Land management and means of planning control

Prof. Stig Enemark Aalborg University, Denmark Vice-President of ric

38th NATIONAL CONGRESS OF LICENSED SURVEYORS ST. MALO. FRANCE, 14-16 JUNE 2006

The content



- The land management paradigm is complex and highly interdisciplinary. This paper attempts to build an overall understanding.
- This paper is not an attempt of to do a comparative analysis of the maturity or completeness of the planning systems in the European countries.
- It attempts to identify some general characteristics and to discuss some key issues such as a centralized versus a decentralized approach and a plan led versus a market led approach. Some general trends are identified in these areas.
- Finally the paper presents the Danish system as an example of a decentralized and led plan led approach to spatial planning.









Major traditions of spatial planning in Europe

- The regional economic planning approach
 Spatial planning as a policy tool to pursue wide social and economic
 objectives, especially in relation to disparities in wealth, employment,
 and social conditions between different regions of the country (France)
- The comprehensive integrated approach
 Spatial planning is conducted through a systematic and formal hierarchy
 of plans at central, regional, and local level (Denmark, the Netherlands).
- The land use management approach
 Planning as a technical discipline which a focus on the control of
 change of use of land (UK town and country planning)
- The urbanism approach
 -key focus on architectural flavour and urban design
 (Mediterranean countries).

	Close	Distant
	(there is a close relationship between the objectives of the system and what happens in practice)	relationship between the objectives and the reality
Discretionary (Departures to plans can be made)	UK	
Moderate (Mechanisms exist for departures to plans to be made)	Denmark Finland Ireland Netherlands	Belgium Portugal
Committed (no discretion for decisions to be made contrary to plans and policies)	Austria France Germany Luxembourg Sweden	Greece Italy Spain

Centralisation versus decentralisation

- Decentralisation in EU to the most local level
 Experienced in most European countries (maybe except France)
 Varies in terms of centralisation versus deconcentration of power
- The principle of subsidiarity
 - Solving the problems at lowest possible level
 This should produce efficient service, better use of local knowledge, greater
 participation and democracy, increased popular consent, and political stability
- Think global act local
 A decentralised decision making process is assumed to produce the right
 - decision in relation to local needs
 - Land use planning then becomes a part of local politics

Centralisation versus decentralization Local level authorities in Europe

Member State	Type of local authority	Number	Average population
France (Metropole)	Communes	36,558	1,550
Luxembourg	Communes	118	3,300
Österreich	Gemeinden	2,300	3,000
España	Municipalities	8,077	4,800
Deutschland	Gemeinden	16,040	5,000
Italia	Comuni	8,102	7,000
Suomi-Finland	Kunnat/Kommuner	454	11,000
Belgique-België	Gemeente/Communes	589	17,000
Danmark	Municipalities	275	20,000
Nederland	Gemeentes	647	23,000
Sverige	Kommuner	288	30,000
Portugal	Câmaras	305	34,000
Ireland-Éire (2)	Districts	88	40,000
United Kingdom	Districts	483	119,000
Ellas (3)	Prefecture	54	190,000

A plan led versus a market led approach A plan led approach - DK

Political Planning decision Regulations	Desirable	Undesirable
Conforming with planning regulation	Permission May be subject to a local plan	Prohibition
Not conforming with planning regulations	Adjustment	Refusal

It is possible to ensure that undesirable development does not occur; but it can not be ensured that desirable development actually happens at the right place and the right time.

The planning regulations are mainly restrictive - not proactive

A market led approach – UK

- Local development plans are prepared to control conflicts between development and protection
 - All developments needs advanced consent planning permission
 - not legally binding
 departures may be permitted if justified
- Any relevant matter can be considered when deciding on development proposals
 - the development plan is seen as only one consideration
 the system is more open to market forces
- Rights to appeal to central government where permission to develop is refused
 - More than 26 000 appeal each year on third are successful in overturning the original decision by the local planning authority

















2 periods of public hearings, 8 weeks:

- 1th period concerns strategies, ideas and

-2th period concerns the planning proposal

The plan are adopted by the regional and local authorities themselves and there is opportunity for appeal against the content of the plans.





A decentralised approach

- Based on democratic ideals such as to establish a • local representative democracy responsible for serving local needs
 - expectations of prosperity and a balanced control towards sustainability
- Finely tuned impact between central and local government deciding on development proposals - mix of vertical and horizontal connections within the various sectors - means of monitoring, dialogue, and the national power of veto
- The purpose is to solve the tasks at the lowest possible level – planning is politics Combining responsibility for decision making with accountability for



