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The problem

Functional Urban Areas – the real cities – are on average more than double the population than the administrative city.

From this follows that one of the important challenges of European urban development is to solve the problem of governance on functional urban area level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admin city</th>
<th>MUA million people</th>
<th>FUA</th>
<th>FUA/city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborg</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratislava</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brno</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katowice</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malmö</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghent</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lille</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampere</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennes</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What we learned about metro governance from MAIA 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Smaller than FUA</td>
<td>Brussels, Ghent, Malmö, Vienna, Zurich.</td>
<td>Helsinki, Katowice, Warsaw</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Rotterdam</td>
<td>Frankfurt, Lille, Lyon, Rennes, Strasbourg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) FUA</td>
<td>Berlin, Budapest, Ghent, Linköping, Lisbon, Strasbourg, Vienna, Warsaw</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Birmingham LEP, Bratislava (Region), Brno, Brussels, Göteborg, Katowice, Lyon, Malmö, Sofia, Terrassa,</td>
<td>Helsinki, Madrid (Region), Munich (?), Manchester, Oslo, Preston, Stockholm (county), Tampere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Somewhat larger than FUA</td>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>BrabantStad, Zurich</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>The Hague, Torino (Province)</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why Metropolitan Areas?

Functional urban areas

- National level
- Regional/provincial level
- Local/municipal
SPIMA

- ESPON Targeted Analysis Project
- Initiated by the EUROCITIES Metropolitan Areas Working Group
- 12 months research phase (2017)
- Wageningen Environmental Research-Altterra, Norwegian Institute for Urban Research, Metropolitan Research Institute (Hungary)
- Lead Stakeholder city: Oslo
- Stakeholder cities: Vienna, Prague, Brno, Zurich, Brussels, Oslo/Akershus, Turin, Terrassa, Lille, Lyon
Planning should encompass the areas across which people live, work and commute.

In metropolitan areas, land use in one community affects all neighboring communities. If local governments are left to pursue land-use policies in isolation, they may individually implement their policies, but collectively fail to achieve their objectives.

Thus, effective mechanisms to co-ordinate spatial land–use planning in metropolitan areas are essential to achieve good outcomes.

(OECD 2017: The Governance of Land Use in OECD Countries)
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
Spatial planning has three key perspectives (that should work together)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational (statutory planning)</th>
<th>Strategic (strategic planning)</th>
<th>Coordinating (collaborative planning)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A regulatory mechanism, government has to give approval for a given spatial development activity</td>
<td>Guidance for long-term development of the territory, while balancing the needs and competing claims for land uses for economic, social and environmental developments</td>
<td>Coordinating across geographic scales and sectors, and steering the actions and measures across vertical and horizontal levels of government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions: FUA or MDA?

Core City admin.

**MUA** = Dense urban space

**FUA** = Travel-to-work

**MDA** = Adapting objective reality to territorial politics
Challenge of defining and understanding the metropolitan area

Source: Riga Regional Strategy, 2009

Source: Development Programme of Riga, 2014
Riga on a regional scale
Two (SPIMA) typologies for understanding spatial planning approaches

### Physical Scalars

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

### Organisational Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Number of municipalities</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Semi-formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local voters are not often persuaded by better collaboration with the neighbours.
Mutual trust takes a long time to build. It can also be destroyed quite fast.
What spatial dynamics in metro areas were observed?

Pressure to grow outside core

Densification & intensity, relocation of uses

Transition from a single, compact urban core towards complex urban networks

Redistribution of population, jobs and functions requires new mobility solutions

New local authorities become involved which raises complexity of spatial planning and need for coordination
Metropolitan challenges most often mentioned in stakeholder areas

Efficient transport infrastructure;
Traffic congestion
Multilevel collaboration;
A shared vision on strategic plans;
A political reluctance to address issues at the metropolitan scale;
A lack of recognition of metropolitan areas;
Inefficient spatial planning process
Spatial planning issues to be addressed at metropolitan scale

- Agreements on strategic locations (e.g. retail centres, transport hubs, hospitals, etc.)
- Limiting and managing urban sprawl;
- Promoting sites for jobs and housing within the metropolitan area, e.g. secondary centres, station towns, strong (well-connected) suburbs, etc.
- Prioritizing regional infrastructures/amenities and mobility, *in relation to* land use and development
- Conserving and protecting the environment and resources
- Addressing potential imbalances in local government finance
Conclusions of the SPIMA institutional analysis

- Spatial planning systems of stakeholder areas address metropolitan development issues “to a limited extent”
- Metropolitan planning needs to be based on a governance process that is closely linked with statutory planning, with clearly defined competences.
- Metropolitan development always concerns a variety of interacting issues. The interplay between institutions must therefore be coordinated and managed.
- Metropolitan areas need a strategy and an implementation plan, accepted by all relevant actors. The arrangements to achieve this (formal, informal) do not seem to be the determining factor.
How to improve metropolitan development and cooperation?

- Most important is **political leadership and commitment**. This requires a better recognition and understanding of common and individual **benefits** of metro areas and an **awareness of the need** to address metro issues cooperatively.

- The budget is your values: Metropolitan issues have to be reflected in the financial framework and given adequate capacities.

- Metropolitan planning must be guided by a general policy framework and/or legislation.
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
Oslo & Akershus – two regions with strong collaboration

Collaboration agreements

1. Transport finance (toll-ring)
2. Joint public transport services
3. Joint regional plan (legal provisions and prioritised growth areas)

Metropolitan structure

De facto – commuting

De jure – Oslo + Akershus
Oslo & Akershus: transport finance (toll ring) and regional plan
International focus – policy and innovation

EMA conference, Torino, Feb 2016

SPIMA conference, Brussels, Feb 2018
Regional reform in Norway, 2020

What does this mean?

- Reduced administrative costs (in the long term)
- Some stronger regional power
- Oslo loses its functional neighbour
- We are cooperating to find new solutions

Fusion of three neighbours minus Oslo
Oslo & Akerhus – delineation challenges

Map 6.1: Relation between FUAs, MUAs and the Metropolitan Development Area of Oslo

Delineation of MUA, FUA & MDA

A) MUA and core municipality
B) MUA, core municipality & FUA
C) MDA and core municipality
What is the SPIMA assessment for Oslo and Akershus?

- Progress in the general understanding of the current urban development trends and in the identification of key challenges of the area.

- Oslo & Akershus have been active in involving relevant actors in the planning process.
What are the SPIMA recommendations for Oslo and Akershus?

- Need to **define the spatial scale of the metropolitan area**. In particular an agreement is needed between the regional and local authorities on delineation scenarios.

- Need to **identify the relevant status of the MA** and strengthen its recognition and legitimisation among all relevant actors.

- Need **support from national government**, especially due to the region’s large impact on the national economy.
  - A formal agreement about the metropolitan area Oslo & Akershus,
  - Support via political commitment, or financial incentives for the two regions to further follow a metropolitan planning approach.

- Suitable **governance model and structure** needs to be developed, based on the shared governance principle across the regions and the municipalities.

- The most relevant policy tools to be employed by Oslo & Akershus will be **collaborative and coordinative policy tools**, followed by strategic policy tools.
SPIMA assessment of Oslo & Akershus
Takings things forward: An approach to metropolitan spatial planning

The SPIMA report advocates an approach of “coordination and collaboration between levels of government across policy sectors in strategic, statutory and collaborative planning”.

MAs can move towards this situation through eight action areas that can be addressed in parallel, at different speeds. Eventually, all eight items must be dealt with.
8 paths to change in MA governance

- Define the borders and the scale of MA cooperation
- Identify spatial dynamics and trends in the MA
- Establish the status of the MA
- Identify key challenges for the development of the MA
- Find and engage all relevant actors for the MA
- Establish a shared governance and institutional structure
- Engineer change through the key factors political commitment, financial means and a suitable policy framework
- Strategically use triggers and incentives to initiate transformation
- Build administrative capacity and expert-based knowledge
Initial questions for progress on governance in Riga MA

- Is the delineation of the region accepted as representing the functional area? Or the development area?
- Is there consensus across the region and between levels of government about the key challenges and issues?
- Which issues are easiest for finding joint solutions?
- Which issues are most important for finding joint solutions?
- What are the main obstacles for joint solutions (both «easiest» and «most important»)?
- Which elected bodies have legitimacy for taking a potential lead at the metropolitan scale?
- What are the legal possibilities for joint planning / action?
- Can Riga / Pir-Riga make use of EU interventions to support metropolitan collaboration?
- What are the potential triggers for metropolitan collaboration?
Paldies par jūsu uzmanību!
https://www.espon.eu/metropolitan-areas

peter.austin@byr.oslo.kommune.no