TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT: TRANSNATIONAL AND NATIONAL ACTIONS WITHIN EUROPE

Cliff Hague
(Heriot-Watt University)

The meeting in Annapolis aims to explore the role of states and nation states in smart growth planning. The context is both the growing interest in smart growth and the recognition that planning in the US is very local in its focus and practice. The impression from afar is that much of the US discourse on smart growth has been primarily shaped by a New Urbanist design language, and by negotiation and mediation of growth boundaries and targets. This paper seeks to provide a point of departure by arguing that in Europe, the idea of transit-oriented development is central to an emerging set of trans-national ideas and practices under the labels of "spatial planning" and (increasingly) "territorial cohesion". However, the paper suggests that this emerging policy consensus is more fragile than it might appear. Similarly, the paper shows that TOD in a more familiar guise is endorsed in national planning policy in the UK, but that outcomes are mediated by other planning doctrines and by consumer preferences. Finally the paper suggests some questions for further research.

Spatial Planning – Towards competitiveness, cohesion and sustainable development

Planning has been predominantly a local practice shaped by national legislation, or state/province legislation in federal systems like those in the USA or Australia. The EU case is exceptionally interesting since it is perhaps the first time that a trans-national political agent has grappled with planning. As global trading blocks develop it may set a precedent – or it may remain (or even be stifled by) the specifically European development path that created this departure.

The Single European Act in 1987 committed all members of the EU to removing all barriers to the free movement of labour and capital within the Union. Thus it conjured into being a European economic space, replacing traditional mental maps of a continent divided by national boundaries. A number of official studies from the early 1990s onwards (see Box 1) recognized that the Single Market and EU policies for sectors such as agriculture, transport, technology and environment, were likely to have significant impacts on the use of the new European economic space and the location of development. Of course, these were not the only ideas about the New Europe. However, these studies grasped that space and territory would intrude on any new European identity, and so needed to be woven into discourses, metaphors, policies and actions.

Box 1: Stepping stones towards a trans-national form of planning

Europe 2000: Outlook for the Development of the Community's Territory (1991) – This report was prepared by the Regional Policy Directorate of the European Commission and its consultants. It analysed pressures on Europe's territory arising from socio-economic developments as well as from national and regional and Community interventions. It divided the Community into eight trans-national regions and identified two core regions – Northwest Europe and the 'North of the South', i.e. Northeast Spain to Northern Italy / Southern Germany. The last chapter, 'Policy implications,' called for concerted attention to the balanced and harmonious development of the Community's territory.

Europe 2000+: Co-operation for the Spatial Development of Europe (1994) – This follow-up study warned of the risk of widening disparities between regions. It began to evaluate the effect of some key EU policies on spatial development, and promoted the need for trans-national planning and a broad European planning framework.

Principles for a European Spatial Development Policy (1994) – This document was tabled at the Informal Council of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning meeting in Leipzig in September 1994. It was agreed by the Committee on Spatial Development. Economic and social cohesion, sustainable development and reinforcing the cohesion of the European continent were 'fundamental goals'. It sought a polycentric system, as balanced as possible, discouraging excessive concentration around some large centres and the marginalization of peripheral areas. Also stressed need for 'spatial coherence' of sector policies.

European Spatial Development Perspective (1999) – A landmark document, though not a masterplan for Europe. The ESDP was agreed by the Committee on Spatial Development. Its sub-title is 'Towards balanced and sustainable development of the European territory'. It discussed trends, opportunities and challenges including spatial development in the accession countries. It recognized that not all regions and local communities are 'automatically converging to a regionally balanced territory in the wake of economic and monetary union'. It therefore proposed 'spatial development guidelines' to be taken into account in 'spatially significant sectoral policies at Community, national, regional and local levels'. The key aims of the ESDP were:

- *Enhancing competitiveness –* The EU has only one 'zone of global economic integration', the 'pentagon' defined by London, Paris, Milan, Munich and Hamburg. The USA has four high income/good infrastructure global economic zones, and similar zones, some trans-national, are emerging in Asia.
- *Territorial cohesion and parity of access to infrastructure –* The traditional response has been to connect the peripheral regions to the core. The ESDP sought to move beyond the core–periphery European identity through development of a polycentric and balanced urban system, based on a partnership between urban and rural areas.
- *Sustainable development –* which was particularly seen in terms of environmental aspects and the development and conservation of the natural and cultural heritage.

There is no legal competence permitting the European Union to act on planning matters, rather the concept of subsidiarity applies. This means that matters should be devolved to the lowest level of spatial administration where they can be effectively carried out. Therefore the approach that has emerged represents a consensus amongst all the member states within the Union.

However, it seems likely that the new constitution once approved will give powers (to be operated in parallel with Member States) to work for "territorial cohesion". Like many Euro-concepts, "Territorial cohesion" is little understood outside a coterie of experts and civil servants, and is also (conveniently) capable of different interpretations. The phrase has French origins, and implies that the gap in living conditions between different places within the same political unit (the territory) should not be so wide as to jeopardise a sense of identity with and loyalty to that unit, such as might be expressed, for example, in calls for secession.

In the geo-politics of a transnational European Union, the phrase "transit-oriented development" is not used. However, the idea of integrating a network of settlements as compact nodes within a public transit system is central to the emergence of spatial planning. More specifically, it offers:
- European identity;
- Competitiveness;
- Cohesion; and
- Sustainable development.

This assertion will now be unravelled and critically assessed.

The European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) identified 'continuing urban sprawl' as a spatial development issue of European significance (CEC, 1999: 65). 'Control of the physical expansion of towns and cities' is described as being particularly important to sustainable development (ibid.: 22). Uncontrolled growth was equated with increased levels of private transport use, increased energy consumption, more costly infrastructure and services, and negative impacts on the countryside and on the environment (ibid.: 65).

Europe's official antidote to suburban spread is the 'compact city', which is the most articulated Euro-narrative of urban place. The Green Paper on the Urban Environment (CEC, 1990) was a conscious attempt to connect a European legacy of urban form with concerns for sustainable development. The contrast is with the low density, car-based North American city; so, as with the whole European integration process, geo-political identity and competition are involved. The ESDP (para. 84) stated that:

> 'Member States and regional authorities should pursue the concept of the "compact city" (the city of short distances) in order to have better control over further expansion of the cities. This includes, for example, minimization of expansion

within the framework of a careful locational and settlement policy, as in the suburbs and in many coastal regions.'

The compact city underpins and supports polycentric development and urban networks as the key ideas on urban form in the ESDP. At the urban-region scale, the form and location of new development, and its relationship to infrastructure, to the landscape and to the existing built environment, are critical factors in redefining urban–rural relationships.

However, implementation of the ESDP aspirations about sustainable development, compact cities and new urban–rural relationships through regional scale spatial planning begs major questions. What is the essence of the place narrative and how is it translated from a general concept to a specific reality? Who has the power to construct it and who challenges it? How do institutions and practices such as day-to-day development regulation, the legal system for contesting planning decisions and the structure and operation of the house building industry, influence meanings and implementation between different countries?

The ESDP strongly endorsed the idea of polycentric spatial development, as the means to ensure regionally balanced growth and sustainable development. It means connecting a number of places so that they form a network. By operating together they achieve a new critical mass that can sustain and grow businesses, services and facilities. Polycentric development means forging new connections by overcoming historical barriers, such as those caused by national boundaries, local rivalries or distance / poor communications. Polycentric development at a European scale implies a dynamic twenty-first century geography in which, for example, cities and regions that were marginalized on national peripheries are now united across fading boundaries to forge new development trajectories. Old ports gain new hinterlands and become Euro-gateways. The gaze shifts from parochial rivalry to regional integration into a networked Europe. The map of this new Europe will show a polycentric pattern of spatial development, with several inter-connected zones of major growth, each carving its own niche in the European and global space economies (Hague and Kirk, 2003).

The obligation to contribute to Trans-European Networks (TENs) in the areas of transport, telecommunications and energy supply infrastructure is part of the EU Treaty, and therefore earlier than the ESDP, which simply incorporates these in its framework. TEN-transport measures comprise the various transport infrastructure networks, traffic management systems and positioning and navigation systems, absorbing more than 80% of the total TEN budget. A current TEN-transport investment priority is high-speed railway lines, often connecting major conurbations. Graham and Marvin (2001) have argued that this high speed train network primarily benefits affluent males.

The ESDP aims for "parity of access to infrastructure and knowledge", and asserts that "Policy must ensure that all regions, even islands and peripheral regions, have adequate access to infrastructure" (p.26). It recognises the risks of the "pump effect" (new transport links move people and firms from weaker peripheral regions to locate in the core and

exacerbate congestion costs there), and the "tunnel effect" (areas crossed by a road/rail line but not connected to it). Thus strengthening the secondary networks has to be part of a polycentricity strategy.

Of course, "infrastructure" is more than "transit", and the development of major trans-European highway connections has been an important part of the idea. However, airports and high speed rail connections are both seen as important contributors to realising the polycentric pattern of development.

ESDP acknowledges the increasing emergence of 'development corridors' in Europe, often based on existing industrial centres, where new business is attracted to because of the good infrastructure networks. These often transnational or cross-border concentrations appear not only around road and rail, but also around airports, especially around the Northwest European hub airports, which have worldwide connections through scheduled intercontinental flights.

In summary there has been an attempt, largely led by the Commission, and supported by member states from north-west Europe, to put in place a set of concepts that frame a transit-oriented development strategy at a trans-national scale in Europe. In terms of debates about equity and sustainability, scale matters. At a continental scale the aim is to connect and facilitate movement. TEN-transport favours a shift to rail as a way to increase access from and to EU areas that are rated as having low accessibility, as well as a solution in central areas where there are rising road and air traffic levels and congestion. In both cases, increased accessibility is seen as a precondition to ensure and increase competitiveness — not only of these areas but also of the European Union as a whole. Arguably this implies a net increase in energy use, other things being equal, as more flights are made, for example. Richardson and Jensen (2000) for example, argued that the ESDP favoured competitiveness over environment. For example, the ESDP advocates more efficient use of existing infrastructure through "strengthening environmentally friendly transport systems and promoting inter-modal transport chains. However, this objective must be achieved without negative effects on the competitiveness of both the EU as a whole and its regions" (p.28).

In terms of incentives, regulations and plans, it is clear that the main driver is incentives – the European finance that supports the rolling out of the TENs network. DG Transport (the arm of the European bureaucracy in charge of transport) is not subservient to DG Environment, and neither would see themselves as bound by any notions of territorial cohesion being elaborated by DG Regio. DG Regio itself must tread warily – regional policy is a sensitive area with member states because it is so redistributive. Also regional matters are the provenance of the member states too. Meanwhile at a Euro level DG Regio has to "fight its turf" against sectoral Directorates. The territorial dimension of policy is therefore a work in progress, with the idea of territorial integration of the various EU sector policies the intellectual aspiration that gives purpose and hope, but remains unattainable.

The period since the ESDP was adopted in 1999 has been one of marking time. In part this reflects the fact that the member states, having agreed the ESDP, had exhausted their enthusiasm and were reluctant to move things further forward. There is some evidence that Germany, for example, which has strong regional units in its Lander, saw the ESDP as a potential Euro intrusion into domestic matters. Meanwhile the Presidencies of countries such as Spain, Italy and Greece were never likely to drive forward the spatial planning agenda, or greater transparency in territorial indicators as an input into the allocation of structural funds (from which these countries, along with Portugal and Ireland) have been beneficiaries.

Spatial Visions

INTERREG is an EU programme that is a vehicle for applying the ESDP. It facilitated the preparation of 'spatial visions'. The Baltic states had already collaborated to produce their *Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea* (Group of Focal Points, 1994). A brief examination of spatial visions for the North West Metropolitan Area (NWMA) and for the North Sea Region (NSR) further illustrates the process of constructing narratives of European space, tensions within and between those narratives, and the language, techniques and institutions that underpin this new form of planning discourse. While both spatial visions start from, and endorse, the ESDP principles, there are significant differences between them, which derive from the nature of their existing urban systems. The spatial vision for the NWMA is set out in a schematic map, whereas *NorVision,* rather like the ESDP, relies on listing desirable strategies without prioritizing them or exploring possible tensions.

Box 2: Summary of *A Spatial Vision for North-West Europe*

A Spatial Vision for North-West Europe: Building Co-operation involved partners from seven countries in the North West Metropolitan Area. The area is characterized by strong metropolitan centres based on services operating in global markets. The Vision argues that cities like London, Frankfurt, Paris and Amsterdam need to co-operate to promote their financial functions as 'an integrated entity'. The four busiest international airports in the world are here, and regional airports are growing fast. These and the ports are key gateways and there are major nodes on the high-speed rail network. Demands on the natural environment and on energy supply are unsustainable, and areas of high quality countryside and tranquil retreats are under intense pressure. There is rural decline in the periphery.

The Vision is expressed in schematic maps. The hubs with global economic functions and super-connectivity are in the highly congested and pressured Central Zone. The Vision sees these areas maintaining global competitiveness and internal and external accessibility, while achieving urban containment and reducing pressures on the environment. Polycentricity is invoked to this end, as a way of fostering clusters of cities in, or connected to, the global zone. Eastern Ireland, Wales, Central Scotland and much of England are in the Island Zone, where the major problem to be overcome is the weak transport linkages to the global cities and gateways. Further north and west is the Open Zone of quality environments but out-migration. Here the

development strategy advocated is to consolidate regional towns and base development on indigenous resources. The final zone – south and east from the Saarland – is the 'green heart', where agricultural change can be balanced by recreation and tourism opportunities.

The NWMA is the core of the 'Pentagon', and its wealth is built on the global role of its strong metropolitan centres. While there are some areas of rural decline, and significant differences within the NWMA are recognized, in the main the urban–rural relationship is defined by urban growth pressures. In this context polycentricity is mainly interpreted as co-operation and integration of the big cities, to enhance their global role. The report recognizes that 'The effect of market forces in concentrating international economic and communications functions in only a few centres is very strong' (Spatial Vision Group *et al*., 2000: 35). Trans-national transport corridors and the fostering of 'counterweight global gateways and economic centres' are sought.

NorVision for the North Sea Region (NSR) had to address a different set of circumstances. Concerns with peripheral rural areas are given notably more weight, and while the language is much the same as in the spatial vision for the NWMA, sustainable development and environmental conservation feature more strongly. The NSR as constituted under Interreg II did not contain real metropolitan centres other than Hamburg and Oslo, neither of which is the kind of world city that London or Paris is. In addition the formidable barrier of the North Sea and the lack of hub airports mean that trans-national networks have not been so developed as in the NWMA. Not surprisingly, *NorVision* stresses inter-regional connections and secondary networks, and hopes that national and regional infrastructure providers will be responsive to such needs.

Box 3: Summary of *NorVision*

NorVision: A Spatial Perspective for the North Sea Region was prepared by local and national government officials from the participating countries, aided by a consultant. It is intended to set the context for spatial planning, and particularly Interreg III projects in the North Sea Region (NSR). Sustainable development is at the centre of the approach. Overall the approach is process-driven, with an audit of basic values and trends leading to 10 'vision statements' (four for the whole NSR, four for urban regions and two for rural areas), aims, strategies and recommended actions.

It recognizes that the NSR is polycentric but not a functional network, since the numerous regional centres tend to connect more intensively with their national capitals (all of which, with the exception of Oslo, are outside the NSR) than with each other. Similarly the ports in the NSR tend to rely on transhipment via intercontinental ports outside the NSR. The NSR, as defined for Interreg II, contains one major national agglomeration – that based on Hamburg – and some half dozen urban agglomerations of regional importance. Parts of the NSR, e.g. Denmark, have a dense network of small and medium sized towns, which have been an important focus for local trade and services. The extent of sparsely settled rural areas is an important feature. The Vision notes that balance is often equated with a polycentric system of metropolitan regions, of city clusters and city networks. However, it stresses that in

peripheral regions that do not have such polycentric systems, rural urban centres have a key role to play in providing access to jobs and services. The task then is to ensure that sector policies contribute to spatial balance. To this end there is emphasis on the need to improve internal transport links, not least on the importance of ferries and bus services in rural areas, matters that are largely determined by regional or national agencies and companies, and not at an international level.

Thus space is being reworked into place at a trans-national level, through the attempt to identify, define and represent new Euro-regions and sub-regions. Spatial visions are themselves new types of policy instruments created directly as a means to contribute to the new narratives of place. However, spatial planning practice across the EU remains framed within distinctive national legislative codes that operate within distinctive political and economic systems. Together these stake out the 'path dependency' of any local practice.

National Action within the UK: Planning Policy Guidance

Since 1999 there have been four different planning systems in the UK, following the devolution of powers to Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales. However, broadly similar instruments are used in each country (though all except England have now produced some form of national spatial planning document). Similarly, policies on the land use / transport relation are not very different between the four administrations. This section of the paper provides a short summary of Planning Policy Guidance on Transport, which applies to England. Its aim is to indicate the form and content of national planning policy in relation to TOD.

Planning Policy Guidance was one of a number of mechanisms introduced by the Conservative governments between 1979 and 1997 in an attempt to strengthen central control over the locally administered planning system. While it is "guidance" in practice, local authorities are expected to implement these central policies at a local level. PPGs are "material considerations" in the determination of planning applications, and in appeals against refusals of permission or the imposition of conditions. Thus PPGs cannot be ignored. They may, however, be subject to differing interpretations. In this way lawyers and planning consultants earn a living. In addition, PPGs have been issued as discrete topic-based statements of policy, and appear in a piecemeal fashion. This means that there is no guarantee of total consistency between PPGs on different topics. This again opens the way for interpretations and disputes at public hearings.

In England PPG 13 on Transport endorses TOD in all but name. It begins by making the point that continued growth in road traffic is contributing to global warming. It talks about integrating transport policy with land use and environment, and reducing the physical separation of key land uses so as to "enable people to make sustainable transport choices".   Another objective is to "promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling", while a third is to "reduce the need to travel, especially by car." The specific advice to local authorities is summarised n Box 4.

Box 4: PPG 13 – advice to local authorities(DETR 2001b)

When preparing development plans and considering planning applications, local authorities should :

1. actively manage the pattern of urban growth to make the fullest use of public transport, and focus major generators of travel demand in city, town and district centres and near to major public transport interchanges;

2. locate day to day facilities which need to be near their clients in local centres so that they are accessible by walking and cycling;

3. accommodate housing principally within existing urban areas, planning for increased intensity of development for both housing and other uses at locations which are highly accessible by public transport, walking and cycling;

4. ensure that development comprising jobs, shopping, leisure and services offers a realistic choice of access by public transport, walking and cycling, recognising that this may be less attainable in some rural areas;

5. in rural areas locate most development for housing, jobs, shopping, leisure and services in local service centres which are designated in the development plan to act as focal points for housing, transport and other services, and encourage better transport provision in the countryside;

6. ensure tat strategies in the development and local transport plan complement each other and that consideration of development plan allocations and local transport plan investment and priorities are closely linked;

7. use parking policies, alongside other planning and transport measures, to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce reliance on the car for work and other journeys;

8. give priority to people over ease of traffic movement and plan to provide more road space to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport in town centres, local neighbourhoods and other areas with a mixture of land uses;

9. ensure tat the needs of disabled people as pedestrians, public transport users and motorists – are taken into account in the implementation of planning policies and traffic management schemes, and in the design of individual developments; consider how best to reduce crime and the fear of crime, and seek by the design and lay out of development and areas, to secure community safety and road safety; and

10. protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choices for both passenger and freight movements.

The Guidance goes on to stress the need for connections with the Regional Transport Strategy – a separate "transport-only" policy instrument. It also stresses the consistency with the PPG on housing, which advises planning authorities to "exploit and deliver accessibility by public transport to jobs, education and health facilities, shopping, leisure and local services". PPG 3 similarly urges planning authorities to "seek to reduce car dependence by facilitating more walking and cycling, by improving linkages by public transport between housing, jobs, local services and local amenity, and by planning for mixed use".

This PPG on housing also sets out a "sequential search" that should be used to identify land to be allocated for new housing development. It starts with assessing the scope to reuse previously developed land and buildings within urban areas. Next come contiguous urban extensions and finally new developments around nodes in good public transport corridors. Furthermore sites for housing should be considered in relation to their accessibility "to jobs, shops and services by modes other than the car, and the potential for improving such accessibility." There are also injunctions to avoid housing developments at less than 30 houses per hectare net, and encourage development at between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare net, and to "seek greater intensity of development at places with good public transport accessibility".

So England offers everything that a US growth manager committed to TOD could possibly wish for. The concept has been adopted in English planning policy. It has also been strongly promoted by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors, which has conducted research on the benefits of higher density development around transport nodes, and published a good practice guide or toolkit that includes examples from around the UK. One of such examples is the mainly 1970s shopping centre of Woolwich, in south London, where a new light rail link across the Thames will link to London City Airport and the city beyond. Its terminus, together with the existing railway line station, will provide an enlarged transport hub that would encourage the high-density development on the surrounding land (Blackman, 2001, RICS, 2002).

So is TOD "working"?
Despite this strong national planning policy, the evidence is that the UK is becoming increasing dependent on roads and cars, and that environmental improvements are elusive. Road transport is responsible for about 88% of all transport emissions and is the fastest growing source of UK emissions of carbon dioxide (CO_2); it is estimated that by 2020 road transport will account for 90% of transport emissions and for 26.3% of all emissions (DETR, 2000, p. 181). Freight movement continues to increase as the economy grows, and road transport is the main means of moving freight. People with children want space around their home, and find cars a very convenient means of coping with the complexity of trips that are part and parcel of surviving a family. Commuting trips account for only about one in five trips in the UK. Furthermore, in 2000 the real price of motoring was below its 1980 level. In comparison, bus and coach fares were more than one quarter above their 1980 level and rail fares about one third higher, in real terms, though their costs have risen at a lower rate than disposable income (DETR, 2001a).

Although data on transport exclusion in the UK is incomplete, there is evidence that the lowest income groups are those most likely to experience transport exclusion – which is related to not having a car – with children, women, older people and the mobility-impaired prominent among those who could be described as transport deprived (Sinclair & Sinclair, 2001). Use of public transport correlates with income, occupation and living standards: 70% of professional, managerial, technical, and skilled manual employees in Scotland travelled to work by car in 2000, compared with 60% of skilled non-manual and partly skilled workers, and 40% of unskilled workers. Only 29% of owner-occupiers

regularly use public transport, most relying on private cars. Public transport in Britain is widely perceived as inconvenient, inadequate or unsuitable (Sinclair & Sinclair, 2001). In short those with freedom to choose prefer the car.

Finally we should also recognise that some bedrocks of British planning have rather mixed impacts in terms of TOD. The balance sheet of the compact city is partly contingent on how it can handle growth pressures. If there is strict containment, then, as numerous authors have shown, the increased densities are likely to be partly at the expense of loss of open space (and hence to also increase run-off unless some form of ecological design approach is adopted). Furthermore, the restriction on the supply of land for development in a situation of increasing demand creates a premium price on land for development, which benefits the landowner and is likely to squeeze out households or businesses that are unable to pay that price.

Of course, the compact city based on public transport is not necessarily a contained city. However, green belt policy has been strong in the UK and the effect has typically been to disperse new growth to sites in and beyond the green belt. The impact is to increase commuting distances and costs, with family households who want space but may lack two full-time earners having to do the trade off. In the city region around Edinburgh, for example, the planning policy very much favours TOD and public transport. There are plans to introduce a cordon round the city for a congestion charging scheme. The revenues raised from commuters would go to fund public transport improvements within the city. What this means is that those who cannot afford housing in the city, and who live in the more dispersed settlements outside, where public transport services are much less frequent than within the city, will then contribute through congestion charges to subsidising further public transport improvements for those resident within the city. It is no surprise to find that out-of-town residents, and their political representatives are unhappy.

There is also a question about the impact of green belt policies on labour markets, competitiveness and hence economic sustainability. Undersupply of land for housing can be relevant both to macro-economic concerns about inflation and to regional economic development efforts. Similarly, there is evidence that the demand for industrial and commercial properties, an essential basis for business competitiveness, has been shifting towards lower density units in prestige landscape settings with good access to a road network and plenty of employee parking (see e.g. Ratcliffe and Stubbs, 1996). These trends seem to be especially marked for new growth industries and those involved in research and innovation, the kind of firms that are seen as drivers of competitive regional economies. Research in my School has shown that planning policy is much more stringent in respect of applications for hosing than it is for industrial development (Bramley, Hague et.al. 2004).

Summary and Research Questions
This paper has demonstrated that in Europe there is an attempt to invest in transport infrastructure at a transnational scale so as to create a form of TOD. The aim is primarily

to increase European competitiveness globally, while also delivering territorial cohesion within the European Union. The policy environment is dynamic and contested, with multiple institutional pressure points involving different sectoral directorates of the European Commission, as well as national (and regional) governments of member states, and business lobbies, environmental NGOs etc. Planners have taken advantage of the spaces for negotiation opened by these changes to elaborate a narrative of "spatial planning" as an integrative practice geared to sustainable development. However, the momentum proved difficult to maintain, though a resurgence under the heading of territorial cohesion can be anticipated, in part because of the self-interest of DG Regio and in part because the next presidencies of the EU are Netherlands, Luxembourg, UK, Austria and Finland. So we can expect to see trans-national mechanisms of investment (through TENs) and exhortation and incentives through new Structural Funds that will encourage regional authorities to develop polycentric growth strategies based around communication networks.

At national level in the UK there has been a strong endorsement of the TOD principles in PPGs and moves to create new projects based on transport led corridor growth. However, people vote with their feet and get and use cars when they can. Furthermore spatial strategies, most notably the green belt idea, have had the effect of restraining the capacity of development to follow transport routes.

Possible research areas for collaboration might be around the institutional architecture and mental models that structure planning for TOD either side of the Atlantic. There also needs to be more done on the equity aspects of TOD. Finally can we evaluate models of urban form, and in particular the growth corridor, as means of managing growth while providing flexibility, choice and sustainable options?

References

Blackman, D. (2001). 'Transport Concept Mooted for Centre', *Planning*,17 August 2001.

Bramley G., Hague C. et.al. 2004, *A Review of Green Belt Policy*, Scottish Executive, Edinburgh.

CEC – Commission of the European Communities (1990) 'Green Paper on the Urban Environment', EUR 12902 EN, Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.

CEC (1991) *Europe 2000: Outlook for the Development of the Community's Territory*, Luxembourg: Office for the Official Publications of the European Communities.

CEC (1994) *Europe 2000+: Cooperation for European Territorial Development*, Luxembourg: Office for the Official Publications of the European Communities.

DETR (2000). *Climate Change: UK Programme*, London, The Stationery Office (available at

http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/climatechange/cm4913/index.htm).

DETR (2001a). *Transport Statistics. Transport Trends: 2001 Ed*ition, London, The Stationery Office. Available at:

http://www.transtat.detr.gov.uk/tables/2001/tt/contents/contents.htm .

DETR (2001b). *Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport*, London, Department for Environment, Transport and the Regions. Available at: http://www.odpm.gov.uk/stellent/groups/odpm_planning/documents/page/odpm_plan_606896.hcsp

European Commission (1999). *ESDP European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the EU*, Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Group of Focal Points (1994) *Visions and Strategies around the Baltic Sea 2010: towards a framework for spatial development in the Baltic Sea Region*, Karlskrona: The Baltic Sea Institute.

Hague C. and Kirk K. (2003) *Polycentricity Scoping Study*, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, London.

Jensen, O. B. and Richardson, T. (2004) *Making European Space: Mobility, power and territorial identity*, London & New York, Routledge.

Pratt, R. and Larkham, P. (1996) 'Who Will Care for Compact Cities?', in M. Jenks, E. Burton and K. Williams (eds) *The Compact City: A Sustainable Urban Form?*, Oxford: Oxford Brookes University.

Ratcliffe, J. and Stubbs, M. (1996) *Urban Planning and Real Estate Development*, London: UCL Press.

Richardson, T. and Jensen, O. (2000) 'Discourses of Mobility and Polycentric Development: A Contested View of European Spatial Planning', *European Planning Studies,* 8(4), 503–20.

RICS (2002). *Transport Development Areas: Guide to Good Practice*, London, Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (can be downloaded from: http://www.rics.org/resources/public_affairs/tda.html).

Sinclair, S.P. and Sinclair, F. (2001). *Access All Areas? An Assessment of Social Inclusion Measures in Scottish Local Transport Strategies*, Edinburgh, CRSIS, Edinburgh College of Art/Heriot-Watt University.

Spatial Vision Group and consultant team (2000) *A Spatial Vision for north-west Europe: Building Co-operation,* The Hague: Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment.