European transport, communications, and infrastructure networks assuring mobility of goods, ideas and information in north-south and west-east directions. Strong urban networks are for example Maastricht (NL) – Liege (B) – Aachen (D) as well as Basel (CH) – Freiburg (D) – Mulhouse (F);
- protected areas: networks exist especially for national parks and nature parks which can be interrelated to allow protection of national natural habitats;
- area networks: here the Alpen-Adria-Working Community, the Pyrenean and the Alps-Regions Community should be mentioned here, as well as the co-operation structures of the Carpathian and the recently created Adriatic region, or the Black Sea Euroregion.

2. Territorial political network

Transnational regional co-operation and transborder co-operation structures should be mentioned here. Jans Gabbe explained the European transfrontier co-operation networks acting in the Association of European Border Regions. Sergey S. Artobolevskiy described Russian border regions and Karoly Miskey presented the case of the Tisza/Tisa river Basin.

3. Social-political networks

The European Network of training Organisations for local and regional authorities (ENTO) was presented as well as the Network of Ombudsmen described Chryssi Hatzi as an example. The problems and management of recent populations migration developments reads also European wide social network publishing as presented out by Irina Molodikova.

4. Sector Networks

Henri Jaffeux presented the Pan-European Ecological Network, a network of protected areas and ecological corridors. The Landscape European Network as well as the European Landscape Convention were presented by Bas Pedroli, who also spoke about the European Landscape Map and the European Landscape Characteristic Assessment Initiative. There are also university co-operation networks which are established at European, transborder and worldwide level.

In the field of spatial planning a European Spatial Planning Observation Network (Espon) exists, described by Thiemo Eser. This network, however, is limited to the countries of the enlarged European Union. Examples from the Russian Cultural Landscape protection work were also presented.

5. Special project – and ad hoc-networks

Co-operation structures set up by CEMAT and its Committee of Senior Officials are an operative example of this type of network as well as the special innovation projects for sustainable planning of St Petersburg, the Leningrad, Kaliningrad and Moscow Oblats. Armenia as an innovating land bridge of CEMAT was also presented by Mrs Alaverdyan.

Since the enlargement of the number of Council of Europe member countries covering today all of Europe and parts of the Asian continent, a new dimension had to be introduced into our work in this field. Strategic territorial planning is necessary to go above the balanced regional development with a view to achieve a balanced continental and transcontinental balance. Two instruments could be developed for successful network building. The first is the elaboration of a “Transcontinental territorial development concept”. This project could define guidelines and territorial projections for closer interrelating territories of Eastern and Central Russia to the industrial and urban centres of Western and Central Europe. Such a transcontinental development concept should be based on a network of transport and communication axes, development corridors and energy networks showing medium and long term prospects for development of human habitats, urban centres and industrial investments.

Such a concept needs new working instruments. Beside the classical methods of regional planning, the recently developed outer space equipments and satellite technologies are at the disposal of governments and should be used. Especially remote sensing which has been developed in the last 15 years as an important tool for surveying ecological and industrial developments at continental and global scale should be further exploited.

It is true that the member countries of the European Union started work on a territorial development concept. However, this approach seems to be much limited to central and parts of Eastern Europe and will not be able to respond to the geopolitical dimension created by the enlargement of the Council of Europe. The “common European house” needs also a new regional planning strategy for being built in a successful way and has to take into consideration the urban and industrial dynamics of the Russian Federation, Ukraine and neighbouring countries for bringing appropriate new tools and objectives into European regional planning.

However, their new geographical constellation brings in a new category of disadvantaged regions. These are the ultraperipheral areas situated at the outer borders of our continent. It is important to integrate these regions into the existing regional development networks and, if possible, to create new ones between them for better representation at governmental and European level.

The recent ecological catastrophes show the need for closer co-operation networks also in specific areas, such as combating the large forest fires in the Mediterranean countries or the water and flood disasters which accored in Central Europe. Regional planning can indicate means to reduce these ecological disasters and accidents which become in recent years stronger and more dangerous. Pan-European co-operation networks should be setup for developing preventive policies and mutual assistance programmes.

Network building is therefore of utmost importance in our society and the Council of Europe has been supporting this for many years. Network building and working with and in networks are important for the creation of synergies and for better working with institutions at national and European level.

Much substantial work has been done in regional/spatial European planning. Studies, research, evaluations, analytical work, exchange of experiences and pilot projects exist. This work has now to be integrated into effective spatial planning work and has to become available to planners charged with the drawing up of development plans. From this level information, knowledge and experiences have to be transmitted to the politicians for use in decision-making and policy guidelines. CEMAT has an important role to play here and to further strengthen work for this transfer of information and of knowledge. It has done so over the past 25 years, but has to continue also in future.

Protection of our environment, sustainable local and regional, national and European territorial development, rational use of land and integration of cultural values and policies for social cohesion should be the guiding orientations for the future of territorial planning of the enlarged European landscape. The Council of Europe offers a large number of legal and technical tools and value systems which should help to assure that all citizens in our enlarged Europe have living and working conditions which correspond to the values of the Council of Europe.

10. International CEMAT Seminar on “Urban management in networking Europe”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the Republic of Slovenia and the European Council of Town Planners (ECTP)

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe Series European spatial planning and landscape, 2005, No. 80]

Venue: Ljubljana/Bled, Slovenia

Date: 17-18 November 2005

Objective

The Symposium aimed at promoting both an integrated approach of spatial planning and a good governance, and to make proposals in view of the preparation of the 15th CEMAT Session to be held in Russian Federation on “*Future challenges: sustainable spatial development of the European continent in a changing world*”.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Elias Beriatos, President, Greek Planners’ Association (SEPOX), Vice-Chair, International Society of City and Regional Planners (IsoCarp)

As conclusions can never be truly final, we shall attempt here to set out some remarks, observations and comments prompted by what has been said and discussed during the seminar and which we regard as essential and useful to potential users of the proceedings of this interesting academic event.

First of all, by way of a quantitative assessment of the Seminar, we can start by giving some figures relating to the papers presented and the speakers present as well as to the ordinary participants, whose presence has greatly facilitated dialogue and contributed to a real debate on the issues forming the subject of the Seminar. This active participation was in fact very representative and very varied in both geographical and cultural terms. Not including the opening addresses given by the organisers at the start of the Seminar, there have been 26 speakers from over 22 different countries in Europe (in other words, nearly 50% of the Council of Europe member states). 150 people were registered on the list of participants.

Moving to a qualitative evaluation and the thematic structure of the Seminar, the following points may be stressed. The central theme “Urban management in networking Europe” is a highly topical and important issue. Indeed, with the rampant computerisation of society, networks of towns and cities today constitute a reality/factor which strongly influences all aspects of planning and urban development. More specifically one of the key aims of the Seminar was to highlight the various aspects of modern urban management not only from a theoretical but also from a political and practical standpoint. These aspects correspond to the three sessions of the Seminar around which the presentations and discussion were focused.

The first session, of a more or less theoretical nature, dealt with the well-known concept of polycentrism (a concept prevalent in Europe, in the last decade), combined with the relationship between the two ends of the spatial scale: the global and the local, as embodied in the term glocal (from global-local). The second and third sessions concerned, respectively, “visions” and “implementation projects and governance”. Case studies were presented at the sessions, showing good examples of urban projects in various cities, regions and countries. Via these examples, it was possible not only to consider what means and mechanisms are used today for implementing policies, but also to learn from the mistakes of others. We should also note the great

importance of the concept of governance, used in the last session, because it ultimately constitutes an innovative mechanism, a social innovation analogous to those introduced in other fields (technology etc.)

Documents

It should also be mentioned that the speakers at the Seminar used many reference documents. These are documents which play an important role in the planning process. They are basic documents which are regarded virtually as gospel by all decision makers (politicians and civil servants at all level of government) as well as by the planners involved in the town and country planning process in Europe:

- the European Spatial Development Perspective (Esdp);
- the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Spatial Development of the European Continent;
- the Council of Europe's Ljubljana Declaration on the Territorial Dimension of Sustainable Development;
- the Council of Europe's European Landscape Convention;
- the Athens Charter of the European Council of Town Planners;
- the European Urban Charter (of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe).

Since it is impossible to comment on each of the presentations individually, we shall now look at the main issues and themes raised by the speakers during the three sessions.

First, however, it should be stressed that all the presentations were interesting, and even excellent, whether they were case studies or presentations of a more theoretical nature. They brought out the somewhat different perspectives and sometimes contrasting issues emerging today in the different countries of Europe or within the same country. One example of this is the Netherlands, where extremely varied attitudes and spatial policies can be seen within a relatively small national territory. Furthermore, the statements and ensuing discussions not only enriched the debate but also revealed a common denominator in policies – some hidden aspects concerning concepts – and in the underlying ideologies with their successes and failures.

Concepts (ends and means)

First of all, the main concept in the theme of the seminar, the “urban network”, is a novelty in the field of urban policy because, basically, it is a new approach in a Europe in which 80% of the population lives in urban areas. However, the number of human beings living within the boundaries of cities or regions is not a real problem. It is the way people use these areas – the “functioning” of space in the wider sense of the term – which engenders difficulties (and this applies to all levels, from the local to the continental and the global). This is the real challenge for today's urban planners, who would genuinely like to help urban societies to improve their spatial management by laying the emphasis on quality rather than quantity.

The most extensively analysed concept during the Seminar was that of polycentrism, but particular attention was also focused on similar and complementary concepts such as “spatial equilibrium” and “territorial cohesion”, which reflect the objectives of spatial planning in Europe over the last few years. It is these concepts that we shall be commenting on below.

To judge from the first session's presentations, polycentrism – advocated by some, contested by others – remains a vague and even ambiguous concept, whose scientific definition is neither clear nor really complete. It means “different things to different people and at different levels” (Robert Kragt). Despite all that, this concept is considered useful and even operational (Peter Mehlbye). It is therefore pointless to look for absolute definitions because, ultimately, it is better to be approximately right than to be precisely wrong. It is not the first time in the history of terminology and knowledge that a concept with an unclear scientific definition is “exploited” – in the positive sense – as a guiding principle. It is a concept which must provide support for spatial planning policy. Every policy comprises elements and aspects that are not scientific and, to some extent, becomes a true “art”, which, according to the great author T.S. Eliot, is the solution to problems which cannot be formulated clearly before they have been solved.

Polycentrism also reminds us of, and suggests a comparison with, another concept, that of “decentralisation”, which was overused in the 1970s and 80s but is somewhat neglected today. However, the difference between polycentrism and decentralisation lies in the fact that the latter always presupposes a “centre”, a powerful “pole” which must be broken up into several pieces or multiplied (to ensure an appropriate distribution of development over a given territory), whereas polycentrism indicates a dynamic process whereby it is impossible to bring about the emergence of new centres, in line with a “bottom up”, not a “top down” model. In other words, it is a question of method, a different way of seeing things, in the sense that it is possible to have a polycentric spatial structure without first going through a centralised structure.

Turning now to the means and process of planning, a distinction is drawn between two (ideologically opposed) types of concepts which serve as working tools for planners and developers. On the one hand there is “competition”, “competitiveness” and “urban marketing”, and on the other “governance”, “three-way partnership”, “synergy”, “solidarity”, interregional or transnational “co-operation” etc, which are the key words for the development and implementation of a spatial development policy. Some more specific terms may also be mentioned, such as “gateway cities” or “brain ports”. These are new terms from a body of literature – both political and scientific – which has grown up over the last few years and which might at a stretch be regarded as a form of “useful verbalism”, or a certain tendency to embellish reality when, in practice, it is difficult to change it.

However that may be, the problem is to reconcile the two “paths”, the two methodological processes towards sustainable development, something which is extremely difficult, if not impossible. Consequently, the question we have considered above constitutes, in our view, the fundamental contradiction of the Seminar, and one that is in fact very fertile and rich in results because the real issues are always contradictory. The proof of this is the lively debate that took place during this Seminar.

Policies

The “eternal” problem of planning in all its forms is how to turn scientific theory into a politically feasible vision. Hence, one of the questions asked very frequently by the speakers was the following: Where do we stand, where spatial management in Europe is concerned, in these early years of the 21st century? (Kalle). A few years ago the European Union launched the Espon (Oratre) programme, which is an excellent tool for obtaining knowledge needed to intervene and carry out rational spatial planning. But what was, and what is, its impact? Similarly, what is the future of spatial planning at the European Union level (Frank d’Hondt)? Will a new (2nd) Esdp be drawn up? Answering this pressing question, Peter Mehlbye of the Espon co-ordination unit says: “The question does not arise for the time being. We shall see in 2007 when Espon has produced visible results.” But then, where planning is concerned, virtually the whole first decade of the 21st century will have been wasted! It really seems that after the efforts made in the 1990s (drawing up of the Esdp), and especially after the year 2000, a silence or a kind of inertia prevails in the upper echelons of the European Union, which is unjustifiable when you consider the experience gained in the 1990s. Instead of speeding up, we have seen a slowing down. Let us hope that, between now and 2007, there will be something new to report (i.e. political action, and not merely monitoring) in the European Union of the 25 (or the 25+4). On this point (the continuation of planning projects at interregional or transnational level), the presentations by some speakers (Walther Stoeckl, Inge Brors, Miran Gajsek) showed that much remains to be done in certain language expanses (“macro-regions”) of the wider Europe, from the Azores to the Urals and Cyprus. In our view, the drawing up of spatial development plans in the different macro-regions, i.e. regionalisation of the Esdp, is the best way of continuing spatial planning in Europe in this decade.

Here is a promising way of taking the history of the Esdp a little further. The real motive behind the planning of large spatial units is to be found in what might be called the “third way” of European spatial policy. This is a cautious position between two extremes: on the one hand, spatial planning carried out and run by Brussels (bureaucratic, therefore) and on the other, co-ordination of national spatial planning policies. In this connection, attention should be drawn to the Council of Europe’s constructive role and the major contribution made by CEMAT, which has launched several campaigns on planning and the environment, organising conferences, Seminars and other gatherings.

Dialectics

On the question of territorial scales, we may refer to the process mentioned by Ann Bogan, which is summed up in the slogan “A national spatial strategy with regional guidelines”, which means that planning is not a one-way process. One can and must always work in both directions: from the local to the regional and national/supranational and vice-versa. A strategy and overview must be promoted at the higher levels, together with sound management at the lower levels, by a dialectical and stepwise process. As classical Greek philosophy teaches us, the way to approach a problem is always: thesis, antithesis, synthesis.

Dialectic logic is also present with regard to mobility and transport, whose role is vital to the territorial cohesion and urban growth of the large European regions and the different spatial levels. Whether at regional or city level, vehicle traffic raises problems which lead to a real vicious circle: the building of new road infrastructures – especially intra-urban – leads to new traffic congestion. More road traffic leads to the building of new roads. The more you open the “tap”, the more the water runs, and so on. Here again, the dialectic approach can be applied.

Furthermore, the transport system influences and modifies the accessibility of remote and disadvantaged regions, but not always in a positive way. Its effect is often negative because, between weak and strong, it is strong which prevails, centripetal forces over centrifugal forces. Experience has shown us that transport infrastructures always lead to concentration if there are no other policies aimed at restoring equilibrium. Here we can see the important role of spatial planning as a public interest policy.

Boundaries

Urban planning and development often come up against problems concerning boundaries of all kinds: geographical, cultural, racial, religious, administrative, legal, etc. Fernando Tapia and Markella Hadjida referred to cases of cities which are near or even on borders and therefore strongly influenced by them. San Sebastian (Spanish city opposite Biarritz in France), Nicosia (capital of Cyprus), Jerusalem (Israel), Berlin (Germany), Belfast (Northern Ireland) and less well-known cases such as Gorizia (border town between Italy and Slovenia) are typical examples of towns and cities close to, or divided by, borders, which require specific and more elaborate spatial planning and management. Not to mention, of course, the often insuperable barriers that exist in our towns and cities in the form of social exclusion, poverty, etc., which it is absolutely essential to remove by means of integrated policies.

Practical application

As already mentioned, there is often a gulf between theory and implementation, between policy and its practical application. In fact, there is a great discrepancy between action plans and programmes from one country or region to another and, depending on the political and administrative system, within the same country, something to which Robert Kragt refers. It is the fundamental antinomy of planning which reduces its effectiveness. For example, there is much talk today about environmental protection and quality of life, but we see the rapid, uncontrolled urban development leads to destruction of the landscape and the natural and cultural heritage. The representatives of the political systems of the countries of democratic Europe, and those they represent, lack the means to resolve these problems.

In this context, social participation is essential to planning provided it is carried out in a creative and inventive, and not mechanical, way. Participation as a social and political process is often regarded as a process totally at odds with efficiency, but this is not always the case in practice. It is often said that more democracy means less efficiency, and vice versa. Exponents to the other viewpoint say “no cities without citizens”. If we accept this principle, the process of participatory democracy and conviviality is therefore a necessary stage in planning in a market economy system, a one-way process.

It is no coincidence that the example of the BTC project in Slovenia (an “international” architectural complex, according to its critics) prompted a very lively discussion by the Seminar participants. Despite its positive economic aspects for the city and the region, this project was regarded by some participants as a product of non-participatory planning not integrated with local conditions. But social participation in these early years of the 21st century presupposes the use of new technology, and from this point of view the PICT programme is a good example of how citizens and residents can be provided with information today. Mechanisms and means of communication are essential tools for modern planning when they are properly used.

By way of a final conclusion, we may say that the debate stimulated by the Seminar has shown that if we are not capable of solving a problem, it is always possible to try to learn from the mistakes and successes of others. Criticism is no doubt necessary, but action is even more essential. We must act, therefore, at the risk of failing. Ultimately, the fairest and most impartial judge is the history of each city, region and country.

11. International CEMAT Seminar on “Sharing responsibility for our region: redefining the public interest for territorial development”

Organised by the United Nations Commission for Europe (UNECE) and the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Spatial Planning and Landscape Division – in co-operation with the authorities of the Slovak Republic.

Venue: Bratislava, Slovak Republic

Date: 22-23 May 2006

Conclusions

Theme I: The city as a living environment and a driving force development

A. General trends

Cities in the UNECE region are facing challenges which are specific to each country; however, there are common trends, which are influenced by the last three decades of neoliberal approaches. These include a reduced role for government combined with fewer rules and regulations for private-sector activities in the market. This approach has affected the physical and spatial metamorphosis of cities to various degrees; some cities declined despite their historic value, while others have prospered.

Since the Second World War, governments in the UNECE region have been involved in various forms of housing delivery and urban planning, either through statutory planning instruments or subsidies taking up most responsibilities in the sector. Nowadays, the effects of the minimalist role of the state in housing and urban planning, which is predominant in most countries, are also visible in the former socialist countries.

The neoliberal approach has influenced the planning and management tools. Policies moved towards releasing “energies” of the private sector through enabling strategies. However, difficult questions arise as to who really benefits from these strategies, without taking into account equity and sustainability goals. The “rolling back” of the state in the neoliberal economic agenda has led to a physical and social polarisation and/or fragmentation of the cities. This is evident not only in transitional countries but also in the most advanced economies.

Related to countries in transition, significant trends influencing the national economies as well as the economic conditions of individual inhabitants, their life styles, preferences and the like had major impacts on the social and urban pattern of cities.

Following are some changes that have seriously affected cities’ development:

- The closure of unprofitable plants was catastrophic for cities which relied totally on those industries, as inhabitants started to abandon cities and towns, or stayed behind without any chances of employment.
- The privatisation of productive plants created a need for new skills and newly trained and educated staff, provoking a change in the social structure and wealth of society. On the other hand, poverty started to increase in absolute and relative figures, and often a small group of individuals become rich.
- Land privatisation and restitution became the most important “planning instrument”, resulting in mass distribution of lands by municipalities. This is due to the fact that land property was restituted without limitations or restrictions on its use. Cities became denser, but without long-term plans or short-term control.

Due to political or economic decisions, some cities started to lose attractiveness and therefore population. These effects were more visible in the new towns and cities dependent on one industry. Even some cities with a longer history were, due to their geographical location, left in the periphery of development. On the other hand, cities with strategic locations became points of attraction, whether because of their tourist

potential, or because they were close to main roads, borders or harbours, or because they were capital cities or engaged in some specific economic activity.

The urban sphere also suffered from physical problems, such as uncontrolled spreading of human activities or urban sprawl, insufficient physical infrastructure, decayed housing stock, changing transport patterns, waste management, etc., environmental problems, such as disappearing of natural areas and biodiversity, socio-economic ones, such as lack of job opportunities, unemployment and the resulting deepening social inequality, increased criminality; weakening of social contacts, limited societal services related to areas as education, health, and cultural activities resulting in problematic disparities in the socio-economic structure of the population.

B. New planning – Different approaches

Interrelationship between the city and its surroundings

When considering the sustainability of city systems, focus should be put on the interrelationship between a city, its environment and the surroundings. The perception of city development in close connection with overall human problems brings new challenges inherent to all those interrelationships.

During the discussion a clear differentiation of approaches were highlighted among countries. The concept of network building and attributing functions to each city in a network drew particular attention of participants.

These networks are defined as entities of larger and smaller cities including the adjacent land in between them. Cities and centers comprising such networks complement and reinforce each other strengths, so that they have more to offer together rather than they would as individual cities. The partnerships between the local and regional governments within the networks are seen as voluntary, flexible and pragmatic. National government expects municipalities to draw up agreements on how to shape the concentration policy in consultation with provinces and urban regions. Within each of these urban networks the national government designates a number of areas where urbanisation will be concentrated.

In countries in transition, efforts seem to concentrate on legislation, planning and effective mechanisms to implement planning documents, as it was clearly spelled out in most of the response papers. However, new metropolitan poles are emerging in these countries. Even though they are not officially recognised as such by legislation – an issue stressed by most participating countries – they are playing a very important role in changing the system, i.e. their development brings changes not only within their own limits but also influences the system of surrounding settlements as part of a larger network. Participants of the conference discussed the important role that cities could play in connection with the regional, national, and international systems. In order to facilitate their role, institutional and governmental structures should be in place.

Governance

Over the past two decades, the general focus of international institutions and national governments regarding urban strategies has shifted from a concern within the spatial and physical dimensions towards a growing importance of governance and institutional aspects.

The concept of governance re-emerged with new connotations as it was reassessed in a context characterised by significant transformations, including the dominance of neoliberal policies, the withdrawal of the welfare state, economic globalisation and the emergence of multinational corporations as agents with supranational powers.

More involvement of the government through legislation, cross-sectoral cooperation and long term planning is required in order to guarantee the redistribution of public investments, to balance the regional disparities and physical and social polarisation.

A “society-centered” approach primarily concerned with the role of civil society in the governance process

has emerged in many countries of the region. For a participatory planning and flexible governance, it is also indispensable to create an integrated organisational and institutional structure dealing with all stages of urban planning from the preparation to the implementation. In other words, there is a need for a structure, a mechanism that guarantees the involvement of all stakeholders.

Decentralisation is another trend in the UNECE region: in countries in transition, municipalities used to be tightly led in their development, have now won a greater autonomy since the decentralisation of political powers. But their financial means are often too small to give them enough real power. They have been obliged to make alliances at the local level and to create new entities composed of several municipalities. This situation is also reflected in the lack of strategic documents and planning mechanisms needed to guide local development, such as city development strategies, general urban plans, master plans and so on.

C. Cities as a driving force for development

Cities are generally considered as driving force for political and economic integration in the process of globalisation, “nodes” for international coordination and for servicing of dynamic economies.

Cultural and natural attributes of cities increase their attractiveness by enhancing public realm, urban design and regeneration, new approach to governance, gearing efforts to stem and control urban sprawl, and/or polycentric and network-based development of the cities are particular gears of development.

Participants of the conference reiterated some of the key concepts related to the driving forces influencing urban planning and spatial development such as the city image including urban identity, the quality of environment, energy use and social trends such as labour costs, levels of education, safe and healthy community life, human resources, gender and generation cohesion which influence the growth and decline of the cities and their important role in the economy.

However, there were no answers to the basic question highlighted in the topic “How to find a balance between economically based urban development and healthy living conditions?”. This area will need more research on current attempts to implement such policies. The UNECE Strategy for a Sustainable Quality of Life in Human Settlements in the Twenty-first Century is a useful framework to that end.

Some countries mentioned the importance of data collection and the establishment of a set of indicators to evaluate current trends and monitor change. The sustainable development approach could be based on identification of concrete targets. Local authorities should incorporate the results of the analyses resulting from evaluation through urban sustainability indicators in the strategic development plans and programmes. Public involvement through opinion pools or other more creative means of participation is also important during assessment and policy elaboration.

Other countries expressed the need to emphasise human safety issues during redevelopment and reconstruction activities, in order to minimize risks from potential floods, landslides, fires and earthquakes.

Urban design

To make cities liveable, several strategies came up during the discussion, mainly relating to urban design. However, when designing a complex entity such as a city, seeking to integrate parts thereof or carrying out urban renewal programmes, it is important to consider both physical and non-physical aspects of the structure of urban networks.

Urban design should be conceived not only as small-scale design, but also as a new spatial order for larger portions of a city and where spatial and functional coordination takes place between elements which are joined up into a planned and later implemented entity.

The conference largely focused on urban sprawl and its dimensions. Sprawl is not only about

suburbanisation and redistribution of the population, but it is closely related to the movement patterns (transportation) and job opportunities. This stresses again the importance to consider equally the physical and social dimensions of planning, avoiding segregation and its negative repercussions.

Theme II: How can polycentric territorial development improve functional integration?

A. *The polycentric concept*

The concept of polycentric urban development is not new, but its recent introduction to spatial policy has given it new meaning. The Conference findings show that new definitions and understanding of the concept of polycentricity are far from clear or consensual. This acknowledged that the meaning of polycentricity is context-dependent (e.g. different territorial and demographic characteristics of countries; their urban development patterns, institutional organisation, etc.). Polycentricity is mainly applied to the meso-level of urban agglomeration focusing on intra-urban patterns. It is also used at the macro-level at the interurban scale. At the mega-level at the intra-European scale, polycentricity is used in policies to reconcile the conflicting aims of competitive economy and socio-spatial cohesion.

Conference participants noted that: (a) polycentricity offers the possibility of combining the effect of cities and urban areas in supporting competition, innovation and growth with a more balanced model of spatial development; (b) polycentricity can improve cooperation, coordination and complementarity and reduce inappropriate competition between cities; and (c) it can help to create synergies by strengthening networks and cooperation between cities and their hinterland, while being able to participate in the provision of the functional complexity of urban systems.

Recent research suggested that polycentric national urban systems do not necessarily reduce regional disparities. Conversely, in certain circumstances more monocentric urban systems are characterised by less regional disparities. This holds particularly for the former EU-15 countries. However, in some cases, monocentric development has produced more negative impacts than positive ones. More research analysing these scenarios should be undertaken the impact of different approaches.

Pan-European scale

Polycentricity tackles the problem of uneven access to services for all citizens while reducing the diseconomy of spatial disparities. Despite policy efforts at the highest European level, the “Pentagon” (the area encompassing London, Paris, the Randstad, Brussels and Western Germany down to Milan with the greatest concentration of innovative and competitive production and services) prevails, not least because it alone is considered capable of competing in the global economy.

Polycentricity figures widely in supra-national policies. Spatial development requires interdisciplinary integration, cooperation between the relevant political bodies and authorities, and wider participation. Polycentricity may favour the developed parts of Europe, and the “core” can offer better potentials for spatial integration. In some countries, national capitals may not evolve as equal partners even in the long run, although the market privileges them against their own national hinterlands.

Diverse scenarios imply different costs and benefits, social, economic and environmental consequences. In practice, different scenarios may suit particular regions. Many factors influence the real shape of polycentricity, like prices of energy, political stability, etc. Therefore it is not only the decision made by governments that are shaping polycentricity. However, impacts of government policies should be looked at in more depth.

National level

The inertia of physical and economic structures, institutional set-up and cultural behavioural patterns will

continue to play an important role in the polycentric approach. The diversity of national and regional settlement patterns can be evaluated as part of national or regional identity, and a sort of common pan-European heritage. Besides national capitals being unrivalled prime centres, a network of secondary centres usually exists, with prospects of strengthening competitiveness.

The level and nature of polycentrism vary within the UNECE region. Countries of the EU-15 introduced spatial policies related to core urban areas and along major transport axes. Urban networks with small and medium size cities reinforcing each other are expected to optimise the use of scarce spaces and to form a new tier of governance by means of voluntary partnerships with central government designating where further urbanisation should concentrate.

The effort to gear cities in Southern and Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia towards a European polycentric network may have detrimental effects on the human and economic potential of the rest of these countries, unless major infrastructure investments of European interest are complemented by adequate improvements in network infrastructures at a national and regional scale.

Regional and local level

Polycentric urban regions are most widespread in North-Western Europe. In more remote areas, the pattern of dominating centres and rural hinterlands is more frequent. In many cases, regions are weak when faced with increased mobility of people, capital and economic activities, especially where there is a lack of regional identity. European polycentric policy which might create an illusion of balanced development, whilst presiding over, or even exacerbating, polarisation on a more localised scale may be avoided when more is known of the spatial trends and policies at lower levels.

The gap gets wider between rural territories which benefit from urban influence through geographical proximity or transport links and those without. The latter lack accessibility, but the benefits from introducing supra-regional transport infrastructure in peripheral areas may pass them by. An alternative model of development is an integrated multipolar rural territory which encompasses small towns and the hinterland.

B. Implementing polycentric development

There is considerable territorial as well as social diversity in the UNECE region. The question is how to benefit from existing diversity for the economic and social well being of societies in the region. The free movements facilitated by the European Union have no doubt contributed to some convergence. However, globalisation and worldwide mobility have brought about new diversity with increased ethnic, racial, religious and class divides. They have given rise to incompatibilities, friction, rivalries and even open conflicts. They provoked defensive responses expressed in gated communities, no-go areas as well as the temptation of fortress Europe. It could thus be argued that polycentricity embedded in cooperation and solidarity does not come naturally to human societies. Concerted human action is required to implement polycentricity. What research attempts to assist is how to get from the is-state to the desired state expected from polycentricity.

The EU has adopted economic measures, in particular capital investment into transportation infrastructure, to create greater territorial balance and social inclusion. Research shows that these measures can have perverse effects – for example, bypass peripheral areas instead of incorporating them into a balanced territorial economy. Similarly, expanding the road network in the Dutch Randstad, the original model of polycentricity, is increasing congestion. It thus reduces both accessibility for all and equal opportunities, two stated aims of polycentricity.

Economic efficiency is often detrimental to socio-spatial equity. In the case of high-quality infrastructures, gaps emerge between running and maintenance costs and their limited usage, especially in less attractive territories with population and economic decline. It is difficult for countries in transition to find *post hoc* solutions for the contradictions of their uncontrolled spatial development.

Other than economic and physical measures are needed to fulfill the objectives of polycentricity. Changes in human behaviour and attitudes are required, such as a change from competitive ethos to a new humanism to reduce polarisation and achieve greater integration.

At the very least it has a number of prerequisites. Implementing polycentricity depends on people who are willing to pool and share their “common wealth” and build institutions which facilitate the development of a more equitable society. They need the cooperation of the business community as well as other interest groups.

Institutional prerequisites

Governance is considered the key to implementing polycentricity. “Good governance” is meant to encompass the rule of law, accountability, a sense of co-responsibility and transparency, and consensus building, inclusiveness, responsiveness and public participation. Governance alone does not suffice, though, and other tools of implementation are required, such as organisational capacity, institutional innovation and partnerships to overcome contradictions between competitiveness and cooperation, complementarity and coordination.

Polycentricity requires different administrative and organisational structures with decision-making legitimacy. Even in the context of ongoing deregulation and privatisation, governments and other public bodies can still influence the decision-making process of the business community. Any governmental decision to actively manage spatial change implies steady and continuous political leadership, long-term cooperation and a shared concept of development.

Partnerships are a prevalent form of modern governance. The very concept of partnership has many different interpretations, encompassing different types of partners with varying roles. It is essential to match the appropriate kind of partnership to specific circumstances of place, time and objectives. Where the public sector is being increasingly handled like the private sector, partnerships and outsourcing are gaining in significance. The transformation from hierarchy and tax-based public service provision to entrepreneurial government with a focus on enabling and contractual responsibility has institutional consequences.

Partnerships can take many different forms of cooperation and sharing: public-public as well as public-private, private-private and a combination of private, public and voluntary sectors. In order to prevent institutional fragmentation, it is crucial to identify the common interests of key stakeholders in the development of polycentric systems. In return, business, which operates in high-risk economic and social environments, expects public-sector spatial policy to be consistent, comprehensive, stable and transparent at all levels.

Networks should be considered as an instrument to facilitate the transition from competition to cooperation. Reciprocal relations of spatial units in existing spatial networks are based on sharing. Individuals or agents can have more than one identity in a spatial network. Spatial network makes meaningless the concept of boundary. The three cities visited during the study tour illustrated the diversity of partnerships available to planning as a means of translating socio-economic aims into space.

The implementation of polycentric networks at the regional and/or local level will demand institutional capacity building in those regions and municipalities which have less developed administrative and cultural traditions in creating partnerships and coalitions. In highly centralised nation states this will constitute an added challenge and emphasise the link between the development of governance mechanisms and polycentric spatial development models.

No matter how desirable the aims of polycentricity, its implementation is bound to change power relations. It requires the empowerment of those who are most actively involved in implementation by granting them political will to legitimise their actions to achieve polycentricity. As research has shown, the regional level is best suited to implement polycentricity. The intermediary level of governance between the nation state and the local level needs strengthening. Moreover, the level in charge of implementation should be empowered to

raise the necessary means through taxation and charges. The chances are slim of anyone wanting to give up power. In real life, short-term gain eclipses long-term sustainability. A serious change of cultural and behavioural attitudes would be required to implement polycentricity and overcome the paradox between competitiveness and cooperation, complementarity and coordination.

Cooperation based on proximity is important, especially for cooperation within a regional and cross-border context. Functional specialisation and influence are more decisive aspects when considering options for transnational cooperation. Complementarity is a driving force of polycentricity. Whether complementarity can be achieved in a climate of short-term gains remains to be demonstrated.

Polycentricity requires multiple governmental units to cope with it. Thus, intergovernmental coordination and partnership – horizontal as well as vertical – seems to be necessary but the examples even from countries that have gone a long way with polycentricity (Netherlands) have difficulties in coordination and cooperation at the local level. It was clear that size matters – not only that of the spatial levels of polycentricity but also the size of the units in which the processes take place.

Polycentric strategies should be compatible with the sustainability concept. Incremental planning from small starts to more complex projects including institutional development could assist implementation. The examples of expected or estimated effects of polycentricity on sustainable development vary. It can provide socially sustainable access to urban infrastructures and services. At the local level (Functional Urban Area) it can increase social segregation through socially unsustainable residential suburbanisation and sprawl. It can also help to get new economically sustainable investment and jobs to remote areas.

Polycentric development is a process complementary to centralisation. Both processes can have positive and negative effects on society, economy and environment. It is a matter of political processes to agree on objectives and priorities, and the role of governments to develop policies to enhance positive and minimise negative aspects of the process. Thus the states and other levels of governments have their roles to play in polycentric development.

C. Key policy issues

The response papers and the conference discussions raised a number of policy issues. Research presented at the conference captured them either as analysis of spatial and socio-economic change and their relevance to polycentricity, or as policy reactions to ongoing urban developments and how they are being handled.

Analytical research

Not clearly defined, polycentricity embodies different conceptual elements and may have acted as an umbrella for different conceptual debates. Nevertheless, conference participants managed to reach consensus on the fact that some sort of polycentric development is taking place. Polycentricity itself is directly linked to consensus building, which is embedded in its aims.

The visibility of polycentric development initiatives varies. Transport-related projects seem to be the most prominent. Scale also plays a key role in terms of visibility. Maps showed polycentric developments throughout Europe but some examples were raised of “forgotten” polycentric regions (e.g. the Veneto region in Italy). Additionally, cross-border cooperation was presented as an implementation tool of polycentric development. Yet the maps included in the vast majority of presentations failed to present any development initiatives beyond country borders.

Research on polycentricity is evolving steadily. A number of comprehensive studies (e.g. Espon) are under way to diagnose ongoing development trends.

Policy and implementation research

Here researchers presented their findings on responses to urban development processes and political preparedness to deal with them. There was no consensus on how to best reach the goal of polycentric development. There was no clear evidence on whether top-down or bottom-up approaches are better. There may not be a single right way to address this issue. It was suggested that rural areas could be a good laboratory for a better understanding of such interaction.

Working towards polycentric development implies a premium on enhanced institutional capacity. Institutional and organisational capacity-building is recognised to be a slow and incremental process. The regional scale was the example used to illustrate this point. Further research which would collate, synthesise and disseminate available information about ongoing capacity-building processes could initiate the development of institutional innovation methodologies, particularly on the role of regional development agencies. Research could show how such institutions could go beyond a solely bureaucratic role and adopt an enabling, mediating stance. Another research issue was the extent to which polycentric development was having an effect on national administrative structures.

Functional complementarity was observed as the cornerstone of sustainable polycentric areas and should be taken into consideration in future policy development.

There was common agreement that there are no one-size-fits-all development solutions. Local contexts matter and should be given top importance in any spatial development strategy. Research should take diversity of local contexts into consideration. There was an interesting variety of approaches to territorial identity. Some presentations referred to the difficulty of creating new territorial identities. Others alluded to strengthening existing territory “personalities” as an essential motor of development.

There was no clear agreement on the possibility of separating the urban from the rural.

Economic development was addressed in the majority of presentations. Yet several questions remain unanswered. For instance, who leads economic “development”? Are the market forces the engines and the public sector the follower or the opposite, or is no unique pattern identifiable?

More generally, there was a call for research which would provide less arguable outcomes. Information dissemination and communication is understood to be of great importance in this context and should not be overlooked.

Some issues raised in the initial conference discussion paper remained unaddressed. No presentation proposed alternative development perspectives. The role of governments in implementing polycentric development strategies was somehow set aside. So was the debate concerning the political issues that may arise from the territorial administrative changes this development model seems to catalyse. Lastly, there was no clarification of the link between polycentric development and social-spatial cohesion.

The debate and response papers and the UNECE conference on “Sharing responsibility for our region” reconfirmed that urban polycentricity offers the possibility of combining the powerful influence of cities and urban areas in promoting competitiveness, innovation and growth with more balanced models of spatial development. Polycentricity may enhance cooperation, coordination and complementarity instead of detrimental competition between cities. It may create synergy by fostering networks of cooperation and pooling complementary functions even across hierarchic levels and discontinuous space. However, polycentricity should not be seen as a panacea for solving problems generated by lack of territorial and social cohesion and growing territorial and economic disparity. Alternative concepts of redressing spatial disparities and extracting value from existing and potential urban assets are worth exploring. Reappraising perceptions of market forces and developing new attitudes toward territorial governance and management of urban change could be promising initiatives.

12. International CEMAT Symposium on “The accessibility and attractiveness of rural and landlocked areas: sustainable transport and services of general interest”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Urban and Spatial Planning of the Principality of Andorra.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe European Spatial Planning and Landscape Series, No. 87, 2008]

Venue: Andorra la Vella, Andorra

Date: 25-26 October 2007

Objectives

The aim of the Symposium was to promote an integrated approach to regional planning and good governance, and to make proposals regarding the preparation of the 15th CEMAT session “*Future challenges: sustainable spatial development of the European continent in a changing world*”, to be held in Russia in 2010.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Mr Jacques Robert, Expert of the Council of Europe

The Pyrenees were one of the test beds of European integration, largely thanks to the Council of Europe. Anyone who remembers the Council of Europe conferences of the late seventies and early eighties (Pau, Oloron, Jaca) knows that they led to the setting up of the Working Community of the Pyrenees. Within that Community, Andorra has always demonstrated a very high level of commitment.

The Symposium now drawing to an end has dealt with several different issues at once. The one thing that these issues have in common is that the areas concerned are rather neglected, and have their own specific problems. Inaccessibility and a lack of services of public interest and sustainable transport solutions jeopardise the attractiveness of some of the areas concerned, the quality of life there and even their survival.

The work that has been done at this symposium has been worthwhile, for we have dealt not only with old problems, such as the disadvantages of a landlocked position, already deplored for several decades, but also with issues connected with a new context, encompassing new values such as sustainable development and an interest in landscapes, as well as new constraints such as those surrounding energy and new challenges presented by, for instance, the potential of rural areas in terms of what we might term the “residential economy” (l'économie résidentielle, economic activity generated by population groups which are not productive in the locality) and the production of renewable energy supplies.

On the subject of accessibility, and in the face of the very wide range of definitions of this concept, I should like to draw attention to the importance of relative accessibility. With competition between areas increasing in the context of globalisation, it is the difference in accessibility between one area and another that creates an advantage.

Next, it has to be pointed out that transport networks have, for decades now, been evolving into systems which favour the major links in the chain, to the detriment of the smaller ones. This has happened not only because of technological progress, as in the case of high-speed trains, but also, and above all, as a result of

profitability issues, with the infrastructure being very costly. Given that it is transport movements between major cities which are most numerous, and constantly increasing, the law of profitability quite naturally favours rapid inter-city links, which are of little benefit to the less developed areas through which they run, or to the more peripheral areas devoid of cities. The problem of secondary networks, with far more interlinking routes, is thus crucial to cohesion between areas, if we wish to avoid a disproportionate increase in the accessibility differential. The role of local and regional authorities in developing such networks has been mentioned several times, but it is one that can be played effectively only if the authorities concerned have sufficient resources. This is frequently the case in western Europe, but is far less likely in the countries of central and eastern Europe. Even those among them which are members of the European Union see Structural Fund resources concentrated on developing major corridors, and local and regional authorities can hardly bear the whole financial burden of improving secondary networks.

Another point which has to be mentioned in relation to accessibility is its relationship with economic development. It has been pointed out that the correlation between the two is not an absolute one, and that there are plenty of factors other than accessibility to explain areas' economic performance or failure to perform. Nor should we restrict our study of the correlation to periods that are too short. Over the longer term, a lasting positive accessibility differential does usually seem to translate into a positive differential in terms of economic development.

And lastly, it is a good thing to remember that accessibility extends beyond infrastructure to encompass transport and also telecommunications services. Just a few years ago, it was feared that a significant gulf between areas would develop where telecommunications networks and services were concerned. While it cannot be denied today that such differences exist, they seem to be shrinking more rapidly than differences in terms of transport infrastructure. High-speed Internet access is expanding faster in Europe than high-speed trains or even motorways, to the extent that in the near future paradoxical situations might arise in which the potential of telecommunications networks and services might not be able to be fully exploited, because of shortcomings in the physical transport infrastructure. To round off the subject of accessibility, mention must also be made of the vital role of territorial integration and related policies, especially in border regions. The connecting up of transport systems long designed in a purely national context may, even through sometimes modest investments, give rise to considerable gains in accessibility for the areas concerned.

Turning to the subject of goods transport in rural areas, the forthcoming production of biomass in large quantities is going to raise the permanent problem of its carriage to processing units (biofuels production plants). It will be important to locate such units with a view to concentrating biomass transport by rail, waterway or sea, keeping road haulage to a minimum.

There are three factors affecting development where the maintenance of services of public interest in rural areas (and also in some urban areas) is concerned. The first is the liberalisation and privatisation of services, which has a worse effect on the less developed areas with low population densities, where services are less profitable, or even loss-making. The second is the ageing of the population and reduction of population density and, conversely, the third is the changing system of values, with access to products and services of public interest now regarded as a right, similar to other fundamental rights. There are now several countries which provide practical examples of the institutionalisation of this right, and it is desirable that all European countries should follow suit. In parallel with the institutionalisation of this right, the practice of supplying, in conditions acceptable both to the community and to the population groups concerned, goods and services of public interest (water, electricity, telephone and Internet access, media and other sources of information, basic commodities, etc) already highlights a number of methods applicable on a large scale in many rural regions (appropriate pricing, guaranteed supply minima, area grouping of services, etc). Where the rural areas most demographically and economically depressed are concerned, it seems that solutions involving the grouping of services at particular centres (small and medium-sized towns) are inevitable in order to protect such areas from the loss of much of their lifeblood.

Whether it is transport services or other personal services that are at issue, it is also important to take account of a number of new opportunities presenting themselves to many rural areas, such as the chance to develop

their “residential economy” by accommodating retired persons moving in from their cities. The general ageing of the population in Europe will, in the years ahead, extend this kind of possibility, of which appropriate advantage will be able to be taken only if highly specific services are available, whether transport, health or cultural services. If the “residential economy” is to develop, an integrated approach must be taken to services, possibly also including on-demand transport services.

Where many rural parts of central and eastern Europe are concerned, the large numbers of country dwellers and the major changes occurring in agricultural and rural activities will result in an inexorable and lasting continuation of the release of labour. The crucial problem is where alternative jobs will be located. Will medium-sized towns be capable of giving expression to sustainable forms of development? Or, on the other hand, will longer migratory movements to major cities (mainly national capitals), and even emigration to other countries, continue? It seems an appropriate strategy for medium-sized towns to offer an integrated range of services, encompassing both personal services and services for businesses.

It nevertheless has to be said that there are many different situations in rural areas, and that the solutions worked out for some of them cannot necessarily be applied, in exactly the same form, to others. Rural areas close to major cities tend to have very different socio-economic and cultural characteristics from those that prevail in peripheral and remote rural areas. General problems in highly contrasting specific contexts inevitably require differentiated solutions.

In conclusion, it is vital to promote a political priority. The current period is a pivotal one for the countryside and for rural areas. At European level (and particularly within the European Union), long-term policies are going to be introduced in the years ahead on which the future of the rural world depends. In the current context of intensifying globalisation, a rush to be competitive and rivalry between areas, the political balance of power between city and countryside is very much to the latter’s disadvantage. There is thus no small risk of the disappearance, or at least severe curtailment, of a number of policies which have hitherto helped to maintain the vitality of rural areas. It is more necessary than ever before to organise a European rural lobby, for a real choice of society needs to be made. The fatal two-way split between European areas which would result from a lack of a rural development policy would, in the long term, entail high social costs (deterioration of human settlements and infrastructure, deterioration of cultural landscapes, the leaving fallow of agricultural land and pastures, etc). If it is to be effective, a modern rural lobby must raise awareness not only among rural populations, but also among urban populations and their political representatives. In the current context, certain opportunities must be grasped, and in particular the wide media coverage of certain subjects affecting rural areas, such as the possibility of producing biomass and other renewable energies as substitutes for oil-based products, the development of accommodation for retired persons in rural areas and the impact of climate change. The rural lobby must base itself on these new opportunities and new risks, which are both real and objective. In future, it will be less a matter of asking for subsidies than one of demonstrating that rural areas have potential which can lead to development and balance for Europe as a whole.

13. International CEMAT Symposium on “Challenges and strategies for metropolises and metropolitan regions, in a context of growing globalisation with regard to economic, social, environmental and cultural development”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Regional Development of the Russian Federation.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe European Spatial Planning and Landscape Series, 2010, No. 90]

Venue: St Petersburg, Russian Federation

Date: 26-27 June 2008

Objectives

The aim of the Symposium was to contribute to the discussions on the following:

- The development of competitive metropolitan functions: what are they? Who influences them? What are the possibilities of public policies? Which forms of cooperation and networking between metropolitan regions can complement the climate of strong competition?
- Basic patterns and changes in the distribution and positioning of metropolitan regions on the European continent (benchmarking, catching up of metropolitan areas of Central and Eastern Europe);
- Impacts of globalisation, privatisation and demographic change on the social structures in and the situation and development in large cities. Strategies and tools for maintaining social cohesion;
- The qualitative evolution of metropolitan regions: enhancement of the cultural heritage, changes in urban landscapes, development of environmentally-friendly transport and energy systems, urban-rural relationships;
- The management of metropolitan areas: global and territorial governance, strategic planning, public participation, public-private partnerships.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Konstantin Ananichev, Expert of the Council of Europe

The First Session devoted to the future of metropolises and big cities included a comprehensive panorama of the current state of spatial planning in the Russian Federation (Mr Dmitry Aratsky, Deputy Minister of Regional Development) and, in particular, in the city of St. Petersburg (Mrs Ekaterina Goloulina). Several important documents of Pan- European importance were presented at the Session, namely: the European Urban Charter (Mr Carlos Alberto Pinto), Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities (Mr Welf Selke), New Charter of Athens (Mr Luc Emile Bouche-Florin), and European Landscape Convention (Mrs Maguelonne Déjeant-Pons). All reports emphasised the beginning of a new qualitative stage in spatial and urban planning.

The Second Session, formulated as “A Holistic Approach: Cities for People”, consisted of presentations of local positive experience gained in Moscow Oblast, Russian Federation (Mr Alexander Frolov), St. Petersburg, Russian Federation (Mrs Ekaterina Goloulina), Alicante-Elche, Spain (Mr Vincente Domenech Gregori), and Bratislava, Slovak Republic (Mr Peter Benuska). The Session was followed by two parallel Round Tables for free discussions concerning (1) Major trends on the development of metropolises and metropolitan regions, and (2) Major challenges for providing good quality of life for the population in

metropolises. The main results and conclusions of the first two sessions were summarised by Mrs Maria José Festas.

The theme of the Third Session was formulated as “Cities for Tomorrow”. The reports were dedicated to large investment projects and issues of public-private partnership (Mr Roman Golovanov), activities under Espon program, in particular, in transfrontier metropolitan regions (Mrs Margarita Jancic), the program for cities participating in the International Federation for Housing (Mrs Alexandra Litchman), and symbiosis of different cultures, experience of Izhevsk, Udmurt Republic, Russian Federation (Mrs Nadezhda Utkina).

Concluding the Symposium, I would like to emphasise a few remarkable moments of this meeting.

1. No city is an island. Let us thank Mrs Festas for this paraphrase. The development of a big city inevitably becomes a regional, national and finally all-European issue. Globalisation of economic processes and the end of political confrontation in Europe have resulted in transfrontier cooperation and even in physical amalgamation of metropolises. Today, we face new problems, requiring more global approaches and universal solutions. However, international cooperation must be based on comprehension of the unique character of the nature and manifestation of problems facing each individual city. In relation to this, it is expedient to mention new urban-planning documents, presented at the Symposium.

2. Solutions can be complex only. There are no more opportunities for “pure” urban planning. Any spatial project influences all aspects of urban life. At the same time, any problem arising with city development exerts a certain impact on the territory. Urban planners have to take into consideration not only the problems of construction and housing, but the issues of the environment, natural and cultural heritage, and the multiplicity of nations and cultures. They have a very limited set of tools and have to operate within an extremely limited space. A trivial but convincing analogy could be drawn with chess; a good position held by a chess-piece can mean more than its nominal value.

3. Investment is just a tool. Six years ago, in the time of the CEMAT Symposium in Dresden, delegates could be divided into two groups: Westerners reporting on successful spatial development projects accomplished on the base of large-scale investment, and Easterners reporting on their plans and looking for appropriate investment. Today the situation has changed. Here we are a uniform group of spatial planners aware of insufficiency of investment for a “proper” urban development. Investment has to be aligned with the interests of society. As society consists of different groups with different cultural, material, aesthetic and ethical demands, our search for consensus will not be an easy one. But if we return to the primitive scenario “project plus investor is implementation” we won’t go further. Instead of a new city for people there will be the same old city growing along with its growing problems. Such a process is called growth without development.

4. It is vital to pay more and more attention to ethics. I know that morality and ethics are not the duties of spatial planners. As we represent states, regions and communities with different levels of economy, different landscapes, different traditions and ways of life, we are not able to draw plans here of an ideal city. Nevertheless, we can discuss its criteria and the criteria of a city for people. The city of the future will be based on human values including ethics and aesthetics.

Generally speaking, the Symposium was a long-expected fruitful exchange of opinions. The main conclusion shall be optimistic: spatial planning remains one of the most efficient tools for metropolitan development. The drawbacks result from improper use and lack of cooperation with society and other sectors.

14. International CEMAT Symposium on “The spatial dimension of human rights: for a new culture of territory”



Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Urban Development of Armenia.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe European Spatial Planning and Landscape Series, 2010, No. 91]

Venue: Yerevan, Armenia

Date: 13-14 October 2008

Objectives

The aim of the Symposium was to consider the relation between human beings and the territory and examine how spatial planning is a key instrument for sustainable development and effective governance. Its objective is to achieve at the same time: balanced socio-economic development of the regions; improvement of the quality of life; responsible management of landscape and of natural and cultural values; protection of the environment; and rational use of land.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Luc-Emile Bouche-Florin, Representative of the European Council of Spatial Planners (ECPT)

Bearing in mind that conclusions have been drawn, to a greater or lesser extent, from each session, I shall not sum up each address again, but take the role of an active outside observer. This is in fact my role as representative to the CEMAT of the European Council of Spatial Planners, but it is also the role of planners in general, who are duty-bound, as multidisciplinary professionals, to take an overall approach and to give enough attention to what others have to say, so as to endeavour to single out ideas that are shared and to encourage the emergence of new ideas, sometimes with a politically incorrect dimension.

It has been pointed out that a nation's heritage encompasses not just objects and immovable property, but also spaces, known generically as landscape, although Mrs Christina Storelli quite rightly pointed out that it is within the landscape that the key to almost all of our concerns in terms of human rights is to be found. I have given a lot of thought to her comment, and it occurred to me that, while the landscape may hold everything within it, this is because landscape, whether urban or rural, the landscape of all our multicultural and borderless territories, in practice holds within it the identity of the populations living there. If we look back at the origins of the very word “heritage” (and patrimoine in French), we find the same concept of what our ancestors have passed on to us.

These thought-provoking perceptions were very clearly illustrated by Mrs Linda Mavian, when she spoke about Venice. It is from multicultural identity that the major ideas flow that we call the pillars of sustainable development. But should we not, in fact, ask ourselves whether that feature of the landscape that is cultural identity – the heritage in the broadest sense – is not the very basis of sustainable development, so far more than an additional pillar and an intersecting element, as described in detail by Mr Jean-François Seguin.

When we turn to the preservation of landscapes and of the cultural identity that they contain, we therefore have to raise the question of first the recognition and then the appropriation of that cultural identity by human beings that makes recognition possible. Recognise – recognoscere in Latin – is a word thought by some to be related to the Latin verb nascere, meaning “be born”, so perhaps to recognise something is to gain a new awareness of it or to regard it as “new-born”. Etymology sometimes plays tricks with words, and in

this case the “birth” dimension is etymologically incorrect, but it helps to confirm the truth of the “recognition”, or “rebirth”, of the perception of our landscapes.

When we explored central Armenia on Sunday, one thing which struck me was that, of the two monasteries that we visited, the first, whilst archaeologically magnificent, seemed to have been totally given over to the admiration of tourists, whereas the second, in contrast, having been brought back into use for worship, with a strong dimension of identity (an impression shared by the local population), gave us a very different feeling. This does not exclude associated economic use, needing to be approached with great caution, as revealed by Mr Niek Hazendonk, and we also saw the positive aspects of such use highlighted by Mr Jean-Claude Rouard.

Thus the question obviously arises, in respect of the landscape heritage, of its protection, its consistency and its reappropriation policy, which may even extend to an economic logic, which is the only way of making such an approach sustainable and justifying preservation, if we ask ourselves what will happen now that “the party’s over”.

Over the course of human history, the creation that has come down to us can, here at the foot of Mount Ararat, only be regarded as divine; in a peaceful land, human beings have been entrusted with the peopling and domestication of nature and with the shaping of their environment in a way which can both respect it and safeguard the survival of humankind. Until very recently, generations of peasants, nature’s gardeners, had for over twelve thousand years been developing ingenious ways, not of fighting against this nature, but of living in harmony with it. Then the time came, barely a hundred years ago, when the human race began to consider that it had the right to take whatever it needed from the vast resources of nature, which it considered to be both freely available and inexhaustible.

This same nature is now obliging us to show greater respect and to embark on a “reconsideration”, a “recognition”, a “rebirth”, which in practice needs to become the new way forward so that we remain within the confines of the freedom given to us: using our human genius to adapt our civilisations to their environment. Thus human know-how becomes part culture, part heritage, in the same way as nature itself, and in harmony with it: the creation of landscapes derives from these processes, and as Niek Hazendonk pointed out, there is danger in failing to give thought to our responsibility as “consumers of landscapes”.

The point was also made that the idea of using and shaping the urban or rural landscape very soon refers us to a visual perception. In this visual perception I can also see a knowledge of the identity of a space. Hence I feel that there is a vital need for planners responsible for spatial planning to foster this openness, encourage quality uses and make possible a concerted juxtaposition of public/private sequences in a move towards a new consistency. It is this concerted and civic approach that we must take.

The subject of our Symposium, the “spatial dimension of human rights”, must effectively, as a matter of urgency, be made the new focus of the attention of spatial planners, and a precondition for this is a reconciliation with our landscapes, a recognition made possible through rediscovered identity. Only then can we adopt planning policies.

This wide-ranging endeavour may become easier, less Utopian, than we think, and this world in which we live, by which I mean the world of this very day, Tuesday 14 October 2008, may rather chaotically create the opportunity for a more appropriate and fairer reconstruction.

I am amazed that we have not, during this Symposium, mentioned the huge global financial crisis currently sweeping away what we thought were the solid foundations of our economic development models, and it has to be said that the human dimension certainly has disappeared from these models, within which terms such as networking and competitiveness underpinned our vocabulary.

Now we come back to this nagging question of what happens now that “the party’s over”. That time has come, or at least we face some searching questions, so there are two options open to us. The first reflects the fears expressed by the World Conservation Congress, which draws to a close this very day in Barcelona, and which senses a risk of the financial crisis causing collateral damage to the environment, a fear which is legitimate in the light of the financial mountains moved in order to save banks: the sums spent would have

been sufficient to put an end to poverty in the countries of the South for several decades. The other is to reconcile human beings with their environment in an economic context which is certainly very different, and may even be built on new foundations. A lot of concepts need either to be given new thought or to be invented. As Mrs Ruzan Alaverdyan said, we need to rediscover true harmony between humankind and nature. The time has perhaps come, as pointed out by Mr Marc Pallemarts, to get back to the fundamentals of the four objectives covering the dimensions of Sustainable Development, which in practice extend to human rights, not forgetting the rights of future generations. Mr Suren Ohanyan told us quite rightly that human beings need to be creative, and raised the real issues of whether what we regard as progress is positive or not, and whether nature should adapt to us or we should adapt to nature. These are real issues that it is important to reconsider as we seek ways of making the urban landscape a human landscape, as suggested by Cristina Storelli.

Perhaps I may come back to an idea that we looked at during our previous meeting, in St Petersburg, where the thought was expressed that, looking back over history, those civilisations which had disappeared had always done so because they had found it difficult to adapt.

Thus the challenge and the opportunity ahead are those of a new humanism, another “rebirth” also extending to landscapes, which, as Jean-François Seguin reminded us, occupy 100% of our territories: their links with spatial planning urgently need to be reinforced. This is an area to which insufficient attention is given, even at the Council of Europe, although this Symposium would seem to demonstrate the opposite: let us hope that this new awareness gives rise to action.

Dealing with what is to happen now that “the party’s over” is certainly an ambitious task, Utopian, but why not? Cristina Storelli issued an invitation to seek a new dimension, and we can all respond to her call. There is surely a mystical dimension, whether or not we are believers, for we can assume, like certain 20th-century philosophers and thinkers, that the spirituality of the 21st century may merely reflect the reconciliation of human beings with the world as it was created, and their rediscovered awareness of their duty to look after the great “theatre of life” to which Mrs Maguelonne Déjeant-Pons referred when she introduced this Symposium.

Here in Yerevan, the strong symbolic presence of Mount Ararat on our doorstep can and must inspire such a desire in us. Our thanks go to Armenia: its cultural tradition over thousands of years has quite clearly inspired our Symposium.

Finally, I should like to thank you, Ruzan Alaverdyan, for your hospitality, the memory of which will stay with us as a lasting gift.

15. International CEMAT Symposium on “A comprehensive approach to balanced sustainable spatial development of the European Continent”

Organised by the Council of Europe – CEMAT Secretariat, Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Spatial Planning Division – in co-operation with the Ministry of Regional Development and Construction of Ukraine.

[Proceedings edited in the Council of Europe Series European spatial planning and landscape, 2010, No. 92]

Venue: Kyiv, Ukraine

Date: 12 June 2009

Objectives

The aim of the Kyiv Symposium was to promote an integrated approach to regional planning, and good governance, and in particular to implement Recommendation Rec. (2002) 1 on the Guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent, adopted on 30 January 2002 by the Council of Europe’s Committee of Ministers and make proposals for the preparation of the 15th Session of the CEMAT, which will take place in the Russian Federation in 2010 concerning “*Future challenges: sustainable spatial development of the European continent in a changing world*”.

Conclusions

Rapporteur: Maciej Borsa, Warsaw School of Economics, Representative of Poland to the CEMAT Senior Officials Committee

The title of our Symposium – “A comprehensive approach to sustainable spatial development of the European Continent” – reflects our conviction, arising nowadays to the kind of mission of spatial planners, that European citizens have right to a sustainable territory. We’ve discussed this topic in two thematic sessions: first focused on the challenges we have to react, and the second concentrated on the approaches we have to apply.

The background thesis of these two sessions, as well as the third - summarizing session, was that clever governance, applying the “comprehensive approach”, leads to the desirable “sustainability” of territory. The sustainability to which, according to our convictions, our citizens have a right. And which we, spatial planners, intend to deliver to them.

But the sustainable territory, as other human rights, beside rights brings obligations as well. Giving values to citizens. It simultaneously expects some inputs. Can we take assets without giving fees? Who knows about these flows. Do our citizens have enough knowledge to fulfill expectations of sustainable territory to activate resources and finally to use or take the advantages of them?

The willingness, readiness and preparation of society to make use of its right to the sustainable territory seems to be a key issue of the desirable “comprehensive approach” to spatial planning. Due to the spirit of the age we are trying to avoid high restrictions in our plans and procedures. We focus more on limitations and regulations in this respect. The final locational decisions are out of our competences, are uncertain (cannot be precisely foreseen) and mostly based on the coincidence of many partial decisions, undertaken by various persons. The final spatial result is based on the partial decisions of unknown number of “small decisionmakers”. It is hard to say that these decisions are “planned” by any of the official plan, nor the spatial plan. We even do not know, whether all of these “small decisionmakers” know, that they had undertaken the spatially important decision or even that they had participated in the spatial development process. They are unconscious actors in the space.

These reflections lead directly to very simple conclusions – to achieve sustainability of the territory, to implement the clever governance or to make planning approach really comprehensive – we have to start with information, awareness-rising of the citizens, first to make them understanding that problem is important.

And later on – to teach them the basic manners how to achieve positive results. So we, spatial planners, should face to the people, focusing on training and education of the spatial behaviours. It means also new jobs for us – moderators, public discussion facilitators. This is quite the opposite job of a GIS specialist, highly introverted. We need more extraverted jobs in planning, opened for the public, implementing spatial goals in practice. In fact the number of potential posts in this respect is probably much higher than in “pure” planning.

The second session of our Symposium has presented or has mentioned a number of positive examples of social engagement into spatial processes. They prove that wilful participation of citizens in the sustainable spatial development is possible. But we have to develop or at least to deepen the useful models of such participation. This may be a huge task both for individuals as for the professional organisations: national and European as well.

The initial step on this way is to define the challenges. This was the topic of a thematic session during our Symposium. We have the broad experience, both from Council of Europe, particular countries and from European Union. We have our “Guiding principles...”, Esdp, the EU Regions 2020 and Barca reports as well as the EU Cohesion ongoing discussion with latest Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion. Particularly this latest process has exemplified that we are still far from recovery of the territorial approach – it hasn’t still grown strong in our policies, especially at transnational level. Some years ago it seemed that “territoriality” was a promising pillar of the EU policies, beside the social and economic issues. These factors are relatively better known and stable. But until now we have no fixed understanding of the meaning “territorial” – whether it is something “spatial” in wider sense, or only (as it is sometimes perceived as) the way of mapping the social and economic statistics. We have to work on the interpretations of some basic keywords, to be clear for other parties. This was already underlined in today’s discussion.

Another of this keywords is “comprehensive”. Does it mean that concerns each sector and whole territory? What is our explanation? Do we agree on common understanding of such basic terms? We can observe many “comprehensive” policies, which are fragmented, dedicated to the territorial “islands” – isolated parts of the wider territory. Can we accept that comprehensiveness has its levels: that we have high comprehensive policies along with the many other with the lower level of comprehensiveness? Maybe we should define the minimum requirements and the desirable levels? We should work on it – to focus and operationalise our policies. They should be more efficient and addressed territorially (now we address them mostly to the easy defined general goals).

The third topic which should be mentioned in summary is how to reconcile the long-term and short-term objectives of spatial development. Or generally – how to achieve goals and implement best practices in it? The useful answer is – through the innovative governance. So we are no longer concentrating on “spatial planning”, switching imperceptibly to “spatial governance”, sometimes we are using the term “spatial management”. What is the difference between planning and management of space?

Management and governance are something much wider than planning itself. We can use the classic definitions of management in non-spatial economic applications: management comprise four elements: planning, organising, motivating and controlling. We can preassume that generally similar content will apply to spatial management. The main conclusion from this classical definition is – that planning is a part of management, not the opposite.

Maybe it is obvious now for all of us. But not so long ago in many Eastern European countries – planning was something what was much wider and situated over the management and governance, one can say: planning was the dogma, influencing everything else. So, in many of these countries the transformation of spatial planning paradigm, which occurs now in Europe, runs harder than in other countries. For many planning officers (and simple soldiers) it is hard to understand and agree that planning is only the tool – tool of governance.

But on the other hand – people who do not directly participate in the spatial development processes have aliasing “spatial planning” with the “central planning” period in their countries. They perceive planning as the past habit, which have to be deeply and quickly cancelled. In these circumstances spatial planners in the post-soviet countries have additional task concerning their public awareness activities – to convince that

spatial planning is not yet retired – that as we make business plans for market operating companies, so we have to make spatial plans for market dependent territories. But of course we have to use proper methods.

It is of high importance for the future that we already have such methods, and are trying to implement them – that was mentioned today in many speeches. The Ukrainian program for cities, programs intended to increase abilities and skills of spatial planning professionals and many others. We need more knowledge, we have to increase professional capacities. Switching from “planning” to “governance” is not the easy way. It is much easier to declare than to implement changes. Even if we know what to do – are we in power to do it? Who will support us and who will obstruct? Are we prepared to construct the coalition for the “new spatial governance” or are we lonely fighters which will lose?

That’s why we have to talk to the wider audience about the rights and obligations for a sustainable territory. To explain that it is not something given, but something what can be achieved by the common long lasting efforts of the uncountable number of actors. This seems to be the basic rule of the comprehensive approach to planning.