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Why Metropolitan Areas?

Functional urban areas

- National level
- Regional/provincial level
- Local/municipal
Looking for models and tools:

There is no «one size fits all»
**Metropolitan areas**

*spatial development challenges*

- Strategic locations, urban sprawl, jobs and housing, connected suburbs, regional infrastructures,
- amenities, mobility, environment, local government finance, actors’ involvement

**Governance of spatial planning**

- Strategic planning
- Statutory planning
- Collaborative planning

**Sustainable metropolitan development**
Definitions: FUA or MDA?

Core City admin.

**MUA** = Dense urban space

**FUA** = Travel-to-work

**MDA** = Adapting objective reality to territorial politics
Local voters are not often persuaded by better collaboration with the neighbours.
Two (SPIMA) typologies for understanding spatial planning approaches

### Physical scalars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population density (pers/km²)</th>
<th>Size (km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000-7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Number of municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-formal</td>
<td>Semi-formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mutual trust takes a long time to build. It can also be destroyed quite fast.
Policy tools – adaptation to context

**Knowledge:**
Definition, analysis, shared knowledge, challenges

**Policy:**
Challenges, formalisation, success-factors, triggers and incentives

**Administrative conditionality:**
Capacity, governance structure, involve stakeholders
Case studies – Central Eastern Europe

**Brno** – Czech Republic

Metropolitan area:
- 620,000 inhabitants
- 166 municipalities
- 1755 km²

13 % of the land is urbanised, the rest is forest and farmland.

Seeking to accommodate and encourage growth without urban sprawl.

Using ITI funding from EU.
Brno focuses on mobility, land protection and preventing urban sprawl

Opportunities:
Use of ITI funding under Cohesion Programme, supported by Czech government
National investments (infrastructure)
Innovative industry

Challenges:
High level of fragmentation
Regional level (S Moravia) too large
Legacy of former socialist period and 1990’s (incl. land restitution, local government finance)
Brno MA

Defining the spatial scale of the MA

Building administrative capacity and expert-based knowledge

Assessing spatial dynamics and trends

Ensuring success factors, incentives and triggers

Defining the status of the MA

Involving relevant actors

Identifying key challenges

Selecting governance model and institutional structure
Other examples:

Czech and Polish cities
Timisoara
Case studies – Cross-border

Lille - France

Metropolitan area:
- 3.9 mill inhabitants
- 682 municipalities
- 7516 km²

22 % of the land is urbanised, and 65% is high-grade arable farming.

Seeking to consolidate the metropolitan area as a key crossing between capital cities, encouraging growth without urban sprawl

Planning within a strong legal framework
Lille focuses on strengthening a fragmented region without sprawl

Opportunities:
Strong national framework for metropolitan areas and strategic planning – SCoT & SRADDET
Geostrategic position between major capitals – innovation centre

Challenges:
High level of fragmentation, including 2 federal states in Belgium
Regional levels too large and mismatch
Former industrial strength has been reduced, with socio-economic problems
Lille MA

Defining the spatial scale of the MA

Assessing spatial dynamics and trends

Building administrative capacity and expert-based knowledge

Ensuring success factors, incentives and triggers

Defining the status of the MA

Involving relevant actors

Identifying key challenges

Selecting governance model and institutional structure
Other interesting examples:

Strasbourg, Basel, Malmö-Copenhagen, Maastricht
ESPON is helping us to find solutions
Metropolitan planning should consider the changes needed in territorial development, …in accordance with the “spatial fit” of the problem field.
“As metropolitan areas are ever-changing territories, the geographical and administrative metropolitan area must be flexible enough to be able to adapt to the spatial dynamics and development trends.”
Thanks for your attention
Takk for oppmerksomhet
Thank you
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This presentation will be made available at: www.espon.eu/xxx