Neil Adams

HARMONISATION AND LOCAL KNOWLEDGE: EU ENLARGEMENT AND APPROACHES TO REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The importance of spatial planning and the territorial aspects of regional policy have increased dramatically at the EU level in the last decade. The publication of the European Spatial Development Perspective (EC, 1999) signaled its arrival on the EU stage and coincided with an increased focus by the European Commission on the importance of regions and regional policy. Regional Policy is now the second largest EU budget after the Common Agricultural Policy and there appears to have been an increasing realisation of the importance of managing the spatial consequences of such spending. Documents such as the Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion (EC 2004) as well as the budgetary breakdown of EU spending confirm that regional policy now forms one of the cornerstones of EU cohesion policy and, whilst the terminology may vary, will continue to do so during the 2007-2013 programming period.

Introduction

There have been significant changes in the disciplines of regional development and spatial planning in recent years and to the context within which planning has to operate throughout the EU. Major worldwide and European processes such as globalisation, EU enlargement and the collapse of the Soviet Union have combined with more local changes in circumstances and institutional structures to change the planning context in many countries beyond recognition. In North-west Europe planning had become stigmatised as being static, inflexible and a barrier to economic development and this created a situation whereby it needed to evolve and prove its worth to a skeptical world of policy makers, civil servants and sectoral actors. Albrechts (2001) has pointed out that these processes, as well as developments in planning theory and practice, have provided us with new approaches to planning that are more strategic, collaborative and communicative. Such processes rely on coalition building, lobbying, strong arguments and engaging a wide diversity of stakeholders. Albrechts also has argued that any process with dialogue, justification and rational persuasion at its heart also has the advantage of being relatively robust and pushes opponents towards using similar methods if they wish to attack it.

Enlargement of the EU has brought significant new challenges for both the established and the new member states. For the Baltic and other former communist states the collapse of the Soviet Union required the construction of an entirely new institutional, economic and political system, which as Downes (1996) pointed out had never been undertaken at such a scale previously. Davoudi (2004) provided an insight into the extent of the challenge pointing out that at the point of accession in May 2004 over 90% of the population (approximately 73 million people) of the ten new member states lived in regions where the GDP per capita was less than 75% of the average of the EU-25 and over 60% lived in regions where GDP was under half the average. In addition, whilst enlargement increased the population of the EU by 20% it added only 5% to the GDP of the Union.

Alongside EU wide issues, individual member states are facing significant challenges. Increasing internal regional disparities, which paradoxically are partly driven by EU regional policy, are becoming increasingly problematic and this is likely to be a key challenge for spatial planning in the coming years. For the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania these challenges are all too apparent as they experience increasing social, economic and territorial disparities between the capital regions and the rest (see Adams et al., 2006 and Dagiliene, 2006). The additional challenges posed by the transition from a centrally planned to a free market economy (see Ovin, 2001 and Petrakos, 2001) exacerbate the situation further.

The transfer of knowledge in spatial planning and other fields has, until now, been rather one way from west to east and as a result North-west European values and systems appear to have been imposed on the new member states. For a variety of reasons these new member states have usually been happy to allow the imposition of such values and systems, at least in principle, although this is likely to change over time. Some of the forces driving this harmonisation process will be examined in the next section.

THE DRIVE FOR HARMONISATION

There can be little doubt that the EU has been a strong force driving harmonisation in many areas including regional development and spatial planning. The collapse of the Soviet Union saw many former socialist states aspire to join the EU in order to improve economic opportunities and reduce economic dependence on Russia. Under EU guidance many set out on a road of political, economic, administrative and institutional reform. The perceived independence offered by EU membership in a post Soviet world and the promise of pre-accession and ultimately structural and cohesion funding ensured that the influence of the EU on the restructuring process has been significant.

The early years after independence were often characterised by the chaotic tendencies typical in transition countries. The fact that planning was associated with the central planning approach of the old Soviet system meant it received little priority or attention from policy makers and the public (Dagiliene, 2006). However, as the influence of the EU grew, it became apparent that embracing planning was one of the pre-conditions of accessing EU funding and this appears to have been a key driving force in the apparent willingness of the Baltic States to allow a Western planning model to be imposed upon them.

The impact of the ESDP as both a process and a document has been widely discussed in the academic literature (see Faludi, 2004) and clearly extends to planning in the ten new member states. When the ESDP was first discussed many were skeptical that the intention was to elaborate a comprehensive master plan as the first step towards the harmonisation of planning approaches throughout the EU. The fears in relation to it being a comprehensive master plan, providing a blueprint for the development of the European space, proved unfounded due to the ethos of the ESDP and its status as a non-binding policy framework. However, whilst it may not have been an explicit intention to stimulate a process of harmonisation, it could be argued that this has ultimately been one of the documents' main achievements due to the impact that it has had in shaping the minds of planners throughout the EU (Shaw and Sykes, 2004).

The ESDP also both stimulated and influenced the various European trans-national spatial visions for various super regions such as the Baltic Sea Region and North-west Europe. The involvement of planners throughout the EU in these and other EU-sponsored initiatives in the field has had a significant impact and it would appear that one result has been the development of a new common spatial planning language with concepts such as balanced and polycentric development becoming common terms. Whilst such concepts individually are highly contested and interpreted in various ways the adopted rhetoric in many of the visions is extremely similar (Jensen and Richardson, 2001). Indeed, such rhetoric is also evident in numerous national and sub-national documents, although as Dabinett and Richardson pointed out "planners are frequently unaware of the European origin of the frameworks and ideas they work with(in)" (Dabinett and Richardson, 2005 P. 202).

Whilst the ESDP tried to cajole member states into applying EU spatial policy, as discussed in Shaw and Sykes (2005), the EU is also influencing approaches to spatial planning in more direct ways by imposing the requirement to implement and adopt various regulations and directives such as the EU's Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (SEA Directive 2001/42/EC). The implementation of such directives in the member states will undoubtedly lead to a certain amount of harmonisation in relation to the planning process and procedure.

However, the situation is rapidly evolving and now territorial capital, territorial development policy and territorial cohesion appear to be the new EU regional policy buzzwords (Kunzmann, 2006). The fact that territorial cohesion is becoming embedded within EU policy places the spatial dimension at the heart of the EU policy agenda (Bynens and van der Lecq, 2005 and Davoudi, 2006). It therefore seems likely that the concept of territorial cohesion will become replicated in spatial strategies and policies throughout the EU especially if cemented in the forthcoming document Territorial State and Perspectives of the European Union as discussed by Kunzmann (2006). Whilst the ESDP contained a chapter focusing on the then accession countries, it was essentially an EU-15 document and one that was undoubtedly North-west Europe dominated in terms of approach. An obvious challenge for the new document will be how to integrate the new member states both territorially and in terms of approach. In the next section some of the general barriers to harmonisation will be examined.

BARRIERS TO HARMONISATION

The various influences discussed in the previous section have driven a convergence in approaches to spatial planning both between North-west European countries and between those countries and a number of the new member states. As mentioned previously the EU has, for various reasons, been in a strong position to influence the evolution of administrative and institutional systems and practices in the new member states. The transfer of knowledge and practice has, therefore, been rather one way from west to east up until now. Although the wisdom of this knowledge transfer increasingly is brought into question. Jaakson argues that "Western planning thought has become legitimised and is presented to the East as a culturally and socially superior model, based on the presumption that because the newly independent States are moving towards market economies, Western planning models are appropriate" (Jaakson, 2000, p. 565).

In order to be able to advise on the elaboration of spatial planning instruments Van Dijk (2002) argues that systematic comparative analysis would have to be undertaken consisting of four stages, all of which need to be undertaken in a linear progression: exhibiting, valuing, explaining and advising. In reality this does not appear to have happened. Whilst to a certain extent the EU has made some effort to undertake the first stage referred to as exhibiting (that is collecting information about the other country and its systems) in its initiatives to prepare various compendiums of spatial planning systems, the other three levels do not appear to have been fully addressed. As a result, western values and systems appear to be imposed with, at best, an extremely superficial understanding of the local context.

Pallagst (2006) also questions the wisdom of this approach. She argues that whilst co-operation between planners within the context of enlargement will contribute to the creation of a joint spatial planning language (so that strategies and perspectives can be elaborated in joint actions), the new member states are more or less forced to accept the North-west European approach. She proposes two scenarios: retention and merger. According to the retention scenario the current North-west European dominance will continue and spatial policy and approaches in Eastern Europe will develop separately. In the merger scenario the two would combine and become integrated thus forming a new approach to spatial planning. The reality is obviously more complex than that and as Altrock et al (2006) identify it would be a mistake to assume that there is only one homogeneous Eastern European planning family.

From the point of view of the EU a simple eastwards extension of current regional policy approaches and instruments is desirable. Despite all the EU rhetoric about encouraging diversity and distinctiveness, the reality of the cohesion agenda would appear to suggest that harmonisation between the regions of the EU is being pursued in many fields. There appears to be an inherent contradiction between pursuing economic, social and territorial cohesion across the regions of the EU whilst at the same time stimulating distinctiveness between them.

Such is the scale and complexity of the Soviet legacy in many countries that it is likely to remain a significant factor for many years to come. The past has shaped the way people think and current economic and other pressures also play an important role in how they think and act. Civil society is not yet fully developed and concepts such as transparency, inclusion, stakeholder engagement and community empowerment are still in their infancy. The logic of promoting such values and concepts on post-Soviet states when they are highly problematic and complex in mature democracies is dubious. It is clear that differences in socio-economic conditions, culture and history in addition to the challenges posed by transition and the Soviet legacy form considerable barriers to harmonisation. It is also likely that as the new member states become more established within the EU family, they will also become less inclined to unquestioningly accept North-west European values and systems and will be more inclined to call on their own traditions and practices in order to address their own local problems.

CASE STUDIES EXAMINING THE EXTENT OF HARMONISATION

Methodology

A recent Interreg IIIc operation entitled "Good practice guidelines for instruments of regional development and spatial planning in an enlarged EU" (or GRIDS for short) sought to identify good practice through case studies of Celtic and Baltic countries (Adams and Harris, 2005). Subsequent and ongoing research by the author has sought to identify commonalities and differences in approaches to spatial planning and on the basis of this to assess the extent to which approaches to spatial planning are converging. The research involved key stakeholders filling in detailed thematic templates in relation to national spatial policy. The information in the templates was supplemented by semi-structured discussions and interviews and presentations at a number of thematic workshops.

The Baltic and Celtic peripheries

The Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and the Celtic countries of Wales, Scotland and Ireland have much in common in terms of the relatively small populations and low population densities, a high concentration of population and economic activities in the capital cities, a similar territorial capital and a geographically peripheral location within the EU. In addition, each has been working actively on the elaboration of spatial policy at the national and sub-national level. To date, all except for Latvia have been successful in adopting a national spatial strategy that is currently in the process of being implemented.

The new member states generally have significant disadvantages in socio-economic terms compared to the more established member states and the Baltic's were amongst the very poorest at the point of accession (Adams, 2006). The impact of the Soviet legacy on the Baltic States extends beyond the physical, institutional and cultural heritage. Paalzow (2006) identifies the altered macro-geographic position of the Baltic States as an additional factor exerting a negative influence on development. From a strategic location close to the gravity centre of the former Soviet Union (close to the triangle of Moscow – St Petersburg – Minsk), the Baltic States are now located at the outer periphery of the EU. A strategic location within one union has been swapped for a peripheral location in another.

Research by Petrakos (2001) suggests that such geographically peripheral countries will be integrated more slowly than countries located closer to the economic core. However, in recent years economic growth has continuously approached double figures in the Baltic States. This has led to talk of the 'Baltic Tigers' in a direct comparison with the Irish economic miracle and the 'Celtic Tiger' phenomenon of the 1980's and 1990's. Nevertheless such rapid economic growth, which is predicted to continue for the foreseeable future, brings its own challenges for spatial planning, not least because of the high concentration of such growth in the capital cities, further fuelling increasing regional disparities (Adams et al, 2006 and Dagiliene, 2006).

Traditionally spatial planning and regional development policy can be seen to have played an important role in the post-communist transition process (Paalzow, 2006 and

Petrakos, 2001). Each Baltic State has now developed its own legislative framework and system dating from the mid-nineties (revised in Estonia and Latvia in 2002). The legislation in each case introduced a formal hierarchy of statutory planning documents to be prepared by the national, regional and local levels in a system with similarities to the comprehensive integrated approach favoured in Flanders, the Netherlands and parts of Scandinavia. The institutional landscape in the UK has also changed significantly, although not as dramatically. Devolution of power to elected governments in Scotland and Wales means that both have considerable power in terms of regional development and spatial planning. As such, each is continuing to develop its own spatial planning system and approach.

COMMONALITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN APPROACH

An examination of the various approaches to spatial planning makes it possible to identify commonalities and differences between the Celtic and Baltic approaches. The approaches were examined according to the following themes: process and approach, the content and principles of spatial strategies and implementation, monitoring and review.

Process and approach

The ministerial or departmental portfolio of the authoring bodies for the various national spatial strategies varies and includes finance, local government, regional development and environment. There appears to be little consensus about the rightful home of the discipline and this will invariably depend on local context and circumstances. The cross-sector nature of spatial planning means that such a variety is perhaps inevitable, although it may also reduce the credibility of the discipline in the eyes of some sectoral actors. An innovative approach appears to have been taken in Wales where the spatial strategy was prepared outside the Ministry responsible for planning. As a result the document has a higher status as one of the Welsh National Assembly's high level strategies and is used as a policy integration tool against which sector policies have to be assessed.

Generally there appears to be a split between the more flexible approaches adopted in the Celtic countries and the more formal approaches adopted in the Baltic States where the legislation is much more prescriptive. The split is reflected in the statutory status of the Baltic documents compared to the non-statutory status of the Celtic equivalents. However, an overly informal approach in a highly fluid transition context, in countries with no culture of community empowerment or stakeholder engagement would be unlikely to succeed. Interestingly, since adoption of the documents each of the Celtic countries is now working towards legislation to give future national spatial strategies a statutory status. There is some concern that this could lead to what Voets and De Rynck (2006) refer to as pilot project syndrome whereby innovative ideas are constrained and diluted once an institutional framework is in place to support it. There is also a danger that if the legislation is overly prescriptive that this could lead to an over emphasis on procedure, thus restricting the scope and potential of what spatial planning can achieve (Purves, 2006).

A number of common themes were identified in relation to the role of the respective strategies with themes such as the facilitation of joined-up government and the pursuance of balanced and sustainable development being common. The role of spatial planning in promoting identity and heritage was also shared by the newly formed Welsh, Scottish and Baltic nations despite the very different contexts.

One area where there appears to be consensus is reflected in the general trend towards relatively short, non-technical and highly accessible documents. The longest of the documents was the Irish National Spatial Strategy at 128 pages with some of the other examples being considerably shorter. The accessibility of the documents can be linked to a general recognition that spatial planning needs to actively engage a wide diversity of stakeholders if it is to be successful. Another trend which is likely to continue is the increased use of communication and facilitation professionals to advise and supervise such processes.

There was a significant division in relation to preparation times, with the Celtic strategies generally being prepared in a little over 2 years whilst the Baltic strategies tended to take 5-6 years, leading to criticism that they were out of date before being adopted. The highly complex historical, social, economic and political context in the Baltic States, combined with the Soviet legacy and the relatively prescriptive planning legislation, determine that long preparation times are currently inevitable. More surprising perhaps was the feeling that such preparation times were not only necessary but also desirable if the quality of the documents is to be ensured. The Estonian respondent justified this by citing the scale of the process and the need to occasionally take time out. It is possible that shorter preparation times may become an aspiration in the Baltic States as their respective democracies mature. Though, this appears unlikely to happen in the short-term. Alternatively, the drive for efficiency and shorter preparation times may be reversed in North-west Europe if the quality of the product is perceived to suffer.

Another area where convergence was not evident was the external appraisal of the documents. Only in the Welsh and Scottish cases was external appraisal promoted. And in the Baltic States it was seen as a potentially dangerous practice within a fragile political context. More rigorous appraisal is, however, likely to become a feature in coming years, for example, in relation to the implementation of the SEA Directive. The attention given to environmental issues

in member states is also likely to become more evenly balanced. However, each member state will implement the Directive as it sees fit. And within this general convergence numerous approaches are likely to emerge. This is already evident in the UK where Scotland is over complying with the Directive whereas sustainability appraisals (rather than strategic environmental assessment) are being promoted in England and Wales.

CONTENT AND PRINCIPLES

Content and principles is an area where there appears to have been a significant convergence in approach. All documents had a similar structure and topic coverage albeit a varied focus. None of the documents contained extensive analysis within the document itself with use being made of supplementary reports or alternative formats such as cd-roms. A wide diversity in the type of visual material also was evident, ranging from the highly detailed to the highly abstract in terms of style. Where cases showed a detailed and complex methodology, this tended to be reflected in the level of detail and type of illustrative material used.

There appears to be little clarity regarding the ability of spatial planning to deal with what Alden (2006) refers to as 'wicked' issues (i.e. deeply problematic and controversial issues). Whilst some would argue that these were just the sort of issues that spatial planning should be seeking to address, others claim that spatial planning should only address issues where it can realistically be influential. It is possible that an approach that seeks collaboration and consensus between a wide diversity of stakeholders is always likely to promote the least divisive solution, thus avoiding tackling such wicked issues head on. Even where such wicked issues have been identified in the documents (e.g. Ireland and Estonia) it is as yet unclear whether the implementation process will be able to address them successfully.

Principles governing spatial policy is one aspect where there appears to have been a clear convergence between the various approaches studied. A common feature has been the way that EU principles, in particular those in the ESDP, appear to have been embraced albeit more explicitly in some cases than in others. However, it remains a significant testimony to the influence of the EU (and ESDP in particular) that such a harmonisation can be detected. In fact, there is clear evidence to support claims in the academic literature (see Jensen and Richardson, 2001 and Pallagst, 2006) regarding the harmonisation of terminology and the development of an EU wide spatial planning language.

Principles such as the promotion of more balanced and polycentric forms of development are prominent and appear to have been widely embraced, even though each concept individually is highly contested and interpreted in various ways. An even greater challenge will be to retain such principles at the level of implementation where there is a direct impact upon peoples' lives. Not surprisingly sustainable development is a strong recurring theme in all approaches studied indicating a common feeling that spatial planning is in a strong position to promote the sustainable development agenda and this is at least in part due to its multi-disciplinary and cross-sector approach.

Another common feature identified was the dual use of both compulsion and collaboration as a means of ensuring that lower levels of government and sectoral stakeholders adhere to high-level principles. There was, however, significant variation in terms of the balance between the two elements. Generally the Celtic approaches sought to seek consensus whereas the Baltic approaches appear to be prepared to use the prescriptive legislation to ensure compliance. Further convergence in this area is likely in the foreseeable future as the Celtic processes become enshrined in legislation and the other approaches seek to become more consensual within the prescriptive frameworks.

Implementation, monitoring and review

The split between formal and more informal approaches is also reflected in the approaches to implementation, monitoring and review. The more formal and prescriptive approaches tended to have more formal and prescriptive implementation processes. Even in these cases however, the importance of collaboration and positive engagement as a key delivery mechanism in facilitating implementation was recognised and this represents a significant common feature in the approaches studied. Generally, there were only limited budgets directly attributed to the implementation process. And, combined with the cross-sector nature of spatial planning, these limited budgets forced implementation to have to focus on influencing the budgets of other stakeholders, increasing the importance of getting stakeholders to buy into the process.

There appears to be a lack of agreement about how implementation should be interpreted in the context of a national spatial strategy. Whereas the Welsh, for example, interpret implementation as a highly abstract concept with a set of general values to work towards in the long-term (Harris, 2006), implementation in Lithuania is seen as a more tangible process whereby concrete actions are programmed for the short to medium term. These differences are also reflected in relation to the perceived need for a dedicated action plan or implementation framework. The need to access EU funding programmes appears to have been an influential factor in interpreting the concept of implementation in Lithuania, which is likely to be so in Latvia as well. The Estonian case was the only approach that appears to identify high-level strategic values as a long term goal and also to recognise the importance of a dedicated action plan. The Celtic examples particularly interpret implementation as a highly fluid concept whilst the Lithuanian approach uses a highly detailed programme

of actions. It is possible that this reflects a division between approaches that consider spatial planning to be communication as opposed to those who consider it to be more of a programming exercise as discussed by De Vries in Zonneveld (2005).

The differences in relation to implementation are also reflected in relation to monitoring and evaluation. Whilst the importance of monitoring and evaluation appears to have been recognised in all cases there appears to be little consensus as to how this should be done. Some approaches promote highly detailed annual monitoring according to a rigid set of quantitative indicators whereas others promote bi-annual monitoring on a more abstract qualitative basis. There is, however, a general consensus that more work was required in developing robust qualitative indicators for monitoring purposes.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE LESSONS

Despite some differences being clearly identified the research indicates a significant harmonisation in numerous aspects. There appears to be a degree of harmonisation in relation to all of the themes examined in this research. Though, this harmonisation appears to be strongest in relation to the principles of spatial planning. The area of least convergence up until now appears to be implementation, monitoring and review. However, this may reflect the fact that the implementation process is still at a relatively early stage in most of the cases studied.

Enlargement of the EU appears to be having a paradoxical affect on harmonisation. On the one hand the influence of the EU in terms of its promotion of inter-regional co-operation, in relation to regulations such as the SEA Directive and also in relation to its funding programmes appears to be a strong force driving harmonisation. This has been felt particularly by the Baltic States where the EU has had significant influence over administrative and institutional reforms since independence. On the other hand enlargement has generated significant challenges and in order to address the national and sub-national aspects of these challenges it is likely that context specific solutions will be more appropriate and effective. If this is the case, then it is likely that a slight divergence in certain aspects will be necessary as has been detected in relation to the component parts of the UK after the asymmetrical devolution of power (Shaw and Sykes, 2005).

It is highly unlikely and equally undesirable that harmonisation will become absolute due to the numerous different contexts within which spatial planning is practiced. Absolute harmonisation would lead to standardised solutions being replicated throughout the EU. New challenges can be seen at the level of the EU as a whole and more specific challenges for the individual member states. These more specific local challenges, combined with the diverse historic, socio-economic and cultural contexts, will require local context sensitive approaches to continue to be developed within the set parameters provided by the general convergence discussed above. The impact of the EU on spatial planning has been considerable. Whilst the research has illustrated a significant harmonisation between approaches, the retention of the ESDP philosophy of shaping minds rather than providing prescriptive solutions would appear to allow room for innovative and context sensitive local knowledge and solutions to flourish.

REFERENCES

ADAMS, N., HARRIS, N. 2005: **Good Practice Guidelines for Regional Development Strategies.** Cardiff University.

ADAMS, N. 2006: **National Spatial Strategies in the Baltic States.** In ADAMS, N., ALDEN, J., HARRIS, N., (eds.), Regional Development and Spatial Planning in an Enlarged EU, p. 155-179, Aldershot, Ashgate.

ADAMS, N.,, EZMALE, PAALZOW, A. 2006: **Towards Balanced Development in Latvia:** The Experience of the Latgale Region. In ADAMS, N. HARRIS, N., ALDEN, J. (eds.), Spatial Planning and Regional Development in an Enlarged EU, p. 199-220, Aldershot, Ashgate.

ALBRECHTS, L. 2001: **From traditional land-use planning to strategic spatial planning: The case of Flanders.** In ALBRECHTS, L., ALDEN, J., DA ROSA PIRES, A. (eds.) the Changing Institutional Landscape of Planning, p 83-108 Aldershot, Ashgate.

ALDEN, J. (2006), **Regional Development and Spatial Planning,** in ADAMS, N., ALDEN, J., HARRIS, N. (eds.), Regional Development and Spatial Planning in an Enlarged EU, p. 17-40, Aldershot, Ashgate.

ALTROCK, U. GUNTNER, S. HUNING, S., PETERS, D. (eds.) 2006: **Spatial Planning and Urban Development in the New EU Member States: Between Adjustment and Reinvention.** In ALTROCK, U. GUNTNER, S. HUNING, S., PETERS, D. (eds.), Spatial Planning and Urban Development in New EU Member States, p. 1-18, Aldershot, Ashgate.

BYNENS, J., VAN DER LECQ, R. 2005: **Connecting Europe to its Regions: Territorial Cohesion as a Toolkit for an interwoven Spatial Development Approach.** Paper for AESOP Conference, Vienna, Austria, June 2005.

DABINETT, G. AND RICHARDSON, T. 2005: **The Europeanisation of Spatial Strategy: Shaping Regions and Spatial Justice through Governmental Ideas.** In International Planning Studies, Vol. 10 No. 3-4, p. 201-218, August – November 2005.

DAGILIENE, G. 2006: **The Response to Regional Disparities in Lithuania.** In ADAMS, N. HARRIS, N., ALDEN, J. (eds.), Spatial Planning and Regional Development in an Enlarged EU, p. 221-241 Aldershot, Ashgate.

DAVOUDI, S. 2004: **Territorial Cohesion: An Agenda that is Gathering Momentum.** In Town and Country Planning, July/August 2004.

DAVOUDI, S. 2006: **EU enlargement and the challenges for spatial planning systems in the new member states,** in ALTROCK, U. GUNTNER, S. HUNING, S., PETERS, D. (eds.), Spatial Planning and Urban Development in New EU Member States, p. 31-38, Aldershot, Ashgate.

DOWNES, R. 1996: **Regional Policy Development in Central and Eastern Europe.** In ALDEN, J.D.,BOLAND, P. (eds.) Regional Development Strategies, a European Perspective, Regional Studies Association, pp 256-272

EUROPEAN COMMISSION 1999: **European Spatial Development Perspective,** Brussels.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION 2001: **Strategic Environmental Assessment** Directive 2001/42/EC, Brussels

EUROPEAN COMMISSION 2004: **Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion,** Brussels.

FALUDI, A. 2004: **The European Spatial Development Perspective and North-west Europe:** Application and the Future. In European Planning Studies, Vol. 12 No. 3, p. 391-408 April 2004.

HARRIS, N. 2006: **Increasing and Spreading Prosperity: Regional Development, Spatial Planning and the Enduring Prosperity Gap in Wales.** In ADAMS, N., ALDEN, J., HARRIS, N. (eds.), Regional Development and Spatial Planning in an Enlarged EU, p. 87-106, Aldershot, Ashgate.

JAAKSON, R. 2000: **Supra-national spatial planning of the Baltic Sea Region and competing narratives for tourism.** In European Planning Studies, Vol. 8 No. 5, p. 565-579, 2000.

JENSEN, O., RICHARDSON, T. 2001: **Nested Visions: New Rationalities of Space in European Spatial Planning.** In Regional Studies, Vol. 35 8, pp 703-717, 2001.

KUNZMANN, K. 2006: **Spatial Development and Territorial Cohesion in Europe.** In ALTROCK, U. GUNTNER, S. HUNING, S., PETERS, D. (eds.), Spatial Planning and Urban Development in New EU Member States, p. 19-30, Aldershot, Ashgate.

OVIN, R. 2001: **The Nature of Institutional Change in Transition.** In Post Communist Economics, Vol. 13, No. 2, p. 133-146.

PAALZOW, A. 2006: **Barriers to Regional Development in the New Member States: The Latvian Experience.** In ADAMS, N. HARRIS, N., ALDEN, J. (eds.), Spatial Planning and Regional Development in an Enlarged EU, p. 181-197, Aldershot, Ashgate.

PALLAGAST, K. 2006: **European Spatial Planning Reloaded: Considering EU Enlargement in Theory and Practice.** In European Planning Studies, Vol. 14, No. 2, p. 253-268, February 2006

PETRAKOS, G. 2001: **Patterns of Regional Inequality in Transition Economies.** In European Planning Studies, Vol. 9, No. 3, p. 359-383.

PURVES, G. 2006: **Quality and Connectivity: The Continuing Tradition of Strategic Spatial Planning in Scotland** In ADAMS, N. HARRIS, N., ALDEN, J. (eds.), Spatial Planning and Regional Development in an Enlarged EU, p. 107-128, Aldershot, Ashgate.

SHAW, D., SYKES, O. 2004: **the Concept of Polycentricity in European Spatial Planning: Reflections on its Interpretation and Application in the Practice of Spatial Planning.** In International Planning Studies vol. 9 number 4 November 2004 pp 283-306.

SHAW, D., SYKES, O. 2005: **European Spatial Development Policy and Evolving Forms of Territorial Mobilisation in the United Kingdom, Planning, Practice and Research,** Vol. 20 No. 2, pp 183-199, May 2005.

VAN DIJK, T. 2002: **Export of Planning Knowledge Needs Comparative Analysis: The Case of Applying Western Land Consolidation Experience in Central Europe.** In European Planning Studies, Vol. 10 Nr. 7, 2002, p. 911-922.

VOETS, DE RYNCK, 2006: **Rescaling territorial governance: A Flemish perspective.** In European Planning Studies, Volume 14, Number 7 / August 2006, pp 905 – 922.

ZONNEVELD, W. 2005: **Expansive Spatial Planning: The New European Transnational Spatial Visions.** In European Planning Studies, Vol. 13 No. 1, p. 137-155, January 2005.