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RURBAN: some critical remarks

What is RURBAN, compared to the FUA-s?

Links between two OECD studies

The governance of RURBAN: some results of European research programmes

EU policy context
Peri-urban relationships

Urban >>> peri-urban
- housing development
- commercial development
- urban infrastructure
- leisure & tourism

Peri-urban settlements
- local economic development
- local community development

Peri-urban >>> urban
- access to markets
- access to services

Human >>> ecosystem
- leisure & tourism
- settlement structure & definition
- social & cultural services

Ecosystem >>> human
- farming & forestry
- minerals, energy, water
- climatic & supporting services

Source: Joe Ravetz
What is RURBAN…?

Rural-urban links can take different forms
Conventional contiguous city-hinterland forms:
• morphological,
• functional area,
• broader economic area,
• urban-rural region including also the rural hinterland
A-spatial forms (Andrew Copus):
• generic areas: not requiring contiguity in urban-rural links
• organized proximity: translocal globalization of rural business for which proximity is irrelevant
The OECD study discusses only the first forms.
"... the European (urban and rural) economic landscape is currently in a state of transition, between a twentieth century reality in which physical distance and agglomeration was a key driver, to a twentyfirst century one in which ‘organised proximity’ will play an increasing role in relation to some (not all) kinds of activity ... it seems difficult to conceive of ‘functional regions’ or ‘city regions’ as bounded spaces within which to implement urban-rural cooperation policies. (Copus, 2012:11)
OECD delimitation of functional urban areas

- OECD identification of core municipalities (year 2000), urban hinterland identified as worker catchment area (at least 15% of the workers commute to any of the core settlements).
- four categories, population size of the total functional urban area:
  - small urban areas with a population of 50 – 200 thousand;
  - medium-sized urban areas (200 – 500 thousand),
  - metropolitan areas (500 thousand – 1.5 million);
  - large metropolitan areas (above 1.5 million population).
- 29 OECD countries: 1175 functional urban areas, public database.
- European OECD countries: 659 functional urban areas (among which 29 large metropolitan areas and 88 metropolitan areas).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European OECD Countries</th>
<th>Large metropolitan area (1,5 mill - )</th>
<th>Metropolitan area (0,5 mill-1,5 m)</th>
<th>Medium sized urban area (200 th– 500 th)</th>
<th>Small urban area (50 th– 200 th)</th>
<th>SUMM</th>
<th>Share of pop in FUAs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>64,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Rep</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>73,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMM</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td><strong>225</strong></td>
<td><strong>317</strong></td>
<td><strong>659</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There should be a link between the two OECD studies

The empirical delimitation of functional urban areas is a big step forward – even if many understandings of FUAs exist.

What is the link of the OECD discussed RURBAN areas to the OECD delimited FUA areas? At least the 11 case study regions should be analysed in this context!
Governance of RURBAN

There are many results existing in European research programmes on governance of functional urban areas

• For the spatial type of RURBAN these results should be the starting point, extended with the rural aspect

• For the a-spatial type new research is needed

To develop models only on the basis of 11 case study areas will lead to limited results
Main types of governance in functional urban areas

1. Structured, pre-defined, fixed boundary metropolitan area organisation
   (French urban communities, Stockholm region, Stuttgart)

2. Flexible and/or bottom-up models of territorial governance
   (Eindhoven, Katowice: MAUS, Helsinki, GMCA, Malmö-Lund, Lille)

3. Strategic planning or project lead metropolitan areas
   (Dutch regions, Romanian Growth pole)
Polul de creştere Timişoara - componența
Suggestion: link RURBAN to existing models

• RURBAN specific issues can be studied on the level of case study areas

• The results, however, should be linked to mainstream functional urban area models!
URBACT evidence on metropolitan governance issues

- **CityRegion.Net**: fair sharing of costs and burdens between the cities and their neighbouring municipalities, role of city-regions

- **Net-Topic**: the case of intermediate urban areas around large core cities – towards policentricity with daytime and multifunctional medium cities

- **NODUS**: how to steer interventions into neighbourhoods from the city-region level
• **LUMASEC**: strategic land-use management from city-region level to address supra-local challenges

• **Joining Forces**: how to handle complex challenges in large-scale metropolises crossing regional and national boundaries

• **EGTC**: how to manage cross-border metropolitan areas with efficient governance models

Summary of the experiences: **URBACT Project Results**
The Eurocities Metropolitan Areas survey: some preliminary results

North-western Europe
• Birmingham, Brussels, Ghent, Helsinki, Lille, Linköping, Malmö, Manchester, Oslo, Rennes, Stockholm, Stuttgart, Vienna, Zurich

Southern Europe:
• Terrassa, Torino

East-central Europe:
• Bratislava, Brno, Budapest, Katowice, Warsaw
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City, size</th>
<th>Areas around the city</th>
<th>Functions of the different areas</th>
<th>Legal background</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vienna (1,7 mill)</td>
<td>1: Suburban region (SUM), local definition, close to MUA (2 mill), 70 municipalities 2: Vienna Metropolitan Area (SRO): local definition, close to FUA (2,6 mill), 268 municipalities 3: Planungs-gemeinschaft Ost (PGO): An association of the three eastern federal states Vienna, Lower Austria and Burgenland, larger than FUA, (3,7 mill), 745 municipalities 4: “Vienna Region” Vienna, Lower Austria and Burgenland (larger than FUA) – same area as the PGO 5: Vienna-Bratislava 6: Centrope (6,5 mill): AU, CZ, SK, HU</td>
<td>1. Primary areas of SUM involvement are spatial and landscape planning as well as traffic issues 2. Strategic planning 3. The task of the PGO is to „prepare and coordinate activities of spatial character“. It mainly focuses traffic, open space and spatial planning issues in the form of studies, research and conceptual work. 4. Marketing and business promotion agency 5. -- 6. Planning in the framework of Interreg projects</td>
<td>1. The SUM is organised as a society under civil law, members are the provinces Vienna and Lower Austria. Strategies are adopted by a steering committee of 23 members 2. The area is not officially defined and has no formal organisation. Currently a project by the PGO 3. College of Governors of the participating federal provinces which convenes once per year 4. VIENNA REGION Marketing GmbH 5. Run by business and industry organisations 6. Centrope Agency with regional offices in the 4 countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National regulations on financial and sectoral policies affecting functional areas
PLUREL – FP6 research

The local government financing system
• from where and according to which parameters the local governments receive their revenues – externalities

The taxation system
• the existence of different types of local taxes and the spatially relevant consequences of these taxes – tax competition

Sectoral policies
• infrastructure, economic development, transport, housing – regulations and subsidy systems
Policy context: towards a better planning system

- European funding should shift from project-funding towards funding of integrated programs
- Strong regulation is needed to force competing local governments to cooperate
- Planning and administrative/monitoring capacity should be developed and made strong on the required supra-local (e.g. functional urban region) level
JACQUIER: Multilevel: yesterday, today and may be tomorrow
A building process: the role of urban and regional policies

Until now
Former Organisation
Polarized Spaces
"Hardware" Policies

Central State

Province

Commune

Now
Transition

Then
New organisation
Homogeneous spaces
"Software" Policies

European Union

Transborder Regions
National Regions

Metropolitan Areas

Neighbourhoods

Vectors
Sustainable Urban Development

Integrated Policies as operators for transition

Social Cohesion Policy
SDEC, INTERREG
CIP URBAN, URBACT

Regional Politicies
DOCUP OP
Interreg

National IPSUD
(Big Cities programme
Politique de la ville,
Soziale Stadt, ...)
CIP Urban

Area-based approaches
New ideas in European policy making for the 2014-2020 period

• ITI: place-based integrated approach, potentially on metropolitan level (larger cities)

• CLLD: people-based integrated interventions on local (smaller municipalities) and neighbourhood level

• Horizon2020: spatially blind innovative economic actions
Potential links between metropolitan ideas and European policies

• **narrow metropolitan areas (zero-sum game): ITIs**, led by cities, in conjunction to **CLLDs**, led by public-private-thirdsector partnerships in smaller areas
  – the need for defined boundaries and (at least delegated) fixed institutional structure

• **broader metropolitan areas (win-win type cooperation):**
  link to regional innovation strategies, led by administrative regions and to **Horizon2020** innovation partnerships
  – can and should be kept on flexible spatial level, including rural areas

• **urban-rural cooperations in a-spatial form:** link to regional innovation strategies and to **Horizon2020** innovation partnerships
EU level interventions are needed for integrated urban development

For the success of EU2020 integrated green and social economy strategies are needed on the level of functional regions

This new approach needs policy guidance and financial support from the EU, initiating cross-sectoral and cross-territorial planning on the functional area level

The inclusion of rural areas has to be discussed in this context, while the special a-spatial forms through economic mechanisms

To initiate urban-rural links should help to overcome the split between Cohesion and Agricultural Policies
Thanks for your attention!

tosics@mri.hu