

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY EXPERIENCES IN UK

Dr. Fatih EREN

Selcuk University Faculty of Architecture, Department of City and Regional Planning,
Aleaddin Keykubat Campus, Selcuklu-Konya, TURKEY.

ABSTRACT

UK has experienced a very interesting and teaching regional governance between 1998 – 2010. UK Government took a radical decision for following spatial development strategy of EU, also solving problems in physical planning, public and economy management issues in the country and passed to a regional government and planning system. In this scope, important powers and sources of central and local administration are transferred to new established regional institutions. Thus, “regional development agencies” entered into agenda of the country as very effective and very strong regional institutions. Agencies have functioned as an active and effective institution for 12 years and dominated government – planning processes in all aspects, but they were closed with a sudden decision in 2010. UK’s regional development agencies experience deserves a detailed examination regarding understanding regional development dynamics and applications. Purpose of this study is to explain regional development and governance experience of UK through regional development agencies marking the period and taking lessons from this experience for benefit of all countries. The study seeks answer for questions such as, what should be the scale of government and planning, who should have priority in development and which issues should be handled together in the development process, as well as provides important determinations for solving relations between development and democracy.

Keywords: Regional development agency, UK, regional governance, regional planning, economic development, public management, spatial development.

INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH METHOD

UK’s regional development agencies experience deserves a detailed examination regarding understanding regional development dynamics and applications. Purpose of this study is to explain regional development and governance experience of UK through regional development

agencies marking the period and taking lessons from this experience for benefit of all countries. This study consists of four sections. First section explains which period conditions the development agencies are opened within and why opened at the end of which process as the main actor of regional governance in UK. Second section focuses on the development agencies period last for 12 years, and handles issues such as which purposes were aimed to be realized and what kind of successes achieved during their active periods. Third section touches the issue of why agencies were closed, problems caused and unsuccessful points. Last section lists lessons those may be taken from regional development agencies experience of UK regarding organizational structure and functioning and public management, spatial planning and economy management. Comprehensive literature scan and deep document analysis methods were used in the research. Books, academic journals, government reports published, opinions of political parties, public handbooks, agency publications, special reports and conference statements were arranged and analysed in detail regarding regional governance and development agencies experience of UK.

CONDITIONS AND PROCESS CREATING DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES IN UK

Regional Development Agencies are not institutions created at once upon an innovative idea coming to mind in UK. Conditions of 1990s necessitate transition to a different economic development, government and spatial planning understanding for the country. Agencies entered into agenda of the country as a very strong organizational structure representing this new understanding. First of all, period conditions and process revealing these agencies should be correctly understood while examining the regional development agency experience of UK.

UK was divided into nine standard areas considering administrative borders in 1940s. Purpose of this division was to establish a statistical database. Various power assignments were realized to certain areas of UK in 1960s. As a continuation of this attempt, the central government has published a report called as “Alternative Regional Strategies” in 1982 and directly selected regional governments were established in Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and London within this framework. Meanwhile, UK has joined the European Economic Community in 1973. As a result of this membership, the country started to develop regional policies and funds complying with laws of community after that date. When the community was turned into European Union in 1993, member states have naturally started to think regional and create new regional institutions within their national borders because every country would have systematic thoughts regarding today and future of their own regions in order to benefit from community funds and enforcing community policies. Within this process, various regional development successes achieved within the European Union having regional thought. Similar regional successes were also experienced in Scotland and Wales regions with realized power assignment a while ago (Glasson & Marshall, 2007: 90). These successes inspired UK and the opinion of transition to a new

regional government understanding in the country started to be created among people as a better idea (Cooke & Morgan, 1998). A certain group was assessing the region status as the most suitable spatial scale to realize national policies required by the country and to solve important local problems at the mid of 1990s.

Towards end of 1990s, the agenda was occupied with the question of “what should be the scale of government” in UK like the entire Europe. In this period, researches were accelerated regarding how to pass to a regional and metropolitan scaled government instead of a central government holding power, finance sources and effect forces on hand (Brenner, 2003) (Herrschel & Newman, 2002). The country was having difficulties in producing effective solutions for interlocking problems such as economic development, housing, spatial planning and transportation. Settlement of these multi-dimensional and critical problems was exceeding limits of local government, as well as the central government organization was failing to produce integrated plan, investment and service presentation decisions to solve these problems with coordinated studies among each other. Another reason of that was having conflicts between duties of institutes serving in different scaled in the country. Another reason was divided (independence) functioning of “economic planning” and “physical planning” processes in the existing system. Similarly, no communication was being established between land utilisation planning and transportation planning, and coordination was failing between area based attempts (Glasson, 2002: 261). Namely, an integrated regional policy was not able to be established in the Country. The regional economic development policy applied between 1970 – 1990 was resulted in revealing regional behaviours hiding information from each other and damaging each other and not supporting development of each other. Requested national economic development was not achieved in UK due to regional behaviours damaging the neighbour (Haughton & Counsell, 2004: 171). It was a fact that, various areas of the country were much less-developed than other areas in economical aspects. Technical capacity of less-developed areas was inadequate; regions were not able to establish their own production capacities. Notwithstanding, the government was approaching every area as they were in the same situation (Breheny, 1996). According to Caborn (2000), it was obvious that UK had an economic management deficient in 1990s. Public budget was shattered. Additionally, the complex planning system was causing delays in progress of works. Status of the private sector was not also positive. Sectors were functioning very inefficiently. Private sector actors were lacking a common future vision and sectoral solidarity (Roberts, 2007: 123). Briefly, a modernization was required in government organization in all aspects (Benneworth & Dabinett, 2001).

In 1997, European Commission was published a document called as “European Spatial Development Perspective” as a recommendation. This document introduced notions such as “spatial planning”, “internationalization”, “innovativeness”, “competition”, “equality”,

“diversity”, “economic change”, “regional welfare”, “occupational ability” and “multi-centred” into agenda of countries (McCann, 2007). Then, a fund named as INTERREG was founded in Europe. While these developments were occurring in Europe, New Labour Party won 1997 elections in UK and came to power alone. New Labour Party became very wishful for fulfilling decisions and claims of European Union from the beginning. The new government was disturbed with division between physical planning and economic development issues. It believed that it is required to handle these issues together, combine the regional policy and collect the shattered government structure of the country at one point (Tewdwr-Jones & Allmendinger, 2007: 33). The new government thought that economic sectors would be able to take rapid decisions if planning process is accelerated and simplified. Prime Minister Tony Blair started to seek ways for combining people from different interest groups and creating beneficial situations for everyone by reconciling them (3rd Way Philosophy) (Fairclough, 2000). New government started its reforms based on these ideas.

New Labour Party Government was willing to narrow the scale of government in the development process (dividing the public sector into sub-sections) and fully benefit from strength of the private sector. In this regard, “Regional Development Agencies” were founded initially. Basic duty of agencies was to direct domestic investments. Agencies received a strong budget and authority to plan and enforce major physical projects. Establishment of agencies was like a response to the question of what the spatial policy scale of management and government shall be in the next process because agencies mean that economic, spatial and other government strategies would be determined and implemented at region scale afterwards (Mawson, 1997). New government was planning to determine and realize regional policies with a more coordinated approach through agencies revealed as strong regional institutions. Various powers and sources of central government were assigned to agencies (Pearce, 2008). Government preferred to follow a combined regional policy by gathering “planning, government and economic development” issues around regional development agencies. Ever after, development of economic capital (roads, industrial zones, etc.) and social capital (hospitals, schools, etc.) was going to be considered together in less-developed areas. Combined regional policy would maintain a hierarchical harmony between strategies targeting different scales. Powers of agencies were not limited with only generating regional policies and strategies. Additionally, they were going to design application based projects. Thus, it was envisaged that agencies was going to take into consideration spatial aspect of the issue while developing regional policies and strategies in issues such as development control, transportation planning, etc. (Dimitriou & Thompson, 2007: 86) Development agencies are liable for fully using the technical capacity of their regions and enforcing their strategies (Pearce, 2008). Difference of agencies from Regional Economic Planning Councils established in 1965, was having actual funds and power of enforcement.

There are other logical reasons for transition from central government to a regional government at the end of 1990s in UK. 1990s witnessed expanding and complexing spatial, social and economic relations in UK and the World. Upon improvement of technology, internet was introduced to lives of people. As a result, social communication and connection of UK with other countries was strengthened. Important improvements were experienced in the country regarding land and air transportation. Rapidly increasing national/international human, commodity and service flows have increased the automobile and truck traffic on highways. Demand for airports was also increased in UK. In this regard, many new airports were constructed in the country. It is recognized that airport location selection and capacity have a dominant role in the future of settlements. Expanding economic and social relations also expanded spatial relations. Planning was exceeded the local scope in the country and it became compulsory to consider the spatial planning in a larger scale. On the other hand, continental cooperation was strengthening in Europe. Namely, changes in the World and the country were having reflections at continental, national and local scales. Therefore, a need was revealed for affiliating these developments experienced in different scales and strengthening inter-scales connection. State activities were also changed in UK during 1990s because the government became obliged to perform its activities with a more limited budget. As a solution for this situation, UK decided to transfer considerable part of its infrastructure and production instruments to the private sector. The logic of “Use the public capital very less for large scaled infra-structure investments, and give the decision and control powers to private sector at a certain rate” became dominant in the management. This logic (economic development idea) has resulted with more flexible environment protection laws and a part of country lands became market materials. Because the private sector was only focusing on business efficiency, and not interested in effective utilisation of country lands. While the economic growth continues, discussions were highlighted regarding how country lands will be used more effectively and the natural environment will be protected. All these changes have considerable impacts on the planning idea. Planning was started to not being perceived as purely good and bad like the past because planning may be bad or good depending on its purpose. “Planning is good for everyone” idea is replaced with the question of “for whom and what the planning is good” (Glasson & Marshall, 2007: 17).

Region scale was relatively a new playground created by the Central Government for itself (Tewdwr-Jones & Phelps, 2000). In 1990s, the country was at a different point regarding “manageability” and “democracy”. Society’s pressure was high against works performed at urban and national levels. Elections and surveys were some of the tools for the society to set that pressure. Non-Governmental Organizations were able to easily manipulate the local scale. The society pressure and manipulation in question were not available on the regional grounds. New Labour Party Government considered the regional level as an empty area for easy movement (Crouch, 2004). In the new process, studies were initiated for the purpose of bringing every

region to same development level through internal investments in accordance with European Structural Program targets. New regional development approach was established on “competitiveness” (Glasson & Marshall, 2007: 15). It was envisaged with the help of agencies that every region will grow and every region will increase its competitiveness (Dimitriou & Thompson, 2007: 86). When each region finds the way to develop within its own conditions, it was believed that the situation will bring national development as a whole. The shattered budget was actually gathered through agencies and regional government was started upon transfer of certain responsibilities belonging to the central government to agencies. For instance, English Partnerships, Rural Development Commission and Single Regeneration Budget sources, powers and responsibilities were transferred to agencies. Agencies with a considerable finance power and authority became doors opening to national government with their offices located at every region.

1998-2010 DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES PERIOD

Prior to 1997 general elections, “Regional Policy Commission made a considerable preparation study regarding regional development agencies planned to be opened in UK. After a short period following elections, new UK Government has enacted the Regional Development Agencies Act in 1998 in the Parliament. Thus, “Regional Development Agencies” entered into country agenda as an independent public authority not affiliated with the Ministry. Agencies were the first leg of troika built for realizing the new regional government. According to the law, development agencies were responsible against Council of Ministers and the Parliament. Eight development agencies in UK were opened on April 1, 1999 and London Development Agency was opened on July 3, 2000. Below given 9 development agencies had activities in UK until their termination on June 2010:

- One North East Development Agency
- Northwest Development Agency
- Yorkshire Forward Development Agency
- Advantage West Midlands Development Agency
- East Midlands Development Agency
- East of England Development Agency
- South West of England Development Agency
- South East of England Development Agency
- London Development Agency

Management of agencies consist of 12-15 persons. It is compulsory to have at least 4 local management representative in the Board of Directors. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Board (at least 3 persons) must be women. Number of ethnic minorities cannot exceed 5% of board members. One of the members

must be expert on rural areas. Board should contain members from business world, trainers, chambers of trade and volunteered associations. Members were selected by the Minister of State and assigned in the Board for 3 years (Allen, 2002). The execution chair responsible for performing works of agencies on daily basis was also assigned by the Minister of State. Upon opening of agencies, various institutions (English Partnerships, Rural Development Commission and Regional Development Organizations) were closed. 414 administrative personnel employed in closed institutions were transferred to agencies. At the beginning, 70 to 250 persons were employed in one agency. After closing 200 to 300 persons were employed in each agency.

After agencies were opened, they initially used the budget of Department for Environment, Transport and the Regions. After 2001, Department of Trade and Investment became sponsor for agencies. Agencies had a considerably large budget from the beginning. At the beginning, an agency had a budget between 57,247 to 277,142 pounds. Largest budget was assigned to London Development Agency. As of 2005, regional development agencies were using 2% of the entire state budget. It was seen that the budget was not enough for realizing the target of eliminating inter-regional imbalance. Therefore, new funds were transferred to agencies from other public authorities (the Learning and Skills Council, Communities England and the National Health Service) (Pearce, 2008: 104). 9 agencies used total 17,6 billion Pounds during the 1998-2010 active period of agencies. That means each agency used approximately 2 billion Pounds every year. Agencies used their assigned budgets completely every year without saving any amounts (Prisk, 2012). Tangible strength of agencies was much more than other regional institutions of the central government and local governments. That budget increased every year. Moreover, the budget flexibility is maintained (the Single Pot) and agencies are allowed to replace the money in its budget under different topics in accordance with long term strategy (Glasson & Marshall, 2007: 15). When agencies were closed on June 2010, they had immovable with total 512 million pounds value. They were managing total 9683 projects with 1,86 billion pounds value. They were partners of 110 organizational structures. Approximately 3470 persons were employed in agencies (Prisk, 2012).

Regional Assemblies were opened on 1998 consisting of 2/3 local government representatives as the second leg of troika following agencies. Assemblies opened in 8 regions except London considered same regional borders as their activity areas with agencies. The main purpose of opening assemblies was to closely monitor success and activities of regional development agencies and audit sensitivity of agencies regarding regional benefits / claims observation. Assemblies were entitled to reject budget plans of agencies. Additionally, duty of Regional Assemblies was to defend regional interests, pioneering preparation of regional housing and spatial sustainable development strategies and coordinating regional strategies. Assemblies did not have an official control power regarding regional economic planning and development issue

but they may affect realization form of the policy with owned tools. Many members of assemblies were selected persons working in local administrations. Assemblies had the right of attendance as an attendant during determination of economic strategies (Roberts, 2000). In 2002, Regional Assemblies were strengthened with the official document published with the name “Your region, your choice: revitalising the English regions”. Assemblies had the responsibility to directly monitor its own development agency and economic development of their regions. In a sense, they had the duty of guiding other regional structures. Agency activities were being reported to Regional Unions.

Third leg of the troika maintaining the regional management was “Government Offices”. New duties were given to “Government Offices” (first established in 1994) in order to work with Regional Assemblies and Regional Development Agencies. “Applying program of central government in a coordinated way, pioneering in regional governance and increasing the regional economic performance” duties were added to Government Offices whose first foundation purpose was “managing and coordinating national policies at regional and local level”. Thanks to Government Offices, Central Government aimed to show its availability in regions. It was envisaged that the troika created with Government Offices, Regional Assemblies and Regional Development Agencies will work in harmony and maintain integration with European Union (Pearce, 2008: 97).

Main actor of the regional government was development agencies. Development agencies were established for coordinating regional economic development and transformation, increasing competitiveness of UK regions, and eliminating in-region/inter-regions imbalance. Purposes of agencies were listed as below in the law:

- Ensuring economic development and transformation
- Supporting business effectiveness, investment and competitiveness
- Increasing employment, decreasing unemployment.
- Developing occupations providing employment, and increasing occupational abilities of the work force
- Contributing the sustainable development in UK

As it can be seen, main purpose of agencies was economic development but also having purposes such as reducing sustainable development and social exclusion. Agencies were assigned for performing below given functions at first stage:

- Formulating regional strategies according to purposes
- Maintaining regional economic development and transformation
- Carrying the regional competitiveness to a better point

- Pioneering in attracting new physical investments to region and occupational education of the work force
- Preparing an “Occupational Ability Action Plan” describing how to provide occupational educations required by the work force market.

However, more responsibilities were given to agencies in time (managing infrastructure investment in less-developed regions, activating production capacity of regions, increasing regional effectiveness and performance, developing socio-economic policies for rural areas, providing support to tourism businesses, etc.) (Pearce, 2008: 103).

Agencies determined their own regional strategies within one year as the first duty following their establishment. Regional economic strategies to be determined by Agencies must comply with the “Regional Sustainable Development Framework” published by the central government. This framework also had the aim of maintaining an effective environment protection while realizing a strong growth. Determined strategies were rapidly approved by the Central Government. Meanwhile, quantitative indicator set was prepared for measuring activity performance of development agencies and economic development performance of regions (Allen, 2002).

Activity performance of development agencies were measured through below given quantitative indicators under the name of “Impact Evaluation Framework”:

- Number of created reliable and new works
- Size of lands opened for use while it was idle (ha)
- Number of businesses newly opened or recovered from bankruptcy
- Percentage rate of medium and large scaled businesses perceived by people as investor
- Amount of private sector capital attracted to the region (£s)

Economic development performance of regions was measured through below given quantitative indicators under the name of “Independent Performance Assessment”:

- Gross domestic product per head
- Rate of persons having over-average life conditions within the population
- Plus value from production activities
- Number of new opened and closed businesses
- Percentage of high school and university graduates within the total population
- Percentage of employers suffering from lack of qualified personnel
- Percentage of attendants to occupational training courses within last 13 weeks
- Unemployment rate within the region
- Number of new houses produced in transformation areas

3 groups of qualitative performance indicators were added later to these quantitative indicators. First group indicators were created for monitoring compliance of agency activities with national targets, second group indicators for monitoring measurable upper-level regional outputs complying with national targets and third groups for understanding whether agencies realize their targets (Glasson & Marshall, 2007: 160).

Regional Development Agencies were also entitled to benefit from various programs and funds for reaching their targets. Used programs and funds may be gathered in three categories in general. These categories are “transformation”, “business competition” and “occupational ability acquisition”. Agencies benefit from “Single Regeneration Budget”, “Rural Development Program” and “Land and Property Programs” under title of transformation. Transformation programs had the largest share in budgets of agencies. “Regional Innovation Fund” and “Regional Venture Capital Fund” were available within business competition category. Programs and funds used in the occupational ability acquisition category were “Skills Development Fund”, “Regional Selective Assistance”, “Inward Investment” and “Regional Supply Office”.

Agencies acted as a locomotive within 12 years of period and combined and organized regional organizations and actors around the common mind and interests. They created a synergy through mobilizing everyone and everything for regional economic development. Agencies were in an intense interaction with local actors and maintained trust between these actors for finalizing certain works at regional level and reaching certain results (Cumbers & MacKinnon, 2011). Agencies were holding technical specialty. Therefore, they were able to develop cost saving, evidence based but highly-profitable programs and projects. Agencies gathered too much information for closely knowing their regions. They transferred these information, determination and findings to leading organizations and actors of their regions because strategies revealed via consensus based on common mind would be determined with that way (England’s Regional Development Agencies, 2015). Working style of agencies was depending on rationality, science and a strategic thought. “Regional benefit” was prioritized in principle instead of “individual interests”. That situation necessitated actors and organizations to destroy their advantageous positions in their regions and claim what is good and beneficial for their regions instead of good and beneficial for themselves. UK regions had long term structural and spatial problems. Particularly, transformation of less-developed areas was a difficult work. Realization of a sustainable and smart growth was requested in the region through agencies. That means growth with investments having high value, profitable but low in harmful impact (Haughton & Counsell, 2004: 171). Agencies took their places in every work for maintaining such a growth (particularly urban transformation, new business foundation attempts, regional competition, attracting investments to the region, training the work force required by the regional work force market) as a strategic key shareholder (Prisk, 2012). Agencies maintained more discussions and

negotiations on rural policies in the country. Regional governance ensured better understanding of the difference between rural and urban areas. Requests of rural lobby were listened. Therefore, the richness in urban areas was shifted to rural areas at a certain amount (Eaton, 2000). It was seen that different groups were available in the country defending rural integration and rural differentiation (Ward, Lowe & Bridges, 2003).

Agencies increased their capacities and specialties in years. They performed their own researches and generated required information within themselves or through purchasing external services. This ability provided agencies the change to clarify required issues, define their priorities and see reflections of decisions taken. Namely, agencies proceeded by making self-assessments and learning. They learned functioning aspects through experiencing. Agencies succeeded in combining short and long term visions and acquisitions. Capacity development, partnership establishment, understanding issues in the region and taking required steps were really difficult issues. Secret of this success was the thought that agencies will always sustain in the future and have the budget enough for realizing whatever they want. They cannot attempt other types of long term works.

Planning policies were most affected from agency activities. While the traditional planning was functioning on “balance and swap” logic, spatial planning was functioning on “earn-earn-earn” logic. This logic was depending on simultaneous realization of economic development, environment protection and sustainable development. While the traditional planning was depending on “predict and provide” logic, spatial planning was using the “plan, monitor, manage” logic (Counsell & Haughton, 2003: 15-19). In this regard, spatial planning was precluding the notion of “tendency planning”. In the new situation, planning system ceased to be a structure struggling for acquiring small public budgets. Public budget was recovered by agencies. Public had the chance to benefit from finance and other sources of the private sector. Public-private sector harmony and cooperation were strengthened. Private sector had started to display solidarity inside itself (Dimitriou & Thompson, 2007: 86). Economic development policy was integrated. Central government’s policy tools and applications were transferred into a lower scale (Roberts, 2007: 123). An economic management understanding effective at regional level was selected. Agencies worked with the principle of “market focused economic development”. Business people were dominant in agency administrations, therefore a commercial logic was prevented in agency administrations (Glasson & Marshall, 2007: 283). Most important success of agencies was to keep financial promises given. Cultural and artistic sectors of cities and regions were added to the economy through new regional governance understanding (Benneworth & Vigar, 2007). Agency personnel worked in a real harmony with regional actors. When agencies were closed on June 2010, administration costs of agencies were corresponding only 8% of total revenues. Agencies produced 3300 pounds benefit for every 1000

pounds expense. If not-easily calculated other side revenues are added, it can be said that agencies reached the economic development target at a certain level (Morse, 2010).

Regional development agencies, as the symbol of New Labour Party, represented a “competitive and cooperative regionalism” (Haughton & Counsell, 2004: 171). According to Danson et al. (1998: 13-25), regional development agencies are samples for bottom-up approaches. Namely, the government was shifted to regional and local levels instead of centre via agencies. Also, a transition is in question from “managerialism” to “entrepreneurialism”. Regionalism was assessed as a part of multi-scaled state organization in UK. Establishment of regional development agencies in the country brought a multi layer governance understanding containing more fluid borders and less hierarchical. Agencies combined experts from all sectors, regional elites and activists in the decision making process and service distribution was started to be performed based on regional priorities (Healey, 2006)(Sanford, 2006: 221-38). Regional development agencies, entering into country’s agenda on 1997, became a “glue institution” combining all institutions active in their regions regarding regional, spatial strategy development and implementation.

CLOSING REASON, PROBLEMS CAUSED AND UNSUCCESSFUL POINTS OF DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES

13 years ruling of Labour Party was ended with elections made on May 2010 in UK. Following elections, the New Coalition Government established between the Conservative Party and Liberal Democrat Party urgently decided to close Regional Development Agencies on June 2010 as the first work. Agencies were officially terminated on 1 July 2012. Immovable of agencies are transferred to “Homes and Communities Agency”. It seems that changing the government understanding with the ruling are main actors for closing agencies. There are many other factors those were indicated as reason for closing agencies. This section briefly defines these different reasons.

One reason for the closure of the Agency is to support the introduction of new regional governmental systems in countries of the British public. People perceived the new regional government system as undemocratic and very centralized. In fact, the new Labour government came to power in 1997, the goal was to create a regional government from directly elected. New regional government system in the Government Offices, Regional Associations and Regional Development Agencies to be governed democratically directly elected by people. However, the Government failed to provide it immediately. Seating systems and boards of regional institutions to start working in the first place "elected local authorities" and "directly appointed bureaucrats" were created through. The government held a referendum on direct failure occurs in the north-eastern region of the chosen people of the management of the Regional Association in 2004 to

form the transition to the regional government wants to build new. This is 78% of the people in a referendum "no" vote was used. This result meant that they did not want the transition of regional government of people. The referendum was revealed by the public acceptance of the new regional government style (Harrison, 2007: 311-32). Considering that majority of the people in a referendum with a dummy democratic functioning of the regional government "no" vote was used. Despite the democratic image of the Central Government of the People empowered to give the final decision on the new regional system it was aware that wants to retain. The central government certain powers and responsibilities that may be exactly what the result of the transfer of the regional development agencies did not fully finished. If that cannot be coordinated on a control agencies fear that had emerged in many actions (John & Musson & Tickell, 2008). This concern has really gone towards centralization with more, not unlike the right to decentralization of state administration in this period. 90% of public expenditure in the new regional system was switched to a central government control. It can be said that the scope, followed by regionalism policy after 1997, resulted in an increase of the power on all child-sized institutions of the central government (Musson & Tickell & John, 2006). They worked like the long arm of central government agencies in the local area (Prisk, 2012). The central government regional administration rather than make their own decisions at the point of release itself assuming very important role regional authorities were forced to act in accordance with national policies and strategies (Jeffery & Wincott, 2006: 3-18). Regional governance in this period turned into a complex bargaining process. Actions were directed as devoid of political coordination by different government departments (Deas & Lord, 2006: 1847-77). People were open to regional governmental efforts cannot be successful without the support of the UK (Rallings & Thrasher, 2005). However, despite the public the government did not cease to maintain the new regional management approach. After the referendum, it was taken to democratize the efforts of the regional government suspended. Democratic legitimacy is weak, that is not the responsibility to the public account, the decision to continue with the non-regional institutions were questioned by the public.

Another reason of closing agencies is the global economic crisis experienced in 2008 and therefore economic problems suffered by the country (Prisk, 2012) because UK economy was very negatively affected from this crisis. Crisis reduced the growth of country economy and increased unemployment. The crisis environment shaped by the new economic conjuncture and danger signals in the national economy that the budget deficit in the country, mandated the transition to a new economic approach. As an important point in front of the Agency guide or limit the use of financial resources by governments was there. So, the Agency acted without unlimited financial resources and adequate analysis by the state in their hands as they used the money (Dimitriou & Thompson, 2007: 86).

Regional development agencies was to keep “the concepts of interregional equality and diversity” at the top of their agenda whereas the crisis environment required to place “regional economic development and prosperity” concepts into the centre of the agenda (McCann, 2007). Amid the economic crisis, the new Prime Minister, David Cameron, but the economic benefits to the state of development agencies, institutions that are regarded as the cost which is a lot less. Only three of the agencies that use the total annual budget “the budget of the Ministry of communities and local government passed (Pearce, 2008: 103).

Another reason for closing agencies is not being easily manageable agencies any more. Agencies became obliged to continuously request more money from treasury during their active period because powers and responsibilities of agencies increased every year. Therefore, used budget has increased every year. Agencies were obliged to realize too many purposes together (work force education, new business foundation, innovativeness, immovable development, sustainable and low carbon economy, etc.) (Politics, 2015). It seems that the central government and local governments were removed and entire management load was given to agencies. Agencies’ having an exaggerated work load and responsibility, namely everyone’s having high expectations from agencies made agencies impossible to get managed easily Money in the hands of the Agency to invest in things that will give the maximum economic benefit of the market to adapt to and to benefit from the economic opportunities that in the middle of the European Union were asked at the same time achieving their aims for territorial. Agencies, regional and national economic goals by neglecting the demands and needs to develop appropriate policies were forced to they gave top priority to national economic goals. So, in the period in which the Agency “the benefit of the regional community” the view “in public (government) the benefit of” is given. The point is that regional planning had exerted pressure on the central government to their requests (Eaton, 2000). Expected a lot from regional governance, but facts did not allow this very thing to do and amenities.

Governmental problems, as well as the conflicts that arise between the institutions of the state over time also were one of the factors effective in the closure of the Agency. Agencies before you closed the picture division, and confusion because the picture was clogging the roles of corporate agencies, the role of local governments and other state institutions was in conflict with. Not alone the administration to hand over the government to the local governments at the regional level more collaborative and institutional ways to run things he wanted. In fact, the introduction of the Agency, together with the powers of local governments because local governments had to be reduced or elimination, while there are the same roles that is connected to another unit that holds the presence of the central government it would be dangerous and harmful, but the government could eliminate the problem of conflict of jurisdiction specified (Eaton, 2000). Naturally, regional planning and governmental processes fair, effective and did

not produce a balanced result (Glasson & Marshall, 2007: 250). As another important point, the traditional institutions in land use planning according to the UK government system was formed. The government wanted to move to a new zoning planning approach to the understanding of regionalism, but the built-in traditional institutions, was forced to adapt to the new regional approach. For example, the government offices, you can't worry about surpassing the limits of old-fashioned (over the border) and continued to think. So, between the old and the new institutions of the state “does my issue” appeared. Most of the time regarded as a blessing, the British within the state, institutional thickness, and resistance to change and innovation has turned into a mechanism of a barrier (Hall, 2007: 25).

Agencies were subjected to critics regarding being unsuccessful in few issues during and after their active periods. At the beginning of this topic “protection and lack of growth” subject. Agencies wanted to make environmental protection and provide economic development together (Rydin & Thornley, 2001). However, in practice, the result is the desired way it didn't happen. Agencies as the most important value in regional planning and management “economic competitiveness” were adopted. The Agency in the period of “long-term environmental sustainability, social justice and democratic decision-making” issues were largely ignored (Glasson & Marshall, 2007: 250). Again, Unified monitoring across agencies were asked to consider regional planning and economic policy. However, this approach resulted in a further deepening of the functional distinction between economic development and physical planning (Regional Planning agencies regional planning Bodies) is not closed with the Agency and continued its activities. The existence of these institutions focus on the issue of the Agency of economic development caused (Haughton & Counsell, 2004: 171). The agencies have developed numerous strategies on regional politics very well, but did not implement many of these strategies (Glasson, 2002: 283). The Agency's contribution to sustainable development was very limited.

Agencies were generally functioned as a bridge between national and local claims. Both parties had the chance to exchange their opinions through agencies. It was an advantage not to have too much agencies. Ministers and government representatives were able to meet easily with agencies. However, Regional interests and demands of the Agency-thinks-axis at every point, the differences of opinion between central government and agency managers emerged. Established the Secretariat of the National Agency, to discuss their conflicts and negotiate disagreements and has functioned as a good forum for these. The same regional boundaries authorized in 3 different institutions because the central government was forwarded to the regional claims 3 through different channels. Over time, the regional institutions of the regional states in different ways from each other they transferred to the centre. This situation gave birth to the regional polyphony.

During active period of Agencies, the country system consisting of cities was tried to be transformed into a system consisting of regions but it was not easy to consider the country through regions (Eaton, 2000) because no actual region was available in UK ever. Regions were created by considering administrative borders (Glasson & Marshall, 2007: 19). Cities within regions did not have too many common points, therefore a regional identity cannot be mentioned. Instead of people to embrace their own cities, their own territory, were forced to belong to him (Eaton, 2000). Regional actors also have the skills and technical expertise in carrying out specific management and planning when they should be employees of the Agency in general, this lacked the technical expertise and skills (Glasson & Marshall, 2007: 283). According to some agencies, it was unnecessary and expensive bureaucratic layer. Moreover, the blocking of the private sector (Wilson et al., 2012). Agencies tried to maximize the growth and competitiveness of each area. However, each region develop itself in trying to develop interregional cooperation and national development could not be provided as requested in the direction of the subject that will have neglected (Dimitriou & Thompson, 2007: 75). The regions between the central government coordination frameworks and integrated regional strategies, Regional Funding Allocations has worked to provide regional sustainable development framework and using the tools. But these tools, policy-making, to resolve conflicts that arise when making resource deployment decisions and service was not enough. Decision of the central government remained the responsibility of the application was shared between national institutions and local governments. This shaping regional policy and the region's resources and services that meet the needs of regional actors was unable to do the transfer. Great Britain, with a vision to the future a national non-to the state of the country fell (John et al., 2008: 126). Its contribution to the national economy, the Agency clearly could not be understood. According to some, there was a distinction between power and resources in the Agency. This situation caused degradation of the capacity of the agencies. Only certain agencies are turning into institutions that were transformed into certain actions, and always work with partners (Crouch, 2011: 301).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

There are many lessons to be taken regarding public administration, spatial planning and economy management and also organizational structure and functioning from UK's experience of regional development agency. Regional Development Agencies laid claim to their regions, keeping the leadership of the region, providing communication between actors in the region that encourage collaboration, moving with an open - net strategy, executing policy-making and practising tasks together. Actually these are the basic features of an institution that wants to display a dynamic management and get good results today. Experience has shown that if "decision-making, policy - strategy development, practice, and accountability" are collected within a single institution, the institution becomes very strong and efficient. Sharing of these

powers and obligations among different institutional structures reduces corporate efficiency and performance. For gaining a democratic legitimacy of a public institution which is similar to regional development agencies, its Board of Directors has to be elected directly in full democratic ways.

Agencies were considered as successful and unsuccessful for certain aspects as mentioned in previous sections. The failure of an institution that element from being precipitated and manageable agencies, the agencies workload and responsibility has been too much for them to handle alone. If the workload of the agency or agencies with duties and responsibilities for less with the same characteristics was taken more and more share between agencies, if the agencies work better with better performance and no doubt a sign that they were giving the best results. Agencies became very dynamic institutions which take quick decisions and implement fast, that can take precautions against sudden economic shocks and that do not miss the opportunities in front of it. Of the most important qualities that it provides a semi-independent institution, have their own budget, and public and private sector actors at the same time, in-house, the region owner, and initiative to be a leading institution. Again, the most important feature which they should put in the successful work of the agency was to take the risk. In this way, successful businesses, high-quality transformation projects and large-scale investments were signed. Therefore, the institutional structure and functioning of the Agency in accordance with today's conditions really innovative and contain elements that teach by example. However, the Agency, the economy and hence the setup was designed according to the period of the rise of the economic crisis when faced with the economic return from the time of receiving the level and the duration of the account depending on the extent of non, began to falter in the administrative sense. For this reason, the institutional structure of the structure while creating similar agencies in times of crisis in a time of prosperity and how to separate the subject from the beginning, detailed models can exhibit behaviour that should be considered.

Regional development agencies showed everyone that having different purposes provide important advantages and previously ignored purposes can be realized (for instance, innovativeness, sectoral development, business support, domestic investment, occupational ability trainings, low carbon economy, social change and transformation, rural development, resistance against economic shocks, e-state applications, etc.). Maintaining economic development and transformation, supporting business efficiency, investments and competitiveness were main duty of agencies and agencies realized these main duties at a considerable aspect. However, they had difficulties in focusing on other side duties (increasing the employment, reducing unemployment, developing occupational abilities of work force, maintaining sustainable development, etc.). That means, it was a mistake to give so much duties

to agencies and expect more than they can provide. Within this scope, main duty should be given to an institution very carefully and other duties should be reduced as much as possible.

Located between the objectives of the Agency, develop professional skills, spatial development, the transformation of a community or social purposes such as topics under these headings are very general and in practice may be too much. Due to the broad objectives, which agencies, with what lies ahead right exactly what to expect. In this context, a main target can be said for an institution that was drawn when this is what practical target details, which include what type of jobs should be calculated well with encountered. Exactly as the subject of the issue of corporate goal setting and national target setting is an issue that requires thinking very carefully about the details to the account. The UK National as a goal for itself has set the target of eliminating the imbalance between regions. However, this is the national target under normal conditions, which are not very easy to be performed and especially in times of economic crisis, coverage, benefits and results proved exactly an unpredictable target. In the example of Great Britain also showed that does not support designated regional targets national targets. At the same time, each agency has its own development of the target region is loaded. Development Agency for each region with speeds close to each other development disparities between regions existing at the end of the 12-year period was preserved in largely the same way. Compliance with national targets, regional targets, however, the English regions it would be possible to apply affirmative action to backward.

One of the most important lessons given by Agencies experience is the requirement that taking “public management, spatial planning and economy management” issues into consideration together. Agencies wanted to combine these inter-connected issues but they did not succeeded. If these issues were successfully realized under a single organizational structure, it is sure that regional efficiency would increase more, inter-organizations conflicts would decrease and works would continue more easily. At this point an internal connection with each other to handle one of the jobs that it will produce useful results, it is understood. But everything is interconnected than ever before as the result of a healthy research of affairs that must be implemented must be determined. This three-successfully merged under the umbrella of the Agency of the subject that can't be the reason the role of the Agency, other agencies of the central government the roles of intersection with each other. For example, domestic investment, exports, vocational skills, tourism and innovation on topics such as role conflict appeared in the obvious way. How regional coordination among the members of the troika will act in assuming that “who is the leader? Who will follow? Who said?” questions led to the weakness of complexity and management. Unable to make independent decisions from central government agencies in the region to give priority to the needs and demands of indigenous peoples. At this point in the planning and governmental processes within the framework of a national future vision of the

leadership of the central government are the issues that necessarily want to do. In the example of Great Britain, about exactly in the direction which the central government clearly wants to progress from the beginning to the agencies that did not report. The agencies from the start in the direction you want to go to the central government if he had known of their decisions in accordance with national objectives and targets within a natural process spontaneously. The direct involvement of the central institutions with a direct impact on the decisions of the agency or guiding you work, to work in free Agency, and the original made it difficult to produce decisions, and negative outcomes.

Agencies considered the secret of regional success as the cooperation between stakeholders. However, institutions and actors selected by agencies as stakeholders and tried to have relations became subjects of discussions. Agencies became obliged to discriminate various organizations and actors those may be very beneficial for them and accused of always working with same institutions and actors. There was a certain distance between particularly agencies and local administrations. Therefore, over time, they were faded to the support of local governments and regional governments. The relationship with other ministries and agencies of the central government was different. The agency can help give a lot of support to some ministries, while some people have experienced too much conflict. The problem of coordination between ministries and agencies, some of which overlaps the task was higher. Here will be without the problems of institutional and human relations management and in the planning process are understood. So, to repair or improve institutional and human relationships from becoming problematic or weakened in the process “reconciliation mechanisms” approach would be to develop a wise situation.

Agencies experience also indicated that human factor as well as systems, conditions and projects have a considerable role in success of an institution and relations established with other organizations and actors. Smart, decent, faithful, prudent, successful in human relations people management of his agency managed to do a great job with a minimal budget. Human factors some agencies more than others helped to get effective and efficient results. However, the Agency bureaucrats on the boards of Directors of public and private sector representatives to take place with public-private partnerships a serious advantage in the proliferation of point created. The leaders and representatives of cities didn't include enough of Agency management. This had a weakness, and revealed a democratic deficit in the management of the new agency. A dialog between agencies have been established with UK experience in general private businesses execute their work in dealing with multiple institutions instead of a single active institution because it has the chance to. However, managers of large private enterprises small private enterprises were unable to establish a relationship with the managers of the Agency. The Board of Directors of the Agency in the work of these people by focusing on people with the right

qualifications to come together and to be able to enter into communication with everyone without discrimination emerges as a vital issue.

It is seen in the UK experience that financial freedom gave a considerable self-confidence and reputation to an institution. Agencies were holding a very large budget. Therefore, they were able to initiate large scaled ventures freely serving to their own purposes. The possession of the agencies of capital power wants to conversely, a sudden gave you the power to rapidly import and evaluation opportunities. Material power, government agencies, the private sector and local governments in the eyes of the reputation has increased. Small fragmented institutional structure for agencies within their own budgets, funds search - they're not to worry about finding. So they saved time.

Agencies considered common mind, interests, science and specialty in their decisions and preferred to remain objective. This objective attitude prevented the local people to own the regional government. Given decisions were not decisions expected and requested by the local people. Agencies that do not require the expertise of local-scale on issues is not a very satisfactory decision. In line with this, decisions that directly concern them of themselves to give people a more accurate approach are understood. Specifically, the physical and social transformation, the demands of indigenous peoples in the forefront of planning and housing decisions, the agencies of the direct and integrated process of similar authority as the decision is not only healthy, it is important to transform institutions that enables you to move that matters. Agencies not required for rationality at the local level could be moved emotionally in sight if they could look after the public interest instead of the interests of the small community and if they could take instinctive decisions, more helpful and more people-pleasing results could have been obtained.

Agencies were regional scaled institutions derived as a response to the question of correct scale to maintain local economic development. UK's experience actually indicated that the question does not have a single response. Which stakeholders can come together with the desire to launch a particular initiative can move and scale the best, most accurate scale is that because it is understood that regional identity is strong in areas where development tends to occur and the stakeholders are very much in the spirit of the enthusiasm is increasing. It was seen that large-scale projects, the realization of small-scale solidarity and coming together is possible. Transportation, access to capital, economic shocks, innovation, the low carbon economy there is a need for studies on such topics as social topics such as community development and urban renewal on small-scale studies are very much needed. Investment, business support, sector development, vocational skills issues such as sometimes local, sometimes requires efforts on a regional scale. That they can act together the stakeholders that can be said in this case the largest scale, the most accurate scale for the study of. At this point the London Development Agency,

the regional development agencies must be separate from the original experience in terms of the other. The presence of London as a global city's own development agencies, to achieve the city's strategic goals, capacity to develop and gave a big advantage to be better managed. Behind this success, London's having an identity of its own, to London and the region stakeholders to come together to create a mood by adopting the lies. Therefore, the development of regional identity regional identity of weak fields' strong fields according to the development can be said to be faster and more comfortable. He couldn't in itself a whole of development agencies in this direction, an identity that does not produce a more accurate approach would be to establish in the areas. In these locations before embarking on Economic and social development efforts, regional efforts to create a spirit and unity should be initiated.

It is seen in the UK sample that different agencies may come together regarding “transportation, innovativeness, private sector investment, energy and marketing” issues and various common decisions can be taken over borders. Also, different regional agencies provided “over-borders cooperation” regarding research and information gathering. Different agencies also came together for reaching the Government and transferred their claims in a stronger way through joint solidarity. However, the housing, employment clustering and the same in matters of cross-border cooperation was exhibited. Because of these issues were issues that need to be considered at more local levels; preference and needs at the local level was very different, and this cross-border was hard about making this kind of thinking. Thinking about everything that can be said that exceed the limits then, not only has its share of certain issues. Cross-border to come together there must be a common cause of that will require current and must provide a public benefit by bringing them together.

In time, Agencies developed a certain system regarding defining, selecting, developing, assessing and applying projects provided to them. Agencies continuously measured their activities and their success levels through certain indicators. It is obvious that, these measurements provide many benefits for giving strategic decisions. However, in the set of indicators that have to be marked, however complicated, unnecessary, time-consuming and there were indications that cause costs. Moreover, this self-evaluation after a period, the agencies began to take a lot of time. The Agency works is that energy, resources and time-consuming endeavour turned into; the late principal's work to be done. What matters in this context which focuses on the choice of performance indicators and self-evaluation form that can be filled simply it can be argued that it should be in the properties.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST NOTIFICATION

The author whose name is listed immediately above certify that he has NO affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest (such as honoraria; educational grants; participation in speakers' bureaus; membership, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, or other equity interest; and expert testimony or patent-licensing arrangements), or non-financial interest (such as personal or professional relationships, affiliations, knowledge or beliefs) in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

REFERENCES

Allen, G. "*Regional Development Agencies (RDAs)*". Economic Policy and Statistics Section. 22 August 2002. Research Paper 02/50. House of Commons Library.

Benneworth, P. and Dabinett, G. "English devolution and regional development: your region, your choice", *Local Work*, 46, 2001.

Benneworth, P.S. and Vigar, G. *Strategic and regional planning in the North East*. Dimitriou H. and Thompson, R. (eds) *Strategic Planning for Regional Development in the UK*, Routledge, Oxon 2007.

Breheny, M. *The scope of regional planning*. RGS-IBG Conference, Glasgow, January 1996.

Brenner, N. "Metropolitan institutional reform and the rescaling of state space in contemporary Western Europe", *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 10, 2003, p. 297-324.

Caborn, R. 2000. Introduction. In *Towards a new regional policy*, E.Balls and J.Healy (eds). London: Smith Institute.

Cooke, P. and Morgan, K.. *The associational economy: firms, regions and innovation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998.

Counsell, D., Haughton, G.F., Allmendinger, P. and Vigar, G. "New directions in UK strategic planning: from development plans to spatial development strategies", *Town and Country Planning*, 72, 2003, p.15-19.

Crouch, C. *Competitive cities and problems of democracy*. Pike, A., Rodriguez-Pose, A. and Tomaney, J. (eds). *Handbook of Local and Regional Development*, Routledge, p.301, Oxon 2011.

Crouch, C. *Post-Democracy*, Polity, Cambridge 2004.

Cumbers, A. and MacKinnon, D. *Putting the political back into the region: power, agency and a reconstituted regional political economy*. Pike, A., Rodriguez-Pose, A. and Tomaney, J. (eds). *Handbook of Local and Regional Development*. Routledge, Oxon 2011.

Danson, M., Halkier, H., and Damborg, C. *Regional Development Agencies in Europe: An Introduction and Framework for Analysis*. Halkier, H., Danson, M. and Damborg, C. (Ed.), *Regional Development Agencies in Europe*. Regional Policy and Development Series No. 21, Jessica Kingsley Publishers, p.13-25, London 1998.

Deas, I. and Lord, A. "From a new regionalism to an unusual regionalism? The emergence of non-standard regional spaces and lessons for the territorial reorganisation of the state", *Urban Studies*, 43, 2006, p.1847-77.

Dimitriou, H. and Thompson, R. *Strategic thought and regional planning: the importance of context*. Dimitriou H. and Thompson, R. (eds) *Strategic Planning for Regional Development in the UK*. Routledge, Oxon 2007, p.86.

Eaton, M. *Regional Development Agencies*, Local Government Association, July 2010.

England's Regional Development Agencies. What we do. <http://archive.is/RhVSZ> (13.10.2015).

Fairclough, N. *New Labour, New Language*, Routledge, London 2000.

Glasson, J. *Some interim conclusions*. T.Marshall, J.Glasson and P.Headicar (eds). *Contemporary issues in regional planning*, p. 261. Ashgate, Aldershot 2002.

Glasson, J. and Marshall, T. *Regional Planning*, Routledge, Oxfordshire 2007, p.90.

Hall, P. *Evolution of strategic planning and regional development*. Dimitriou H. and Thompson, R. (eds) *Strategic Planning for Regional Development in the UK*. Routledge, p.25, Oxon 2007.

Harrison, J. "From competitive regions to competitive city-regions: a new orthodoxy, but some old mistakes", *Journal of Economic Geography*, 7, 2007, p.311-32.

Houghton, G. and Counsell, D. *Regions, Spatial Strategies and Sustainable Development*. Routledge, London 2004, p.171.

Healey, J. *Speech by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury at the Core Cities Summit*, HM Treasury, Bristol, London, 27 June 2006.

Herschel, T. and Newman, P. *Governance of Europe's City-Regions: Planning, Policy and Politics*, Routledge, London, 2002.

Politics. Regional Development Agencies, October 2015.

<http://www.politics.co.uk/reference/regional-development-agencies> (10.10.2015).

Jeffery, C. and Wincott, D. "Devolution in the United Kingdom: statehood and citizenship in transition", *Publius*, 36, 2006, p.3-18.

John, P., Musson, S. and Tickell, A. *Co-ordinating governance in the South-East mega-region: towards joined-up thinking?*, Bradbury, J. (editor) *Devolution, Regionalism and Regional Development: the UK experience*, Routledge, p.117-129, Abingdon 2008.

Mawson, J. "New Labour and the English regions: a missed opportunity?", *Local Economy*, November 1997, p.194-203.

McCann, P. "Observational Equivalence? Regional Studies and Regional Science", *Regional Studies*, 41, 9, 2007, p.1209-1222.

Morse, A. "Review of the UK's Competition Landscape". *National Audit Office Report*, 18 March 2010.

Musson, S., Tickell, A. and John, F. "Government, governance and decentralisation", Tewdwr-Jones, M. and Allmendinger, P. (eds.) *Territory, Identity and Spatial Planning*, Routledge, Abingdon 2006.

Pearce, G. *Institutional capacity in the English regions*. Bradbury, J. (editor) *Devolution, Regionalism and Regional Development: the UK experience*, Routledge, Abingdon 2008, p.97-116.

Prisk, M. *Closing the RDAs: Lessons from the RDA transition and closure programme*. Department of Business, Innovation and Skills, July 2012.

Rallings, C. and Thrasher, M. *Why the North East said "No": The 2004 Referendum on an Elected Regional Assembly*, ESRC Devolution and Constitutional Change Programme, Briefing No.19, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh 2005.

Roberts, P. *Regional economic planning and development: policies and spatial implications*. Dimitriou H. and Thompson, R. (eds) *Strategic Planning for Regional Development in the UK*. Routledge, Oxon 2007, p.123.

Roberts, P. *The new territorial governance*, Town and Country Planning Association, London 2000.

Rydin, Y. and Thornley, A. *An Agenda for the New Millennium*, Y.Rydin and A.Thornley (eds) *Planning in the UK: Agendas for the New Millennium*, Ashgate, Aldershot 2001.

Sanford, M. "Civic engagement in the English regions: neo-corporatism, networks, new forms of governance", *Regional and Federal Studies*, 16, 2006, p.221-38.

Tewdwr-Jones, M. and Allmendinger, P. *Regional institutions, governance and the planning system*. Dimitriou H. and Thompson, R. (eds) *Strategic Planning for Regional Development in the UK*. Routledge, Oxon 2007, p.33.

Tewdwr-Jones, M. and N.A.Phelps. "Levelling the uneven playing field: inward investment, inter-regional rivalry and the planning system", *Regional Studies*, 34, 5, 2000.

Ward, N., Lowe, P. and Bridges, T. "Rural and Regional Development: The Role of the Regional Development Agencies in England", *Regional Studies*, 37, 2, 2003, p.201-214, DOI: 10.1080/0034340022000057479

Wilson, N., Clacher, I., Veronesi, G. and Altanlar, A. *An analysis of UK Regional Development Agency Support on Company Performance: evidence from Yorkshire and the Regions*. Leeds University Business School, 2012.