Metro in Progress

From strategies to implementation
Introduction

The INTA Community of Competence on Metropolisation and the Deltametropolis Association are developing a worldwide comparison of Metropolitan Strategies through the ongoing Programme Metro in Progress.

Urban development is undergoing transitional changes: territories are widening from the district level to the city level; from the city to the agglomeration; and from the agglomeration to the metropolitan area, leading to new urban patterns influenced by the global economy and changing lifestyles. In this context, we ask: How significant are the relationships (particularly in terms of cooperation) between the different territories?

Metro in Progress has been established to offer solutions for many of our respective members (i.e. regional authorities, provinces and municipalities) when confronted with designing and/or implementing metropolitan strategies.

Nowadays the programme is heading towards a new phase. Interviews with stakeholders of 13 metropolises and the ensuing debates, raised questions about the nature of metropolitan strategies and of the conditions for implementation, i.e. questioning the governance mechanisms of the metropolitan system.

The next step in the study is to analyze more extensively the metropolitan processes occurring within large as well as smaller territories, in particular how to guide the process of moving “from strategies to implementation”, i.e. moving from the long term vision to the daily life of the citizens.

This one-day meeting in Brussels, jointly organised by INTA, Deltametropolis Association and Vlaams Bouwmeester will discuss in particular the European metropolitan issues.

Cases studies will frame the debate, which is open to those willing to share their experiences and concerns in dealing with metropolitan governance and projects.

Moreover INTA’s Community of Competence Metropolisation launched a Call for Papers, inviting members of INTA and the Deltametropolis Association to build a knowledge base with insights, methods and inspiring experiences to bolster this upcoming Governance of European Metropolises event. The members contribution could be in the form of one question, which will be presented at the meeting, and an accompanying 2 page text (maximum) on the best, most relevant and thought-provoking ideas for any of the topics covered in the roundtable.

These are:

1. Accessibility and Mobility: How can an efficient and well-coordinated infrastructural system contribute to reducing social inequalities at the metropolitan scale?

2. Innovation and Economic Development: Specialisation and Economic Identity: How can larger territorial policies better accommodate for innovators and innovation development clusters?

3. Participation and Representation: How can metropolitan inhabitants be given voice? How can democracy, so well established at the local level, be expressed on a larger scale?

4. Metropolitan Identity: Is a metropolitan identity necessary? If so, how can a common metropolitan identity be developed?
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PROGRAMME

“HOW CAN AN EFFICIENT AND WELL-COORDINATED INFRASTRUCTURAL SYSTEM CONTRIBUTE TO REDUCING SOCIAL INEQUALITIES AT THE METROPOLITAN SCALE?”

“SPECIALISATION AND ECONOMIC IDENTITY: HOW CAN LARGER TERRITORIAL POLICIES BETTER ACCOMMODATE FOR INNOVATORS AND INNOVATION DEVELOPMENT CLUSTERS?”

“HOW CAN METROPOLITAN INHABITANTS BE GIVEN VOICE? HOW CAN DEMOCRACY, SO WELL ESTABLISHED AT THE LOCAL LEVEL, BE EXPRESSED ON A LARGER SCALE?”

“IS A METROPOLITAN IDENTITY NECESSARY? IF SO, HOW CAN A COMMON METROPOLITAN IDENTITY BE DEVELOPED?”
09:00 – 09:30
Welcome and registrations

09:30 – 09:50
Opening

- Michel SUDARSKIS
  Secretary General INTA (Paris)

- Paul GERRETSEN
  Director Deltametropool Association (Netherlands)

- Stefan DEVOLDERE
  Deputy Bouwmeester Team Vlaams Bouwmeester (Belgium)

09:50 – 11:10
Accessibility and Mobility

- Jaap MODDER (session animator)
  Urban and regional planner Brainville (Netherlands)

- Thomas KIWITT
  Managing Director VERBAND REGION STUTTGART (Germany)

- Frek PERSYN
  Architect 51N4E (Belgium)

- Sven DE BRUYCKER
  Coordinator Metropolitan and International Brussels Urban Development – Studies and Planning (Belgium)

11:10 – 12:30
The Economic Development

- Jaap MODDER (session animator)
  Urban and regional planner Brainville (Netherlands)

- Simon NOKES
  Director Policy and European Strategy at New Economy Manchester (United Kingdom)

- Marie DEKETELAERE-HANNA
  Director Paris Métropole (France)

13:30 – 14:50
Governance of Metropolitan Planning and Development

- Jaap MODDER (session animator)
  Urban and regional planner Brainville (Netherlands)

- Christer LARSSON
  Director of the City Planning Department Municipality of Malmo (Sweden)

- Anne SKOVBO
  Director Finance Administration - Municipality of Copenhagen (Denmark)

- Bob CLEMENT
  Territorial Dynamics Team a’urba - Planning Agency Metropolitan Bordeaux Aquitaine (France)

- Françoise LELAY
  Project Manager Bordeaux Métropole 3.0 Bordeaux Urban District, Innovation and Metropolitan Strategies (France)

14:50 – 16:10
Metropolitan identity

- Jaap MODDER (session animator)
  Urban and regional planner Brainville (Netherlands)

- Anna FRAT
  Director Associazione Torino Strategica (Italy)

- Andrei FERARU
  Architect and urban planner DFAB AA FERARU - Architecture & Urbanisme (France)

- Tiberiu FLORESCU
  Dean University of Architecture and Urbanism at Ion Mincu Institute (Romania)

16:10 – 16:30
Conclusions

- Jeroen SARIS
  Director De Stad BV (Netherlands)

16:30 – 17:00
Drinks

WIFI:
NETWORK: VQ BEZOEKER
PASSWORD: q07eBzh5
TWITTER: #METROINPROGRESS
LIVEBLOG: METROINPROGRESS.ORG
“DEVELOPING A SMART COMBINATION OF HUBS AND CONNECTIONS [...] IS THE ROUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF SUSTAINABLE, POLYCENTRIC NETWORK CITIES.”

“ACCESSIBILITY IS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT ELEMENT FOR COHESION WITHIN THE REGION.”

“FORM FollowS FUNCTION?”

“TRANSIT HUBS NOT ONLY HELP TO REDISTRIBUTE TRANSPORTATION FLOWS, BUT ALSO SERVE AS AN ATTRACTIVE MAGNET.”

“BRUSSELS CAN USE ITS KEY ADVANTAGE OF HISTORICALLY HAVING ONE OF THE DENSEST RAIL NETWORKS IN THE WORLD.”

#1 ACCESSIBILITY & MOBILITY
FIGURES

population (pp)
- Stadtkreis Stuttgart 613,392
- Region Stuttgart 2,691,666

area (km²)
- Stadtkreis Stuttgart 207
- Region Stuttgart 3,654

density (pp/km²)
- Stadtkreis Stuttgart 2,963
- Region Stuttgart 737

economic sectors
Automotive sector, Machine building sector

innovation sectors

“ACCESSIBILITY IS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT ELEMENT FOR COHESION WITHIN THE REGION.”
Stuttgart
Mobility and Accessibility

Stuttgart Region is a public body with legal competences in regional planning, economic development and public transport. All activities are coordinated by the regional assembly with directly elected members. Therefore, layout and operation of the regional railway system follows an integrated strategy to improve the regions competitiveness.

It is established as backbone of spatial development, connecting all mayor cities, important housing areas and the main elements of gateway infrastructure i.e. trade fair / convention center, airport. With more than 350,000 passengers every day it is crucial for the functionality of the region - as most artery road are used to their capacity or beyond.

The accessibility provided with this infrastructure has a significant impact on commuter relations and the trading area of retail facilities or other installations with supra-local character (i.e. culture, education, health care). An integrated, reliable, safe and comfortable regional system of mobility connects people with the metropolitan amenities, workers with jobs, customers with services. It equally improves the quality of hinterland locations as well as the efficiency of the core area.

Accessibility is one of the most important element for cohesion within the region. However social identity is primarily local - unless people are on holiday far away.
**Figures**

**Population (pp)**
- Brussels City: 166,497
- Brussels Capital Region: 1,159,448

**Area (km²)**
- Brussels City: 37
- Brussels Capital Region: 161

**Density (pp/km²)**
- Brussels City: 5,100
- Brussels Capital Region: 7,201

**Economic sectors**
- Services
- Public institutions

**Innovation sectors**
- Brussels
- Capital Region

"Brussels can use its key advantage of historically having one of the densest rail networks in the world."
Brussels Capital Region
Mobility and Accessibility

Today Brussels, as a city, as a metropolitan region, is held hostage by the concentric model that once shaped its tissue: the hyper-accessible center has become a bottleneck for public transport, while the periphery and the agglomerations in between are left out of the radar.

Our proposal for mobility is based on the belief that these multiple, mixed and layered centralities can be activated and intensified by radically rethinking the mobility network beyond the confines of the Brussels region, connecting it to the larger Eurodelta region.

Brussels can use its key advantage of historically having one of the densest rail networks in the world. However, today it copes with heavy congestion, and is paradoxically not used to its full potential. We propose to rethink and recycle the network on different scales, ranging from national to urban. In Brussels the existing infrastructure is reconfigured into a double loop which is a transition figure between the national network and the urban network; and which connects different centers (cultural, economical, geographical, etc.) and thus reinforces the polycentric urban substance.

This integrated, multimodal approach can be taken as an example for activating metropolitan territories, addressing their polycentrality and connecting them to their larger regions.

FREKE PERSYN
ARCHITECT 514N E, BELGIUM
“KEEPING AN INDUSTRIAL BASIS IS A KEY LEVERAGE TO FOSTER INNOVATION AND SUCCEED IN THE ‘NEW ECONOMY’.”

“How can we capitalise upon strategic metropolitan territorial assets to achieve smart, sustainable, inclusive growth?”

“The Greater Manchester Strategy provides the framework for leveraging growth from the city’s critical assets.”

“I wonder in what respect the quality of the larger region plays a role in terms of living conditions and in terms of economic symbiosis.”
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ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
**METROPOLITAN AREA**

**FIGURES**

**population (pp)**
- Manchester 510,800
- Greater Manchester 2,702,200

**area (km²)**
- Manchester 116
- Greater Manchester 1,276

**density (pp/km²)**
- Manchester 4,351
- Greater Manchester 2,102

**economic sectors**
- Bus., Fin. & Prof. Services (€ 15.13 billion), Health & Social Care (€ 4.97 billion), Manufacturing (€ 6.15 billion), Sport (€ 0.35 billion), Tourism (€ 7.8 billion),

**innovation sectors**
- Creative & Digital (€ 6.38 billion), Advanced Manufacturing ((€ 2.84 billion) low carbon and environmental goods and services sector, (€ 6.38 billion), Life Sciences.

**GREATER MANCHESTER**

“The Greater Manchester Strategy provides the framework for leveraging growth from the city’s critical assets.”
Greater Manchester Economic Development

Manchester was the first city of the industrial revolution – building its wealth on cotton, mining and heavy industry. As the city prospered its population grew, with waves of migration from across the world. Manchester also developed its reputation as an innovative and dynamic city, a city of firsts. As industry declined during the last century this left the city was faced with major challenges around population loss, deprivation, a lack of employment opportunities, skills gaps, and poor environment including housing.

Today, the Greater Manchester city region is home to 2.7million people and generates £48.2billion GVA per annum. A proactive approach to growth and regeneration sit behind a major transformation of the city, which has now reversed population decline. The city has a diverse economy with particular strengths in financial and professional services; life sciences; creative, digital and new media and advanced manufacturing and materials among others.

Greater Manchester is unique in its governance structure in the UK. Growing from a voluntary collaboration of the ten local authorities which began in the 1980s, a Combined Authority was established in 2011 which has statutory responsibility for economic development, regeneration and transport and works in close partnership with the private sector. In 2008 the Greater Manchester authorities commissioned the Manchester Independent Economic Review, which provides a robust evidence base on which the Greater Manchester Strategy has been built. The Greater Manchester Strategy and governance structures which sit behind it provide the framework for leveraging growth from the city’s critical assets, such as science and technology.

SIMON NOKES
DIRECTOR POLICY AND EUROPEAN STRATEGY AT NEW ECONOMY MANCHESTER, UNITED KINGDOM
PARIS METROPOLITAN AREA

FIGURES

population (pp)
- Paris 2,211,297
- Ile de France 11,659,260

area (km2)
- Paris 105
- Ile de France 12,012

density (pp/km2)
- Paris 21,059
- Ile de France 970

economic sectors

innovation sectors

"KEEPING AN INDUSTRIAL BASIS IS A KEY LEVERAGE TO FOSTER INNOVATION AND SUCCEED IN THE ‘NEW ECONOMY’."
Greater Paris
For an attractive and inclusive Metropolis

The Greater Paris Region is considered to be the richest in Europe, and as powerful from an economic point of view as certain Member States. It has a lot of resources (in terms of HR qualifications, R & D, infrastructures...). Nevertheless it is at the same time one of the most unequal region of the EU (with growing poverty, social exclusion and segregated territories).

This contradiction - and the ways to grow out of it - is the major challenge our metropolis is faced with. Indeed all major cities in the world have to tackle this issue, at the heart of sustainable development.

Unlike London, which is also a very powerful economic stakeholder, the Paris region has kept a strong variety of economic activities, industrial production included. The still wide scope – even if it has shrunk – of sectors in which people are employed and productive is a precious asset, and a protection in times of crisis. Keeping an industrial basis is a key leverage to foster innovation and succeed in the “new economy”. The mixture of major multinational companies and the SMEs fabric helps maintaining attractiveness and inclusion. And the dynamics of the clusters born in the last decade encourages the links between business, laboratories, universities and national and local authorities.

The quality of infrastructures and public services is also a favorable factor, as (and even more) relevant to attract foreign investment as taxation policy. Nevertheless, the housing crisis, with a very high rise in prices, is a weakness and leads people to go further and further to try and find an affordable place to live. After public transportation, which is on the eve of a major improvement and change, housing is now the key problem to solve.

The French Government and the local authorities are very much involved in fostering territorial development and encourage cooperations between the different stakeholders.

The movement towards a new governance for Greater Paris is seen as a necessity to organize in a more efficient and flexible way, it is motivated by the will to reconcile attractiveness and solidarity. It can be considered that in our metropolis there are now, adding to Paris intra muros, about twenty poles of urbanity with their own resources and development trends.

Paris Métropole has been able to gather more than two hundred local authorities of different “levels” and political backgrounds, to work together. So what is at stake is a coopetition – cooperation + competition – approach, aiming at a win-win evolution.

It is true within Greater Paris, this also applies to cooperation between metropolises of the world. That’s why I am happy and honoured to be with you today, in order to exchange and learn.

MARIE DEKETELAERE-HANNA
DIRECTOR PARIS MÉTROPOLE, FRANCE
If the Metropolitan territory is polycentric, this must find its expression in its mode of governance.

“A common political vision has been formulated and joint solutions have been identified.”

“The key is to ensure that the demographic growth does re-densify the centre of the urban area where the jobs, infrastructures and services are.”

“A metropolis embodies at the same time a project of solidarity, a response to the problems of governance and also a development project. It does not have a single purpose.”

GOVERNANCE OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
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FROM STRATEGIES TO IMPLEMENTATION

METROPOLITAN AREA

FIGURES

population (pp)
- Communaute Urbain Bord.: 1,050,000
- Gironde Departement: 1,473,569

area (km²)
- Communaute Urbain Bord.: 3,875
- Gironde Departement: 10,000

density (pp/km²)
- Communaute Urbain Bord.: 286
- Gironde Departement: 147

economic sectors

innovation sectors

COMMUNAUTE URBAIN DE BORDEAUX

"THE KEY IS TO ENSURE THAT THE DEMOGRAPHIC GROWTH DOES RE-DENSIFY THE CENTRE OF THE URBAN AREA WHERE THE JOBS, INFRASTRUCTURES AND SERVICES ARE."
Communaute Urbain de Bordeaux
“Shaping the metropolis our way”

The Bordeaux urban area is particularly attractive and must take up the challenge of exceeding the one-million population mark around 2030 (representing an additional 250,000 inhabitants). The key is to ensure that this demographic growth does not accentuate the already considerable urban sprawl and to re-densify the centre of the urban area where the jobs, infrastructures and services are.

In addition to this, in recent years, the Bordeaux metropolis has been the focus of an unprecedented number of major projects, notably around the arrival of the High-Speed Rail Line (LGV) which will bring Bordeaux within 2 hours of Paris in 2017. These major projects will boost the attraction of the Bordeaux metropolis and contribute to establishing its place among the main European cities.

These two phenomena combined will bring a leap in scale, as Bordeaux grows from a city into a metropolis, but this metropolisation process must not be a passive or “standardised” one. To reconcile metropolitan ambitions and quality of life, Bordeaux Urban Community (La CUB) has sought to define its own development model: a process of forward studies and citizen participation launched in 2010 has resulted in the collective construction of a shared project for tomorrow’s metropolis.

From defining the strategy through to implementation: building the metropolis collectively. At Session 3 on “Governance of Metropolitan Planning and Development”, the speakers from the metropolis of Bordeaux will begin by presenting the metropolitan project preparation phase in which over 15,000 participants – municipalities, institutional partners, associations and citizens - were mobilized for 18 months to construct a shared, collective representation of the Bordeaux metropolis of 2030: a “common destiny”, in fact.

This process culminated in the drafting of a document, “5 Senses for Metropolitan Bordeaux” setting out the main strategies for the Bordeaux metropolis through to 2030 and voted on at the end of 2011 by the elected CUB councilors.

The second part of the presentation will be dedicated to the implementation of the project. In the same spirit as that presiding over the metropolitan strategy preparation phase, the CUB is proposing new ways of doing things, based on active, ongoing cooperation between metropolitan stakeholders in all their diversity.

How is the CUB getting local stakeholders involved in implementation of its 12 metropolitan labours and how is the metropolitan cooperative taking shape? How does this governance fit into the institutional landscape?

FRANÇOISE LE LAY
BORDEAUX URBAN COMMUNITY, FRANCE

BOB CLÉMENT
BORDEAUX METROPOLIS AQUITAINE URBANISM AGENCY, FRANCE
“A COMMON POLITICAL VISION HAS BEEN FORMULATED AND JOINT SOLUTIONS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED.”
Copenhagen-Malmö
Urban planning and political cooperation

The proximity of Copenhagen and Malmö – by far the two largest cities in the cross border region – has contributed to a fruitful cooperation in politics and urban planning in particular. A common political vision has been formulated and joint solutions identified in the Municipal Plan of Copenhagen and Malmö in 2011 and 2012 respectively. The two cities are facing the same challenges of welcoming many new citizens in combination with a lack of economic growth, insufficient infrastructure and ambitious climate goals.

In order to move from strategy to implementation Copenhagen and Malmö have established regular meetings with politicians and high ranking public officials. The two administrations work together on a daily basis to follow up on earlier decisions and prepare new initiatives. One of the latest results of the cooperation is a joint international marketing of the urban development areas in the two cities. And the ongoing efforts include investigating the possibility of an offshore wind farm in the dividing Øresund strait and a new highly frequent metro that would reduce the travelling time between the two city centers from 34 min. to about 15 min.

ANNE SKOVБRO
DIRECTOR FINANCE ADMINISTRATION, MUNICIPALITY OF COPENHAGEN, DENMARK

CHRISTER LARSSON
DIRECTOR OF THE CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT, MUNICIPALITY OF Malmö, SWEDEN
“BUCHAREST IS A CLASSICAL EXAMPLE OF A BIG CITY UNABLE TO DEVELOP ITS ‘NATURAL’ METROPOLITAN TENDENCIES.”

“CAN THE PARTICIPATION AND DAY-TO-DAY EXPERIENCE OF INHABITANTS LEAD TO AN EFFECTIVE METROPOLITAN STRATEGY THAT IS ALSO POLITICALLY ROOTED?”

“THE ASSOCIATION IS NOW EXPLORING WAYS TO SUPPORT THE LONG-TERM PROCESS OF REINFORCING THE COLLECTIVE TERRITORIAL IDENTITY.”

“FOLLOWING A BUDGET DRIVEN AND CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE OF GOVERNANCE, CURRENTLY METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT IS BEING INITIATED AS A PUBLIC PROJECT.”
**FIGURES**

**population (pp)**
- Turin: 872,091
- Metropolitan Area: 1,570,963

**area (km²)**
- Turin: 130
- Metropolitan Area: 899

**density (pp/km²)**
- Turin: 6,708
- Metropolitan Area: 1,747

**economic sectors**
- Automotive, ICT, Aerospace

**innovation sectors**
- Biotechnology and biomedical, Mechatronics, Agrifood

"The association is now exploring ways to support the long-term process of reinforcing the collective territorial identity."
Metropolitan Turin Identity

The Association Torino Internazionale/Strategica started in 2012 with the preparation of the third strategic plan for the metropolitan area of Torino, following the plans of 2000 and 2006. The work is undertaken mainly by involving local stakeholders (economic, social, public bodies and local authorities, universities, etc.) via an articulated one-year long consultation process designed to help generate ideas, come up with visions, strategies and priority actions, and engage decision-makers in making agreements for implementation.

Alongside the crucial local economic issues, for the first time the focus on the opportunity to build a metropolitan government is perceived as central to the future urban vision. 38 Municipalities, the Region and Province are engaged in a discussion on how to devise a metropolitan strategy and reinforce cooperation in many sectors. The metropolitan area has 2.5 million inhabitants, of which more than 800,000 in the regional capital of Torino.

But given that the strategic plan process mainly includes decision makers and experts, how can it be ensured that the larger issue of helping to build the Metropolitan identity is also taken into account? For this reason, the Association is now exploring ways to support, via a set of coordinated activities, the long-term process of reinforcing the collective territorial identity, which in turn will also reinforce the governance process driven by the Mayors.

The awareness of being part of a functional and morphological metropolitan area – besides historical and geographical dimensions – does exist in some forms. The more than 50 cooperation practices, of different kinds, set in place by Municipalities during the last two decades have created in some specific areas an inter-communal sense of belonging, which goes beyond administrative boundaries.

There is also a shared recognition, among politicians but also citizens, of the key role of some metropolitan functions which are not in the core city (main hospitals, tourism and heritage attractions, retail centres, parks). The sense of belonging to the metropolitan area is definitely higher for the inner circle Municipalities, fully attached to the main City.

But looking at the larger area, Municipalities which are far away from each other, in different geographical areas (such as the industrial plane towards Milano compared to the low density residential hills) have expressed the feeling that they do not really know each other and may not have much in common. In addition, the strong Italian tradition of the key role of local authorities and Mayors implies that competition, also at a symbolic level, remains high. Moreover the impression (or prejudice) – found among some politicians and local authority officials - exists that the main City not willing to cooperate with the surrounding Municipalities, or vice versa that the latter are not capable of keeping up with the delivery skills of the core city.

Given this picture, what can be done? The Association is planning to launch a programme of activities to foster participation and reciprocal knowledge in different ways. The activities could include mainstream research (reciprocal knowledge is essential to foster awareness of differences and common challenges), visual projects (photos and videos of the metropolitan landscape), storytelling projects, participatory workshops with schools and other local groups, a major town meeting with 1,000 metropolitan citizens, a dedicated web site and social media, etc. Looking at good practices around Europe can definitely help the Association to understand which programme to define and provides evidence on what may work better.

ANNA PRAT
DIRECTOR ASSOCIAZIONE TORINO INTERNAZIONALE/STRATEGICA, TORENO, ITALY
METrO iN PRoGRess FRoM STRATeGIeS TO IMPLeMeNTATIoN

METROPOLITAN AREA

FIGURES

population (pp)
- Bucuresti 1,924,299
- Bucarest Metrop Area 3,668,231

area (km²)
- Bucuresti 237
- Bucarest Metrop Area 21,018

density (pp/km²)
- Bucuresti 8,119
- Bucarest Metrop Area 174

economic sectors

innovation sectors

METROPOLITAN ORGANISATION

STATE
MUNICIPALITY
BUCHAREST METROPOLITAN AREA
+ 5 COUNTIES

MUNICIPALITY COUNCIL
GENERAL COUNCIL
SECTORAL COUNCIL
MAYOR
STATE APOINTED VOTE
GENERAL MAYOR
REGIONAL ASSEMBLY
GOVERNOR
MUNICIPALITY
BUCHAREST
METROPOLITAN AREA

METROPOLITAN PROJECTS

BUCHAREST

“BUCHAREST IS A CLASSICAL EXAMPLE OF A BIG CITY UNABLE TO DEVELOP ITS ‘NATURAL’ METROPOLITAN TENDENCIES.”
Bucharest
Bucharest metropolitan?

Metropolitan history

XVIIth century: Ottoman decision to establish the capital of the servant Wallachia kingdom in the merchant city of the plain, with the obligation to never fortify it. 60 km from the historical frontier of the Danube River and the port of Giurgiu, on the main roads North / South, from Stockholm to Istanbul, and East / West, from Paris to Moscow (or Athens and Istanbul).

1907: international competition for an urban scheme; half dense urban Haussmannian centre-ville, half Viennese, elegant banlieues in a green belt. In 1900, Bucharest has 1 million inhabitants and a big boom after the first Big War, 1.3 million in 1940; the sixth European city.

1945 to 1989: Bucharest is the capital of a socialist Romania for half a century. During this period its development is directly steered by the politic power, against the “metropolitan” evident tendencies (quite like the Paris vision of JF Gravier and the French desert) the strategic economy is more and more concentrated in the capital, but the growth of the population is drastically limited. Important investments in infrastructures were however realised, but not finished: a new international Airport and the old dream of the Channel from Bucharest to Danube and the Danube / Black Sea Channel (the notorious “Canal”).

In 1990, officially 2 million inhabitants of Bucharest, probably 2.5.

1989: the “Revolution” changed the urban vision of the city. The liberal ideology replaced the communist top–down centralised strategies and imposed a complete entrepreneurial freedom. Bucharest developed a gentrification growth, following in this an old tendency, a rich North against an each day poorer and ghettoized South. But still no metropolitan vision nor strategy, just a chaotic sprawl in a speculative spiral.

1995 to 2001: (Romania entered the European Community in 2000), the evolution of the urban legislation under European pressure; the law of 2001 imposes the creation of “metropolitan areas”; 7 big cities are concerned, but not Bucharest.


2005: the first metropolitan proposal for Bucharest, the ZMB (Zona metropolitana bucuresteana). No urban plan, neither economic or infrastructure vision, just a perimeter of 8000 km2 and a legislative proposal for stakeholders decision–making. But the ZMB project stresses the real political brake, at all levels, from governmental to regional and local: not only there is no metropolitan identity, but a systematic rejection of participating in any kind of shared governance.

Today, there still is no vision, neither top–down metropolitan strategy nor bottom–up local initiatives; and no responsible and/or motivated actors to build it. This situation raises two kinds of questions.

On the one hand, is a spontaneous bottom–up strategy credible? Made by local economic private initiatives (as the Blue Air Airport, a naval port development and/or touristic and leisure equipments on the Danube River, etc.)? On the other hand, which are the actual top–down ambitions present in the new regulation for Bucharest, the PUG 2015?

It’s not easy to answer the first question. If we must admit that private investments can become, sometimes, metropolitan catalyst, we are also convinced that “natural” bottom–up policies add to the “spontaneous” polarisation and segregation of the metropolitan area.

The massive gentrification of the North of Bucharest offers an explicit example, with its gated communities and private cities...as the Grand Parisian agglomeration actual dislocation. From an academic point of view, the “natural growth” goes from comprehension and even admiration (ideological and/or cultural, like Reyner Banham’s for LA) to real despair like Mike Davis’ “urbanism of fear” or Rem Koolhaas’ “Dunkaspace”.
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To answer the second question we must remember the 1999 strategic program “2025 Bucharest European Metropolitan” which still guides the actual work on the new PUG. The creation of a metropolitan area (AUB Aglomeratia Urbana Bucuresti) was clearly recommended for multiple economic, social, and environmental reasons. Will this principle injunction be followed in the operational regulation?

A signal in this direction was sent recently by the actual mayor of Bucharest who reopened the ZMB project by asking a "scientific study" on its actual physical limits and social and cultural identity. But let’s see the orientations of this new regulation.

**Presentation of PUG-MB, Bucharest dynamic master plan**

The proposal for the General Urban Plan of Bucharest is governed by the dynamic nature of this document. A continuous adaptation of measures for the development of the urban territory will be pursued in real time (by a constant updating of the Urban Database and of the Dynamic GIS System proposed for implementation), as well as an urban management differentiated according to the importance, priority and extent of interventions (measures and regulations for current management, measures and regulations aimed at achieving major necessary urban operations that may occur). Both management and control are aimed at improving current practices through the introduction of tools for urban management, considering development scenarios and implementing simultaneous adaptive measures (correlation and updating of real-time prescriptions for the local urban planning regulations). In this sense, three levels of regulation have been put forward:

1) **Firm Regulations**, aimed at areas that define Bucharest’s European dimension, containing firm functions, flexible indicators and specific requirements for establishing quality criteria for building (efficiency and quality indicators).

2) **Flexible / Adaptable Regulations**, for areas covering Bucharest’s Business dimension, containing mixed amenities (maximum thresholds determined by their percentage) and flexible urban indicators.

3) **Directive prescriptions**, aiming to develop amenities with a decisive role in relation to the characteristics of each area of development, as well as to global urban indicators.

In terms of the methodological approach of Dynamic PUG 2015, an audit of the existing situation and implementation for the proposed strategy will target the following strategic levels for approaching the vision (they form criteria and objectives for spatial organization, essential components within the newly proposed urban management system):

1) **Permanent Bucharest**, which includes morphological elements that give structure to Bucharest’s territory, and within which intervention is envisaged for management of a proper functioning urban system (central core, neighborhoods and areas with a crystallized urban tissue);

2) **Distinctive Bucharest**, which emphasizes the possibility of establishing areas with a dominant character (resulting from the morphological analysis), oriented towards neighborhoods as the main urban management units. They provide a clearer picture of its identity, thus providing an effective tool for planning for urban diversity;

3) **Bucharest for Business**, which includes items related to local economic development, focusing on current trends and existing land resources for the development of amenities of a municipal interest, which are representative at a metropolitan and a European level. The development of various productive or higher tertiary activities poles is pursued, within a balanced territorial system;

4) **Public Bucharest**, integrating the existing and proposed public spaces into a coherent network, while at the same time increasing accessibility, increasing urban mobility and providing better access to public services;

5) **European Bucharest**, referring to representative areas of the city at a European level (historical areas, business districts and areas dedicated to sports and recreation), incorporating strategic development areas with special status, while ensuring the mobility of capital;

6) **Connected Bucharest**, referring to the integration of functional networking of Bucharest and its suburban area (territorial development through cooperation and partnership, development management in urban-rural contact areas, as well as territorial mobility).

Obviously, some items of this new regulation concern suburban areas and even territories quite far from the core of the capital; does this mark the beginning of a proactive metropolitan policy?

In conclusion, Bucharest is a classical example of a big city unable to develop its “natural” metropolitan tendencies.

The first group of reasons (not always avowable) are politicians connected to economical interests, wealthy competition but also speculation.

The second group is the lack of interest of citizens in this young democracy; lack of urban and common interest in culture.

So not much interest of the politicians in this field...

Do we see an issue?

We see a spontaneous one, a kaleidoscope of opportunistic private initiatives, but forming together, in time, a segregative explicit bottom-up policy; so a very dangerous issue...

Do we imagine a political issue? Proactive, in the sense of social solidarity and sustainability? We would like to believe in a long–term municipal / metropolitan policy, but we do not trust too much in the cooperation of local mayors, nor of regional and provincial politicians.
#5
SPEAKERS & PARTICIPANTS

Internship: ecological architecture, exhibition ‘recycling is another chance’, competitions for a school, a library, a cultural center and a walk in the sea.

Since 2011, Studies en Planning, Urban development, Brussels Capital Region. Responsible for Metropolitan and International Coordination: Regional plan for sustainable development, Interregional Forum, projects and studies and European urban and territorial representation and working-groups.

Bob Clement is responsible for planning studies at the Bordeaux Metropolis Aquitaine Urbanism Agency.

From the management of operational projects to a prospective analysis, public spaces to energy questions, his urban planning journey is based upon a triple questioning that can be summarized as:

“How do the urban space and the geographical space define themselves and impacting our relation to the Earth, our relation to others, and for each its relation to itself?”

The relation to the Earth refers to environmental problems at different scales of the project.
The relation to others relates to questions concerning urban forms and our modes of communication.
The relation to itself refers to the inner life of the individual.

In terms of design, the inner life of the individual finds its echo in the “qualité d’âme” of urban space (instead of the sensitivity in the city), in environmental health issues, or in the place the child has in the city.

Marie Deketelaere-Hanna, graduated in maths and linguistics, has carried out most of her career in the public sector, in different positions for the Ministry of Economy, Finance and Industry, and then with local authorities.

After working as a tax inspector and being union representative, she managed European projects in the fields of taxation, translation and training. Involved in the development of clusters for the Paris Region, she also was in charge of cooperation partnerships with Vietnam, Lebanon, South Africa, Chile and active member of the UCLG - Metropolis network.

Her current position is director of Paris Metropole, a body gathering more than 200 Greater Paris local authorities, in order to propose a new governance suited to social, economic and ecological challenges.

Her main fields of expertise resort to territorial development, economic and innovation policy, european and int’l affairs, and her most relevant experiences deal with complex project management, gathering teams form different backgrounds.

Stefan Devoldere is an engineer-architect and urban planner. He was the editor of the Belgian architectural review A+ from 2004 till 2010 and continues to write about architecture and urbanism on a regular basis. He has co-curated several exhibitions, including “Robbrecht & Daem. Pacing through Architecture” and “Laurent Ney. Shaping Forces”.

He participated in the Belgian contribution to the International Architecture Exhibition La Biennale di Venezia in 2008, 2010 and 2012. He is currently the deputy of the Government Architect of Flanders, whose objectives are to develop a long-term vision for a high quality architectural environment, to advise and supervise the execution of the architectural policy of the Flemish government, and to establish and broaden cultural/architectural awareness amongst public authorities in general.
ANDREI FERARU

Andrei Feraru has been, since 1991 free-lance architect and urban planner, since 1998 manager of AA, since 2011 manager of Paris.


Research
From 2007, Laboratory ACS Architecture, Culture, Société XIXe–XXIe, CNRS, AUSar / UMR 3329 Actual research : TerrHab : De l’habitabilité à la territorialité et retour (From Habitability to Territoriality and return).

5 years collaborative research of 6 French laboratories from Grenoble, Lyon, Pau, St. Etienne and Paris.

TIBERIU FLORESCU

Tiberiu Florescu is an architect with high experience in large-scale project and urban planning, with sustained activity in the field of architecture, urban design, spatial planning, research and education. Associate Professor at “Ion Mincu” University of Architecture and Urban Planning Bucharest, Faculty of Urban Planning - Dean

An outstanding personality of the field in Romania, member of several national professional bodies and commission for approval of planning documentation: National Committee for Territorial Development – Ministry of Development of Romania – member since 2010;

Technical Committee for Urban Planning Development of Giurgiu – Giurgiu City Hall – member since 2009

Technical Committee for Urban Planning Development of Bucharest – Bucharest City Hall – member since 2008;


Areas of expertise (academic and scientific):
Specialization in Sustainable Urban Development and Town Planning at Nan Yang Technical University, Singapore.

Specialization in urban theory & urban design;
Theory of urban structures, Risks, vulnerability and sustainable planning at “Ion Mincu” University of Architecture and Urban Planning.

Coordination on behalf of UAUIM of scientific and research projects (2001 – Project Leader for Research contract no. 5054/07.11.2002; 2006 – scientific coordinator, CNCSIS Consortium, grant contract no. 382/2006; 2009 – Project Leader contract no. 32/2009);

Experience in many national and international organizations, international workshops on urban planning topics, domestic and international juries.

PAUL GERRETSSEN

Paul Gerretsen is chief designer in the fields of regional planning, urban planning and architecture. He has studied at the renowned Universities TU Delft and ETH Zurich. He graduated with honourable mention in 1989 at the TU Delft as Master of Architecture.

After his education he has been employed by the Dutch National Spatial Planning Agency where he has been involved in studies for the development of strategic regional planning.

From 2005 Paul Gerretsen has worked at Maxwan Architects and Urbanists on both urban and regional planning projects.

He has been the project leader of the prestigious Barking Riverside Master Plan, a new town for 25’000 people in East-London and the regional project “Deltametropool”, a study on the future of the Randstad Region in the Netherlands, housing 7 million inhabitants.

Between 2005 and 2007 Paul Gerretsen was appointed Director of the South Wing Studio for Research and Design of the Province South-Holland. In this function he was responsible for projects and publications considering topics such as the Network City, Accessibility and Mixed-Use Areas. Since 2001 he teaches and lectured at numerous schools and universities most prominently at Delft University of Technology and Technische Universität München.

From 2008 onwards he is appointed director of the Deltametropolis Association. The Deltametropolis Association is a members association that focuses on the development of the Randstad area, consists of the metropolitan area around the four major cities of the Netherlands. Members are government institutions, non-governmental pressure groups, companies and private persons.

THOMAS KIWITT

Thomas Kiwitt is head of the department of regional planning in one of Germany’s most densely populated and prosperous regions. He leads the implementation of Stuttgart Region’s spatial strategy for mitigation and adaptation, which comprises the enforcement of mandatory guidelines for spatial development, consultancy and support services for local authorities and research activities.

Recently he coordinates a pilot project to improve sustainable transportation in Stuttgart Region. Within the European Network of Metropolitan Areas and Regions (METREX) he is a member of the working groups for major infrastructure and urban/rural cooperation.

He is a member of the German academy for spatial research and plannings’ study group for regional planning and the Baden-Württemberg committee. He is a lecturer and member of the advisory board at the masters program for city planning at the University of Applied Sciences in Stuttgart. Thomas Kiwitt holds “Dipl.Ing.” degree for spatial and environmental planning from the University of Kaiserslautern, Germany. Prior to working for Stuttgart Region, he has been working for cities and regions in Germany as well as for the metropolitan administration of Jakarta, Indonesia.

Research
From 2008 onwards he is appointed director of the Deltametropolis Association. The Deltametropolis Association is a members association that focuses on the development of the Randstad area, consists of the metropolitan area around the four major cities of the Netherlands. Members are government institutions, non-governmental pressure groups, companies and private persons.
Christer Larsson is Director of Urban Development for the City of Malmö, Sweden. He is responsible for strategic development planning for the city, including during recent years the Western Harbour site and the urban reconfiguration of Malmö.

Christer is Chairman of Nordic City Network, is active in international architectural competition juries, and is central in knowledge transfer projects concerning Malmö’s sustainable development.

Françoise Le Lay is in charge of projects within the Metropolitan Strategies and Innovation Directorate of Bordeaux Urban Community (CUB) / Bordeaux Metropole. She headed the Bordeaux Métropole 3.0 forward study for the local territory and took part in implementation of the citizen participation phase organised around the project (“La Fabrique Métropolitaine”) in 2010 and 2011.

This unprecedented process for the CUB resulted in the drawing up of a metropolitan project “5 Senses for Metropolitan Bordeaux” defining the strategic priorities for the Bordeaux metropolitan area through to 2030, a document that was passed by a vote of the elected members of the CUB at the end of 2011.

Today, Françoise Le Lay is conducting implementation of this metropolitan project through twelve priorities (“The 12 Metropolitan Labours”) and by promoting new ways of doing things, embodied by the “Metropolitan Co-operative”, the goal of which is to mobilise and unite the stakeholders of the metropolitan area in all their variety around the key issues and projects of the territory.

Françoise Le Lay has a background in political science and public communication. She began her career in a local development body in the Bordeaux area, before joining the CUB in 1997.

Jaap Modder is member of the Board of the Deltametropolis Association and also a personal member of INTA.

He is working as a national and international consultant for his own firm Brainville and as an associate partner for Buck Consultants International. Experienced in the field of urban and regional planning in the Netherlands and abroad (USA, Russia, Belgium and Eastern Europe).

Chief editor of the Dutch leading magazine on urbanism S+RO, chair at the foundation Tall Buildings and Urban Habitat, and also active in the governance of cultural institutions.

At this moment active in the fields of area development, smart cities, transit oriented development and metropolitan governance.

Jaap Modder

Simon has a long experience in economic development in the North West of England. He started his career in Local Government, before moving to become Director of Strategy for a Training and Enterprise Council.

From there he set up and ran his own social enterprise for 5 years supporting the long term unemployed back into employment. He joined the North West Development Agency in 2004 and became the Director of Policy and Planning. Amongst other things he was responsible for the Regional Economic Strategy and Corporate Strategy/Governance.

In 2012 he joined New Economy, the economic development company working across Greater Manchester (GM) with the Local Enterprise Partnership and Combined Authority. His focus is on GM policy in relation to the ‘place’ part of economic development (linkages between planning/housing, the environment and the economy) and on positioning GM to influence, and make best use of, European strategy/ funding.
Freek Persyn

Education
1992/97 St. Lucas School of Architecture, Brussels
Campus, Architect
1996 Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland, Erasmus programme

Academic Record
2010/11 Visiting Professor, Accademia di Architettura, Mendrisio, Switzerland
2009/10 Studio Professor, H20bitat studio, Berlage Institute Rotterdam, NL
2004/05 Visiting critic at studio of urban design, Berlage Institute, Rotterdam, NL
2004 Workshop ‘Perimeter realities, Finding (new) freedoms’, Michigan, USA

Professional Record
- Alvéoles St Nazaire, Regeneration, St Nazaire, FR
- Beyza, Teritorial Strategy, Istanbul, TK
- Hoogbouwnota, Densification Strategy for the city of Brugge, BE
- Vigorelli, Urban Park Regeneration, Milan, IT
- MCBA, Lausanne, Cultural Infrastructure, Lausanne, CH
- 2 prisons, Dendermonde/Beveren (in process)
- Monnikenlaar, nursing home (prize winner)
- ACC, port coordination centre, Antwerp, BE (in process)
- Speelpleinstraat, kindergarten + greenery service, Morksem, BE (prize winner)
- The Good Life, squa development, Arnolfini Arts Centre, Bristol, UK
- Regatta, seniors’ campus, Linkeroever, Antwerp, BE (prize winner)
- Kantorei+, study for highly sustainable office development
- Skanderbeg Square, masterplan central square
- Tirana, AL (prize winner)
- Garve d’Auteuil, 350 units housing, Paris, FR
- C-Mine, cultural infrastructure in former mine, Winterslag, Genk, BE


Anna Prat

Since July 2011, Anna Prat is Head of Large urban projects at Torino Municipality. She is in charge of assisting Piero Fassino Mayor’s office in defining strategic urban projects for the City, and helping in setting up strategic planning and local development strategies.

Her job involves strong vision, analytical, organisational and team management skills, alongside passion for excellence and success. Since June 2012, Anna Prat is also the Director of the Association Torino Internazionale (soon renamed Torino Strategica), in charge of devising the strategic plan for the metropolitan area of Torino, through a wide inclusive governance approach.

Before joining Torino Municipality and Torino Internazionale, she was working as project manager at Finpiemonte Spa, the financial agency of Piedmont Region. Before that, she was a consultant for more than 10 years in Europe, developing a strong expertise in concept & option appraisals for real estate projects, market and economic analysis, planning & masterplanning, European and urban regeneration funding advice and feasibility studies.

During this period, she worked as free lance in Torino, Italy, working on a variety of urban programmes and real estate development projects. She was also a Principal Associate at Locum Consulting, providing project management services to projects in Southern Europe. She supported Locum’s expanding international business, particularly in resorts and mixed-use developments.

At the beginning of her career, Anna worked as an economic planner for Ove Arup & partners in London and as a project manager at Ecosfera spa in Rome. She was for three years a University lecturer in Italy on tourism destinations planning. She holds a university degree in Architecture and a Master in Urban and Regional Planning Studies from the London School of Economics. She is a chartered architect and urban planner. She was also a member of a regional park administrative committee for three years.

Jeroen Saris

Jeroen Saris started his own business de Stad BV in 1997.

Previously he had been Alderman of Urban development, waterfront and the Inner city in Amsterdam (1990-1994), and party leader of Groen Links (the green party) in the municipal council.

De Stad BV is a consultancy in urban and regional development in a broad sense: physical planning, future research, economic performance, urban culture and governance.

Jeroen Saris is one of the founding fathers of the Dutch Platform for regional cooperation and strategy.

Jeroen Saris is and has been involved as consultant in several Dutch regions: Arnhem Nijmegen, Brainport Eindhoven, Metropolitan Region of Amsterdam, BrabantStad (5 cooperating cities and the provincial board) and North Netherlands. He also made a study of Metropolitan development in the US, Germany and UK. De Stad by specializes in informal planning: innovation of policies of decision making in the field of environmental development and infrastructure. This innovation, directed towards the interaction between stakeholders often widely different in interests, has become indispensable for policy makers to be able to manage the increasing complexities of a global urban system.

Anne Skovbro

Professional career
2007 - 2010 Head of Planning, Urban Development, Finance Administration
2007 Chief Consultant, Lord Mayor’s Office, Finance
2006 – 2007 Team Manager, Urban Development, Finance Administration
2005 – 2006 Project Manager, Ministry of Environment
2003 – 2005 Finance Administration, City of Copenhagen
2002 – 2003 Spatial Planning Department, Ministry of Environment
2000 – 2002 Research Center for Forest and Landscape, Ministry of Environment
1996 – 2000 Ph.d student, Research Center for Forest and Landscape, Ministry of Environment
1996 Consultant, Danish Technological Institute
1995 Project employment in Spatial Planning Department, Ministry of Environment

Education
2001 Ph.D, Department of Architecture and Design, Aalborg University
1995 Master of Science in Engineering, Department of Development and Planning, Aalborg University

Areas of responsibility
City Development and Planning, Container Terminal, Northern Harbour, Traffic Management, Public Procurement, Traffic, Northern Harbour Station, Christiania (Urban Area), Analysis concerning extension of Metro, Investment planning, Fast Track project
Michel Sudarskis is the Secretary General of INTA, the International Urban Development Association, since 1987. He holds PhD in Economics and Political Sciences. Before joining INTA he taught on international co-operation and foreign affairs as Associate Professor with several Universities (Strasbourg, Paris, Nice and Lille) and served with international organisations in Italy and Belgium.

Michel Sudarskis writes and speaks regularly on urban issues; he has lead more than 50 international urban development missions on behalf of INTA including spatial analysis and strategies, establishing spatial framework for infrastructure planning, new towns and major urban regeneration or development projects, and worked with the UNCRD in Latin America, the EIB in the Middle East, Spanish Cooperation Agency in Morocco.
"How can we capitalise upon strategic metropolitan territorial assets to achieve smart, sustainable, inclusive growth?"

"Drafting and sharing a political vision, willing to build an inclusive metropolis, supported by the more common economic and attractiveness objectives are key."

"If the metropolitan territory is polycentric, this must find its expression in its mode of governance."

"Developing a smart combination of hubs and connections [...] is the route to the development of sustainable, polycentric network cities."

"Transit hubs not only help to redistribute transportation flows, but also serve as an attractive magnet."

"A metropolis embodies at the same time a project of solidarity, a response to the problems of governance and also a development project. It does not have a single purpose."
Roundtable “From strategies to implementation”

On behalf of Randstad Region I am pleased to take part in the Roundtable session “from strategies to implementation”. You have asked to formulate a question which addresses the theme of the roundtable and some ideas to feed the discussion.

“How CAN WE CAPITALISE UPON STRATEGIC METROPOLITAN TERRITORIAL ASSETS TO ACHIEVE SMART, SUSTAINABLE, INCLUSIVE GROWTH?”

Ideas/background

Metropolitan and its linked Peri Urban areas have large populations, living in varied settlements of villages, towns and dense urban area’s. They provide space to breathe, housing, agriculture, leisure, international connectivity and room for a broad range of business settlement on a relatively small scale. Each metropole has a unique set of strategic assets which have the potential to be more capitalized upon. Within Randstad Region the unique assets are: metropolitan horticulture, combination of a product-oriented economy (Mainport Rotterdam / Greenports food&flowers / agro-food business) and a service oriented economy (international law, financial centre) and the availability of international research centres and a well educated population. The innovation potential of the population is enormous.

To capitalize on the potential of these assets, smart sustainable growth strategies are needed. The strategies require a broad integrated territorial approach and symbioses between the economic clusters that form the assets. Public and Private sector need to work together in effective governance structure to make strategies reality. To illustrate how integrated territorial policies can accommodate smart, sustainable and inclusive growth the example of foodprocessing is useful.

Food has always been produced close to cities. The large areas, which provided food for the cities within a day travel, are still part of the metropolitan fabric. These areas are still vital for food production. Local and global. But food production has disconnected from its surrounding, food processing is no longer transparent and quality is more about food safety than taste, social values and sustainability. To reconnect food & food processing to its metropolitan surrounding together with growth, smart solutions are needed. Two examples can illustrate the early steps and the dilemma’s arising from these examples.

The example of industrial symbioses between Horticulture and heavy industrial complexes. In Randstad a major greening area is present. To keep the greeninghouse competitive major challenges emerge for product innovation, energy and resource efficiency and (inter)national connectivity. These challenges are met by an integrated territorial approach. To meet energy efficiency standards a “heat network” is being developed to transport and use residual heat from nearby heavy industry in the mainport of Rotterdam. Also CO2 is captured and transported to the greeninghouse areas using an OCAP-pipeline. This form of symbioses reduces energy costs and lowers CO2 emissions contributing to climate goals.

To facilitate product-, technological and social innovation campuses are being developed where researchers, practitioners & other relevant stakeholders can meet and work close to each others making face to face interaction possible.

The example of a multi stakeholder approach to achieve circular food processing. In Randstad one of the world leading beer companies is settled. This company sets ambitious sustainability goals. Together with citizens, farmers and public government a dream was shared about brewing the most sustainable beer in the world. Making use of regional assets and in symbioses with its surroundings. The dream requires an almost circular beer brewing process. Connecting multiple stakeholders to the concept. Also outside the food chain! The concept is as follows. Natural resources are coming from farmers who grow crops through a biodiversity stimulating concept. Road traffic is being avoided as much as possible. Natural water comes from the coastal dunes which are also a major recreational area. Energy is coming from biomass collected in the surroundings of the plant. Beer brewing residue is used to feed cows. And dairy from cows that regional diet is used to make high quality milk, cheese and meat sold on regional markets (equals EU internal markets). In a broad coalition regional government provides the needed room for spatial development, access to relevant research networks and is willing to target rural and structural development funding to facilitate innovation.

The examples show that symbioses of assets on a metropolitan scale will lead to innovation and growth. But these examples are just the first steps. We should also look at the metropolitan potential of numerous small scale initiatives experimenting with smart solutions for energy production, waste management and food production. It is clear that smart, sustainable growth will only flourish if stakeholders really want to make it happen and act flexible with there legislation, innovation funding and priorities. New dilemma’s emerge for spatial development (how and where to cluster assets based on symbioses), infrastructure planning and legislation. Future EU-policy need to be ready for these symbioses.

PETER VERBON
SR. STRATEGIC ADVISOR SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT, PROVINCIE ZUID-HOLLAND,
POSTBUS 90602, 2509 LP DEN HAAG
+31 70 441 76 40 / +31 6 11868663
P.VERBON@PZH.NL / WWW.ZUID-HOLLAND.NL
Towards multimodal mobility networks

Venhoeven CS aims to improve the integration of infrastructure and urban development, an essential condition for the development of truly sustainable cities. Good junctions of all transportation methods (car, bicycle, railway, bus, and pedestrian, as well as high-speed rail, airplane, and boat) by means of hubs will create a single integrated and sustainable mobility network with a multitude of choices for all users at all times. If networks of non-motorized transport are non-existent, unsafe, or have too many missing links, this results in extra road traffic, with major consequences for the quality of life and the economy. Construction and expansion of large-scale infrastructure too often comes at the expense of the networks for pedestrians, cyclists, and public transport users. It is essential that a great deal more attention be given to the quality and transport potential of these fine-meshed networks when designing road and rail systems.

As Dutch chief government advisor for infrastructure, Ton Venhoeven was a member of the think tank Duurzame Mobiliteit (“Sustainable Mobility”), and he was also responsible for the study and publication entitled Station Centraal (“Central Station”), about multi-modal hubs. His book about multimodal mobility, written together with Tijs van den Boomen, was published in August 2012 by NAI Publishers.

Towards multimodal mobility networks

All modes of transport are projected to increase substantially in the coming decades at the worldwide level. Freight and air travel are expected to grow most substantially, with projected growth of 100% and 150% respectively (and that in Europe alone). But the expected growth in passenger travel is, at 66%, also enormous, especially in consideration of the current pressures on transportation in busy urban and metropolitan regions. While the rise of the internet has made working at home an option for many more people than ever before, that development is more than offset by the rising demand for travel resulting from the many new contacts that the internet has made possible. Paradoxically, this growth offers major opportunities for increasing the quality of life and health in cities and urban regions, while helping these areas function smarter and better in the process.

“a major challenge lies in distributing the enormous traffic flow among the different transportation options as efficiently as possible”

Causes of growth in transport

A number of different causes lie at the roots of this tumultuous growth in transport. More and more goods are being shipped all over the world, whether as raw materials or semi-manufactured products to factories or assembly sites, or as end products on their way to distribution centers, end users or rubbish tips. With the internet, anyone can individually order products and have them delivered right to their door. And thanks to cheaper and cheaper air travel, we are going away further and farther more often to cheaper and cheaper holiday destinations. We are travelling more, because as welfare goes up, travelling gets easier. And so, too, do our ambitions increase; we look for better work further away, or partner’s job and children’s school make moving closer to one’s own job less of a workable option. Because transportation is easily available to most people, more and more companies, schools, hospitals, shopping centers and sports clubs are gravitating towards cheaper construction locations at the periphery of cities, where economies of scale can make them more profitable or affordable. This also makes them, on the whole, better accessible to more people from different centers of the urban region. And this, in turn, generates extra infrastructure and traffic.

Choosing between different transportation options for each journey

A major challenge lies in distributing the enormous traffic flow among the different transportation options as efficiently as possible. This means, where feasible, using the options afforded by pedestrian and bicycle travel, and where this is not feasible, by using the forms or forms of public transportation that best meet the need, and ideally those which are not overcrowded so those who need to can still squeeze in. And for the rest, by car or by airplane, but in the minimum possible flow.

Urbanization happens around transit hubs

To allow people to choose per journey on a daily basis, the different mobility networks have to be optimally connected. These connections may be at transfer points, the hubs, or better still, at multimodal transit hubs where passengers can switch from car to railway, bicycle, boat or aircraft. Such transit hubs not only help to redistribute transportation flows, but also serve as an attractive draw and place of establishment for people and businesses, as a catalyst for urbanization and transport.

“TRANSIT HUBS NOT ONLY HELP TO REDISTRIBUTE TRANSPORTATION FLOWS, BUT ALSO SERVE AS AN ATTRACTIVE MAGNET.”

Multi-modal transit hubs can be found on a wide range of scales, each with its own spatial development opportunities – from international hubs like airports and seaports to urban and even smaller hubs, all of which present their own opportunities. Likewise, there are hubs for passenger transport and hubs for freight transport. Developing a smart combination of hubs and connections tailored to each individual urban region is the route to the development of sustainable, polycentric network cities with a hyper efficient transport structure and a high quality of life.

“DEVELOPING A SMART COMBINATION OF HUBS AND CONNECTIONS […] IS THE ROUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF SUSTAINABLE, POLYCENTRIC NETWORK CITIES.”

Drawing people and businesses to places that are accessible

The pull to urban regions is increasing, because these are the places where the prosperity is, with many more jobs and facilities than in rural areas. Businesses and facilities are also drawn from the country to the city, where it is easier to find personnel and clients. The result: cities and suburbs bursting at the seams, and rampant, clumping urban clusters, networks of many centers and sub-centers, with often vague and undefined interconnecting areas, some of which may be less than savory places to be. Coordinating the expected growth in transportation and the growth of these urban regions, and doing it in a smart way so they do not grow themselves out and lose their attractiveness, is a major challenge.

On the other side of the spectrum, we have more and larger areas where people are leaving, as the people who remain in them become more and more dependent on the distant urban regions for their work and facilities. Here, the challenges are very different: for example, the frequently observed need of the elderly for combining maintenance of basic facilities with accessibility by public transportation.

The major differences between the clumping urban regions, their peripheral interconnecting areas and the demographically shrinking regions call for a smart, differentiated traffic and transport strategy. The motorist, railway passenger, cyclist and walker all have their own advantages and limitations; what we need to develop is a hybrid traveler, one who opportunistically switches modes of transport with changing situations. Connecting different networks into a cohesive, multimodal mobility network presents this strategy, with refined transfer opportunities from which the traveler can choose from at any moment.

“what we need to develop is a hybrid traveler, one who opportunistically switches modes of transport with changing situations”
Linking of space and mobility through combined mobility networks

There are a number of opportunities for structuring cities and urban regions to create maximum efficiency in people’s use of mobility networks and space. One concept for doing so is Transit Oriented Development. This is a concept focused on optimizing the use of public transportation by making hubs accessible by the maximum number of modes, and concentrating the maximum development, commercial space, apartments and facilities around them.

Secondly, making public space as attractive as possible to pedestrians and cyclists increases the advantages of railway connections for passengers within walking distance (approximately 1 km) and cyclists (2 km). Bus passengers and motorists can also use the facilities of the hub and benefit from the railway connection if they can park in the vicinity. Car and bus accessibility further expands the reach of the hub. The combination of car and train is becoming more and more prevalent. On certain routes, the train is more attractive than the car, because the transit time can be spent sleeping, working or meeting.

“The combination of car and train is becoming more and more prevalent”

Transit Oriented Development and the polycentric urban cluster

When connections are optimal and the space is optimally organized for slow traffic, this creates an attractive place for a wide range of stores, businesses, meeting centers, residential space and facilities, from which a new type of city-within-the-city arises. Combining Transit Oriented Development with the development of polycentric urban clusters can create a combination of refined multimodal transportation network with a collection of strongly individual urban and suburban centers from which all can benefit.

The combination of a polycentric structure with a spread of functions around hubs can be used to prevent trains and metros being packed in one direction and empty in the other around peak commute times. This way, multimodal hubs can also be attractive places for social amenities like schools, theatres, museums and hospitals. This, in turn, draws residents with a taste for urban life. Others may prefer to live on the fringes, with room for a garden but still close enough to the facilities, and so not too far from such a hub. The consequences will be significant: better accessibility, lower threshold, improved health from more attractive public space with more opportunities to walk and bike, shorter travel times, better utilisation of facilities and better occupancy of public transportation both day and night.

Check out more about the subject at http://venhoeven.nl/vision-and-research/towards-multimodal-mobility-networks

TON VENHOEVEN
VENHOEVEN CS
The law creating a Metropolitan level the case of the Greater Paris

The bill to organize the Greater Paris is not yet final as the issue remains highly controversial. The debate on the creation of a Paris metropolitan has been revived for the last three years, but it actually dates back almost to a century ago. The bill is the culmination of a debate that was picked up in 2011, among the policy makers of the Paris metropolitan, and the City of Paris took the leadership.

This debate was made possible, on the one hand by the impetus given by the mayor of Paris, Bertrand Delanoé, and by the establishment in 2009 of a new political setting, Paris Métropole; on the other hand by the visibility given to the Greater Paris’ issues by the former President of the Republic. The metropolitan issue has become a central theme then.

In 2010, the law reforming the local governments in France had made no provisions for Paris. Everything that could have been done within an unchanging institutional framework has been done. Today, Paris is facing the challenges of every 21st century’s metropolis. But Paris still has to cope, like most global cities, with government’s tools dating back to the 20th century and administrative boundaries of the 19th century.

When the government addresses the issue in 2012, it immediately announced its desire to finish off the unfinished system of the Ile-de-France Region.

This is actually a very old debate.

It dates back from the 1920s, when MM Morizet, and Sollier Mayors of Boulogne and Suresnes, coined the term “grand Paris”. Three main ideas were dominant at that time: (1) Residents of the Greater Paris share a common fate; (2) Political and administrative fragmentation is damaging the effectiveness of public policy; (3) Opposition between Paris and suburbs is a source of inequality, but has led to the emergence of the suburbs of a singular destiny.

Yet in a century, two majors decisions were made: in 1964, a decree ended off the Seine County and created three new counties. In 1977, the direct election of the Mayor of Paris took place for the first time.

Two schools of thought have gradually emerged.

These opposite visions can be found, in different forms, in all major historical periods: in 1944, the liberation of Paris (Paris Committee of Liberation), in 2007 with the Balladur Committee.

1) The integrated metropolitan territory / leadership / project:

In order to effectively address the problems of the Metropolis, it is necessary to ensure the uniqueness of decision-making. (2) Efficiency implies a simplified institutional system and fewer numbers of administrative levels ensuring their place to the municipalities. (3) A single decision-making body must enable efficiency in the identification and implementation of the metropolitan responsibilities. (4) The institutional unity is seen as the mean of achieving greater territorial solidarity. (5) The creation of a single “intermunicipal body” at the same scale, instead of the many existing urban groupings.

The main technical measures

1) Creation of Greater Paris, effective on January 1, 2016, a Metropolitan structure of common law, with its own statutes. It will be an EPCI (public structure for intermunicipal cooperation) that can levy its own tax. This is not a local authority in its own right. But a public body that respects the principles of specialty and exclusiveness. The idea is not to coordinate but to do “in place of instead of” the municipalities themselves. It is meant “to define and implement actions of metropolitan interest, to promote a model of sustainable development, to reduce inequalities and improve the competitiveness and attractiveness of the territory and the quality of life of its inhabitants”. This EPCI is replacing 19 existing EPCI that will merge into the new one; it also takes over all their powers.

2) Greater Paris will gather 128 mandatory members: the Paris Municipality, the 123 municipalities belonging to the first ring of suburban counties; the municipalities of the counties of the second ring as long their EPCI include at least one municipality belonging to the first ring. All included, these municipalities have a population of 412 municipalities consisting of 10 million inhabitants) led the Government to favour a federation of major intermunicipal bodies. So, the law focuses both to organize large intermunicipal bodies (with a minimum of 300,000 population), and to create a coordinating structure - The Greater Paris as a kind of G20, to manage policy priorities. An ad-hoc model, with the priority to produce affordable housing; however, with limited jurisdiction.

But the Senate rejects the article organizing the intermunicipal bodies. And thus, the entire bill collapsed.

The conclusion drawn from the failure in the Senate was that “the consultation process went too far, we cannot rely on local officials.” The Government thoroughly review the draft bill before returning to the National Assembly in July 2013 and introduced a series of principles: (1) Simplification of the administrative geography: creation of a metropolitan structure without any new layer added. It is therefore necessary to remove a level. (2) The Metropolis is not only intended to “eliminate distortions and territorial inequalities”, it must also contains a real development project. (3) The State is legitimate to bring order and assume a stronger role in the organization of local authorities. (4) Paris should be brought under the common law regulating metropolises.

What do metropolitan representatives want?

When in 2012, President François Hollande said he will address the subject, he also says he will base his proposals on those of the elected representatives. But these representatives failed to come to a common position. There was a desire to move forward, to institutionalize an agreement, but no clear position on the mode of Governance. Paris Métropole (re)created the debate, organized it, draw public attention, but failed to arrive at a decision.

The terms of the law

The bill introduced by the Government evolved strongly, favoured by the lack of consensus among the elected representatives.

1) In the Upper House – the Senate, the Government proposes a bill for a “Confederate Metropolis”

The size of the Paris urban area (412 municipalities consisting of 10 million inhabitants) led the Government to favour a federation of major intermunicipal bodies. So, the law focuses both to organize large intermunicipal bodies (with a minimum of 300,000 population), and to create a coordinating structure - The Greater Paris as a kind of G20, to manage policy priorities. An ad-hoc model, with the priority to produce affordable housing; however, with limited jurisdiction.

But the Senate rejects the article organizing the intermunicipal bodies. And thus, the entire bill collapsed.

2) In the Lower House – the National Assembly: the Government proposes a bill for “an integrated Metropolis”

The conclusion drawn from the failure in the Senate was that “the consultation process went too far, we cannot rely on local officials.” The Government thoroughly review the draft bill before returning to the National Assembly in July 2013 and introduced a series of principles: (1) Simplification of the administrative geography: creation of a metropolitan structure without any new layer added. It is therefore necessary to remove a level. (2) The Metropolis is not only intended to “eliminate distortions and territorial inequalities”, it must also contains a real development project. (3) The State is legitimate to bring order and assume a stronger role in the organization of local authorities. (4) Paris should be brought under the common law regulating metropolises.

The main technical measures

1) Creation of Greater Paris, effective on January 1, 2016, a Metropolitan structure of common law, with its own statutes. It will be an EPCI (public structure for intermunicipal cooperation) that can levy its own tax. This is not a local authority in its own right. But a public body that respects the principles of specialty and exclusiveness. The idea is not to coordinate but to do “in place of instead of” the municipalities themselves. It is meant “to define and implement actions of metropolitan interest, to promote a model of sustainable development, to reduce inequalities and improve the competitiveness and attractiveness of the territory and the quality of life of its inhabitants”. This EPCI is replacing 19 existing EPCI that will merge into the new one; it also takes over all their powers.

2) Greater Paris will gather 128 mandatory members: the Paris Municipality, the 123 municipalities belonging to the first ring of suburban counties; the municipalities of the counties of the second ring as long their EPCI include at least one municipality belonging to the first ring. All included, these municipalities have a population of

"IF THE METROPOLITAN TERRITORY IS POLYCENTRIC, THIS MUST FIND ITS EXPRESSION IN ITS MODE OF GOVERNANCE."
6.7 million inhabitants. The bill passed at a first reading and it allows the extension of the initial perimeter. This remains a small perimeter with mandatory constitution, leaving aside the 3 airports, the New Towns and very much of the less developed territories.

3) The Greater Paris is organized into fifteen territories. Like what is planned for the city of Marseilles, the “territories” would serve as a decentralized level for the implementation of policies adopted by the Metropolis. Each territory is controlled by a Council, and must have at least 300,000 inhabitants. The Greater Paris is then intended to replace the intermunicipal bodies included in its perimeter.

4) How the Metropolis is governed?
The Metropolis has two levels of governance: the Metropolitan Council and its president, and the territorial Councils. The Council of the Grand Paris in 2016 will include approximately 312 members: 1 Metropolitan advisor per municipality plus 1 additional metropolitan advisor for every 30,000 inhabitants.

The text of the bill foresees that a quarter of metropolitan advisors should come from the Council of Paris. Eventually, the Council would be composed of a panel of metropolitan counsellors elected by direct universal suffrage and a college of representatives of municipalities. This rule should be specified by an electoral law and should be apply to municipal elections in 2020. Decisions are taken by an absolute majority, unless otherwise provided (the definition of metropolitan interest requires at most 2/3 of the votes).

A powerful metropolis
The bill, at this stage, foresees that the Greater Paris, will have several types of powers in the place of the municipalities. On 1 January 2016, the Greater Paris will exercise the following powers:
Specific jurisdictions for the Greater Paris and explicitly referred to in the bill: these include the definition of a metropolitan project, a rationalization of management tools and bodies, and definition of priority tasks such as housing (metropolitan housing and habitat plans), environmental planning (climate and energy metropolitan plans), as well as the management of housing development programmes.

Powers exercised by the metropolises of common law. Those include the areas of development planning (SCOT, PLU approval, ...), housing, urban policy, economic development and environmental policy. In addition, the metropolis will take over the powers exercised by the EPCI of the first ring that were in operation before the 1st of January 2016.

By 1 January 2018 (or to two years after its creation), the metropolis may exercise additional powers to implement projects of metropolitan interest. The metropolitan interest, defined by the Metropolitan Council by a majority of two thirds, helps to set the dividing line between the actions are under the responsibility of the metropolis and those that relate to the municipality. This concerns in particular the areas of economic development, the management of urban services (sanitation, waste, ...) but also the creation and management of large equipments in the fields of sport, culture, social and education. For most of them, these powers, once recognized as of metropolitan interest, may be delegated back to the “territories”. Finally, since its inception, the metropolis of Greater Paris may exercise powers delegated by the State, the Counties or the Region.

Budget
The Grand Paris is financed by: (1) a general operating grant from the State; (2) its own taxes levied on behalf of the municipalities including all the economic taxes; (3) other financial support from the State.

“A METROPOLIS EMBODIES AT THE SAME TIME A PROJECT OF SOLIDARITY, A RESPONSE TO THE PROBLEMS OF GOVERNANCE AND ALSO A DEVELOPMENT PROJECT. IT DOES NOT HAVE A SINGLE PURPOSE.”
Bridging the gap between long term strategies and socially requested short term results?

What is at stake?

Becoming a metropolis is a long term project, that should involve the whole population, private partners, NGOs and, as well, numerous public entities. Numerous research papers and examples confirm the role of a strong and sustained political will at the heart of success stories. In addition, strategic alignment among all categories of actors is a key issue for success. Indeed, developing synergies and alliances among investments projects, along with education or development of services will allow synergies, cost reduction, and sometime cut of losses. However, the process to initiate the discussion, draft a vision and translate it into sector strategic document and feasible projects will required some years.

At the same time, population as well as economic actors demand short term results. Indeed, they are struggling with difficult life conditions and exacerbated economic competition. Therefore, public authorities shall demonstrate their capacity to deliver prompt improvement of life conditions: traffic, air and water pollution, housing, land for economic development, education, leisure, services to economic activities, the list is endless. This pressure is regularly measured when the metropolitan area is run by elected representatives. However, the best metropolitan project will remain an idea if uncertain utilities delivery, bad recruitment conditions, increasing insecurity and other difficulties remain. It is no need to search far away in poor country to find examples: Marseilles struggles since decades to find its way, even though geography and history have given enormous advantages to this 26 century old city. Recruitment is yet as difficult as it is in old industrial cities in North-East of France.

Do we have constraints?

For sure, constraints are well known and a simple list is sufficient to support the reasoning: (1) prestige, as component of attractiveness, (2) engineering teams, more interested in preparing structural networks and big projects, (3) poor knowledge of the real life of people, particularly the poor ones, as well as the micro-entrepreneurs, (4) limitation of available budget, etc.

What comes from the field?

Citizens and businessmen didn’t wait for us. Following examples illustrate the large range of projects and technologies we can observe around the world:

1) From the IT sector, using data liberated by public authorities through open-data processes, we can mention services giving real time situation of traffic, parking availability or car sharing opportunities. Numerous start-up propose new services, aiming to facilitate daily life, more or less taking into account sustainable development objectives.

2) From NGOs experiences, groups of Pioneers test new ways of life, more respectful of the climate, reducing waste or water consumption, looking for more healthy food and transport schemes. These experiences give very rich evaluation of existing projects and innovations, mobilization of cross sectoral research teams (technology, economy and sometimes negative (train to car sharing or low cost air travel!). On the same way, new IT services on smartphones don’t reach people that are not equipped, regardless on the bad quality of data and services outside dense and vibrant centres. Finally, strong reluctance to change habits can undermine efforts and consensus. For example, implementing offices or retails in business parks at the fringe of the metropolis is still attractive for decision makers (owning houses somewhere in the suburbs), but absolutely counterproductive in regards of transports policies aiming to develop public transport and active modes (by foot or bicycle).

Nevertheless, the main issue for metropolitanises remains to ensure a more equitable development among cities and neighbourhoods, as well as to reduce inequalities among citizens in access to public services. Because it will take time to deploy large programs to the far end of the metropolitan area, metropolitan authorities and theirs partners need to succeed when proposing attractive solutions and opportunities through short track projects and action plans. Special focus on specificities can also express interest and recognition to people, as well as less attractive neighbourhoods, contributing to foster metropolitan identity.

Therefore, it seems that special attention should be made on short term projects and action plans. Strong evaluation of existing projects and innovations, mobilization of cross sectoral research teams (technology, economy as well as sociology, ecology, political sciences), large and honest participatory process are mandatory prerequisites. Success will need innovative approaches and dedicated human resources, as well as acceptance to take real but limited risk (limited because those short track projects are not expensive). The need to adapt administrative processes is also often identified. Even so, the key remain drafting and sharing a political vision willing to build an inclusive metropolis, supported by the more common economic and attractiveness objectives are key.
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