European Planning Studies

Relational complexity and the imaginative power of strategic spatial planning

Patsy Healey [a]
[a] Global Urban Research Unit, School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape, Newcastle University,
Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Relational Complexity and the Imaginative Power of Strategic Spatial Planning[1]

PATSY HEALEY

Global Urban Research Unit, School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape, Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK

ABSTRACT *This paper explores the imaginations of place and spatial organization and of governance mobilized in recent experiences of strategic spatial planning for urban regions in Europe. Drawing on examples of such experiences, it examines how far these imaginations reflect a relational understanding of spatial dynamics and of governance processes. Spatial imaginations are assessed in terms of the nature of the spatial consciousness expressed in a strategy, the way the multiple scales of the social relations of a place are conceived, and the extent to which relational complexity is understood and reflected in a strategy. Governance imaginations are assessed in terms of how the relation between government and society is imagined, how the tensions between functional/sectoral and territorial principles of policy organization are addressed, and what assumptions are made about the nature and trajectory of transformative processes in governance dynamics. The paper concludes that signs of a recognition of the "relational complexity" of urban and regional dynamics and of territorially-focused governance processes can be found in these experiences, but a relational understanding is weakly-developed and often displaced by more traditional ways of seeing place/space and governance process. The paper concludes with some comments on the challenge of developing a stronger understanding of "relational complexity" within strategic spatial planning endeavours.*

Introduction

This paper considers the ambiguous ambition and activity of "strategic spatial planning". Particular concern is with the imaginations mobilized in episodes of such planning activity. What spatial conceptions do they embody and express? What notions of governance are presented through them? How do such imaginations get articulated? How do they accumulate the power to frame policies and project ideas and to shape the allocation of

resources and the exercise of regulatory power? What kinds of simplifications, syntheses and integrations are involved in such intellectual and political work? Scott (1998) provides a powerful argument that government inherently involves the mobilization of ways of "seeing". These then lead to actions which seek to shape the perceived terrain according to such perspectives. He calls this "seeing like a state". He highlights the necessity of the simplifications involved in arriving at some kind of perspectival synthesis on which to base collective action, but also underlines the dangerous exclusions and oppressions that such necessary simplification can produce. In the highly complex socio-spatial dynamics through which what become recognized as metropolises, cities and urban regions are materially and imaginatively produced, what are the prospects for developing spatial and governance imaginations which release creative energies and synergies and reduce exclusions and oppressions? Is such an enterprise an "impossible venture", destined to drop back into just the kind of oppressive and exclusionary practices for which past planning endeavours have been so much criticized?

These issues are explored through examining some experiences of strategic spatial planning within Western Europe. This is achieved through the lens of a relational approach to understanding urban and regional dynamics, which emphasizes the multiplicity of the webs of relations which transect a territory and the complex intersections and disjunctions which develop among them (Allen, 1999, 2003; Graham & Healey, 1999; Healey, 1997). In this perspective, social relations are understood as webs or networks with diverse morphologies, connecting people and events in one node to others near and far. They are driven by different driving forces operating at many different spatial scales and timescales. "Places" in this relational conception emerge as nodes in one or more networks. They are institutional sites, with particular material geographies. The physical places which planners are typically concerned with—neighbourhoods, development areas, cities, regions may have very different social, economic and environmental meanings for those located in them. Through relational dynamics, material resources are accumulated and dispersed (as in a firm's value-added chain). At the same time, knowledge and values are generated, mobilized and consolidated, shifting and creating meanings around which political attention may be mobilized. "Places" and their qualities, both social and physical, are thus double creations. They are produced in part by the ongoing flows in multiple relations which accumulate resources and values at particular sites. They are also consciously produced by collective action, calling up particular attention to place qualities. In this perspective of relational complexity, planning activity can be understood both as part of an effort of collective imagination about place qualities, and as a set of relational webs which, intersecting with other relations, can produce substantial resources and constraints on other relational dynamics.

Within this complexity, how, why and for whom is an idea of the "place" of the urban brought into existence? How is governance capacity generated to act on this idea? If the contemporary period is one of dynamic instability in both the relations which transect urban regions and in governance relations, what is the possibility and desirability of attempting to develop spatial strategies at the level of the urban region? What kinds of institutional efforts and imaginations may work with the grain of "relational complexity", and what material and imaginative work can thereby be accomplished? In the simplifications necessary to reduce the complexity to graspable dimensions, do spatial strategies end up as efforts to maintain established discourses and practices against pressures to fragment a governance focus on place and territory? Are they co-opted to pursue the agendas of

particular networks, in which certain key actors pursue specific ideas about how urban region territory should be organized? How far can the "urban region" become a key imaginative focus to orient new ways of "integrating" collective action around combined economic, social and environmental objectives, and what is the likelihood that such a focus can provide a ground on which a socially-just politics of place can be built (Amin *et al.*, 2000; Amin & Thrift, 2002)?

Strategic spatial planning endeavours are themselves complex governance processes, through which concepts of spatial organization are mobilized with the ambition of accumulating sufficient allocative, authoritative and imaginative force to shape both the materialities and identities of particular places (Giddens, 1984; Healey, 1997). Where such endeavours are linked to transformative momentum, the power of such endeavours lies in their capacity to frame attention among those with significant allocative and authoritative power and to focus the selection of priorities. This implies that transformatively successful efforts in such planning demand not only the capacity to "imagine" strategic frames. To have significant effects, such frames need to have the capacity to "travel" from the institutional site of their formation to other institutional arenas without losing their framing power, and to hold that power through considerable time-spans (Gromart & Hajer, 2003; Albrechts *et al.*, 2003). In the context of the mobile, dynamic, relational complexity of urban regions, such endeavours are faced with the challenge of responding to the dynamic and unpredictable whilst contributing some degree of stabilizing force. How can such an ambiguous challenge be achieved?

In this paper, the focus is primarily on the imaginative content of such endeavours, particularly as regards conceptions of place and space, and conceptions of governance. In relation to spatial imaginations, the focus is on the nature of the spatial consciousness expressed in a strategy, the way the multiple scales of the social relations of a place are imagined, and the extent to which relational complexity is understood and reflected in a strategy. In relation to governance imaginations, the focus is on how the relation between government and society is imagined, how the tensions between functional/sectoral and territorial principles of policy organization are addressed, and on assumptions about the nature and trajectory of transformative processes in governance dynamics. The next section of the paper expands the context for the discussion and provides an outline of two recent European examples of strategic spatial planning endeavours. The following two sections then explore the issue of spatial imaginations and governance imaginations. The final section returns to the question of the possibility of strategic spatial planning as a dynamic yet stabilizing force.

Strategic Spatial Planning and Governance Transformations

The renewed policy interest in the qualities of urban regions and the "turn" to a strategic orientation within which to locate particular interventions is by now well-established in Europe, as are the reasons for it (Motte, 1995; Healey *et al.*, 1997; Albrechts *et al.*, 2001; Salet *et al.*, 2003; Pugliese & Spaziente, 2003). This has led to a consideration of the governance capacity to focus in an integrated way on the development of the territories of cities and regions (Cars *et al.*, 2002; Le Gales, 2002). This in turn has highlighted the significance of spatial planning, understood as a strategic orientation which emphasizes the spatiality of policy interventions and emphasizes the qualities of places (Healey, 2004).

   The issue of governance capacity relates not merely to how the vertical and horizontal relations of government are articulated. It also relates to the relations between government, the economy and the wider society, especially given the scale of transformations in both economic activity and social-cultural ways of thinking and acting in recent decades. As is widely discussed, the governance arrangements set in place in the post-war welfare settlements have come under increasing strain in this new, so-called post-Fordist, context, producing pressures for, and substantial initiatives to, transform the organization, discourses and practices associated with formal government initiatives.[2] In these transformations, devolution to sub-national levels of government, making government more responsive to demands from the economy and the society, and coordinating government interventions around territorial development objectives have been given increasing prominence (Cars *et al.*, 2002; Cooke *et al.*, 2000; Cooke, 2002; John, 2001; Le Gales, 2002). Developing spatial strategies to help reorient government activity, build relations with economic and civil society actors and coordinate development agendas has been promoted vigorously in this context at European Union (EU) level and by some national governments (Bohme, 2002; Faludi & Waterhout, 2002; Jensen & Richardson, 2004). However, these wider influences transforming governance imaginations seep in diverse ways into local governance cultures. Local trajectories may look very different to the broad hypotheses articulated at a trans-European scale. This potential diversity is illustrated through two examples, one from the Netherlands, with a strong spatial awareness in its overall governance culture (Faludi & Van der Valk, 1994), and one from England, where a weak spatial consciousness has characterized public policy, despite a strong cultural association with landscape.[3]

Strategic Spatial Planning in Amsterdam

The first case comes from the heartland of European spatial planning. In the Netherlands, the planning policy community is strong, with a long tradition of consensus-focused, multi-level government in addressing urban land development issues. Concepts of spatial organization such as the Randstad and its Greenheart and the principle of limiting "urban sprawl" have become deeply embedded in policy cultures focused on the public sector provision and management of land resources, urban land extension and re-development (Faludi & Van der Valk, 1994). Over many years, the City of Amsterdam (*Gemeente Amsterdam*) has played a major role in articulating spatial planning ideas and has had a big influence on national policy agendas, both at the technical level and politically, through the role of powerful city mayors (Jolles *et al.*, 2003). As at national level, the City's tradition is to "see" like a social-democratic welfare state. In Amsterdam's case, this has meant until recently an especial emphasis on providing a large social rental housing stock. During the first part of the twentieth century, the City was able to expand itself through municipal annexation, becoming a large entity of over 730,000 inhabitants by 2000. But over the past two decades, the City's power has been challenged as metropolitanization processes have expanded labour and housing markets across surrounding municipalities and as major investments outside City borders, especially at Schiphol airport and the eastern new town of Almere, have produced new urban nodes in an urban region of over 1.4 million (Salet, 2003). Since the 1960s, annexation strategies have been resisted. The City has therefore sought to retain control of its "functional" territory by creating new arenas through which to develop coordinated sub-regional spatial

strategies. But these efforts have repeatedly encountered political resistance. In response, Amsterdam has sought to use what land development opportunities are left to promote greater "diversity" in its population, meaning in this case a mixture of accommodating lifestyle diversity as well as substantial old and new immigrant populations and attracting more affluent residents back into the city by creating opportunities for more owner-occupied housing. It has also sought to promote its own "peripheral nodes", to take pressure off its world heritage city centre but also to exploit its remaining land and property assets to sustain municipal budgets, under threat by national government which seeks to reduce general welfare and land development funding for cities in favour of more targeted funding.

Amsterdam has had a continuous history of spatial planning in the twentieth century, with a large and powerful planning department (Jolles *et al.*, 2003). Its role was to organize the urban land extension process. But since the 1980s, with the shift towards urban re-development and with new priorities in national programmes for the location and funding of major infrastructure projects, such as the location of high-speed train stations, its ability to impose its imagination on other departments and levels of government has weakened (WRR, 1999). In the 1990s, the production of strategic spatial plans ("*structuurplans*") for the city accelerated. A revision of a key 1985 Plan was agreed in 1991, a further major revision was made in 1996, and in 1999 an effort to produce a new *structuurplan* was initiated, finally approved in 2003 (DRO, 2003). In these revisions, the City struggled to keep up with changing planning concepts at national level while at the same time attempting to re-conceptualize the key qualities of Amsterdam itself, as the core of a dynamic urban region. Concepts of "borderless" territories, polycentric development, urban nodes and networks, and natural systems, physical infrastructure systems and social networks perceived as over-layering each other appear in both the draft Netherlands National Planning Document (Fifth NPD) of 2000 (VROM, 2001), and the Amsterdam *Structuurplan* (DRO, 2003). Some of the strategic planners, encouraged by planning academics, sought to express in spatial terms the fluid network complexity of their city region (Bertolini & Salet, 2003). The title of the 2003 plan, *Opting for Urbanity*, emphasizes open, cosmopolitan diversity. Large numbers of people were involved before and during the preparation of this latest plan in discussions about the nature of the city and its future, and the content of the plan. Amsterdam has a lively and critical governance culture, with citizens prepared to assert interests and points of view on any planning strategy or project. But the planning team's attempts to open up new spatial imaginations with which to grasp urban complexity coexisted with struggles with other municipalities over the nature, location and timing of major projects which would attract national funding. They also coincided with an increasing emphasis within Amsterdam municipality on realizing financial returns from urban development projects. In the end, the Amsterdam 2003 plan was unable to incorporate a strong sub-regional perspective and in presentation looks very like earlier plans. The Amsterdam planners continue to work on a more regional approach.

In this episode of strategic spatial planning, a process of transformation seems to be underway in both dominant spatial imaginations and governance imaginations. The City of Amsterdam, powerful politically and in terms of formal powers and resources, still "sees like a state", but it is having to change from a technically-strong professionalized state managing an urban extension process, to a role as a strategic shaper of conditions for its powerful economic nexuses and its diverse groups of citizens. This puts a

premium on understanding the dynamics of these conditions and on working collaboratively in all kinds of ways with a wide range of stakeholders. The result so far is a more fluid and dispersed process than the city planners are accustomed to, in which they have much less control through investment and regulatory powers. The imaginative power of a strategic spatial frame holds considerable shaping potential in this context, if it can accumulate sufficient persuasive force. Nevertheless, the Amsterdam planners still tend to assume that they are "in charge" of development processes and it is their interpretation and filtering of diverse perspectives which are consolidated in the spatial frame. The governance imagination thus assumes that planning strategies shape development patterns, with significant economic, environmental and social consequences, as in the past. It is perhaps no surprise that, in the Netherlands currently, there are intense debates challenging the power of spatial planners (WRR, 1999; Hajer & Zonneveld, 2000).

Strategic Spatial Planning in the Cambridge Sub-region

The second case comes from Britain, a country famous in the mid-twentieth century for its spatial planning ideas and its innovative planning legislation but which has found long-term investment in infrastructure and coordination between sectors and levels of government extremely difficult. Rather than a multi-level consensus-building government tradition, urban and regional governance has evolved in the context of a highly centralist state with little respect for local government, and persistent tendencies to address problems of coordination at lower tiers of government by re-organizing sub-national political entities. One result is that policy development and management have been strongly concentrated in functional/sectoral departments, revolving hierarchically around national government policy. The planning function has been no exception and until recently has been boxed into a narrow focus on land use regulation (Healey, 1998a; Tewdwr-Jones, 2002). In contrast to the Netherlands, little attention was given to new ways of shaping spatial organization in the last two decades of the twentieth century (Vigar *et al.*, 2000). Instead, longstanding ideas about the protection of landscape ("the countryside") and keeping urban settlements contained/compact are deeply embedded in cultural perceptions of what "planning" should protect ("greenbelts"). Such ideas are incorporated as much in the consciousness of land and property developers, citizens and politicians as in the actual content of plans.

How then does such a governance culture address growth in demand for space for urban development? In the mid-twentieth century, the planning answer was to create new towns. In the early 1970s, these were replaced with "growth areas" in the buoyant, dynamic south-east of England (SEJPT, 1970). This concept evolved in the subsequent 30 years into a complex incremental politics of determining amounts of development to be accommodated (housing, employment sites, etc.) and then distributing them among localities, some accepting them and some resisting them (see Vigar *et al.*, 2000; Murdoch & Abram, 2002). Meanwhile, the dynamics of urban and regional economic and social development shifted socio-spatial patterns in ways which only tangentially impinged on this allocation practice. Not surprisingly, all kinds of problems of spatial imbalances appeared, especially in southern Britain where growth has been concentrated in the past 25 years.

The Cambridge "sub-region" is perhaps the most extreme example of such imbalances. In planning strategies of the 1950s, the Cambridge area was seen as a small, if rather

special, town, surrounded by rural landscape celebrated by poets and valued by generations of elite undergraduates, and far from metropolitan development pressures. With a population of around 80,000, it was surrounded by a large greenbelt. Beyond this were rural areas and small towns with economic problems. Any growth pressures in Cambridge itself could be deflected to areas beyond the greenbelt. Into this contained world, a major expansion dynamic began to evolve from the late 1960s (While *et al.*, 2004). By the end of the century, the UK's most successful new-tech cluster had emerged (Crouch *et al.*, 2001). The University of Cambridge played a key role in this development, both as a land developer and in its promotion of research and development spin-offs from university activity. Well-connected to national government over the years, both through politicians and civil servants, this dynamic proceeded apace, creating opportunities for other firms to come into the science and business parks provided. By the 1980s, the "Cambridge Phenomena" was acquiring a spatial identity, linked to the recognition of an area, the Cambridge Sub-region, which needed some special development attention. By the 1990s, the problems of the promotion of economic activity without accompanying attention to housing and infrastucture investment was becoming obvious to a number of University and business interests, as well as planners in Cambridgeshire County Council, as housing affordability became compromised and road congestion became serious. By this time, Cambridge was no longer just a growing town within in a rural area. It was an expanding sub-region of nearly 400,000 inhabitants, increasingly drawn into the expanding London metropolitan area as a result of major national government investments in motorway connections and a third London Airport at Stansted. This magnified the relational complexities of its growth dynamics.

In this context, and in the absence of any national policy initiatives, local actors concerned to maintain the growth momentum but balanced with appropriate housing and infrastructure provision mobilized into what became The "Cambridge Futures" group. This was an informal grouping, linking public sector officials and business interests. In effect, during the 1990s, the problems of this group managed to capture the attention of both the regulatory power of the planning system and the investment resources of national government. By 2000, the "Cambridge Sub-region" was identified in "policy guidance" for the East Anglia region. By 2002, a new draft Structure Plan was produced for the county, with a special section on the development needs of the sub-region. This indicated areas for new housing development, including a new settlement beyond the greenbelt, and "corridors" for transport investment. The planners and Cambridge Futures lobbied for investment, and by 2003, the area was part of one of four "major growth areas" in England, to which some funding for infrastructure would be allocated as part of a national policy to promote "sustainable communities" (While *et al.*, 2004; ODPM, 2003). Within national government, the economic importance of enabling growth to proceed has helped to force more attention to the coordination between infrastructure investment and housing development in particular, necessary to counter political resistance to growth which has arisen after years of housing growth without adequate infrastructure investment.[4]

Here is a governance process which "sees" like a business nexus. Government is made to work by accessing formal powers through the manipulation of informal networks, especially between business leaders, politicians and officials at national, county and local level. County and district officials, deeply concerned about the imbalances, see the Futures group as a device for getting the reality of the area's growth into public consciousness, to challenge a well-established lobby focused on preserving the distinctive character

of the city and its surrounding rural area. This preservationist imagination of the city retains an idea of the distinctive, special city of colleges, surrounded by a green belt, a small centre of a small, rural region. In reality, the city is becoming not just the core of a burgeoning new-tech cluster, but also a public administration centre for an enlarging region (Morrison, 2003). Exactly what this means in terms of the spatial organization of the sub-region is given little attention by the pro-growth campaigners. The growth strategy as expressed in the regional, county and district plans is rapidly converted into a well-established vocabulary of amounts of development, sites (including new settlements) on which it is to be located, and infrastructure projects. There has been much less attention so far to the place qualities to be fostered in this emerging city region and in its various nodes and neighbourhoods. Exactly how the strategy in the plans was to be linked to the financing of projects remained unclear by 2004, with struggles ongoing between different projects within the wider growth area of which the sub-region is a part, leading to the kind of uncertainty which makes land and property developers hold back from investing their own funds in development projects. Meanwhile, it is not evident that the business-driven strategy has sufficient depth and appeal to avoid intense criticism from stakeholders concerned about local environmental quality, about the daily life experience of different parts of the sub-region and about how the needs of those on low incomes are to be met. The pro-growth lobby may have achieved a shift in national government strategy and attention in their favour, very important in the context of English centralism. But translating this into a strategy that helps to stabilize the many uncertainties that any area growth strategy will encounter as it unfolds seems in need of richer and more inclusive spatial and governance imaginations than are readily available in English governance cultures.[5]

The Spatial Imaginations Mobilized in Episodes of Strategic Spatial Planning

Episodes[6] of policy formation with transformative power achieve this by developing new concepts and ways of thinking which change the way resources are allocated and regulatory powers are exercised. They mobilize intellectual, relational and political resources which command attention, develop the power to "travel" and "translate" into an array of practice arenas and transform these, rather than merely being absorbed within them. Those which accumulate substantial power to become routinized may then "sediment" down into the cultural ground which sustains ongoing processes and feeds into new episodes of policy formation. How far do the spatial imaginations being mobilized in cases such as the above have such transformative potential? What kinds of spatial consciousness do they reflect, how do they address the multiple scales of the socio-spatial relations they seek to shape and how far do they engage with notions of relational complexity? In the discussion which follows, evidence is drawn from both of the earlier examples, and from other examples in the expanding European literature on strategic spatial planning.

Spatial Consciousness

Despite the efforts to build a spatial planning discourse at the European level, there are still substantial differences between national planning cultures (Newman & Thornley, 1996; CEC, 1997). One expression of this is in the extent to which concepts of place, spatial organization and territorial identity are embedded in policy cultures and political assumptions. In the mid-twentieth century, planning policy cultures were intellectually dominated

by concepts of urban form and physical structure. But the capacity of these concepts to "travel" and interrelate with wider policy cultures and political assumptions varied. A spatial consciousness informed by physical planning concepts was perhaps most strongly developed in the Netherlands, underpinned by geographical and technological necessities and a strong multi-level state, as illustrated earlier in the Amsterdam case. Within France and Germany, notions of settlement hierarchy and regional identity were sustained by longstanding cultural recognition of local territorial identities. In Italy, urban planning discourses and practices focused on the design of cities, while in the UK, the enduring emphasis of the "planning system" was on the defence of the countryside. In both Italy and England, the cultural identities and lifestyles of elites gave support to spatial organizing concepts. The same may be said of the Scandinavian concern about the relation between built form and "nature". These various physical planning ideas provided the intellectual resources which turned government planning systems and land use regulations into practices which are both valued and heavily criticized today. Ideas about how to organize the urban landscape were energetically developed within a professional planning community with a strong transnational dimension. The concepts developed within this community travelled well in the particular opportunity structures of European (welfare) state-building.

But since this mid-century hey-day of spatial planning, the traditional "spatial consciousness" associated with planning has been undermined by many factors. These include the force of sectoral policy development, the critique of the narrow determinism of architectural concepts of spatial organization and the growing influence of neo-liberal economics in national politics and administration. Planning practices in the 1970s and 1980s moved increasingly away from plans and strategies to focus on projects and regulations. Business interests, politicians and other policy communities remembered the old spatial ideas and associated them with "constraints" on their own freedom of manoeuvre. Public financial strains recast the relations between the state and economic actors, many of whom saw little relevance in spatial organizing concepts. Traditional spatial concepts were left locked into governance processes and embedded in governance cultures, without, in many instances, a legitimizing intellectual discourse to support or refresh them.

This lack of explicit spatial consciousness was particularly strong in highly fragmented states where individual property owners were privileged, as in Belgium, or in highly centralized states, such as England, where in addition public policy towards territorial development has been strongly shaped by the commercial and financial sectors.[7] In such contexts, it has not been easy to re-awaken a spatial consciousness, despite vigourous contemporary efforts. Albrechts highlights the enormous political effort needed to create a momentum behind a capacity to "see" the Flanders region/state in spatial terms. He stresses the importance of re-awakening traditional concepts of landscape, and combining these with a new image of unity in polycentricity, in the "Flemish Diamond", deliberately intended as a "travelling metaphor" (Albrechts, 2001; Albrechts *et al.*, 2003). Concerns about economic competitiveness and territorial cohesion provided the political "opportunity structure" for this planning effort.

Within England, more rural areas have retained strategies for conserving landscapes and traditional settlement qualities. This approach sustained the "containing" of growth in the Cambridge Sub-region. But, with weak and financially-dependent local government, it has been much more difficult for urban areas to see beyond specific projects and sectoral policies, to develop an "integrated" and spatially-differentiated view of the urban "territory". The planning system itself (as noted earlier) has become largely a-spatial, with

spatial allocation principles expressed in national policy guidance and then re-expressed in local guidance (Vigar *et al.*, 2000). In this context, it took effective coalition-building initiated from outside formal government arenas to make a significant difference, as in the Cambridge Sub-region (see earlier). Intellectually and politically, however, this particular coalition promoted a narrow conception of territory, dominated by economic interests concerned with growth and infrastructure coordination, with a colouring of ecological modernization to make it acceptable to local conservationists. The situation nationally is now changing, however, with a new policy emphasis in all the "regions" of the UK on "spatial planning" (Tewdwr-Jones, 2002). An early example of the development of an explicit spatial consciousness was in Northern Ireland, where a new vocabulary of spatial concepts has been promoted in a regional development strategy which aims to challenge and displace the old, vivid, culturally-embedded sectarian geography (DRDNI, 2002; Murray & Greer, 2002; Albrechts *et al.*, 2003; Healey, 2004). Other innovative examples are now appearing in Wales (Welsh Assembly Government, 2003), in some of the English regions (Marshall, 2004) and in a few urban regions as well. In Northern Ireland, in Wales and in the innovating English regions, spatial strategies and a spatial vocabulary are being created in situations where new powers, politicians and technical teams encourage the development of new ways of "seeing" their territory and developing regionally-grounded principles to guide their decisions about investment and regulation. Spatial strategies can thus in some instances mobilize a new spatial consciousness. In situations with a traditionally strong spatial consciousness, the challenge may be to displace one imagination with another. In the Netherlands, efforts to introduce a more relational imagination into national spatial strategy have so far been largely "captured" by the traditional conceptions of urban form which remain dominant in the planning policy community (de Vries & Zonneveld, 2001; Wolsink, 2003).

Some episodes in strategic spatial planning thus involve explicitly re-discovering and re-articulating a spatial imagination. Others seek to displace what are presented as outdated concepts of spatial organization. In many other cases, the spatial dimension is much less explicit, a by-product of other concerns, such as providing land supply for demographic projections of new households (a strong emphasis in English planning) or coordinating infrastructure and development (as in concepts of development "corridors"). These hardly reflect the contemporary understanding of the relational complexity of urban regions. Do more complex recognitions lie in the way scale and relational dynamics in urban areas are conceptualized?

Scalar Consciousness

By scalar consciousness, I refer to the way in which an "area" or "territory" is imagined, both in relation to its external positioning and its internal differentiation. Many traditional development plans and planning schemes positioned themselves in a hierarchy of plans, approached their strategies within contained borders (usually legal-administrative) and sought to provide comprehensive detail over a narrow range of issues, primarily the allocation of sites to land uses. The force behind many of the new sub-regional strategies reflects the recognition that these borders no longer "contain" the relational reach of significant living and working patterns, let alone that of production and distribution chains. This has lead to attempts to find territorial foci and boundaries which encompass expanding metropolitan areas and "city and countryside". The search for boundaries encourages a

treatment of territory as a container, widening the dimensioning of the container to capture the most significant relationships rather than working with concepts of discontiguous space and the multiple spatial "reach" of different networks transecting a territory. Many of the current exercises in spatial planning continue to focus largely within defined borders, concentrating attention on the intra-territorial distribution of major infra-structure and development investments. Others are more oriented towards external spaces but tend to treat their territories as a homogeneous entity to be moved around a European and global map. Driven in particular by concerns for economic competitiveness, these approaches emphasize re-positioning an urban area in global or European space (Healey, 1998b). Such "container" and "positioning" treatments contrast with the focus on fluidity, openness and multiple time-space relations of "relational complexity" ideas.

In contrast, the Netherlands Fifth NPD in its presentations eschews defining political borders, locating the Dutch economy and society in a diffuse, "polycentric", borderless European growth zone (VROM, 2001). Internally, however, traditional divisions live on in concepts of settlement hierarchies and clear divisions between town and country. In the Amsterdam case, the planning effort did seek to develop a metropolitan consciousness, but this primarily focused on "widening" the territorial boundary through inter-municipal cooperation rather than accepting the diversity of scales and "borders" in complex multi-layered webs of urban relations. The Dutch debates are important because of the uneasy attempt to combine a geography of places with particular qualities and a geography of flows (of water and transport in particular). This is expressed in the Fifth NPD in terms of interrelating "layers/strata", each of which is driven by different forces operating at different timescales (Priemus & Zonneveld, 2004). Implicitly, each is connected to relations with a different scalar reach, though this is not so clearly expressed (de Vries & Zonneveld, 2001; Healey, 2004). A spatial vocabulary of nodes and corridors is common in other European spatial strategies, often indicating how the corridors connect into some adjacent territory. Few strategies explicitly develop the spatial implications of the coexistence in places of multiple relations, each with their own network mor-phologies and scalar reach, which lies at the heart of the "relational complexity" idea. In many strategies, "scale" is primarily understood in terms of levels of government responsibility, which again tends to treat territory as a hard-edged container. As a result, there is little pressure to displace traditional concepts, with their focus on bounded-ness and the internal cohesion of a narrowly-understood range of territorial relations. This leads to a weak intellectual basis for spatial strategies, which makes them easy to challenge and demolish.

Relational Complexity

This "thin" conception of scalar relations reflects the intellectual challenge of articulating and expressing multi-relational urban and regional dynamics in spatial terms. The import-ance of such an understanding is increasingly stressed in the introduction to strategies, often calling up sociological and geographical literature in support. But the ambition narrows down as strategies get developed into more traditional vocabularies of urban form and infrastructure networks. The Netherlands Fifth NPD is a prime example (de Vries & Zonneveld, 2001). In the Northern Ireland Regional Development Strategy too, a new discourse wraps around an old one (Healey, 2004).

Current endeavours in strategic spatial planning seem thus to experience difficulty in translating an appreciation of relational complexity into a multiplex, relational spatial imagination (Healey, 2004). Instead, there is a strong tendency to revert back to traditional physicalist concepts about spatial order. These help in allocating sites for development and developing criteria for guiding changes to local environments. But they fail to capture the dynamics and tensions of relations with very different driving forces and scalar relations as these coexist in particular places and flow through shared channels. They provide little guidance on "reading" the evolving dynamics of land and property markets, or the changing ways people are moving around and using metropolitan regions, or the signs of new social conjunctions which could either release creative energy or produce oppressive or violent confrontations. Despite the often invoked rhetorics of broadly-based consultation and inclusive ambitions, many relations are ignored or inadequately considered because those taking the lead in strategy formation are unable to "see" the relations in question (Jensen & Richardson, 2004). This limits perceptions of diversity and makes deliberate exclusion all too easily hide behind the mask of inclusionary rhetorics.

The result of such a weakly-articulated relational spatial imagination is that either a narrow set of relations dominates the development of strategy, typically that of "economic competitiveness", as in the Cambridge Sub-region. Or strategies call into play narrow and static concepts of territorial cohesion and "integrated area development", focused on stabilizing and retaining old identities in the face of external challenges. In these latter situations, there is a tendency for old myths to suppress the recognition of vibrant, conflictual cosmopolitan and inclusive "urbanity" (Sandercock, 1998). The Amsterdam *structuurplan* at least seeks to stretch out towards a multi-vocal "urbanity". The imaginative weakness of contemporary strategic spatial planning endeavours may lead to further narrowing, as the ideas in a spatial strategy "travel" to arenas which shape resource allocation and regulatory practices. A confused spatial imagination may also limit the capacity of a strategy to travel through time. Thus just as the lack of arenas for collective actor formation within which debates about how to "see", "hear", "feel" and "read" an urban territory could evolve inhibits the development of new spatial imaginations, so the lack of development into policy terms of a relational spatial imagination inhibits the emergence of government arenas which could "see, hear, feel and read" the place-relevant dimensions of relational complexity.

The Governance Imaginations Reflected in Episodes of Strategic Spatial Planning

All collective action embodies in discourses and practices some conception of how governance is and should be performed. How do actors in arenas of governance "see" their organization and capacities and the institutional landscape in which they operate? Within Western Europe, there has been vigourous debate in recent years on the transformation of the formal institutions and procedures of all levels of government, fuelled by diverse objectives, from promoting more "competitive" local economies to reducing the "gap" between citizens, business and the state, and diminishing the so-called "democratic deficit" (John, 2001; Le Gales, 2002). Government is criticized as inefficient, bureaucratic, remote and self-seeking. These often contradictory debates have resulted in all kinds of transformation and "modernization" initiatives—at the local level, in different countries and by the EU. As a consequence, episodes of strategic spatial planning are often caught up in a whirl of ongoing institutional changes, reflecting a variety of conceptions and criticisms of governance purposes and modes. These episodes are typically not only

struggling to articulate a different conception of the appropriate territory and territorial dynamics around which policy initiatives should focus. They are also affected by, and sometimes constitutive of, attempts to create both new arenas of governance organization and new foci of governance attention. In these endeavours, how are the relations between government and society imagined? How is the tension between sectoral and territorial principles of organization addressed? What assumptions are embodied in these endeavours about how changes in governance discourses and practices come about? As in the previous section, I draw on the illustrative examples outlined earlier and other European examples available in the literature.

Government-Society Relations

The story of imaginations of governance in European debates is a rich and highly complex one which cannot be entered here. It involves considerations of how authority and legitimacy for collective action are established, the various modalities and rationalities of governance processes, how citizens and states are constituted and related to territories, conceptions of the "nation state", the dynamics of the relations between the state and economic activity, and the relation of states to citizens. Most recent episodes in strategic spatial planning reflect a challenge to the view of the state as a separate, autonomous sphere within society, operating by the principles of accountability established in a hierarchical bureaucratic organization answerable to politicians. Instead, their practices emphasize the creation of horizontal relations through a deliberate effort to involve a range of government organizations along with representatives of economic activity and "civil society" in deliberations about strategy formation and implementation. This can be seen in both the Amsterdam and the Cambridge cases outlined earlier, and in many others. If power relations are more diverse and diffused than in the past, then, so the argument goes, new ways of mobilizing governance attention need to be found.

Three concepts run through recent discussions of urban and regional governance and into strategic spatial planning episodes in the past decade: multi-level governance, partnership and participation. The multi-level governance concept challenges hierarchical models of the organization of the nation state, in which structures of policy development and implementation emphasize policy development at national level and implementation at local levels (Hooghe, 1996; Gualini, 2001). Instead, the interdependency of levels and jurisdictions of government is stressed, with levels working together in "partnership". Most episodes in strategic spatial planning display such "multi-governance" characteristics, as formal arenas rarely exist with a specific jurisdiction for an urban region bigger than a city and smaller than a large region (Albrechts *et al.*, 2001; Salet *et al.*, 2003). Mobilization force has to be accumulated by the participation of those who control resources and regulatory powers at higher and lower tiers. The multi-governance partnerships which underpin many strategic spatial planning episodes, although usually centred within state organizations, may affect economic actors and citizens by altering the geometry of institutional spaces and the flows of influence and accountability.

Transforming the relations between state, economy and civil society may also be an explicit target of episodes in strategic spatial planning, driven by ideas of governance in "partnership" between the state, economic actors and citizens (Elander & Blanc, 2000; Pierre, 1998). Such partnership, harnessing in particular those actors and social groups likely to have an interest in territorial promotion and in creating a "voice" for place, is

partly justified by key actors in terms of spreading ownership of a strategy among those with a role in investment and regulation. In these contexts, government actors may approach building new kinds of relations in an instrumentalist way. The Amsterdam case has echoes of such a justification for its deliberative processes. A "partnership" or "multi-stakeholder" approach may also be justified as a way of tapping into the knowledge of local actors, to make a strategy more robust. For state actors concerned to build up collective actor power around a focus on territorial qualities, partnerships may in addition help to accumulate sufficient power to challenge other centres of power within the arenas of formal government. Critical issues, however, surround the question of who gets invited in, or can develop the capacity to push their way into, membership of such partnerships. Sometimes, vigorous lobbying leads to involvement, as in the Cambridge case. In other cases, government actors incorporate the "critical voices" they need to respond to. In these circumstances, partnerships often draw in obvious actors (the "usual suspects") in well-established policy arenas. In other instances, there have been deeply-committed attempts at broad-based involvement in policy formation, drawing in quite new participants. The Northern Ireland Regional Development Strategy drew on academic experts in collaborative planning processes to develop an approach to discussing the strategy with a wide range of societal groups at many different levels. In this case, the motivation was not just to develop support for the strategy. It also aimed to contribute to a process of developing a different kind of politics (McEldowney & Sterrett, 2001; Healey, 2004).

These efforts at "coalition-building" and at accumulating legitimacy through consultative and collaborative practices have become characteristic of European episodes in strategic spatial planning (Albrechts, 2001; Salet *et al.*, 2003). Such efforts could be seen as an organizational response to the multi-vocality characteristic of the complex, diverse networks which coexist in urban regions. These not only raise a diversity of demands in a range of different ways. The time-space "reach" of the networks which transect a space also challenge traditional notions of a unitary form of "territorial citizenship". Those who are legally citizens of a particular territory may have diverse notions of what citizenship means to them and diverse territories with which they associate, while many others outside a territory may have a stake in it. Some episodes of strategic spatial planning are underpinned by an acute, if often unstated, awareness of the interaction between this multi-vocality and its institutional expression in networks of power and authority [see Albrechts (2001) on the Flanders case and Rosa Pires (2001) on initiatives in Portugal]. In Northern Ireland, the emphasis on multi-vocality was explicit, as a challenge to the traditional sectarian division which has dominated political discourse and practice for so long. In other cases, as in the Cambridge example, the awareness of multiple voices beyond those at the core of the mobilization effort is noticeably absent. As a result, the inclusionary rhetorics of partnership may mask all kinds of exclusionary practices. The potential for such exclusion raises concerns about the authority and legitimacy of strategic spatial planning episodes. Establishing this legitimacy for formal land use plans, which may result in major impacts on development opportunities, land values and property rights, has always been required to buttress the mechanism of representative democracy with formal procedures for objection and inquiry. However, the strategies developed in multi-stakeholder arenas may be subject to significant narrowing down, distortion and "capture" by other agendas as a strategy "travels" through more formal legitimation procedures.

Territory Versus Sector

The struggle to establish a territorial focus in a government landscape traditionally organized around functional "sectors" concerned with the delivery of services to people and firms lies at the core of episodes in strategic spatial planning in Europe. For policy communities in specific sectors, territory may be conceived merely as a container in which their particular claims and projects are located. In many examples, commentators report the difficulty faced by actors from, for example, the different infrastructure "communities", or from service communities such as health and education, in grasping what it means to focus on an area, place or territory, and to attempt to "integrate" one sector's concerns with that of another (see, for example, Harris & Hooper, 2004). In effect, the search for "territorial" or "area" "integration" means a "disintegration" from some sector priorities, in order to be able to "see" an issue from the angle of the interrelation of activities in particular places.

Such a "territorially-integrated" imagination seems to develop most effectively in governance contexts where financial and regulatory resources are already strongly concentrated at local or sub-regional level [see examples from Stuttgart (Heeg, 2003) and Hanover (Albrechts *et al.*, 2003)]; or where there are strong local actors with good national connections, as with French and Italian mayors (Le Gales, 2002; Magnier, 2004; Nigro & Bianchi, 2003; Novarina, 2003). But it can be very difficult in situations such as England, where traditionally investment resources and regulatory powers are concentrated at the national level. In the Cambridge area, the sub-regional partnership referred to earlier was constructed between elite business, university and local state interests with a city and regional focus. But they still had to lobby "up the scale" to national government to press for locally-relevant investments, using their formal and informal elite networks to do so (While *et al.*, 2004). The Northern Ireland Regional Development Strategy, for all its participatory efforts, lacks local government bodies which could deliver the strategy's ambitions, even though at the level of the Province government, there has been considerable cross-department support for the strategy (Healey, 2004).

With weak formal arenas and powers and entrenched sectoral policy communities, episodes of strategic spatial planning typically require a major institutional effort to have long-term effects (Salet *et al.*, 2003; Albrechts, 2001; Albrechts *et al.*, 2003). This situation is often described as the challenge of overcoming "fragmentation". The dangers of fragmentation are all too obvious in the field of urban policy and area regeneration (Taylor, 2000, 2003; Cars *et al.*, 2002). Intellectual grasp, practical skill and relational capacity may be lost. Weaker groups may lose hard-won protection and voice. The disorganization of fragmentation may lead to major inefficiencies in resource use. The re-combinations which arise may be narrow and exclusive in focus. Yet if vertical, sectoral relations are strongly embedded and if these no longer effectively serve the demands of citizens and firms, then institutional change strategies which have a fragmenting effect may be a necessary first step to create the institutional fluidity within which new combinations can arise. This suggests that effective strategic spatial planning episodes will require a sophisticated grasp of the institutional terrain in which they are situated and of its diverse dynamics.

Conceptions of Governance Transformation Processes

This raises the question of how those involved in strategic spatial planning episodes imagine that institutional changes will come about. The idea that a plan, once articulated,

acts as the prime mover of change has been largely discredited. Recent European episodes in strategic spatial planning more usually assume that the power to change governance modes will come from the development of the interactive practices of collaborative partnerships of some kind. These range from consultations around a strategy articulated by government officials or by consultants, to enlisting local elite actors into involvement in analysis and policy formation and complex interactions with diverse social groups.

Evidence from these interactions certainly indicates that these experiences lead to substantial changes in perceptions.[8] Those involved find themselves re-assessing and re-aligning their interests and re-articulating their values. Even actors with very particular business interests may find they have a moral, or emotive, attachment to some wider value such as promoting the qualities of an area, protecting the environment or seeking greater social justice. Such interactive episodes of strategic spatial planning can develop the awareness that there are different ways of doing governance than through formal bureaucracy, technical rationality or machiavellian power-seeking, as is shown in the cases from Northern Ireland and Portugal referred to earlier. But the mechanisms for transferring this learning into other arenas are often ill-developed. The political dynamics within which an episode is located and which some participants may seek to change is often left as an "unarticulated reality" which some slowly grasp and others do not appreciate. Inevitably, this undermines the development of the relational resources with which existing practices can be challenged.

There are other ideas around about how governance change happens. One is the image of a strong "leader", encapsulated in the perceived power of mayors (John, 2001; Magnier, 2004; Taylor, 2003). Another is the power of changing the rules of formal law, leading often to projects to "transform" the legislation in planning systems and in arrangements for sub-national governance. Many countries by 2000 were proposing "fundamental" changes to their planning and land use regulation laws. Recent strategic planning innovations in Milan are closely linked to the creation of new legal instruments at regional level (Comune di Milano, 2000; Balducci, 2001; Gualini, 2001; Mazza, 2003; Pomilio, 2003). Another change model has been taken from the "new public management" with its focus on targets and outputs (Kickert *et al*., 2003). This produces attempts to force changes in modes of governance at lower levels by the criteria governing financial allocations and by the articulation of regulatory rules. The result as it is emerging in the UK appears to be increased confusion and fragmentation, as new initiatives of this kind layer over and contradict each other (Imrie & Raco, 2003; Johnstone & Whitehead, 2004; Taylor, 2003). These "models" of how governance transforms seem to reflect an attempt to narrow down the exploding complexity of urban and regional governance dynamics, rather than facing into its emergent qualities.

Episodes of strategic spatial planning therefore challenge not only established divisions of government and the cultures embedded within them. They are also likely to bring different models of governance and governance change into encounters with each other. The collaborative model being promoted in many examples of strategic spatial planning emphasizes the social learning and invention which can occur in these encounters (Albrechts & Lievois, 2004). This assumes that transformative potential lies in the very multiplicity of tensions and stresses of the relational complexity of governance processes, creating all kinds of "fissures" and "cracks" which can be opened up to create and enlarge "moments of opportunity" for new ideas (Tarrow, 1994: Healey, 1997). However, this last approach is uncertainly developed. If it is to link more explicitly to contemporary notions

of relational complexity, it might be helpful to make it more explicit. This might involve developing an understanding of the fluidities as well as the fixities of governance dynamics, as episodes generate all kinds of reactions and learning which may both de-stabilize established discourses and practices and "sediment" into governance cultures before governance processes themselves change. This suggests that more attention is needed to developing a dynamic relational understanding of the processes which are involved in the governance of "place" and what this means for conceptions of citizen and stakeholder legitimacy and accountability. This could then lead to more consideration of the circumstances in which a "spatial imagination" for an area or territory would be likely to have sufficient cohesive force to accumulate power, while sustaining creative energies, promoting diversity and socially-just inclusivity as qualities in a place.

"Relational Complexity" and Territorial Governance: An Intellectual and Institutional Challenge

There are many signs that, within the movement towards strategic spatial planning in urban regions in Europe, some kind of relational understanding of the complexity of urban and regional dynamics and a relational perspective on governance processes is being carried forward. Such endeavours commonly accept the need to engage with a dynamic, fluid and open relational diversity and build some kind of collective actor consciousness and mobilization force to enlarge the synergies, reduce the conflicts and turn coexistence into some kind of identification with the place of the urban region.

But these efforts are limited by a weakly-developed relational imagination and by competing imaginations of policy agendas and models of governance transformation. As a result, the rhetorics of collaboration, of multi-vocality, participation and multi-stakeholder engagement often "wrap around" the recycling of established discourses and practices. This may produce an uncertain strategic voice, which limits the persuasive power and diffusion potential of the strategic ideas. Or a dominant voice may take over, typically the discourse of "economic competitiveness" and the political and business elites which express it [see Salet *et al.* (2003) for the difficulties in creating governance capacity at the metropolitan level]. A spatial strategy will always have difficulty accumulating power where sectoralized government structures are strongly embedded. A strategy-formation process which demands attention to multi-vocality and relational complexity places even more demands on the transformative ability of established governance discourses and practices.

However, it cannot be concluded that efforts to create persuasive strategies which are more inclusive and multi-vocal, and which are grounded in a deeper understanding of the complex dynamics of urban and regional relations, are necessarily "impossible ventures". Developing new spatial imaginations and evolving new governance processes takes time—to explore, to think, to learn, to struggle, to diffuse. Transformative change rarely occurs in instant revolutions. Changes evolve in many small ways, building a ground of understanding and experiences which, over time, eventually come together in what history may then describe as a "transformative moment". The challenge for academic and policy communities is to push the concept of "relational complexity" further. The value of such a concept lies in its ability to combine an appreciation of the open, dynamic, multiple and emergent nature of social relations with some degree of stabilizing force.

A "relational complexity" approach to urban region governance means eschewing notions of inherent territorial coherence or "integration", and univocal concepts of territorial identity. It demands a dynamic sensibility which recognizes the complex interrelation between place qualities and multiple space-time relational dynamics rather than relapsing into a focus on traditional analyses of, for example, territorially-contained housing markets, labour markets and land use and transport interactions. It requires a recognition of multiple and fluid identities associated with places, and a realization that attachment to the place of an urban region is only one of the identities that people living and working in a place may have, while many others who do not live and work in an area may have a "stake" in a place. However developed, it demands a broad and multiple conception of "citizens" and "stakeholders", avoiding a relapse into singular identities and discrete relational webs.

These qualities are even more important if the ambition is to promote more socially-just and inclusive modes of governance centred around qualities of place. Above all, strategy-making with an appreciation of "relational complexity" demands a capacity to "see", "hear", "feel" and "read" the multiple dynamics of a place in a way which can identify just those issues which need collective attention through a focus on place qualities. Strategic spatial planning informed by ideas of "relational complexity" is therefore decidedly not "comprehensive" in its approach. It needs to be highly selective, focusing on the distinctive histories and geographies of the relational dynamics of a particular place. It may recognize borders and cohesions, but also the tensions, exclusions and conflicts which these generate. It needs to be able to identify the different timescales of different kinds of relations, to mix fixities and fluidities, while recognizing the multiplicity of "citizenships" and forms of "stake" which all kinds of people, groups and interests have in a place. It needs to be able to mix different forms of knowledge and expertise to grasp the many ways in which people experience the complex relational dynamics which constitute their existence and identity "in places". It should have the capacity to grasp when interventions are likely to reduce openness and stifle creativity and those which have the opposite effect. Similarly, if exclusion arises in complex relational ways, interventions which aim to promote more socially-just and inclusive life situations for people and stakeholders in places need to find some way to grasp the specific power dynamics of relational interactions and co-locations not just in an urban region, but in all the particular locales within it. This means being able to appreciate the significance of the fine-grain of interactions and the particularity of experiences in the shaping of more systemic relations, the detail in the strategy and the strategy in detail.

Finally, recognizing the complex relational dynamics of urban regions and the inherent simplifications of any kind of strategic initiative demands a strong ethical sensibility among those involved. "Seeing into relational complexity" means an awareness of the damage that strategic simplification can produce as well as the beneficial synergies which may be sustained and enlarged. Spatial images can be very powerful ways of "boxing up" a strategy to help it "travel" well. But it is all too easy in this packaging work to narrow a strategy down or to convert it into more traditional concepts. This then may reinforce the resistance of practices to the multi-vocal and multi-valent realities of place relations which the concepts of "relational complexity" are designed to capture. Instead of narrowing, such spatial images need to have the capacity to "carry" a situated and multi-valent richness of understanding in ways which can release strategic imaginations. Images need to become "buoyant floating signifiers with remarkable staying

power but no settled meaning" (Jay, 1998).[9] In short, episodes of strategic spatial planning informed by "relational complexity" concepts which accumulate sufficient power to "travel" effectively and have enduring material and mental effects should be judged in the long-term in terms of their capacity to enrich the imaginative resources, creative energies and governance cultures through which quality of life and experience of diverse citizens and stakeholders in particular places are likely to be enhanced.

Acknowledgements

Notes

1. A much reduced and revised version of this paper is included in L. Albrechts and S. Mandelbaum (Eds) (2005) *The Network Society: A New Context for Planning?* (London: Routledge).
2. Following Le Gales (2002) and Cars *et al.* (2002), governance is used as a general term to describe collective action arrangements and practices.
3. This brief summary draws on my current research on Spatial Complexity and Territorial Governance, part-funded by the Leverhulme Trust, forthcoming in Healey (2006).
4. See the budget allocations for the "growth areas" from different national departments in 2003 and 2004, following the direction of the national Sustainable Communities Plan (ODPM, 2003).
5. The author would like to thank Nicky Morrison for helpful discussion on this case.
6. By "episode", one refers to the work in producing a new policy or strategy, or designing and initiating a major project.
7. Traditionally, commercial and financial interests have been less interested in integrated territorial development than industrialists (see Harvey, 1985; Healey, 1983).
8. This is well-established in the literatures on urban regeneration partnerships, Local Agenda 21 processes and collaborative conflict resolution processes.
9. Jay is here referring to the concept of "pagan" (1998, p. 186).

References

Albrechts, L. (2001) From traditional Land Use Planning to Strategic Spatial Planning: The case of Flanders, in: L. Albrechts, J. Alden & A. da Rosa Pires(Eds) *The Changing Institutional Landscape of Planning*, pp. 83–108 (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Albrechts, L & Lievois, G. (2004) The Flemish Diamond: Urban network in the making, *European Planning Studies*, 12(3), pp. 351–370.

Albrechts, L., Alden, J. & da Rosa Pires, A. (Eds) (2001) *The Changing Institutional Landscape of Planning* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Albrechts, L., Healey, P. & Kunzmann, K. (2003) Strategic spatial planning and regional governance in Europe, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(2), pp. 113–129.

Allen, J. (1999) Worlds within Cities, in: D. Massey, J. Allen & S. Pile (Eds) *City Worlds*, pp. 53–97 (London: Routledge/Open University).

Allen, J. (2003) *Lost Geographies of Power* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing).

Amin, A. & Thrift, N. (2002) *Cities: Reimagining the Urban* (Oxford: Polity/Blackwell).

Amin, A., Massey, D. & Thrift, N. (2000) *Cities for the Many not the Few* (Bristol: The Policy Press).

Balducci, A. (2001) New tasks and new forms of comprehensive planning in Italy, in: L. Albrechts, J. Alden & A. Rosa Pires(Eds) *The Changing Institutional Landscape of Planning*, pp. 158–180 (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Bertolini, L. & Salet, W. (2003) Planning concepts for cities in transition: Regionalisation of urbanity in the Amsterdam structure plan, *Planning Theory and Practice*, 4(2), pp. 131–146.

Bohme, K. (2002) *Nordic Echoes of European Spatial Planning* (Stockholm: Nordregio).

Cars, G., Healey, P., Madanipour, A. & de Magalhaes, C. (Eds) (2002) *Urban Governance, Institutional Capacity and Social Milieux* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Commission for the European Communities (CEC) (1997) The EU Compendium of spatial planning systems and policies (Strasbourg & Luxembourg: Office for the Official Publications of the European Communities).

Comune di Milano (2000) *Ricostruire le Grande Milano: Documento di Inquadrimento delle politiche urbanistiche communale* (Milan: Comune di Milano).

Cooke, P. (2002) *Knowledge Economies: Clusters, Learning and Competitive Advantage* (London: Routledge).

Cooke, P., Boekholt, P. & Todtling, F. (2000) *The Governance of Innovation in Europe* (London: Pinter).

Crouch, C. & Le Gales, P. *et al.* (2001) *Local Production Systems: Rise or Demise* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

de Vries, J. & Zonneveld, W. (2001) *Transnational Planning and the Ambivalence of Dutch Spatial Planning* (Shanghai: World Planning Schools Congress).

Dienst Ruimtelijke Ordening, Gemeente Amsterdam (DRO) (2003) *Plan Amsterdam: Het structuurplan 2003* (Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam).

Department for Regional Development (DRDNI) (2002) *Shaping Our Future: Regional Development Strategy for Northern Ireland 2025* (Belfast: Department for Regional Development, Northern Ireland Government).

Elander, I. & Blanc, M. (2000) Partnerships and democracy: A happy couple in urban governance, in: H.T. Anderson & R. van Kempen (Eds) *Governing European Cities: Social Fragmentation, Social Exclusion and Urban Governance* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Faludi, A. & Van der Valk, A. (1994) *Rule and Order in Dutch Planning Doctrine in the Twentieth Century* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers).

Faludi, A. & Waterhout, B. (Eds) (2002) *The Making of the European Spatial Development Perspective* (London: Routledge).

Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Graham, S. & Healey, P. (1999) Relational concepts in time and space: Issues for planning theory and practice, *European Planning Studies*, 7(5), pp. 623–646.

Gromart, E & Hajer, M. (2003) Is *That* Politics? For an inquiry into forms of contemporary politics, in: B. Joerges& H. Nowotny (Eds) *Looking Back, Ahead— The (2002) Yearbook of the Sociology of Sciences* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers).

Gualini, E. (2001) *Planning and the Intelligence of Institutions* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Hajer, M. & Zonneveld, W. (2000) Spatial planning in the Network Society— rethinking the principles of planning in the Netherlands, *European Planning Studies*, 8(3), pp. 337–355.

Harris, N & Hooper, A. (2004) Rediscovering the "spatial" in public policy and planning: An examination of the spatial content of sectoral policy documents, *Planning Theory and Practice*, 5(2), pp. 147–169.

Harvey, D. (1985) *The Urbanisation of Capital* (Oxford: Blackwells).

Healey, P. (1983) *Local Plans in British Land Use Planning* (Oxford: Pergamon).

Healey, P. (1997) *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies* (London: Macmillan).

Healey, P. (1998a) Collaborative planning in a stakeholder society, *Town Planning Review*, 69(1), pp. 1–21.

Healey, P. (1998b) The place of "Europe" in contemporary spatial strategy-making, *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 5(2), pp. 139–153.

Healey, P. (2004) The treatment of space and place in the new strategic planning in Europe, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(1), pp. 45–67.

Healey, P., *Urban Complexity and Spatial Strategies* (London: Routledge).

Healey, P. (2006) Khakee, A., Motte, A. & Needham, B. (Eds) (1997) *Making Strategic Spatial Plans: Innovation in Europe* (London: UCL Press).

Heeg, S. (2003) Governance in the Stuttgart metropolitan region, in: W. Salet, A. Thornley & A. Kreukels (Eds) *Metropolitan Governance and Spatial Planning*, pp. 163–174 (London: Spon).

Hooghe, L. (Ed.) (1996) *Cohesion Policy and European Integration: Building Multi-level Governance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Imrie, R. & Raco, M. (2003) Community and the changing nature of urban policy, in: R. Imries & M. Raco (Eds) *Urban Renaissance: New Labour, Community and Urban Policy*, pp. 3–36 (London: Routledge).

Jay, M. (1998) *Cultural Semantics: Keywords of our Time* (London: The Athlone Press).

Jensen, O. B. & Richardson, T. (2004) *Making European Space* (London: Routledge).

John, P. (2001) *Local Governance in Western Europe* (London: Sage).

Johnstone, C. & Whitehead, M. (2004) Horizons and barriers in British urban policy, in: C. Johnstone & M. Whitehead (Eds) *New Horizons in British Urban Policy: Perspectives on New Labour's Urban Renaissance*, pp. 3–21 (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Jolles, A., Klusman, E. & Teunissan, B. (2003) *Planning Amsterdam: Scenarios for Urban Development 1928–2003* (Rotterdam: NAI).

Kickert, W. J. M. (2003) Beyond public management: Shifting frames of reference in administrative reform in the Netherlands, *Public Management Review*, 5(3), pp. 377–399.

Le Gales, P. (2002) *European Cities: Social Conflicts and Governance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Magnier, A. (2004) Between institutional learning and re-legitimisation: Italian mayors in the unending reform, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(1), pp. 166–182.

Marshall, T. (2004) Implementing Regional Planning Strategies in England. Paper presented at the AESOP Congress, Grenoble, France, July.

Mazza, L. (2003) Regole e strategie per la pianificazione degli usi del suolo: riflessione su un caso italiano, in: C.S. Bertuglia, A. Stranghellini & L. Staricco (Eds) *La diffusione urbana: tendenze attuali, scenari futuri* (Milan: FrancoAngeli).

McEldowney, M. & Sterrett, K. (2001) Shaping a regional vision: The case of Northern Ireland, *Local Economy*, 16(1), pp. 38–49.

Morrison, N. (2003) Assessing the need for key-worker housing: A case study of Cambridge, *Town Planning Review*, 74(3), pp. 281–3000.

Motte, A. (Ed.) (1995) *Schema directeur et project d'agglomeration: l'experimentation de nouvelles politiques urbaines spatialisees 1981–1993* (Paris: Les editions Juris Service).

Murdoch, J. & Abram, S. (2002) *Rationalities of Planning: Development Versus Environment in Planning for Housing* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Murray, M. & Greer, J. (2002) Participatory planning as dialogue: The Northern Ireland regional strategic framework and its public examination process, *Policy Studies*, 23(3/4), pp. 191–209.

Newman, P. & Thornley, A. (1996) *Urban Planning in Europe* (London: Routledge).

Nigro, G. & Bianchi, G. (Eds) (2003) *Politiche, Programmi e Piani nel governo della Citta* (Rome: Gangemi Editore).

Novarina, G. (2003) *Plan et Projet: L'urbanisme en France et en Italie* (Paris: Anthropos).

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) (2003) *Sustainable Communities Plan: Building for the Future* (London: ODPM).

Pierre, J. (Ed.) (1998) *Partnerships in Urban Governance: European and American Experience* (London: Macmillan).

Pomilio, F. (2003) Il "Documento di Inquadramento delle politiche urbanistiche" di Milano: un caso anomalo di pianificazione strategica?, in: T. Pugliese & A. Spaziente (Eds) *Strategie per la citta: piani, politiche, azioni: Una rassegna di casi*, pp. 187–206 (Milan: Franco Angeli).

Priemus, H. & Zonneveld, W. (2004) Regional and transnational spatial planning: Problems today, perspectives for the future, *European Planning Studies*, 12(3), pp. 283–297.

Pugliese, T. & Spaziente, A. (Ed.) (2003) *Strategie per la citta: piani, politiche, azioni: Una rassegna di casi* (Milan: Franco Angeli).

Rosa Pires, A. (2001) Breaking the ties with the master plan: Spatial strategic plans in Portugal, in: L. Albrechts, J. Alden & A. Rosa Pires(Eds) *The Changing Institutional Landscape of Planning*, pp. 181–208 (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Salet, W. (2003) Amsterdam and the north wing of the Randstad, in: W. Salet, A. Thornley & A. Kreukels (Eds) *Metropolitan Governance and Spatial Planning*, pp. 175–188 (London: Spon Press).

Salet, W., Thornley, A. & Kreukels, A. (Eds) (2003) *Metropolitan Governance and Spatial Planning: Comparative Studies of European City-regions* (London: E&FN Spon).

Sandercock, L. (Ed.) (1998) *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History* (Berkeley, CA: University of Berkeley Press).

Scott, J. C. (1998) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

South East Joint Planning Team (SEJPT) (1970) *Strategic Plan for the South East* (London: Ministry of Housing and Local Government).

Tarrow, S. (1994) *Power in Movement* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2002) *The Planning Polity: Planning, Government and the Policy Process* (London: Routledge).

Taylor, M. (2000) *Top-down Meets Bottom-up: Neighbourhood Management* (York: York Publishing Services).

Taylor, M. (2003) *Public Policy in the Community* (Houndmills: Palgrave).

Vigar, G., Healey, P., Hull, A. & Davoudi, S. (2000) *Planning, Governance and Spatial Strategy in Britain* (London: Macmillan).

VROM (Netherlands National Spatial Planning Agency) (2001) *Making Space, Sharing Space: Fifth National Policy Document on Spatial Planning 2000/2003* (English Summary) (The Hague: Ministry of Spatial Planning and the Environment).

Welsh Assembly Government (2003) *People, Places, Futures: The Wales Spatial Plan* (Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government).

While, A., Jonas, A. & Gibbs, D. (2004) Unlocking the city? Growth pressures, collective provision and the search for new spaces of governance in Greater Cambridge, England, *Environment and Planning A*, 36(2), pp. 279–304.

Wolsink, M. (2003) Reshaping the Dutch planning system: A learning process?, *Environment and Planning A*, 35, pp. 705–723.

WRR (Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy) (1999) *Spatial Development Policy* (The Hague: SDU).