

Connecting Europe to its Regions: Territorial Cohesion as a Toolkit for an Interwoven Spatial Development Approach

Bynens, J. & Van der Lecq, R.

Administration for Spatial Planning of the Ministry of Flanders
Julie.Bynens@lin.vlaanderen.be / Rene.vanderlecq@lin.vlaanderen.be
Phone +32-2-553.83.79

Keywords: territorial cohesion; ESDP; regions

Introduction

Territorial cohesion is hot. The entrance of this concept in the EU policymaking arenas offered spatial planners a new opportunity to open the debate on bringing the territorial dimension of EU policies and legislation on the agenda. Up till now this has been a quite fruitful operation since the awareness of the need to take the territorial dimension into account in cohesion policy and environmental directives has severely grown. The elaboration of the concept of territorial cohesion, however, implies not only an internalisation of a spatial mindset amongst European officials. Also the responsible spatial policy authorities within the Member States - in many cases the regions - have to play a role to put territorial cohesion into effect. They are the ones to address their international aspirations and their strong concerns about the impact of EU directives within their own policies as well.

In this paper we wish to draw attention to the need of a stronger focus on national and regional spatial policy instruments and their possible contribution to territorial cohesion policy. The overview of the policy debates on European spatial development and territorial cohesion in the first two chapters shows how this aspect has remained somewhat underdeveloped until now. After that, we will show that the working package - recently lined out by the ministers responsible for spatial policy - nevertheless keeps the responsibilities for the Member States on board. In line with this, we wish to discuss the potentials of regions and of spatial policy instruments within the Member States towards more territorial cohesion. Finally we wish to conclude that in order to use these potentials the Member States and the Commission have to take on some severe responsibilities over the next couple of years.

Territorial cohesion: new chances in an ongoing process

The introduction of the concept of territorial cohesion in the European Constitution initiates a new era of European collaboration in the field of spatial development policy. This process of collaboration knows deep roots (Williams, 1996). Already from the very beginning of the European integration process, more than half a century ago, it was clear that increased collaboration and the vanishing of borders had a significant territorial dimension. While the impact of a broad range of EU policies on spatial development has been increasing over the last decades (EC, 1999), the competence for spatial planning policies remained within the Member States. Therefore a remarkable relationship had grown between the European Commission and the Member States and its regions. A step by step process of cross-border experiments and EU wide collaboration, in 1999, finally led to the formulation of a common framework for the development for the European territory: the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) (Faludi and Waterhout, 2002). The essence of the ESDP is to strengthen a sustainable spatial development of the European territory by stimulating global competitiveness and cohesion through a polycentric development model.

The adoption of the ESDP by the Commission and the ministers responsible for Spatial Planning was one of the most important milestones in the EU-wide co-operation process on spatial development. The document set out a

series of common principles and policy options for the territorial development across Europe that offer a framework for co-ordination of EU sector-policies and territorial policies within the Member States. In this sense the territorial dimension of policymaking was seen as a contribution towards the efficient implementation of EU goals, in particular the goals of improving competitiveness throughout the EU regions, strengthening economic and social cohesion and safeguarding the sustainable development of the EU territory (ARL, 2004).

In spite of the ambitious political action programme agreed upon in Tampere quickly after the adoption of the ESDP, the considerations of the ESDP practically only found effect via the INTERREG programmes and the establishment of the European Spatial Planning Observatory Network (ESPON). In the meanwhile the political discussion on territorial co-operation was pushed aside by some new driving forces influencing the agenda at EU level. The orientation on economic development became more prominent as a result of the economic challenges in the new Member States, the growing global competition and the ageing population in major parts of the Union. The Lisbon Summit, in March 2000, set out an ambitious goal of making the Union the most dynamic, competitive, sustainable knowledge-based economy, enjoying full employment and strengthening social and economic cohesion. The European Council in Gothenborg in June 2001 later on added the environmental dimension to this strategy, thus creating what is often called a sustainable development strategy for Europe.

Meanwhile, as a result of the extension of the Union, the Commission was preoccupied with streamlining the institutional framework. The number of working parties had to be cut and should follow strictly the philosophy of the 'comitology' in which a steering position is given to the Commission. As being the odd one out because of its equal relationship between the Commission and the Member States, there was no longer room for the Committee for Spatial Development (CSD). This committee was to be categorised as a technical working party for Spatial and Urban Development (SUD) of the Committee of the Reconversion and Development of the Regions.

In spite of the fact that the territorial dimension of EU policymaking seemed to be pushed aside for a while the existing collaboration in the field of spatial planning, as for instance within the ESPON framework, proved itself sufficiently embedded. As a result territorial thinking never disappeared completely from the agenda. Quite the contrary, it became a reality when the European planning community found itself capable of formulating new policy challenges on the basis of the aggravated global competition and the increase of regional imbalances and disparities as a consequence of the EU enlargement. They saw possible contradictions within the cry for both more competitiveness and more cohesion. Whereas more competitiveness might lead to a stronger concentration of investment within the Pentagon, cohesion is about creating a certain economic balance throughout the European continent. In reaction spatial planners saw the polycentric development model as a useful framework to integrate both options and hence create balanced growth. In this sense, the new policy insights focussing on economic development gave a new boost to territorial thinking with regard to EU policymaking. The reorientation of EU policies seems to address the same important elements that also form the basis of the ESDP, mainly considering polycentricism, in which different spatial entities have different assets that can be used, as a desirable framework for action. Nevertheless, spatial planners feared the sector approach and the neglecting of the spatial dimension (e.g. the spatial impacts of increased competition). Within the framework of the ESPON studies on the impact of the territorial dimension of the Lisbon and Gothenborg strategy were launched (ESPON, 2003). Or, as the German ARL (2004, p.4) put it: "*an important task of the future will be to show just how the spatial dimension of the competitiveness and sustainability goals can be integrated within the Lisbon and Gothenborg process*". Integrating the Lisbon strategy into the territorial agenda (and vice versa) leads to the redirection of the classical notion of cohesion with a focus on the reduction of differences to the notion that regional diversity now is to be seen as a quality.

The Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe, published in December 2004 put the territorial dimension of policymaking back on the map by the introduction of the term territorial cohesion as an explicit objective of the EU - next to economic and social cohesion - and as a shared competence of the Community and its Member States. Many policy makers and organisations felt the inclusion of the concept of territorial cohesion into the Treaty as a necessity. In the course of the debate on the future of the EU Cohesion policy after 2006 the concept came on the agenda. With the presentation of the Second Cohesion Report the Commission introduced the concept of territorial cohesion and gave a new élan to the debate on the territorial dimension of policymaking. In its Third Cohesion Report, published in February 2004, the European Commission set out its vision for Europe's future cohesion policy, for the post 2006 period. It explains the concept of territorial cohesion in the following way: "*The concept of territorial cohesion extends beyond the notion of economic and social cohesion by both adding to this and reinforcing it. In policy terms, the objective is to help achieve a more balanced development by reducing existing disparities, avoiding territorial imbalances and by making both sector policies, which have a spatial impact and regional policy more coherent. The concern is also to improve territorial integration and encourage co-operation between regions.*" (EC, 2004).

The elaboration of this concept by the commission resulted in a policy instrument called European Territorial Co-operation (ETC) that is in fact the follow up of the structure fund programmes INTERREG, Urban and Leader. The Member States have to draw up National Strategies in which they explain how they wish to spend their money as effectively as possible.

As a consequence of these turns in EU policymaking, the territorial dimension of policy design is expected to contribute to a better integration of EU sector policies and to formulate a territorial strategy in order to implement the Lisbon and Gothenburg strategy. The last few years some important initiatives were taken in this respect, also at the political level.

New dynamics to carry on the political debate

The introduction of the concept of territorial cohesion in the Treaty and the new circumstances that Europe was encountering worked as driving forces for the political debate. The ESDP was considered as a valuable basis for the continuation of the process of an EU-wide collaboration in the field of spatial development policy, since it was flexible enough to adapt to these new circumstances. This allowed for the process to build on the ESDP instead of starting from scratch. The ESDP proved its strategic value.

In consideration of the forthcoming Dutch Presidency, **the French planning administration DATAR** launched the first in a series of high level administrative meetings in the spring of 2004. They wanted to start a discussion amongst the Member States on what the meaning of territorial cohesion for spatial development policy could be. The Directors General responsible for spatial policy indicated a first list of topics and key messages that are at stake. Especially the necessity of having an integrated and territorial based policymaking approach - for which the ESDP had given some first guidelines - ranked high on the agenda. The concerns about a lack of co-ordination of EU sector policies and the necessity of addressing specific regional geographical circumstances in EU policies were widely addressed.

The **Dutch Presidency** conscientiously took up the concerns that were expressed. Being aware of a range of sensitivities they chose a bottom-up approach to bring the different ideas and positions together. Based on the results of a *'tour des capitales'*, a discussion paper was written for the informal ministerial meeting on territorial cohesion. This paper was first presented and discussed by the Directors General and later on formed the basis for the conclusions of the ministerial meeting.

The purpose of the Rotterdam Conference in November 2004 was to elaborate the objective of territorial cohesion, particularly in relation to the Union's ambitions for sustainable economic growth and to adopt a political agenda for the next 2-3 years with the aim of creating a coherent approach to territorial development in EU policies, improving their effectiveness and efficiency. The key message of the Ministers for spatial development under the Dutch Presidency was that the Union should exploit more effectively its impressive territorial diversity as a potential for sustainable economic growth, or in short, conceive its diversity as strength. And second, territorial governance does not imply creating a separate policy, but integrating the territorial dimension into EU policies.

In order to stress the basic idea that territorial diversity is to be seen as a starting point for a coherent territorial approach contributing to the general objectives of the Union, the ministers were given an opportunity to point out the territorial capital of their country. Most of the ministers showed that the territorial capital of their country could not be seen separate from a greater European spatial context or - to rephrase this - within a framework of territorial cohesion. The Flemish minister for spatial planning for instance showed the spatial relations of the development of the harbour of Antwerp as an important main port with the wider European territory.

The succeeding **Luxembourg Presidency** in the first half of 2005 was given the ambitious task to elaborate this political agenda. The Luxembourg Presidency therefore developed in close collaboration with the Troika and the Commission a policy synthesis document under the name 'The Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union'. Based on research done by the OECD, the Commission, ESPON and INTERREG, the document lines out a summary of the political messages and a more detailed analysis of the policy scope and the territorial state and perspectives of the European Union. The document reflects the strong attention that the policy debates have given to governance. It recognises the need for multilevel governance in which the different levels (EU, national and subnational) have to play a complementary role.

The Ministers also decided on a specific agenda for the forthcoming presidencies enabling the development of a Synthesis Report on Territorial Cohesion that is to be adopted under the German Presidency in 2007.

A new working package defined

With the agreement among the 25 ministers responsible for spatial development that the political agenda for territorial cohesion should build further on the ESDP, the basis for a EU common frame of reference with regard to the development of the European territorial structure has been reconfirmed.

The EU and its Member States have a shared responsibility to strengthen territorial cohesion. An important aim in this respect is creating an effective and coherent application of instruments, which the EU and its Member States have at their disposal (Luxembourg Presidency, 2005). The policy debate up till now shows us three tracks in order to develop the concept of territorial cohesion.

The first track that can be recognised is the **internalisation of the territorial dimension in EU policymaking**. By ensuring that EU policies take spatial considerations into account, a more coherent and co-ordinated approach towards the European territory needs to be created. Nowadays we often see that European sector legislation can have a contra productive effect at the local scale. Looking at the territorial impact of EU policies and legislation can not just prevent this, it can even ensure that the objectives of economic development, cohesion and territorial balance are reached in a more targeted way. For instance, incorporating the concept of European territorial structure into development decisions would steer the investments in a more "made to measure" approach, targeting the different potentials of the regions. (SUD, 2003) The diversity of the EU territory and thus the specific territorial capital of each region needs to be seen as an important added value in this process. The ministerial meeting in Luxembourg issued that the territorial dimension can bring added value to both specific territorial instruments such as INTERREG and more sector bound instruments such as the TEN Policy or environmental directives.

The second track concerns the need for **territorial knowledge and territorial observation**. If the EU, the Member States and the regions are to take more advantage of differing territorial potential and conditions, new knowledge and indicators are needed about the European territorial structure. In this sense the ESPON Programme delivered a considerable progress. Within a period of only two and a half year 30 research projects were launched in order to obtain knowledge on territorial trends, on the impact of EC policies and to bring forward integrated territorial analysis, tools and scenarios for spatial development. The ESPON Programme is not only delivering a goldmine of information for policymakers, it also created a scientific network at EU level for territorial research.

The third track deals with the creation of **a more active role for the responsible planning authorities within the Member States with respect to EU policy**. This should focus on a more pro-active attitude and a more co-ordinated implementation of EU policies. The general thought behind this is that national and regional authorities are able to elaborate EU policy options in such a way that they are applicable to their own specific circumstances. Hence, this approach focuses on a positive dynamic that promotes using the territorial capital of every region, each according to its own needs, in order to create a more balanced development and add to the Lisbon strategy. It also highlights an inclusive strategy towards the challenges of all regions, and not only those that are lagging behind. National and regional spatial policies also offers opportunities for the co-ordination and integration of EU policies, especially directives, based on an area-oriented approach. In this way territorial cohesion can be strengthened, also at a lower level.

The policy debates up to now showed a great deal of emphasis on the first two tracks, which are inclined to focus on improving EU policy. In our opinion it is a missed opportunity to neglect possible contributions of bottom-up initiatives deriving from policy initiatives within the Member States. Besides, it is in conflict with the postulated multi-level approach as lined out under the Dutch and Luxembourg Presidency. Therefore we wish to discuss some spatial policy instruments that exist within the Member States, that are to be examined for their potential added value to a territorial cohesion policy and that can be brought into action on a complementary basis.

Potentials and role of instruments within Member States

The Commission and the responsible Ministers for Spatial Policy support a multilevel approach as far as territorial cohesion is concerned. However, in preparation of the Commissions new cohesion policy for the period 2007-2013, the policy debate up to now was mainly focussed on the policies and instruments at EU level. Although the role of national and subnational policy entities has been mentioned, it has not been thoroughly elaborated yet. Under the Luxembourg Presidency (2005, p.7) it is said that "*national instruments for strengthening EU territorial cohesion naturally vary between Member States. However national and regional*

territorial development policies and strategies can have a pivotal role in offering an integrated and space-based framework for development, adding value to EU Cohesion policy and the Lisbon action plans."

This statement reflects the recognition under the Dutch Presidency that the territorial diversity of Europe has grown after the last enlargement and that specific territorial capital of different sub areas within Europe is to be used to create competitiveness and cohesion. It seems obvious that (coalitions of) authorities representing these sub areas play an important part in formulating their territorial capital.

The political ambitions reflect opinions in recent planning literature. Different authors point out the specific role of the regions. The German ARL (2004) indicates that because of the increase of the territorial diversity after the last enlargement, the regional level has got more importance as appropriate sphere for decision-making and action since they are able to bring about a diversified and space-based approach. While Member States in the Pentagon would for instance concentrate on promoting decentralised, polycentric spatial structures, some of the Member States in the European periphery could give priority - at least initially - to consolidating the major cities as precursor to subsequently also developing a balanced, polycentric spatial structure. Van der Heijde and Houtsma (2005) consider the regional level often best placed to set regional priorities, depending on their specific territorial capital. This may concern location factors, climate and natural resources, but also customs and social contact that are characteristic for the region. This approach allows the Member States to set different priorities and attract those investments that will make better use of the region's qualities and potentials and thus create a larger return. Van der Heijde and Houtsma (2005) illustrate this by elaborating the concept of territorial cohesion and the Lisbon strategy for the area between Eindhoven, Aachen and Leuven. They show how balanced growth can be achieved by formulating a strategic policy for innovative urban networks that are likely to be very keen to locate themselves in relatively quiet urban environments between bigger urban networks of the Randstad, the Flemish Diamond and the Rhine Ruhr Area.

The debates at administrative and political level show that Member States are becoming aware of their territorial capital. Whereas more peripheral countries such as Poland, the Baltic States but also Portugal tend to draw attention to new road infrastructures, Pentagon countries tend to stress the need for smart mobility (e.g. multimodal transport). Also specific assets, such as cultural heritage (Malta), dense areas (Belgium, Netherlands) or river valleys (Germany, Netherlands) are given attention. It is remarkable that at the ministerial meeting in Luxembourg, many Member States draw attention to the relation between EU policies and spatial policy documents and initiatives within the Member States. Among them were the Benelux countries, France, Denmark, Czech Republic, Slovenia and Lithuania. Part of this debate is the importance of the regions. In many Member States regions have far reaching spatial planning competencies at their disposal. This is the case in for instance Austria, Germany or Spain. In Belgium the regions are even completely autonomous with regard to spatial planning policy and hence are a direct partner at European level (Van der Lecq, 2001).

The challenge for the spatial policy administrations within Member States is now to prove the role they can play in order to bring added value to the Lisbon and Gotheborg strategy. It is exactly their competence for spatial planning that imposes a considerable responsibility. They have spatial planning and development policy frameworks at their disposal offering specific instruments that have a great potential in order to define territorial capital and establish policy integration. Besides, spatial policy authorities often have a huge experience in the field of integrative territorial thinking at their disposal. An EU strategy on territorial cohesion in a multilevel governance setting might be significantly intensified if some kind of a relationship between EU policies and spatial planning policies within the Member States could be made. It is evident that such an exercise shall be extremely difficult, taking into account that the Commission has no competence in spatial planning.

Here below, we wish to point out the potential strength with respect to three possible instruments of planning authorities within the Member States that can contribute to territorial cohesion policy. These instruments might form important elements in order to put multi-level territorial governance into practise.

National and regional spatial policy documents

National and regional spatial policy documents within EU Member States often show a great potential for carrying out the concept of territorial cohesion. In most cases these documents show how territorial analysis provides an integrated policy approach for spatial development.

The first results of the GRIDS-Project, executed under the INTERREG IIC Programme (Adams and Harris, 2005), show that regional development strategies have a great potential to fulfil this role. The Cardiff University analysed in this project five regional development and spatial plans from respectively Flanders (Belgium), Ireland, Latgale (Latvia), Lithuania and Wales (UK) in order to define good practice guidelines for what they call "regional development plans". The project shows that regional planning and development administrations

already possess a common approach towards regional territorial development and that - in spite of the diversity that exists within the methodologies and elaborations - some common characteristics can be defined. In general terms, regional development plans define policy actions and projects based on a clear purpose and development scope that has been elaborated in an integrated and cross-sector vision for the (territorial) development of the region. This makes them useful as a basis for the formulation of conditions for the National Strategies that are to be drawn up by the Member States as a framework for European Territorial Co-operation programmes.

The Spatial Structure Plan for Flanders is a good example of a framework document for the National Strategy since it shows some characteristics that can contribute to the concept of territorial cohesion and exploiting territorial capital. The analysis of the spatial structure brings together the most important spatial elements that structure the territory of Flanders on one map. The desired spatial structure forms the basis for a spatial vision on how the spatial structure - or in other words the territorial cohesion - is to be strengthened by applying specific policy approaches for the different spatial entities: urban areas and networks, open areas, areas for economic activities and infrastructure. Hence these policy documents offer a valuable framework for territorial co-operation. The existence of good spatial and physical infrastructures stimulates the economic activity of a region and increases the attractiveness for investments. In this way the need for economic development can be approached in a strategic way. A central position of sustainability is assured by the integrative approach.

Thus, the use of spatial structures can be of an important added value. These can be considered as the binding elements for the territory. They consist of physical infrastructures as roads and railways, settlement structures, territorial-economic structures, water and ecological structures. If these spatial structures are taken as the basis for different (sector) policies, a fragmented approach towards the territory can be avoided and synergies can be realised. This is very valuable in reaching an integrated and cross-sector approach for collaboration and development at the local level.

Integrated implementation processes

Spatial planning authorities within the Member States employ well-developed processes in order to implement their policy options. These processes are characterised by a series of qualities that make them very suitable as a framework for decision-making and fine tuning of different demands regarding the development of a territory. They focus on the integration of spatial demands of different policy fields into a coherent and balanced result. Giving well-underpinned reference to (spatial) policy frameworks, participation, dialogue and sustainability are key words. Every process is based on a case by case evaluation of the given situation and the desired outcome and of the spatially relevant legislation that needs to be taken into account. An integrated, tailor-made policy approach is the outcome of this process that then requires each sector to take actions accordingly. This means that there are no fixed solutions for a specific situation. In stead flexibility is an important aspect of the process.

In most cases the outcomes of these processes contribute clearly to policy options lined out at EU level such as sustainable development or economic growth. European policies more and more become an issue of debate. Within these processes solutions can be found for apparently contradicting policies such as respecting a bird or habitat directive on the one hand and using EU funding for regional development on the other hand. However, as a consequence of the increase of EU directives it occurs more often that incompatibilities for development come across, even when development project proposals are broadly supported and are of quality. This is especially the case in dense urban regions where spatial concentration and mixing of activities (by for instance multiple use of space or the development of transit nodes) is being made very difficult or even impossible by regulations concerning noise, safety or air quality. The perverse result is that environmental EU directives result in a stimulation of suburbanisation of activities and hence a further loss of open space and an increase of mobility.

For this reason certain flexibility of EU directives on project level seems to be needed so that good projects won't be rejected. Since EU policies and EU legislation are integrated into the spatial policy process through sector policies and actors, it is important that their requirements are adapted to the spatial policy processes and instruments. Since policy objectives can differ between the European regions - depending on their territorial capital - EU directives will have to show a certain amount of flexibility in their formulation. In order to sustain balanced decisions some conditions with respect to the content and process can be formulated. The spatial implementation processes as carried out by some Member States or regions show the right characteristics to guarantee qualitative policy outcomes.

A good example of integrated spatial implementation process are the delineation processes of urban areas in Flanders in order to catalyse and facilitate a wide range of spatial operations within the urban areas and stop suburbanisation of activities (Van der Lecq, 2005). The wide range of objectives for each urban area is to be brought together in a coherent vision on the future spatial development. This vision looks at the functioning of the urban area itself and the relationship that it has with its surroundings. The basis on which urban growth can

take place is to be defined by the determination of an urban spatial structure. In order to know up to where urban growth can take place the edges of the urban area are to be defined. This process knows two important phases. The first phase concerns the development of a common vision in collaboration with a wide range of regional administrations, different administrative levels, pressure groups and public and private bodies. Based on several partial studies (e.g. economic structure) a hypothesis for the desired future development is to be formulated together with a list of possible actions. After a broad consultation round, this results in a definitive proposal. The second phase contains the formal decision making and approval of the plan. The proposals are to be translated into a so-called spatial implementation plan. This is a kind of destination plan that contains regulations on land-use and management as well as indications with respect to the realisation. It indicates the boundary of the urban area and locates the different project zones. A delineation line defines up to where urban development is to be stimulated.

Regional territorial development indicators

A third important responsibility with respect to the contribution of national and regional authorities towards a territorial cohesion policy concerns the development of regional territorial information. The ESPON programme of course delivers important territorial information at EU-scale that is also relevant for national and regional policymakers. This information, however, often is to be refined and specified to the specific circumstances. Regional territorial information gathering comprises the collection and the analyses of data on the short and the long term, the identification of spatial trends, the development of spatial scenarios and the monitoring of spatial development in the field.

The creation of regional spatial data observatories is an important supplement to the existing ESPON network and can complement ESPON research. It can also deliver data input to the ESPON programme, making territorial capital at regional / national scale more concrete and identifying specific difficulties with the implementation of EU directives. Existing national observatories like the German BBR and the Swedish Nordregio already play an important role in the ESPON programme. Davoudi (2005) supports the creation of national and regional ESPON-types of networks like Nordregio in Sweden or the BBR in Germany, in order to overcome fragmented and spreaded research expertise in spatial planning, as in the case of the UK. In Flanders the creation of such a network is on the way as a reaction to stop fragmented research.

Conclusion

The introduction of the concept of territorial cohesion gave a boost to the policy debate on the relation between spatial development and EU policymaking. The Commission and the Member States formulated an ambitious road map in order to elaborate the concept of territorial cohesion. Important steps have been taken with respect to the internalisation of the territorial dimension into EU policy. The aim to set up a multi-level territorial governance approach and hence giving a role to spatial planning authorities within the Member States has, however, been somewhat underdeveloped until now.

This is regrettable, because in our opinion spatial policy instruments within the Member States can offer a great added value to a territorial cohesion policy. In many cases subnational entities are endowed with important spatial planning competencies. They have a great potential in order to define territorial capital and establish policy integration, since they are characterised by a series of qualities that make them very suitable as frameworks for decision-making and fine-tuning of different demands regarding the development of a territory. Every process is based on a case by case evaluation of the given situation and of the integration of spatial demands – and legislation - of different policy fields into a coherent and balanced result. An integrated, tailor-made policy approach is the outcome of this process that then requires each sector to take actions accordingly.

In order to allow the regions to develop these tailor-made and integrated approaches, EU policies and policy instruments will have to show a certain amount of flexibility in their formulation. The task of the EU will be focused more on setting a framework and an overall goal as well as co-ordinating rules for the Member States and their regions. Also some research is to be carried out in order to explore more precisely the potential role of Member State spatial policy instruments.

Reference list

Adams, N and N. Harris (2005). GRIDS - Best practice guidelines for regional development strategies, working draft of 25 March 2005, Cardiff University

Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung (ARL) (2004). Why the EU needs a European spatial development policy, position paper

Davoudi, S. (2005). ESPON – past, present and future, in: *Town & Country planning*, vol. 74 (3), pp. 100-102

Dutch Presidency (2004). Exploiting Europe's territorial diversity for sustainable economic growth, discussion paper for the EU informal ministerial meeting on territorial cohesion, Rotterdam, November 29, 2004

European Commission (2004). Third report on economic and social cohesion, A new partnership for cohesion, convergence, competitiveness, cooperation, European Communities.

European Commission (1999). Report on Community Policies and Spatial Planning, working document of the Commission Services: Brussels

European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) (2003). ESPON in progress, preliminary results by autumn 2003

Faludi, A.K.F. and B Waterhout (2002). The making of the European Spatial Development Perspective: No Masterplan, Routledge, London / New York

Luxembourg Presidency (2005). Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union, towards a stronger European territorial cohesion in the light of the Lisbon and Gotheborg ambitions, endorsed for further development by the Ministers for Spatial Development and the European Commission, 20/21 May 2005 in Luxembourg

Ministerie van de Vlaamse Gemeenschap (1997). Ruimtelijk Structuurplan Vlaanderen, integrale versie

SUD (2003). Managing the territorial dimension of EU policies after enlargement, Expert document

Van der Heijde, W. and Houtsma, W.H. (2005). Van territoriale cohesie naar innovatieve stedelijke netwerken, Ruimtelijke implicaties van de Lissabon- en Gothenborgstrategie, in: *Het zichtbare Europa*, gebundelde papers plandag 2005, red. P.M. Schrijnen, Stichting Planologische Discussiedagen, pp.217-227

Van der Lecq, R. (2005). Spatial structure planning: a new perspective for urban areas in Flanders, in: *Local land and soil news*, no. 12/13 I/05, pp. 13-14

Van der Lecq, R. (2001). Belgium in the ESDP Process, in: *Built Environment*, vol. 27 (4), special issue: Regulatory Competition and Co-operation in European Spatial Planning, edited by A. Faludi, Alexandrine Press, pp. 278-286

Williams, R.H. (1996). *European Union and Spatial Planning*, Paul Chapman Publishing, London
Additional Information

Acknowledgements:

This article has been written on personal title and doesn't automatically reflect the official standpoints of the administration nor the Flemish authorities.