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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The report provides a brief overview of the development of spatial planning in Europe and addresses some of the potential synergies between spatial planning and ICZM relevant to North West Europe. It addresses the emerging trends in both terrestrial and marine spatial planning, highlighting some of the opportunities and barriers to integration between these planning systems and ICZM at local levels.

The report notes that the recent renaissance in regional development and spatial planning provides a strategic context for ICZM development. Not only does spatial planning promote sustainable development at regional levels, but it also influences the levels and types of development in coastal areas, which, in turn, affect management issues. Consequently, there is a clear need for ICZM, with its focus on sustainable development and management issues, to develop closer links with the terrestrial regional spatial planning system. To achieve this, however, there is generally a need to strengthen ICZM policy development at regional levels.

With respect to local development planning, the report suggests that there is considerable synergy with ICZM efforts at local levels. Both development planning and ICZM have compatible objectives as well as similar aims and processes for plan preparation and engagement of stakeholders and the public. Development plans with their ability to influence the character of the terrestrial component of coastal areas, are an important tool for ICZM. However, the report suggests that there are various challenges to further integration between the systems. To improve this, the report points to the need for further commitment to communication, coordination and collaboration between planning and ICZM at local levels; further resources and guidance to support 'joint' working between ICZM and planning; and, finally, a need to learn from best practice in coastal and marine spatial planning.

With an ability to facilitate sustainable development, strategic planning, multiple use allocation, conflict mitigation and reduction, the report notes that marine spatial planning is an essential tool for the coasts of North West Europe. Given the interest and impetus for the development of MSP, this is a time of considerable opportunity, particularly given the similarity in aims, objectives and principles between MSP and ICZM. Exactly, how MSP will develop and how it will interface with ICZM, however, is still emerging. It is suggested that any new MSP system should make adequate provision for planning across the land-sea boundary and should utilise suitable administrative arrangements enabling full engagement of relevant sectors and other key stakeholders including the ICZM community. The role of ICZM in providing a ‘zip’ to bring these systems seamlessly together should be investigated and promoted.
1. INTRODUCTION

The COREPOINT Project identified the need to address the role of regions and spatial planning for improving the capacity for Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM) in North West Europe early within the project's development. A general review of legislation and policy relevant to ICZM undertaken by the COREPOINT Project (COREPOINT: O’Hagan et al., 2005) had revealed a need to investigate the planning policy system in more detail as this system, it was considered, had considerable synergy with the aims and objectives of ICZM as well as playing a central role in determining the character of coastal lands. Indeed, the Commission of European Communities (CEC) suggested as early as 1999 that there was scope to develop research and policy to investigate links between spatial development and coastal/offshore management (CEC, 1999). However, such research investigations have, sadly, been rare.

This short report provides a brief overview of the development of spatial planning in Europe and addresses some of the potential synergies between spatial planning and ICZM relevant to North West Europe and the COREPOINT partner Expert Couplet sites. The study focuses on the characteristics of regional spatial planning and development planning which are relevant to ICZM and the ICZM principles. Chapter 2 outlines the development of spatial planning and regional development within the EU from the 1999 ESDP to 2007 “Territorial Agenda.” Chapter 3 presents an overview of the key features of the spatial planning systems within the Member States of North West Europe, relevant to the local COREPOINT project sites. Most of the general information on spatial planning has been synthesised from a series of technical appendices which were produced by Jeremy Alden as part of the COREPOINT project in Autumn 2007 (Alden, 2007a, b, c, d).
2 THE EUROPEANISATION OF SPATIAL PLANNING AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Background to the early development of spatial planning within the EU

Interest in spatial planning within the European Union (EU) has never been greater, and particularly interest in the activity of planning at the regional level. As Albrechts, Alden and Pires (2001) concluded in their book on the changing institutional landscape of planning, there has been a renaissance of interest in planning at all spatial levels, and this has been reflected in its institutional framework, particularly at the regional level. The regional dimension of planning and policy-making has been strengthened within both nations and the EU as a whole, now including twenty seven Member States.

The transition from traditional land-use planning and master planning to spatial planning at an EU level began with the European Commissions’ policy document ‘European 2000+ (1994) on regional development and spatial planning. This publication emphasised the increasingly important regional dimension of European policies, and an enhanced role for regional development strategies in achieving the objectives of nations, regions and localities in an enlarged EU. The key spatial unit in the Europeanization of planning has become the ‘region’.

However, it was the 1999 ESDP (European Spatial Development Perspective), produced and agreed by fifteen Member States (EU15), which has dominated the regional development and planning agenda and debate in recent years. Shaw and Sykes (2004) have illustrated how the ESDP and its concept of balanced and sustainable polycentric development has become one of the hallmarks of the emerging field of European spatial planning. The ESDP made a significant contribution in terms of a new planning methodology paradigm. It addressed issues of both cohesion and competition. It redefined the core-periphery model paradigm and addressed the excessive economic and demographic concentration in the congested areas of the EU. The subsequent EC Second Report on Economic and Social Cohesion (2001) promoted the following aspects, all of which are relevant to the development of ICZM within North West Europe:

- improvement of access to peripheral regions
- achievement of better balance of use along coastlines
- inclusion of ports into EU transport policy
- promotion of a freight network based as far as possible on rail and water, and

Polycentric spatial development promotes the establishment of multi-centred, balanced development foci as well as ‘dynamic and competitive cities and urbanised regions’ and ‘indigenous development of productive rural areas’ (Wiesbusch, 2004). It also recognises the functional linkages between urban and rural areas and the role of urban clusters and gateways in achieving such balanced development.

Box 1 A definition of polycentric development
Based on Wiesbusch (2004)
• promotion of diversity in the natural environment.

**Box 2  The purpose and aims of the ESDP**

The ESDP addressed environmental issues as well as those of economic and social cohesion (Box 2). Section 3 of the ESDP identified policy aims and options for the territory of the EU. These included coastal zone management, management of the natural and cultural heritage, and the importance of water resource management in presenting a challenge for spatial development. Indeed, Kidd *et al.* (2003), in a rare paper on the relationship between spatial planning and ICZM, suggest that there is much ‘common ground’ between the ESDP and ICZM with scope for the latter to take advantage of the forward looking and spatial conceptual thinking of the ESDP. However, they do suggest that the different origins and nature of the two processes may present challenges for coordination, particularly the more abstract and conceptual approach of the ESDP compared with the more pragmatic and concrete application of ICZM. However, it should also be noted that the ESDP in its coverage of spatial issues of European significance identified the role played by coasts with their great diversity of sensitive biotypes, which are of major importance for human living space, for tourism and transport, for industry and energy production and for agriculture and fishing. The ESDP also examined the loss of biological diversity and natural areas, risk to water resources, increasing pressure on the cultural landscapes, and on cultural heritage.

**2.2 Key features of spatial planning**

The term ‘spatial planning’ has come into widespread use only since the early-mid 1990s. The traditional approach to town and country planning often comprised a planning system that was intended to facilitate development, regulated land-use, and distinguish between urban and rural dimensions. However, the pace of change during the past ten years has produced a planning system across EU countries far more complex and with the new label of spatial planning. The transition from traditional land-use planning to new-style spatial planning has been driven by a number of forces (Box 3). Clearly, many of the key features of this new approach to spatial
planning relate closely to the EC’s ICZM principles of best practice, notably those relating to a holistic, broad approach, a long-term perspective and stakeholder involvement.

It is generally recognised that spatial planning is a much wider concept and activity than the more narrowly focused activity of land-use planning which was, for example, the hallmark of Britain’s traditional planning system. The main characteristic of spatial planning is that the activity of land-use/physical planning is closely linked to economic, social and environmental development policies. Promoting economic progress alongside environmental improvement at regional levels, strategic spatial planning facilitates sustainable development and is a vital tool for ICZM.

The nature, definition, purpose and remit of planning have undergone considerable change within all Member States of the EU. Whilst spatial planning can operate at all spatial levels i.e.: global, national, regional, sub-region and local, it is the regional level which has attracted most attention.

### Spatial planning:
- introduces a new planning paradigm
- is wider concept and activity than land-use planning
- links land-use planning with economic, social and environmental development policies
- operates at all spatial levels e.g. global, national, regional, sub-regional and local
- focuses on the regional level, providing a roadmap for future regional development
- provides a strategic framework for resource allocation and investment
- joins up and integrated public and private sector policies
- strengthens regional and local governance capacity
- takes a long-term perspective, usually 20 years
- explains the spatial dimension of national policies
- embraces the concept of balanced and sustainable polycentric development
- identifies and addresses ‘wicked’ issues
- includes evidence-based rigorous monitoring and review

---

**Box 3**  
Key Features of spatial planning of relevance to ICZM  
Source: Compiled from Figure 2.4 in ‘Regional Development and Spatial Planning in an Enlarged EU (2006) edited by Adams N, Alden J., Harris N, Ashgate Publishers.

---

2.3 The new focus on regions and Europeanization of planning

The European Commission’s periodic reports on ‘economic and social cohesion’ present a vision for the future of Europe’s policy which aims to reduce regional disparities and to promote greater economic, social, environmental and territorial cohesion. Of particular importance have been the Commission’s Third Report in 2004 and its fourth Report published in May 2007.

The Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion (February 2004) illustrated the new architecture for EU cohesion policy for the enlarged EU in 2007-13 programme period. This was to include a focus on

---

¹ ‘Wicked’ issues are those which are difficult to deal with because of their multi-dimensional nature, uncertain causes and effects, frequently multiple and competing goals, as well as potentially ambiguous or controversial potential solutions (Mason and Mitroff 1981, Lachapelle et al. 2003).
• convergence
• regional competitiveness, and
• territorial cooperation.


The Fourth Report on Economic and Social Cohesion (May 2007) gave increased coverage to environmental issues and how they are likely to affect some regions more than others. In chapter 1 of the Report, coverage of climate change (particularly floods, droughts and heat waves) was examined for regions across the EU.

The importance of issues such as coastal zone management and climate change, in spatial planning can be seen by their coverage in the new Regional Spatial Strategies produced by the new Regional Assemblies in the UK, as a result of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. Indeed, Taussik (2007) notes the considerable opportunity for incorporating coastal policy into these documents in England under the reformed planning system. Reference should be made to Gubbay (2002) and Ballinger and Dodds (2004) who provide details of the commitment of these new regional institutions to ICZM and coastal risk management, respectively. The Regional Spatial Strategy produced by the East of England Regional Assembly in 2004 is a good example of the issues facing regions with a long coastline. The East of England Plan has been the subject of wide public consultation and examination during 2007, and is expected to be formally adopted in early 2008.

2.4 The New Territorial Agenda of the EU (May 2007): towards a more competitive and sustainable Europe of diverse regions

With a growing awareness of the need to up-date the 1999 ESDP following EU enlargement in 2004 and 2007, the Commission produce a new territorial agenda for the twenty seven Member States (EU27). This ‘Territorial Agenda of the European Union (2007)’ was agreed by the EU Ministerial meeting held in Leipzig in May 2007. The new document:

a) presents the future task of strengthening territorial cohesion,

b) identifies new challenges facing territorial cohesion (including the spatial impact of climate change/sustainable development, and

c) re-states the main aims/principles of European spatial policy, which remain very similar to those contained within the 1999 ESDP.

The Territorial Agenda seeks to strengthen the global competitiveness and sustainability of all regions in Europe. This matches aims of the renewed Lisbon Strategy agreed by Member States in 2005. The Box 4 summarises the key contents of the document which are relevant to
COREPOINT. It should be noted that Alden suggests that there is a clear need for further work to be done on this agenda in the context of the enlarged Europe (Alden, 2007b.).

**Overall features**
The new agenda:
- presents the future task of strengthening territorial cohesion
- identifies new challenges facing territorial cohesion:
  a. includes the spatial impact of climate change & sustainable development
- re-states the main aims and principles of European spatial policy:

**Aims of European Spatial policy:**
- i. Development of a balanced and polycentric urban system
- ii. Securing parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge
- iii. Sustainable development, prudent management and protection of nature and cultural heritage

**Priorities for territorial development in the EU**, including:
- (5) promotion of trans-European risk management including the impacts of climate change
- (6) requirement for strengthening of ecological structures and cultural resources as the added value for development

**Implementation**, to be achieved via:
- (a) actions by EU institutions
- (b) engagement through national, regional and local development policies
- (c) joint activities by Ministers

### Box 4 Key contents of the new Territorial Agenda of the EU

#### 2.5 Other European programmes and initiatives of relevance to spatial planning and ICZM

Both the European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON) and the European Spatial Planning, Research and Information Database (ESPRID) provide invaluable capacity building support to the spatial planning community of academics and policy makers across Europe. In addition, the NORVISION spatial perspective for the North Sea, which is relevant to the eastern regions of the North West European INTERREG region, is also relevant. The main features of these initiatives of relevance to ICZM are briefly summarised below.

**ESPON**

ESPON, a pan-European research community which was established in 2002, facilitates the development of a European scientific community and associated applied research capacity in the subject areas of territorial development and spatial planning. Through increasing knowledge and understanding from a European perspective the effort supports and informs relevant policy development. As ESPON recognises the need to involve a multiple of academic disciplines and facilitates the development of integrated tools and instruments to improve spatial coordination of sectoral policy (Wiesbusch, 2004), it is a potentially useful network for ICZM.

---

ESPON 2006
The ESPON 2006 programme which included over thirty applied research projects as well as additional data project and networking activities, aimed to:

- provide evidence on territorial dynamics and imbalances within Europe and its regions
- improve the perception and application of the ESDP
- facilitate the inclusion of a spatial dimension in territorial cohesion policy and other EU policies
- provide for better coordination of territorial decisions
- integrate policy makers, administrators and scientists
- establish a European ‘territorial’ scientific community (ESPON, 2006)

Figure 1 lists the key priorities of the ESPON 2006 programme with Priority 3 being of most relevance to ICZM.

ESPON 2013
ESPON 2013 Programme, launched in January 2008, will continue the development of a European observation network on territorial development and cohesion which supports associated policy development. The new programme ensures continuation and enhancement of ESPON activities within the 2007 – 2013 Structural Funds period. Priorities within this ESPON programme of relevance to ICZM include applied research on territorial development, competitiveness and
cohesion as well as the development of territorial indicators and data, analytical tools and scientific support.

**ESPON and coastal areas**
ESPON has recently shown interest in coastal areas and issues associated with spatial planning of such territory. It has recognised the specific challenges of integrating human living, economic activities and environmental protection in coastal areas (ESPON website, January 2008). It has also noted issues associated with the peripherality of some European coastal regions as well as the increasingly high demographic pressure on other coastal regions which, it suggests, may pose a threat to environmental quality. In response to these pressures, ESPON has stressed the importance of looking at economic, social and territorial conditions of coasts to improve understanding and response to such challenges. It is vital that the ICZM community engages with such debate and discussions.

**ESPRID**
The European Spatial Planning, Research and Information Database, ESPRID, provides a useful web-based information resource for both policy-makers and researchers in the field of strategic spatial planning within Europe. Although it has been particularly designed to help those in ESPON 2006 and to those developing spatial strategies, it is potentially of considerable value to the ICZM community including both researchers and policy makers. Containing a wide range of source materials from both academic and grey literature sources as well as from plan, policy statements, databases and websites, it covers both academic and practical aspects related to spatial planning. As Figure 2 shows it is easy to use and search as well as providing a useful array of information relating to each resource (Figure 3).

![Figure 2 ESPRID search results for 'coastal zone management'](image)

2 The first page of search results for a search under the key phrase ‘coastal zone management’

3 This figure provides the details of one of the resources related to this search.
NORVISION, a spatial perspective for the North Sea Region

NORVISION, an advisory document, was put together by a range of representatives from national and local governments across the region⁴ to help operationalise the ESDP in the North Sea region. It was also designed to influence associated projects under Interreg III and to provide a vision for spatial development, including the spatial distribution of activities and linkages, in order to achieve sustainable development. Figure 4 summarises the key components of the Spatial Vision which are relevant to ICZM.

![Diagram showing components of the NORVISION vision for the North Sea region](http://www.planco.de/norvision.htm)

---

⁴ Including representatives from the UK and the Netherlands.
Together these European programmes and initiatives of relevance to spatial planning provide policy positions and discourses. However, although they underpin arrangements for project funding, they have no regulatory power. Consequently, although there is an effort by the EU to shape an agenda, there are few direct powers with which to steer it. This provides a contrast with the planning powers available at national levels.
3. **Spatial Planning in Member States of COREPOINT Project**

3.1 **General characteristics**

Table 1 and the following section provide a summary of the main components of the spatial planning systems of the Member States relevant to the COREPOINT Project Expert Couplet sites (COREPOINT: Ballinger *et al.*, 2008) and the development of associated local ICZM efforts. Information relating to the planning hierarchy, the objectives and topics covered by the planning systems as well as aspects related to the planning process and engagement of stakeholders has been provided. It was considered that this information would be useful to the COREPOINT Project partners, helping them develop a stronger understanding and relationship with the terrestrial planning system in their respective areas. This table and the following section were produced by Alden (Alden, 2007c). Further details can be found in Adams *et al.* (2006), the EC (1997) and Booth *et al.*, (2007).

The table shows that all six Member States of the project have a similar pattern of spatial planning at national, regional and local level with a clear hierarchy of planning for each State. Belgium, being a federal country, however, does not have responsibility at national level for spatial planning. Here there is such a responsibility for the Regions (Flanders Government). Likewise for the UK, there is no UK national spatial strategy, but there are such documents for the devolved governments of Wales and Scotland. The UK Government does have responsibility for spatial planning in England and has produced national guidance.

There is considerable consistency across EU in recognising the importance of national spatial planning systems in providing a policy and procedural framework for managing land use change, and relating this to wider economic, social and environmental objectives. In unitary states like France, Ireland and the UK, the general rule has been for the National government to make the law in relation to spatial planning and for this then to be applied throughout the country. However since the establishment of the devolved government in the UK in the late 1990s, there have been devolved spatial planning powers for Scotland and Wales since 1999. In federal states power is shared between national government and another tier. In the case of Belgium spatial land planning is a regional competence. Therefore Flanders plays the primary role in land and coastal spatial planning. Marine spatial planning, however, remained a federal competence.

At local level, local authorities have the primary responsibility for regulating land use control and detailed plan making across most of the EU, but within a framework set and supervised by national or regional government. Such local systems of planning, often referred to as town and country planning, have been described as operating as the ‘gatekeepers’ of development (Taussik, 2007). As such, they have a vital role in determining the location and distribution of development and land
### Table 1  Spatial Planning Systems of the Member States relevant to the COREPOINT Expert Couplet sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Member State</th>
<th>National Spatial Strategy or plan</th>
<th>Regional spatial strategy or plan</th>
<th>Development plans / framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Local / Unitary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork Harbour</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donegal Beaches</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severn Estuary</td>
<td>Wales / England</td>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefton Coast</td>
<td>England (NW)</td>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Coast</td>
<td>England (NE)</td>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Isles</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont St Michel Bay</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golfe Du Morbhan</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>YES for Flanders NO for Belgium</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: compiled by Alden (2007c)

use as well as in shaping the resultant character and associated management issues of coastal areas, albeit the plans are confined by their limited seaward jurisdictional limit.5

With a shift in attitudes and approach towards the 'utility of land use planning as a means of delivering effective environmental management' (Allmendinger et al., 2002) there is considerable renewed interest in planning and its potential for delivering ICZM (op. cit., Taussik, 2000, Allmendinger et al., 2002). Box 5 summarises some of the key features of town and country planning relevant to ICZM, which have sparked renewed interest in planning’s potential for delivering ICZM. The role of these plans in coordinating and harmonising disparate activities has also been recognised (Taussik, 1997) alongside the common features of both planning and ICZM systems, including their increasing adoption of plan-led systems and their use of open, transparent and inclusive processes in plan /strategy development (Taussik, 2000). However, studies by Allmendinger et al. (2002), Ballinger (2001) and Taussik (1996) investigating the extent to which land use planning is addressing coastal management issues, have shown a rather mixed picture and only partial realisation of this role. This may be a result of the limited understanding and background of planners in coastal processes as well as the different priority, status and resourcing

5 Low water in England and Wales, for example.
of planning and ICZM within local government. Despite this, these authors and others (Tyldesley, 2005) are clear of planning’s central role in helping deliver ICZM, particularly in the context of major recent planning reform in some Member States (op. cit.). Indeed, Taussik (2007) suggests that it is a time of opportunity for coastal planners and managers to communicate, cooperate and collaborate so that they can acquire a wider and better shared understanding of coastal issues in order to generate improved policy frameworks for both ICZM and planning (Figure 5).

Features of town and country planning relevant to ICZM

• Planning determines the location and distribution of land use and development
• Planning’s shift towards helping deliver effective environmental management
• Land use plans and planners coordinate and harmonise disparate activities
• Specific national planning guidance for coastal areas in some countries
• Some emerging regional spatial strategies recognise the importance of and start to address coastal issues and climate change

Common features of both the planning system and ICZM

• Synergy between aims and topic coverage
• Increasing adoption of plan-led systems
• Increasing use of open, transparent and inclusive processes in plan/strategy development

Obstacles to coordination between planning and ICZM

• Limited understanding and background of planners in coastal processes
• Limited understanding and background of ICZM professionals in land use planning
• Limited consideration of coastal and particularly offshore issues in land use planning documents
• Contrasting priority, status and resourcing of planning and ICZM within government (at all levels)
• Contrasting training and discipline-basis of planners and ICZM professionals
• Seaward jurisdictional limit of land-based planning systems

Box 5 Key features of the town and country planning of relevance to ICZM

Figure 5 The inter-relationship between land use planning and ICM
Source: Taussik (2007)
3.2 Individual Country Profiles

The following discussion highlights some of the characteristics of the spatial planning systems of each of the Member States relevant to the COREPOINT project. This information is taken directly from Alden (2007c).

Ireland

- The National Spatial Strategy (2002) is widely quoted as one of the best examples of national/regional strategic planning in the EU. Its methodology and processes have been adapted/adopted by many other EU countries.
- the 2002 National Spatial Strategy has strong backing by the Irish Government.
- there are 7 regions in Ireland, each with its own regional spatial strategy.
- local authorities prepare Development Plans, including cities and countries.
- the local authority system is complex, comprising municipalities which cover county (29) city (5) town (75) and borough councils.

Flanders

- the 3 regions in Belgium, Flanders - Wallonia - Brussels, are fully autonomous in the field of spatial planning.
- within Flanders, spatial planning legislation was introduced in 1996, and the Flemish Spatial Structure Plan was adopted in 1997. Within Flanders, the new structure planning was applicable at 3 spatial levels i.e.: (i) the regional level (Flanders); (ii) the provincial level with 5 provinces; and (iii) the local level with 308 municipal structure plans.
- the principle of subsidiary is embedded into the planning legislation of Flanders. This is important in establishing the role and responsibilities of the various levels and ensuring action is taken at the appropriate level.
- the 1997 Structure Plan for Flanders had a 10 year life and is under review (2007)

England

- in England, the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act requires the 8 English regions plus London, to prepare Regional Spatial Strategies. This has been done since 2004. These have been examined in public and involved considerable public consultation, and undergone review before adoption.
- local planning authorities prepare Development Plans called ‘Local Development Frameworks’ (LDF).
- whilst there has been a system of national policy guidance on spatial planning for England issues by the UK government, there has been no preparation of a UK-wide or England-wide spatial strategy, despite attempts by bodies like the RTPI (Royal Town Planning Institute) and TCPA (Town and Country Planning Association) to support such documents being produced.
Scotland

- Scotland has the status of a devolved administration within the UK. The Scottish planning systems reflects UK land use planning traditions, though it is subject to separate legislation.
- responsibility for the preparation of development plans and determining applications for planning permission lies with 32 local authorities.
- Scotland differs from Wales in that it has a strong tradition of strategic planning at the regional level. The current instrument of regional strategic planning is the structure plan. Structure Plans are prepared by local authorities and require approval by Ministers. At present these are 17 structure plan areas, providing all – Scotland coverage.

Wales

- Wales also has the status of a devolved administration within the UK (through the Government of Wales Act 1998), but with less significant law-making powers compared to Scotland.
- NAW published its Wales Spatial Plan in 2004, and this is now regarded as one of the principal policy documents of the Assembly, and has been promoted as a document to which all cabinet Ministers are signed up to. Within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) there is a requirement for the production, review and revision of the “Wales Spatial Plan”.
- since 1996 some 25 local planning authorities (i.e.: 22 unitary local authorities and 3 National Park authorities) across Wales have been responsible for land use planning. Since the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, local planning authorities prepare ‘Local Development Plans’. These plans must have regard to a range of relevant policy documents including the Wales Spatial Plan and relevant local authority community strategies.
- as an instrument of regional planning, the Assembly has undertaken regional workshops across Wales, designed to foster direct participation in the plan preparation process.

The Wales Spatial Plan:

- shows considerable coherence with the principles of ICZM
- reflects the Welsh Assembly Government’s commitment to sustainable development
- integrates a range of social, economic and environmental aspects in considering current problems and future potential
- raises the profile of spatial development and, thereby, of environmental quality, economic potential and social need
- provides a framework for integrated decision-making by the Assembly on matters with spatial dimensions or affecting the Wales territorial space
- provides a framework for EU structural and other funding for project delivery
- includes key partners in the plan making process
- establishes the commitment of the Assembly to local solutions developed through shared local agendas
- provides a framework for local town and country planning and other decision making and regulatory frameworks

Box 6 Key benefits of the Wales Spatial Plan for ICZM development

Sources: adapted from Ballinger et al. (2006) and Ballinger et al.(2005)
France

- France like the UK has seen a renewed interest in strategic spatial planning: in UK via 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, and in France by 2000 Loi SRU (Loi relative à la Solidarité et au Renouvellement Urbains).
- sub-national government has been weak in France, but there has been more devolution of powers to regions in recent years.
- sub-national government operates at 3 levels in France i.e.: (i) 26 regions (including 4 overseas) (ii) 100 départements (including overseas) and (iii) 36,763 municipalities
- the 22 mainland regions of France select regional councils with a wide range of responsibilities, including economic development and transport
- the central government has used 4-yearly contractual negotiation with the regions to impose national priorities rather than to allow bottom-up regionalism to emerge. The ‘Contrat du Plan’ pulls together state and regional actors around development, although the State dominates negotiation on policy goals and implementation
- there are therefore tensions between the centralist French republican tradition and the principles of regionalization
- the creation of DATAR (Délégation à l’Aménagement du Territoire et à l’Action Régionale) in 1983 was a key date in French planning. It was conceived as a cross-cutting strategic body directed by an inter-ministerial committee chaired by the prime minister. The DATAR conception was closely linked to France’s distinctive system of national economic planning, and gave a spatial dimension to the priorities of France’s successive national economic plans
- in January 2006 DATAR was re-shaped or renamed as the DIACT (Délégation Interministérielle à l’Aménagement et à la Compétitivité des Territoires) under the direction of the Ministère de l’Intérieur et de l’Aménagement du Territoire. The change of name from DATAR to DIACT is important in the new focus in France on city-regions, and that territorial competitiveness has now become the key concept behind national policy.

Comparison between Member State Planning Systems

The above Member State summaries highlight the similarities between the planning systems of the COREPOINT Project's Member States, particularly their similar vertical hierarchical structures. The discussion also reveals considerable consistency in the way in which planning helps to deliver effective environmental management in each country. This is important for ICZM.

3.3 COREPOINT partners’ observations about local development planning

As part of the COREPOINT project a survey was designed to provide an overview of the way in which the ICZM principles are being addressed across North West Europe through analysis of the experience in the COREPOINT local expert couplet study areas. This survey, which was completed by the COREPOINT partners, included a brief review of the characteristics of development planning which were relevant to ICZM development at the local level. For a full report of the COREPOINT survey reference should be made to COREPOINT: Ballinger (2008).
Although there was limited knowledge of development planning by many of the COREPOINT partners, it was clear that there is considerable synergy between ICZM and these plans in terms of their aims and topic coverage. For example, the UK partners reported that development plan aims include sustainable development, protection of natural areas, urban regeneration and revitalisation of coastal communities, all of importance to the local ICZM efforts. The coverage of topics relevant to ICZM within the local development planning documents was similarly wide for the all partner sites. Topics most frequently cited include economic development, transport/infrastructure, landscape protection, nature conservation and land use. These reflect the traditional focus of such planning efforts. Those topics receiving least coverage include commercial fisheries, pollution control and coastal defence. The lack of reference to the latter is clearly a potential issue for ICZM and the development of sustainable coastal management solutions. Indeed, Taussik (2007; 2004) and Ballinger et al. (2002) highlight problems and suggestions for improved practice associated with this issue in the UK (Figure 6). The latter paper suggests that, although recent planning policy and shoreline management plan guidance should help alleviate this issue, there remain deep-seated cultural and discipline differences between planners and engineers which present barriers to a truly integrated approach to coastal risk management and planning.

The partner survey also highlighted some significant differences between the development plans and ICZM efforts at the local level which may hinder integration between the two systems. In particular, partners noted the difference in status, resources and stage of development of development planning compared with the ICZM initiatives. Most of the development plans reviewed by the partners are statutory documents and consequently are better resourced than the ICZM efforts. However, it is commonly recognised that even land use planning is facing recruitment issues within many European countries as a result of poor remuneration of staff and the limited appeal of this profession and career (Coccosis, pers. comm.). Even so, traditional development plan systems are much better developed than ICZM, having evolved for over half a century in many European countries. As such then, ICZM is often the ‘poor relation’ and somewhat ‘peripheral’ to local authority responsibilities. The seaward limit of development plans, low water in England and Wales for example, is a further hindrance to integration. However, in this particular case, specific coastal planning policy guidance (Planning Policy Guidance 20 for England; Technical Advice Note 14 for Wales) suggest the need to address issues associated with the land-sea interface and to take into account potential offshore impacts of onshore development. Reviews of planning practice, however, suggest that this guidance is not always strongly adhered to (Allmendinger et al., 2002; Ballinger, 2001; Taussik, 1996).
Figure 6  Details of interaction between coastal defence authorities/agencies & planning system in England.

4. **MARINE SPATIAL PLANNING**

4.1 **Background**

Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) is concerned with analysing and allocating uses to specific locations within three-dimensional space to achieve ecological, economic and social objectives (UNESCO, 2006). As such it is an essential tool for the coasts of North West Europe, particularly those of the southern North Sea, which are facing increasing pressure from traditional as well as emerging new uses within already congested coastal space.

International experience from a wide range of countries and areas, including the US, Australia and Canada, suggests that it can facilitate sustainable development of the marine environment as well as helping conflict mitigation and reduction related to offshore resource access and allocation at different spatial scales (Ballinger, Taussik and Ball, 2005). MSP is an evolving process with still discussion on the exact elements of the process. However, key characteristics include acknowledgement that the process should be based on the ecosystem approach, should be planned and involve the integration of a wide range of interests (op. cit.). Additionally, Peel and Lloyd (2004) suggest that MSP is a challenge to traditional approaches and government practices, confronting a complexity of private-public, formal-informal and statutory-non-statutory customs and traditions. Box 7 lists some of the general characteristics of MSP of particular relevance to ICZM and Box 8 summarises the key conclusions from the recent international workshop on MSP in UNESCO in 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic principles within MSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-termism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on sound science, but acknowledging limits of science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polluter/uses Pays Principle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision-making framework and policy-making requirements of MSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive and flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent and clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key elements to be considered by MSP relevant to ICZM:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate legal status of MSP system in relation to existing competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine sectors to be addressed by the marine spatial plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical extent of marine spatial planning system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data and information requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial allocation and other tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery and administrative structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement mechanisms and approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and review processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Box 7 General characteristics of marine spatial planning of relevance to ICZM**

Adapted from: Ballinger, Taussik and Ball (2005)
A statutory or legislative basis is beneficial
The ecosystem should be kept in ecosystem management
The human dimension needs the same diversity of perspectives and disciplines as approaches to the biophysical environment
MSP need to be applied alongside other tools of sea use management
Early and continuing stakeholder engagement in a clear MSP process is vital
MSP should consider the level of uncertainty regarding existing and predicted uses
Lack of scientific knowledge about ecosystem functioning and its components should not be used as an argument for delaying the MSP process
Political criteria for evaluating MSP proposals are frequently different to those used by scientists and planners
Monitoring and evaluation are critical to the MSP and to broader sea use management
MSP and implementation should be closely linked with ICZM activities
Ecosystem-based sea use management should evolve over the next decade as MSP adopts a learning, adaptive process

Box 8 Conclusions and next steps from the International Workshop on MSP
UNESCO, 2006

As many countries begin to implement MSP, allocation of marine space to certain marine uses has become a crucial issue for many coastal states (Maes et al., 2007), particularly where there are intense, competing offshore space claims, such as in Belgium (Section 4.2.1). Zoning is frequently used for spatial allocation of activities and uses, as successfully applied at regional scales, for example in the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (USA, 1996), the East Scotian Shelf, Canada (GHK Consulting Ltd. 2004) and in Australia where the tool has been likened to a ‘town planning scheme’ (Day, 2002). In recent discussions relating to MSP in the UK, Kidd (2008) and Claydon (2008) have also suggested that MSP provides an opportunity to demonstrate that the principles of spatial planning can bring benefit to policy and decision-making in arenas other than land-use planning. Although some marine spatial plans are sectoral (such as fisheries plans, offshore oil and gas exploitation plans, plans for marine protected areas) increasingly such plans are looking at multiple use allocation. The Netherlands approach of opportunity mapping6 is particularly interesting in this context (Figure 7). The need for multiple use allocation necessitates wide stakeholder engagement, as demonstrated by recent Canadian and Australian experience. The former has demonstrated the need for significant resources and persuasion to engage with sectors and industries with limited capacity and willingness to engage.

The different character of the marine natural environment, the contrasting nature and patterns of land and sea use as well the difference information and data requirements for marine and terrestrial environments, suggest that marine spatial planning systems may need to adopt a somewhat different approach to current land-based spatial planning systems (Ballinger, Taussik and Ball, 2005) as demonstrated in Table 2.

6 An opportunity map shows locations where a function is allowed and where new uses of this function are expected.
The different character of the marine environment

**The three dimensional nature of the marine environment**
- Development and uses can occur on the seabed, on the sea surface and within the water column.
- This necessitates a three rather than two-dimensional approach to land-use planning.

**The dynamic nature of the marine environment**
- This demands a more flexible and adaptive approach to planning. For example, pollution can spread much quicker than on land due to wave, current and tidal action; offshore features such as sand-banks are more dynamic than topographic features on land.

**The mobility of marine species**
- Marine species tend to be more mobile than terrestrial species.
- Such species are difficult to protect with static geographical designations, such as those on land.

The different nature and patterns of land and sea use

**Many sea-use activities are not restricted to linear routes**
- For example, roads and rail set are aside specifically for transport (shipping lanes are an exception)
- There are public, common rights to navigation and fishing which have to be upheld.

**Variations in temporal uses**
- Characteristics of development on land (buildings/ fixed assets) do not change significantly over time.
- Many sea-use activities are highly mobile and intensity of use may vary temporally.

**Land use tends to be more exclusive i.e. used for either a single purpose or relatively few purposes**
- Not so at sea, where multiple uses are widespread.

**Different levels of dependency on the supporting environment**
- Development on land is generally less dependent on the condition of the land than most offshore industries, many of which are reliant on a healthy, marine ecosystem

Other considerations

**Identification of planning units on sea compared with on land**
- It is more difficult to identify static, easily-identifiable planning units at sea compared with for land areas.

**Information, data and knowledge**
- No comparable data on the extent of physical/biological processes or the impact of development upon these for the marine compared with the land environment
- Implications of ‘resource depletion / state of the marine environment’ may be less obvious / less immediately identifiable than on land.
- Additional complexities associated with monitoring / data collection in a dynamic and constantly changing environment offshore

---

**Figure 7 Opportunity map for offshore wind farm in the Netherlands**
(Source: De Vrees, L., 2006)

**Table 2 Key differences between terrestrial and marine spatial planning**

Source: Ballinger, Taussik and Ball (2005)
Drivers for MSP in Europe

Interest in MSP at both the European level and national level has been triggered and supported by a range of policy drivers (Box 9). At the European level the following have been important:

- the 2002 Bergen Declaration (agreed at the 6th north Sea Conference of ministers)
- the EU Natura 2000 network and the second Ministerial Meeting of the OSPAR Commission Recommendation 2003/3 on a Network of Marine Protected Areas
- The EU Recommendation on ICZM (2002)
- The EU Maritime Policy (COM 2006)

The former made a commitment to strengthen cooperation in planning and management of the North Sea though spatial planning as well as recognising potential conflicts between the need for conservation and restoration of the marine environment on the one hand, and human activities in the North Sea on the other. The Declaration also invited the OSPAR Commission to investigate the possibilities for further international cooperation in MSP as a planning and management tool. The need to promote a network of marine protected areas (MPAs) to ensure the sustainable use, conservation and protection of marine biological diversity and its ecosystems for Europe and the North Sea, has been a focus of such discussions by OSPAR and by the EU in relation to the EU Natura 2000 network. As noted by the MSPP Consortium (2006), there are significant issues to be resolved with the establishment of MPAs within MSP processes: MPAs tend to place conservation objectives above use-related objectives and, therefore, seek to install additional control of existing human activities to achieve conservation goals.

OSPAR has organised annual workshops on MSP planning in the North Sea (2003 and 2004) and on marine spatial management (2005). These have concentrated on exchange of information on good practice, developing a description of the spatial control systems in place in the North Sea and the Irish Sea as well as discussing the transboundary and cumulative impacts of decisions permitting the use of specific sea areas. In the context of ICZM, the EU Recommendation on ICZM (2002) and recent EU maritime policy documents (EC, 2006; EC, 2007) are also important. The former identifies MSP as a key ingredient for achieving ICZM and the latter calls for MSP to manage increasing competition between maritime economic activities and to help safeguard biodiversity.

- Increased development pressures on the marine environment and potential for multiple use conflicts, for example arising as a result of the rapid expansion of offshore renewable energy generation as well as from shipping, fishing and dredging activities
- The House of Commons EFRA Committee Marine Environment Report - this identified marine spatial planning as a possible means of overcoming problems associate with the complex regulatory framework and multiplicity of regulatory agencies with responsibilities for marine development (EFRA, 2004)
- The Review of Marine Nature Conservation (RMNC) Irish Sea Pilot (Vincent et al., 2004) which recommended a statutory process of MSP involving national planning guidelines, strategic plans at the Regional Sea scale , and more detailed local plans
- Commitments made by the UK Government in Safeguarding our Seas (Defra, 2002a) and Seas of Change (Defra, 2002b)
- Publication of the Wales Spatial Plan for the terrestrial area of Wales
- Scotland: various documents (Section 4.2.2)

Box 9 Drivers for marine spatial planning in the UK
Development of marine spatial planning in NW Europe

In addition to the Trilateral Wadden Sea Plan, the first European transboundary marine spatial plan between the Netherlands, Germany and Denmark (2001), marine spatial plans are under consideration or in preparation by various individual Member States (Table 3). These include national and regional initiatives in France as well as national efforts in Belgium and the Netherlands. The MSP process for Belgium is particularly noteworthy. The turbulent history and legal contests associated with this case illustrate the importance of transparent, clear and extensive procedures for stakeholder involvement (Maes et al., 2005; Douvere et al. 2007). The Belgian experience also shows the merits in adopting a phased delivery to MSP implementation, adapting to changing circumstances and benefitting from new, innovative planning and management solutions (op. cit.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member State/marine area</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Key references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>I (local &amp; regional level)</td>
<td>S (national; local)</td>
<td>At local level, a mechanism of marine spatial planning exists. It is defined by national legislation and implemented locally (SMVM: Schéma de Mise en Valeur de la Mer). At regional level, non statutory spatial planning exists like in Brittany (charter for the coastal zone management).</td>
<td>SMVM : art L.122-1 et suivants du code de l’urbanisme. Région Bretagne, 2007. Charte des espaces côtiers pour une gestion durable du littoral breton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under consideration for the German EEZ. Various states have extended plans offshore (Mecklenburg-Vorpommern: 2005; Lower Saxony: 2006; Schleswig-Holstein: in preparation). The Federal Spatial Planning Act was expanded to the German EEZ in 2004. Planning targets and principles for the EEZ including the designation of priority areas for specific forms of use have been developed. A formal consultation on the draft spatial plan for the EEZ will take place in 2008.</td>
<td>Gee et al. (2004) Siegel (2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- **Stage:**
  - D: Under discussion / consideration
  - P: Being prepared
  - I: Being implemented

- **Status:**
  - NS: Non-statutory
  - S: Statutory
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4.2 Case studies

4.2.1 Belgium

Because of increasing pressure caused by activities and the limited availability of space on land and at sea in the Belgian Part of the North Sea (BPNS), society has to anticipate how the sea can be used in a sustainable way. The BPNS is small and intensively used (Figure 8).

Space within the BPNS is limited and in most cases, the use of space for one type of activity restricts possibilities for other types of uses. New demands for exploitation of the BPNS are additional to an actual theoretical exploitation rate of 2.6 times the available space. Space allocations are based on current legislation and on the presumption that this space would actually be used (Figure 9).
In Belgium, discussion and controversy regarding new uses of the sea and seabed relate to the installation of wind turbines for green energy production, the growing demand for laying cables and pipelines and for sand and gravel exploitation, the increase in shipping traffic and recreation, the need for establishing marine protected areas and, more generally, the increased pressure from land-based activities on sea-based activities.

In order to respond to some of these new challenges, a Master Plan for the BPNS was developed. Political priorities were the delimitation of a zone suited to offshore wind farming, the delimitation of marine protected areas, the elaboration of a policy plan for sustainable sand and gravel extraction, the enhancement of financial resources for the prevention of oil pollution, the mapping of marine habitats, the protection of wrecks valuable for biodiversity, and the management of land-based activities impacting on the marine environment. Together, these objectives provided the basis for a “Master Plan” that was to be implemented incrementally. In 2003, the Master Plan proposed a

---

7 Space within the Belgian Part of the North Sea is limited and in most cases, the use of space for one type of activity restricts possibilities for other uses. New demands for exploitation suggest estimated exploitation rates of 2.6 times greater than the available space. This figure shows spatial allocations based on current legislation and presume all space will be used.
more diverse zoning system for sand and gravel exploitation. The most intensive exploitation is designated as control zones, with a sequential rotation procedure for exploitation. This rotation system was intended to spread extraction pressure and to guarantee restoration possibilities for that part of the seabed. In other areas, extraction is prohibited during fish spawning seasons. Dredged material will be reused if sand quality is not the driving force. Exploitation quota is limited to 15 million cubic metres over a five-year period. If more sand is needed, it will have to be imported. Furthermore, this ceiling assures a more controlled shift from sand exploitation on land to sea extraction in the BPNS. A new Royal Decree of 1 September 2004 introduces those conditions and the procedure for granting concessions for the exploration and exploitation of mineral resources and other non-living resources in the territorial sea and on the continental shelf, as well as the new exploitation zones. Another Royal Decree of 1 September 2004 sets out regulations for the environmental impact assessment of the exploration and exploitation of non-living resources in the territorial sea and on the continental shelf under the 1969 Continental Shelf Act (Douvere et al. 2007).

So far, the designation of zones for offshore wind parks in the BPNS has had a short but very turbulent history, with concession permits granted for the Vlakte van de Raan being contested in several legal procedures in court (Council of State) and finally being cancelled by the Minister of the North Sea. A new political approach foresees two adjacent zones on the Thornton Bank. For both of these zones, companies can submit proposals for the construction of offshore wind farms. The Thornton Bank is situated at approximately 27 to 30 km from the coastline, while the Vlakte van de Raan lies at a distance of approximately 12.5 km from the coastline (Maes et al. 2005). The cross-sectoral, multi-use approach laid out by the Master Plan (e.g. sand and gravel extraction limitations during fish spawning periods; future offshore wind farms hosting aquaculture projects;...), is an entirely new approach of Belgian sea use management (Douvere et al. 2007).

The second phase of the Master Plan focussed on the implementation of Natura 2000 by delimitating Special Protection Areas (SPAs) for rare, vulnerable or regularly occurring migratory species and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) to support valuable natural habitats in the BPNS. In 2005, five zones received legal status: three bird protection areas or SPAs and two SACs as habitat protection areas. Prior to their delimitation, the sources of threats and disturbances were analysed. In March 2006, a sixth zone received protected status: the waterfront of the marine reserve of the Bay of Heist (Douvere et al. 2007).
Despite the lack of a legal basis for MSP in Belgium, the Master Plan provides a translation of current and future objectives of various sectors into a spatial vision. The first two phases of the Master Plan are now operational and focus on spatial delimitations for sand and gravel extraction and a zone for future offshore wind energy projects (Phase 1), followed by the delimitation of marine protected areas as part of the EU Natura 2000 Network (Phase 2).

4.2.2 Case study: Scotland
The development of what would now be called coastal management measures in Scotland has a long history. Apart from ports and harbours conservancy measures and related development of fishery harbours in the nineteenth century, these revolve principally around economic sectors including fishing, salmon farming and the offshore oil and gas industry, supplemented in the past two decades by more integrated approaches.

In the fisheries field a particularly notable development was the Inshore Fisheries (Scotland) Act 1984 which provided a national framework for coastal fisheries management within the twelve-mile Territorial Sea in the context of the EC Common Fisheries Policy. In 1998 an innovatory partnership agreement was reached among all stakeholders in the Shetland sand eel fishery, followed in 1999 by a similar approach to the framing of the Shetland Shellfish Regulating Order.
The salmon farming industry was established in the 1970s in the sea lochs of the West Coast and the voes of Shetland. The Crown Estate assumed a leading role initially on the West Coast, followed by the Highland Regional Council, which established non-statutory plans for several lochs in association with the Crown Estate. In Shetland the local authority issues works licences under the provisions of the Zetland County Council Act (below).

The advent of the offshore oil industry in the early 1970s provided the impetus for substantial coastal management measures at both local and national levels. While the Scottish Office provided survey material for the coast as a whole (Scottish Development Department 1973), two reports dealing with oil platform yard sites and pipeline landfalls respectively, and a set of Coastal Planning Guidelines were also published (Scottish Development Department 1974). The lead was then taken by the Zetland and Orkney County Councils whose respective Acts gave the local authorities planning powers in the territorial sea up to three miles from land, together with port authority powers. A similar approach was adopted at national level the following year to curb speculation in platform yard sites through the Petroleum Development (Scotland) Act of 1975. Provision for pipeline routes offshore and related landfalls and refinery sites was made in the Petroleum and Submarine Pipelines Act 1975.

The final stage of integrated management development arrived in the 1990s with the instigation of the ‘Focus on Firths’ initiative under the aegis of Scottish Natural Heritage in association with other stakeholders; and the parallel inauguration of the national Scottish Coastal Forum. Since devolution in 1999, the Scottish Executive has been promoting both coastal planning and national marine spatial planning approaches (National Planning Policy Guideline 13: Coastal Planning 1997) (Seas the Opportunity 2005) which will shortly result in a Marine Act. In addition, under the Scottish Sustainable Marine Environment Initiative (SSMEI) integrated coastal and sea use management pilot studies for Shetland (Shetland Marine Spatial Plan 2008), Berwickshire, the Firth of Clyde and the Sound of Mull are being produced. The Shetland Marine Spatial Plan, which currently exists in consultative draft form, provides a comprehensive policy framework integrated with existing land and water use and other strategies, policies and plans at all geographical scales.

4.3 Links between MSP and ICZM

Given the considerable interest and impetus for the development of MSP both across Europe and at Member State level, this is a time of considerable opportunity for ICZM, particularly given the similarity in aims, objectives and principles between MSP and ICZM. Exactly, how MSP will develop and how it will interface with ICZM at the various levels, however, is still emerging although it is clear from the EC ICZM Recommendation that the Commission is convinced that MSP is a key ingredient for achieving ICZM (EC, 2002). Within discussions on the role of ICZM in providing a linkage across the land/sea divide, the need to make adequate provision for planning across this boundary is also a key consideration (Scottish Coastal Forum and AGMACS Secretariat, 2007; Atkins, 2004; Ballinger et al., 2005) along with consideration of the potential role of local coastal
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partnerships/initiatives in the MPS (AGMACS, 2007). The experience of Oregon Ocean-Coastal Management program (US) which includes land and sea-based programmes, undertaken as part of the state-wide spatial land use planning system, suggests that ICZM programmes can provide a ‘zip’ bringing land and marine systems seamlessly together (op. cit.). Given uncertainties regarding MSP development, MSP may to be ‘shaped’ to country specific needs, assisting with the ICZM principle of ‘local specificity.’ This, however, is only likely to be achieved with suitable administrative arrangements which enable full engagement of relevant sectors and other key stakeholders including the ICZM community.
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction
The following chapter summarises some of the main conclusions and recommendations relating to
the review of terrestrial spatial planning (Section 5.2; based on Chapter 2), the COREPOINT
partners’ survey of local development plans (Section 5.2; based on Chapter 3) and a review of
Marine Spatial Planning experience (Section 5.3: based on Chapter 4).

5.2 Terrestrial spatial planning
An overview of the development of terrestrial spatial planning systems in Europe has been
provided, largely based on the work of Alden (Alden, 2007a, b, c, d). This review has addressed
some of the potential synergies between spatial planning and ICZM relevant to North West Europe
and the COREPOINT partner Expert Couplet sites and has highlighted some of the opportunities
and barriers to integration between development planning and ICZM at local levels, based on the
findings of the COREPOINT partners’ survey (Ballinger, 2008). In particular, the review highlights
the importance of the strategic context provided by regional terrestrial spatial planning system as
well as the local context provided by local development plans for ICZM development at regional
and local levels. These points are discussed in more detail below.

- Regional terrestrial spatial planning provides strategic context for ICZM development
  The recent renaissance in regional development and spatial planning has provided a strategic
  context for ICZM development. The linkage between spatial planning and economic, social and
  environmental development policies is particularly important as are the implications of the spatial
  development drivers, particularly the potential impacts of proposed polycentric development and
  associated infrastructure, which influence coastal development, character and resultant
  management issues. Consequently, it is essential that:

  - ICZM develops closer links with terrestrial regional spatial planning.
    This would enable ICZM to be able to proceed with a much clearer understanding of the spatial
    planning process as well as to:
    - engage with the decision-making process for spatial plan and local development plan
      development at all levels
    - share its knowledge and understanding of coastal systems and governance with the spatial
      planning community
    Given the challenges of climate change, there is also a need for sharing of ideas and best
    practice so both spatial planning and ICZM can proceed in the context of a wider
    understanding of coastal systems.

- Local development planning provides the local context for coastal management
  Local development planning is a long-established mechanism for influencing the distribution of
  development within coastal areas. With planning’s wide objectives and ability to influence the
character of coastal areas, there is considerable synergy between it and ICZM efforts at local levels. However, the findings of the COREPOINT partners’ survey suggest a number of challenges to further integration between the two systems. However, it is clear that there is a need for:

- **further commitment to communication, coordination and collaboration between planning and ICZM at local levels**
  
  *It is suggested that, at this time of opportunity for coastal planning and management, this can help:*
  
  - gain a wider and better shared understanding of coastal issues
  - generate improved policy frameworks for both ICZM and planning

- **resources and guidance to support ‘joint’ working between ICZM and planning**
  
  *This will need support through appropriate resourcing and guidance at national and regional (sub-national) levels, as suggested by Tyldesley for England (2005).*

- **learning from best practice in spatial planning**
  
  *Given the similarities between the spatial planning systems within the COREPOINT Expert Couplet countries, there may be considerable potential in providing examples of best practice and opportunities for discussion on this important topic across the INTERREG North West Europe region.*

**5.3 Marine Spatial Planning**

With an ability to facilitate sustainable development, strategic planning, multiple use allocation, conflict mitigation and reduction, marine spatial planning is an essential tool for the coasts of North West Europe. Given the considerable interest and impetus for the development of MSP both across Europe and at Member State level, this is a time of considerable opportunity for ICZM, particularly given the similarity in aims, objectives and principles between MSP and ICZM. Exactly, how MSP will develop and how it will interface with ICZM, however, is still emerging although it is clear from the EC ICZM Recommendation that the Commission is convinced that MSP is a key ingredient for achieving ICZM (EC, 2002). It is vital that any new MSP system addresses the land-sea divide and makes adequate provision for planning across this boundary. In this context, the role of ICZM in providing a ‘zip’ to bring these systems seamlessly together should be investigated and promoted. The experience of Oregon State (US) may be relevant in this context (Ballinger, Taussik and Ball, 2005).

The uncertainties regarding MSP development should enable MSP to be ‘shaped’ to country specific needs and so assist with the ICZM principle of ‘local specificity.’ This, however, is only likely to be achieved with suitable administrative arrangements which enable full engagement of relevant sectors and other key stakeholders including the ICZM community. The Belgian experience with its turbulent history and legal contests, illustrates the importance of transparent,
clear and extensive procedures for stakeholder involvement. The Belgian case also shows the merits in adopting a phased delivery to MSP implementation so that it can adapt to changing circumstances and benefit from new, innovative planning and management solutions.

In summary, the recommendations related to MSP are:

- **Marine Spatial Planning: an essential tool for ICZM**

To maximise the benefits of this newly emerging tool and to influence its future development, there is a need to:

- integrate terrestrial spatial planning and marine spatial planning
  
  *This is needed to ensure coherency of the policy for the coast as a result of the continuum of natural processes and human uses on land and sea*

- investigate and promote the relationship of ICZM in facilitating land-sea integration of land and marine spatial planning
  
  *There are various options for combining ICZM and marine spatial planning which need to be investigated so that there is strong land-sea integration.*
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APPENDIX 1  
Spatial Planning and regional development within the EU  

From the 1999 ESDP to 2007  
“Territorial Agenda”  

Spatial Planning Issues and the COREPOINT Agenda  

1. The Europeanization of Spatial Planning and Regional Development.  

1.1 The COREPOINT Project has identified the need to address the role of regions and spatial planning for improving the capacity for Integrated Coastal Zone Management in North West Europe.  

1.2 Interest in spatial planning within the European Union (EU) has never been greater, and particularly interest in the activity of planning at the regional level. As Albrechts, Alden and Pires (2001) concluded in their book on the changing institutional landscape of planning, there has been a renaissance of interest in planning at all spatial levels, and this has been reflected in its institutional framework, particularly at the regional level. The regional dimension of planning and policy-making has been strengthened within both nations and the EU as a whole (now 27).  

1.3 The transition from traditional land-use planning and master planning to spatial planning at an EU level began with the European Commissions’ policy document ‘European 2000+ (1994) on regional development and spatial planning. This publication emphasised the increasingly important regional dimension of European policies, and an enhanced role for regional development strategies in achieving the objectives of nations, regions and localities in an enlarged EU. The key spatial unit in the Europeanization of planning has become the ‘region’.  

1.4 However, it was the ESDP (European Spatial Development Perspective) in 1999 which has dominated the regional development and planning agenda and debate in recent years. Shaw and Sykes (2004) have illustrated how the ESDP and its concept of balanced and sustainable polycentric development has become one of the hallmarks of the emerging field of European spatial planning. The ESDP made a significant contribution in terms of a new planning methodology paradigm. It addressed issues of both cohesion and competition. It redefined the core-periphery model paradigm and addressed the excessive economic and demographic concentration in the congested areas of the EU.  

1.5 The ESDP addressed environmental issues as well as those of economic and social cohesion. Section 3 of the ESDP identified policy aims and options for the territory of the EU. These included coastal zone management, management of the natural and cultural heritage, and the importance of water resource management in presenting a challenge for spatial development. Moreover, the ESDP (pages 72-75) in its coverage of spatial issues of European significance identified the role played by
coasts with their great diversity of sensitive biotypes, which are of major importance for human living space, for tourism and transport, for industry and energy production and for agriculture and fishing. The ESDP also examined the loss of biological diversity and natural areas, risk to water resources, increasing pressure on the cultural landscapes, and on cultural heritage.

2. Key Features of Spatial Planning

2.1 The term ‘spatial planning’ has come into widespread use only since the early-mid 1990s. The traditional approach to town and country planning often comprised a planning system that was intended to facilitate development, regulated land-use, and distinguish between urban and rural dimensions. However, the pace of change during the past ten years has produced a planning system across EU countries far more complex and with the new label of spatial planning.

2.2 It is generally recognised that spatial planning is a much wider concept and activity than the more narrowly focused activity of land-use planning which was, for example, the hallmark of Britain’s traditional planning system. The main characteristic of spatial planning is that the activity of land-use/physical planning is closely linked to economic, social and environmental development policies. The nature, definition, purpose and remit of planning has undergone considerable change within all member states of the EU. Whilst spatial planning can operate at all spatial levels ie: global, national, regional, sub-region and local, it is the regional level which has attracted most attention.

2.3 The transition from traditional land-use planning to new-style spatial planning has been driven by a number of forces, which are illustrated in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: The Transition to Spatial Planning across the EU: Key Features

- Spatial planning driven by EU initiatives
- Spatial planning wider than land-use planning
- Strategic framework for resource allocation and investment
- Long term perspective, usually 20 years
- Joins-up and integrates public and private sector policies
- Links land-use planning with economic development policy and other policies (eg: environmental and social)
- Explains spatial dimension of national policies
- Achieves more balanced distribution of economic development
- Embraces the concept of balanced and sustainable polycentric development
- Identifies and addressed ‘wicked’ issues
- Strengthens regional/local governance capacity
- Puts focus on space, place and issues of spatial distribution
- The region is a focus for spatial planning
- Spatial planning provides roadmap for future regional development
- Evidence-based rigorous monitoring and review.

Source: Compiled from Figure 2.4 in ‘Regional Development and Spatial Planning in an Enlarged EU (2006) edited by Adams N, Alden J., Harris N, Ashgate Publishers.'
3. The New Focus on Regions and Europeanization of Planning

3.1 The European Commission’s vision for the future of Europe’s policy to reduce regional disparities and to promote greater economic, social, environmental and territorial cohesion, has been articulated in its periodic reports on ‘economic and social cohesion’. Of particular importance have been the Commission’s Third Report in 2004 and its fourth Report published in May 2007.

3.2 The Third Report on Economic and Social Cohesion (February 2004) illustrated the new architecture for EU cohesion policy for the enlarged EU in 2007-13 programme period. This was to include a focus on a) convergence (b) regional competitiveness, and (c) territorial cooperation. The Third Report was then followed by the European Commission’s resolve to strengthen the relaunch both the Lisbon Agenda of 2000 on economic competitiveness and the Gothenburg Agenda of 2001 on sustainable development.

3.3 The Fourth Report on Economic and Social Cohesion (May 2007) gave increased coverage to environmental issues and how they are likely to affect some regions more than others. In chapter 1 of the Report, coverage of climate change (particularly floods, droughts and heat waves) was examined for regions across the EU.

3.4 The importance of environmental issues such as coastal zone management and climate change, in spatial planning can be seen by their coverage in the new Regional Spatial Strategies produced by the new Regional Assemblies in the UK, as a result of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The Regional Spatial Strategy produced by the East of England Regional Assembly in 2004 is a good example of the issues facing regions with a long coastline. The East of England Plan has been the subject of wide public consultation and examination during 2007, and is expected to be formally adopted in early 2008.

4. The New Territorial Agenda of the EU (May 2007)

4.1 There has been growing awareness of the need to update the 1999 ESDP, which was produced and agreed by the EU15. With EU enlargement in 2004 and 2007, the European Commission worked to produce a new territorial agenda to the EU27. This document was agreed by the EU Ministerial meeting held in Leipzig in May 2007.

4.2 This 11 page document is re-produced in full as Appendix 2, and should be read in conjunction with this Appendix 1.

4.3 This new ‘Territorial Agenda of the European Union (2007)’ (a) presents the future task of strengthening territorial cohesion, (b) identifies new challenges facing territorial cohesion (including the spatial impact of climate change/sustainable development, and (c) re-states the main aims/principles of European spatial policy, which remain very similar to those contained within the 199 ESDP.
APPENDIX 2

Territorial Agenda of the European Union (11 page document)

Towards a More Competitive and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions

Agreed by EU Ministerial Meeting in Liepzig on May 24/25, 2007

(i) Ministers responsible for spatial planning and development presented on ‘Territorial Agenda’ for 27 countries: 4 main Sections to Report.

(ii) Section 1 presents the future task of strengthening territorial cohesion.

(iii) Section 2 identifies 6 new challenges facing territorial cohesion, including regionally diverse impacts of climate change on the EU territory and its neighbours, particularly with regard to sustainable development.

(iv) Section 3 identifies three main aims of European spatial policy:

a) Development of a balanced and polycentric urban system
b) Securing parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge
c) Sustainable development, prudent management and protection of nature and cultural heritage

Section 3 includes coverage of 6 priorities for territorial development in the EU:

No. 5 “we promote Trans-European Risk Management including the Impacts of Climate change”,

No 6 “we require the strengthening of Ecological Structures and Cultural Resources as the Added Value for Development”.

(v) Section 4 covers implementing the Territorial Agenda: (a) actions by EU institutions (b) engage national, regional and local development policies (c) joint activities by Ministers.

(vi) The Territorial Agenda seeks to strengthen the global competitiveness and sustainability of all regions in Europe. This matches aims of the renewed Lisbon Strategy agreed by Member States in 2005.

(vii) See the 11 page ‘Territorial Agenda’ document (EU May 2007) attached and its implications for COREPOINT project. This document is the follow-up to the 1999 ESDP, and has been signed-up to by all 27 EU Members (compared to ESDP15). There is clearly more work to be done on this 2007 version for the enlarged EU.
APPENDIX 3

Matrix Table of Spatial Planning in Member Countries of COREPOINT Project

(i) Ireland
(ii) England
(iii) Scotland
(iv) Wales
(v) France
(vi) Flanders (Belgium)

1.0 Information Sources and Preparations of Matrix Table of Spatial Planning in Member Countries of COREPOINT Project.

1.1 The author has used a member of references for the preparation of this Appendix and the Matrix Table shown in figure 1. These references are shown in Appendix 4. Of particular interest are the following:


1.2 Figure 1 provided a Matrix of Spatial Planning in Member Countries of the COREPOINT Project. The Matrix shows that the 6 Member Countries of the project have a similar pattern of spatial planning at national, regional and local level. Belgium, being a federal country, is an example of a Member State Government which does not have responsibility at national level for spatial planning. However, there is such a responsibility for the Flanders Government. Likewise for the UK, there is no UK national spatial strategy, but there are such documents for the devolved governments of Wales and Scotland. The UK Government does have responsibility for spatial planning in England and has produced national guidance etc.

2.0 Spatial Planning Systems in Member Countries of COREPOINT Project.

2.1 It is important to note that there is considerable consistency across EU countries for recognition of the importance of providing a policy and procedural framework for managing land use change, and relating this to wider economic, social and environmental objectives.

2.2 In unitary states like France, Ireland and the UK, the general rule has been for the National government to make the law in relation to spatial planning and this is then
applied throughout the country. In the UK, since 1999 devolution has

Figure 1 Spatial Planning Systems in Member Countries of COREPOINT Project

COREPOINT CASE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Spatial Strategy / plan</th>
<th>Regional spatial strategy / plan</th>
<th>Development plans / framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Local / Unitary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork Harbour</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donegal Beaches</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severn Estuary</td>
<td>Wales / England</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selton Coast</td>
<td>England (NW)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Coast</td>
<td>England (NE)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Isles</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont St Michel Bay</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golfe Du Morbihian</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flanders</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>- for Flanders</td>
<td>- for Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- for Belgium</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other countries of Interreg NW Europe region:
- Netherlands
- Germany

Source: compiled by Jeremy Alden (Dec 2007)

devolved spatial planning powers to Scotland and Wales. The federal states like Belgium have power being shared between national government and another tier (as with regions in the case of Belgium). In Belgium, the regions, like Flanders, play the primary role in spatial planning.

2.3 At local level, local authorities have the primary responsibility for regulating land use control and detailed plan making across most of the EU, but within a framework set and supervised by national or regional government.

3.0 Individual Country Profiles.

a) Ireland
- the National Spatial Strategy (2002) is widely quoted as one of the best examples of national/regional strategic planning in the EU. Its methodology and processes have been adapted/adopted by many other EU countries.
- the 2002 National Spatial Strategy has strong backing by the Irish Government.
- there are 7 regions in Ireland, each with its own regional spatial strategy.
- local authorities prepare Development Plans, including cities and countries.
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- the local authority system is complex, comprising municipalities which cover county (29) city (5) town (75) and borough councils.

b) Flanders
- the 3 regions in Belgium, Flanders - Wallonia - Brussels, are fully autonomous in the field of spatial planning.
- within Flanders, spatial planning legislation was introduced in 1996, and the Flemish Spatial Structure Plan was adopted in 1997. Within Flanders, the new structure planning was applicable at 3 spatial levels ie: (i) the regional level (Flanders); (ii) the provincial level with 5 provinces; and (iii) the local level with 308 municipal structure plans.
- the principle of subsidiary is embedded into the planning legislation of Flanders. This is important in establishing the role and responsibilities of the various levels and ensuring action is taken at the appropriate level.
- the 1997 Structure Plan for Flanders had a 10 year life and is currently under review in 2007.

c) England
- in England, the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act requires the 8 English regions plus London, to prepare Regional Spatial Strategies. This has been done since 2004. These have been examined in public and involved considerable public consultation, and undergone review before adoption.
- local planning authorities prepare Development Plans called ‘Local Development Frameworks’ (LDF).
- whilst these has been a system of national policy guidance on spatial planning for England issues by the UK government, there has been no preparation of a UK-wide or England-wide spatial strategy, despite attempts by bodies like the RTPI (Royal Town Planning Institute) and TCPA (Town and Country Planning Association) to support such documents being produced.

d) Scotland
- Scotland has the status of a devolved administration within the UK. The Scottish planning systems reflects the land use planning traditions of the UK, though it is subject to separate legislation.
- responsibility for the preparation of development plans and determining applications for planning permission for planning permission lies with 32 local authorities.
- Scotland differs from Wales in that it has a strong tradition of strategic planning at the regional level. The current instrument of regional strategic planning is the structure plan. Structure Plans are prepared by local authorities and require approval by Ministers. At present these are 17 structure plan areas, providing all – Scotland coverage.

e) Wales
- Wales created the National Assembly for Wales via the Government of Wales Act 1998.
- the N.A.W. published its Wales Spatial Plan in 2004, and this is now regarded as one of the principal policy documents of the Assembly, and has been promoted as a document to which all cabinet Ministers are signed up to.
- since 1996 some 25 local planning authorities (ie: 22 unitary local authorities and 3 National Park authorities) across Wales have been responsible for land use planning. Since the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, local planning authorities prepare ‘Local Development Plans’.
- as an instrument of regional planning, the Assembly has undertaken a series of regional workshops across Wales, designed to foster direct participation in the process of plan preparation.

f) France
- France like the UK has seen a renewed interest in strategic spatial planning: in UK via 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, and in France by 2000 Loi SRU (Loi relative à la Solidarité et au Renouvellement Urbains).
- sub-national government has been weak in France, but there has been more devolution of powers to regions in recent years.
- sub-national government operates at 3 levels in France ie: (i) 26 regions (including 4 overseas) (ii) 100 départements (including overseas) and (iii) 36,763 municipalities
- the 22 mainland regions of France select regional councils with a wide range of responsibilities, including economic development and transport
- the central government has used 4-yearly contractual negotiation with the regions to impose national priorities rather than to allow bottom-up regionalism to emerge. The ‘Contrat du Plan’ pulls together state and regional actors around development, although the State dominates negotiation on policy goals and implementation
- there are therefore tensions between the centralist French republican tradition and the principles of regionalization
- the creation of DATAR (Délégation à l’Aménagement du Territoire et à l’Action Régionale) in 1983 was a key date in French planning. It was conceived as a cross-cutting strategic body directed by an inter-ministerial committee chaired by the prime minister. The DATAR conception was closely linked to France’s distinctive system of national economic planning, and gave a spatial dimension to the priorities of France’s successive national economic plans
- in January 2006 DATAR was re-shaped or renamed as the DIACT (Délégation Interministérielle à l’Aménagement et à la Compétitivité des Territoires) under the direction of the Ministère de l’Intérieur et de l’Aménagement du Territoire. The change of name from DATAR to DIACT is important in the new focus in France on city-regions, and that territorial competitiveness has now become the key concept behind national policy.