
PAPERS FROM PRACTICE

Benchmarking for Strategic Regional Metropolitan Plans

Mary Darley

Technical Director, Strategic Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area

Background

There are approximately 120 metropolitan regions and areas, with populations over 500,000, in the European Union, non-EU and Central and Eastern European Countries (CEEC).

METREX is a Network of practitioners - that is, politicians, officials and their advisers with a common interest in spatial planning and development at the metropolitan level.

The Network has a twin purpose:

- to promote the exchange of knowledge between practitioners on strategic issues of common interest.
- to contribute the metropolitan dimension to planning at the European level.

The Porto Metropolitan Magna Carta 1999

In 1999 METREX and the Junta Metropolitana do Porto, with the support of the European Commission, convened the Porto Convocation of European metropolitan regions and areas. An outcome was the Porto Metropolitan Magna Carta and its associated Practice Benchmark. Over 40 European metropolitan regions signed the Metropolitan Magna Carta of Spatial Planning and Development Intent and areas and the partners confirmed a common intention to:

- Pursue the aim of effective spatial planning and development at the metropolitan level in Europe, by promoting the necessary competence, capability and process.¹

The Scope of the Benchmark

Benchmarking implies learning from others so as to improve your own operations. In metropolitan planning terms this should involve the selection of comparable strategic planning systems, the identification of their levels of effectiveness and then the selection of indicators with sufficient level of detail to allow detailed understanding and realistic comparisons of effectiveness.

The Practice Benchmark 1999

Workshop discussions identified the following three main themes for the identification of Indicators:

- **COMPETENCE** the ability to make effective decisions
- **CAPABILITY** the ability to make informed decisions
- **PROCESS** the ability to achieve accepted decisions

The partners see the Benchmark as operating primarily as a self-assessment tool, but do not

regard the process as implying the application of an absolute standard. The benchmarks are regarded as indicators rather than precise measures. It is recognised that legal/constitutional circumstances are likely to limit potential responses to Benchmark “deficiencies”. In such circumstances the partners believe that the Benchmark, taken as a whole, can identify compensating responses. One example of such compensation, which was identified in the project discussions, is the development of mechanisms to ensure greater involvement through partnerships with other stakeholders under the *Process* heading to overcome deficiencies under the *Competence* heading, such as limited legal powers or a lack of coherence. It is also appreciated that at any point in time there may well be impending changes to *Competence* or *Process* which will affect the balance of the assessment and can be taken into account in assessing the need for improvement.

The partners are also aware that the overall effectiveness of metropolitan planning practice in any one area is not solely the product of good performance against the Benchmark Indicators. The Practice Benchmark does not seek to benchmark the entire management process, and should be seen as being part of a wider management framework. Such a framework would take into account issues affecting the effectiveness of planning, which are not addressed in the Practice Benchmark e.g. the quality of civic leadership, professional skills and personnel management.

The European Foundation for Quality Management’s (EFQM) Model of Excellence provides such a framework and has a public sector configuration, which recognises some dimensions of performance that are fundamentally different from that of private sector organisations. The partners recognised that committed civic leadership can markedly improve the credibility and effectiveness of the metropolitan planning process. It was also accepted that the role of a dominant local authority in a metropolitan area can be influential in terms of effectiveness, when it supports the concept of mutual responsibility.

The introduction of market economies in accession countries has led to the need for effective spatial planning and development practice at the metropolitan level to balance public and private interests. It is considered that the Practice Benchmark can offer useful guidance on the characteristics of the most appropriate system in terms of *Competence*, *Capability* and *Process*.

The most appropriate system will have to reflect the broader legal and constitutional systems of the countries involved, but the Practice Benchmark can provide an indication of the most appropriate response to any such circumstances.

The role of the Practice Benchmark as a guide for the development of a new system need not be restricted to the accession countries. In EU Member States, reviews of the structure of local government and the related planning systems are initiated from time to time. While it is not intended that the application of the Benchmark should impose a standard model it is considered that the Practice Benchmark can provide guidance for such initiatives as and when the opportunity arises.

The Benchmarking process can never be an absolute prescription. There will always be a need to balance the conclusions against other conflicting priorities. An identified need to improve the approach to inclusiveness, involving greater levels of consultation with the

public, may very well conflict with pressures to complete the process more expeditiously. Similarly an identified need to improve the quality of a number of the technical aspects of plan making, e.g. the acquisition of a more sophisticated land-use/transportation model, may well conflict with the overall resources available. The final outcome will be the product of a judgement between these conflicting priorities, but Benchmarking will ensure that it is an informed judgement.

Project Context

The Practice Benchmark 1999 has been evaluated against the practice in six regions, which reflect not only the differing planning legislation in six countries (Scotland, England, Ireland, the Netherlands, Belgium and France), but also very different local government structures and physical circumstances.

The Practice Benchmark concluded that:

- A Practice Benchmark of this kind has to be promoted, developed, applied and reviewed to be effective and remain effective.

The Practice Benchmark contained 4 key Benchmarks (dealing with related aspects of competence, capability and process) supported by 13 Indicators of an effective technical spatial planning capability at the metropolitan level.

The Benchmark Project 2001

In 2000 METREX made a submission under the Interreg IIc programme of the European Commission to pilot the application of the Practice Benchmark in six European metropolitan regions and areas, namely, Glasgow (Lead Partner), Bradford, Dublin, Lille, Brussels and Rotterdam. These partners represent a range of differing spatial planning circumstances and therefore offer a good basis for the application and review of the Benchmark, in practice, as was envisaged.

The European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) recognises that many of the policy options requiring co-operation at the European and transnational levels are dependent on complementary implementation at the regional level. It is at that level of spatial planning, the functional urban region, that the application of the goals of the ESDP can be implemented most effectively e.g. through land-use transportation planning.

The 2001 InterMetrex Project

The partners progressed the project with visits to each metropolitan area thus building an overview of how strategic regional planning functioned.

At each of the meetings time was allocated to the preparation of a revised practice benchmark using the experience of the participant partners. The InterMETREX project has now been concluded and provides a basis for a review of the Benchmark. The report of the project is published on the METREX web site.¹

The METREX Benchmarks that evolved are described on Figure 1.

Inter METREX Dublin Meeting

The visit to Dublin took place in September 2001. A field study tour of the Greater Dublin

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Competence PLAN</p> <p>1 National Spatial Plan availability 2 Status of the planning body 3 Formal scope of the planning authority 4 Strategic planning responsibilities 5 Coherence of area of planning authority</p> | | <p>Competence IMPLEMENTATION</p> <p>6 Power to implement and safeguard a strategy 7 Level of influence on implementation strategy</p> | | |
| <p>Capability RESOURCES AND INFORMATION</p> <p>8 Professional resources 9 Survey and data collection, 10 Projections and forecasts 11 Urban development capacity</p> <p>SCENARIO FORMULATION 12 Preparation of strategic scenarios</p> | <p>Capability KEY ISSUES OUTCOME</p> <p><i>Identification of key issues</i></p> | <p>Capability POLICY ANALYSIS</p> <p>13 Social development 14 Economic development 15 Housing development 16 Retail development 17 Transportation 18 Sustainable environmental quality</p> | <p>Capability OPTIONS OUTCOME</p> <p><i>Preparation of strategic options</i></p> | <p>Capability STRATEGY OUTCOME</p> <p><i>Integrated strategy policies, programmes projects</i></p> |
| <p>Process PARTICIPATION</p> <p>19 Legal rights of involvement 20 A pro active and inclusive approach 21 Stakeholder involvement 22 Transparency</p> | | <p>Process IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND REVIEW</p> <p>23 Implementation 24 Monitoring 25 Review</p> | | |

Table 1. The METREX Benchmarks summarised by COMPETENCE, CAPABILITY and PROCESS

Area was followed by a day of discussion and presentations that included:

- Challenges for the socio-economics of the region
- The Statutory Environment
- National Spatial Strategy
- Regional projects for drainage and water
- The evolution of the regional transportation strategy
- Regional project for sustainable recreation SRUNA
- Regional Waste Management Plan
- Dublin Docklands Development
- GIS Projects for the region
- The region in context

The project team identified their key issues:

(i) National Spatial Strategy

Ireland can be compared with some of the larger English regions, and therefore there is a danger of overlap unless there is a clear view, based on the principle of subsidiarity, of what needs to be resolved at an all-Ireland level, and what requires to be resolved at the Greater Dublin Area level. There is a need for scenario analysis at the national level in order to properly evaluate the non-Dublin growth options.

(ii) Growth Assumptions

There is a need to obtain a better understanding of the driving forces behind the indications of growth - could the housing boom be driven by finance availability rather than household demand? Such an understanding will give greater security to the strategic planning of the area, and will reduce the risk of unfulfilled assumptions. This could be exacerbated by changes in financial availability, e.g. changes in the European regime. There is a need to adopt a precautionary approach.

(iii) Coherence

There is a need to establish the extent to which the "leakage" across the Greater Dublin Area boundary is relevant to policy formulation; e.g. will it jeopardise housing distribution proposals?

(iv) Implementation

There is a risk that greater congestion will lead to further decentralisation if public transport plans are not implemented in phase with projected growth. This might be achieved through a Fast-Track Agency to bring forward development and transportation in parallel.

(v) Intensification

Sprawl seems out of control. There is a justification for a policy of intensification of development. This would not only include increased densities for new development, but the explicit encouragement of a process of intensification across large areas of existing development, e.g. in Tallaght. This could be allied with the identification of regeneration areas. Such a policy should involve a wide range of uses, and could involve the acceptance of higher buildings in areas such as the docklands, particularly where they would be well related to public transport and main facilities.

(vi) Sustainability

There would appear to be a need for a mechanism to ensure that the benefits of the economic boom can contribute to the problem of exclusion.

(vii) Hinterland

The resistance to the policies for the hinterland could be reduced if the plan provided a better understanding of the scope for change in the no-growth areas.

(viii) Organisation

There is a strong argument for a single organisation charged with responsibility for strategic land-use and transportation planning and implementation in the Greater Dublin Area. The remit for the Dublin Transportation Office provides a model for the scope of the responsibilities of the monitoring and review organisation.

Summary of the Strategic Planning Environment for Each Partner

Each partner prepared a report on the present situation in their metropolitan area using the benchmarks agreed in 1999. Brief extracts from these reports highlight the similarities and differences in approaches to strategic metropolitan planning among the partners.

Dublin Regional Authority

The Dublin Regional Authority (DRA) is charged with the responsibility to review from time to time the development plans of the local authorities in its area and to prepare a regional report covering all the development needs of the region. However the Regional Authority is not empowered to make strategic decisions and relies on the co-operation of the constituent local authorities.

In 1994 the DRA produced a report *Dublin - A Regional Focus*, which identified a number of inconsistencies among local authority development objectives. The area of the DRA no longer contains the commuting patterns of the city region, which extends into the Mid-East Region.

In 1998 the Department of the Environment and Local Government and the managers of the local authorities in the Dublin and Mid-East Regions initiated a study of the Greater Dublin Area. This study resulted in the publication in 1999 of a non-statutory document (*Strategic Guidelines*) drawn up for the local authorities in conjunction with the Dublin and Mid-East Regional Authorities.

These Guidelines have been adopted by the two Regional Authorities as their regional plan under the 1991 Local Government Act. The 1991 Act provides no statutory basis for the implementation of the Guidelines, but since January 2001 the Planning and Development Act 2000 has given statutory recognition to the Strategic Planning Guidelines for the Greater Dublin Area as the statutory regional planning guidelines for the Dublin and Mid-East Regions. Local Authorities must have regard to the Strategic Planning Guidelines when reviewing Development Plans.

The Greater Dublin Area has experienced substantial growth with development occurring at a low level of density. The net result has been a sprawling metropolitan area, which is threatening valued environmental areas. The Strategic Planning Guidelines are encouraging greater intensification. The sprawl is also generating levels of traffic, which the existing

transportation infrastructure cannot absorb. The improvement of the transportation networks and the achievement of a closer relationship between transportation facilities and development areas is a major strategic issue. At the same time there are many areas in the region in need of urban regeneration and the Strategic Planning Guidelines is encouraging action in these areas.

Glasgow and the Clyde Valley Structure Plan Joint Committee

The Structure Plan Joint Committee is the response of eight unitary local authorities to a Scottish Government requirement that a single structure plan should be prepared for the whole metropolitan area of Glasgow. The eight councils, which have a wide range of other functions such as housing, roads and education, remain individually responsible for the planning of their own area. This is a relatively new arrangement (since 1996) and has not yet completed a full cycle of plan making and review, although a new structure plan was submitted to the Scottish Government in 2001.

The City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

Bradford Council is required by national legislation to prepare a single plan for the area, a Unitary Development Plan (UDP). The UDP must conform to a wide range of national Planning Policy Guidance Notes, which set out what is to be included in the Development Plan on specific issues. The Government also produces statements of national policy on broad issues such as the future of transport, but there is no integrated National Spatial Plan to guide the preparation of the UDP.

Initiatives have been taken to provide a wider strategic framework. Strategic Planning Guidance for the wider conurbation of West Yorkshire was published by the Government in 1989 to guide the work on UDPs. This Strategic Guidance has subsequently been integrated into Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) for the much larger region of Yorkshire and Humberside, published in 1996. This regional approach to planning for the larger area has been substantially expanded by the present Government, resulting in a review of the RPG. This review is a partnership between the Regional Assembly for Yorkshire and Humberside, the Regional Planning Forum (the planning authorities) and the Government. The new RPG is expected to be issued by the Government in 2001, but the new regional body has yet to establish any firm competence in the sphere of spatial planning, and has no protocol for dealing with contentious planning issues.

Whilst the UDP area enjoys a substantial degree of self-containment there is a substantial degree of leakage and overlap with adjoining metropolitan areas and beyond into North Yorkshire. As a result, within West Yorkshire, a number of informal networks have been established to look at common strategies and cross-boundary issues. The integration of transport issues is facilitated through the preparation of a Local Transport Plan for West Yorkshire by the five Metropolitan District Councils in partnership with the West Yorkshire Passenger Transport Authority.

Région Bruxelles-Capitale

The Regional Administration, with the aid of various consultants, is responsible for the preparation of the Regional Development Plan (PRD) and the Regional Land Use Plan (PRAS). The first PRD was adopted in 1995. A new PRD 2001 will be adopted shortly. The PRD implementation is monitored every year in a special report (not made public). There

are, however, 19 local communities (Communes), including the City of Brussels, which have strong local planning and implementation powers. Decisions at the Commune level can inhibit the proper implementation of the Regional Plans. Not all of the Communes have a fully approved Local Development Plan.

The Government has great influence through the national railroad system and airport development policies. The region is not a coherent area in terms of employment and housing markets and there are large travel to work movements across the border with adjoining regions. As a result, decisions on development issues in adjoining regions can have a significant impact on the Regional Plans. There has been some co-operation on transportation issues, but there has not been much progress on land-use matters.

The area of the Region forms part of a wider urbanised area. The presence of international organisations such as the European Commission and NATO has transformed the city region into an international location, with many associated organisations and lobbying consultancies seeking accommodation in the city. This has generated substantial growth in the region and particularly at the airport, which has physical limitations. Despite this economic growth which has to be addressed by the Regional Plan, there are significant areas of social deprivation in the city and concentrations of immigrant population requiring regeneration initiatives.

L'Agence de Développement et d'Urbanisme de Lille Métropole

In France the two documents that constitute urban planning are the *schémas directeurs* (SDAU) and *plans d'occupation des sols* (POS). The SDAU are strategic documents determining the general use of land, the nature and location of large infrastructure, the extension of urban areas and the redevelopment of existing urban areas. The legislation on town planning is being changed and the SDAU will become *schémas de cohérence territoriale*.

These will be strategic documents co-ordinating the different tools for the planning of specific sectors, including the successors to the POS - *Plans locaux d'urbanisme*. The new legislation will give greater authority to the strategic plans. The *schémas directeurs* are prepared or reviewed on the initiative of municipalities that constitute a community with common economic and social interests.

Rotterdam City Council

Rotterdam city forms the core of the Rotterdam city region. A proposal for the establishment of a formal city region was rejected by the inhabitants of Rotterdam in 1996. Since then the 18 municipalities in the region have been co-operating under the Kaderwet law to prepare (sectoral) regional visions (transportation, green areas and spatial planning), which will ultimately result in (sectoral) Regional Structure Plans.

The formal legal context for the region means that there are no directly elected councillors. The constituent municipalities nominate councillors as their representatives. The technical resources of the Rotterdam City planning services provide the means of preparing the plan on behalf of the participating municipalities. The area of the city region is not self-contained. There is considerable inter-action with adjoining areas in the 'South Wing' of the Randstad and it is likely that land allocations to meet the needs of the region will increasingly have to be found in these areas. The area of the Province of South Holland coincides with this more coherent area, but the Province does not have the appropriate powers to act as an effective

strategic planning authority.

The Revised Practice Benchmark

Twenty five indicators of effective metropolitan spatial planning competence, capability and process each of which has 3 levels of effectiveness ranging from a minimum, through an increasing, to a maximum level are identified in the report. The purpose of this approach is to recognise that although the maximum levels represent 'best practice' many metropolitan bodies may have to progress incrementally, over time, towards these. The report therefore provides a means by which any metropolitan region and area can assess its practice, position itself, and progress to greater effectiveness in its spatial planning. A summary of the report is on the METREX website.

Although this Revised Practice Benchmark sets out 'best practice' it is recognised that metropolitan areas with established strategic planning arrangements and those that are in the process of setting these up will most probably move towards best practice in stages. The benchmarking process is a useful tool that can be used to make progress step by step.

It is also recognised that the Revised Practice Benchmark is a 'snapshot' as of summer 2001 and that best practice will continue to evolve and develop. METREX therefore intends to keep the Benchmark under review, as it continues to extend its application across Europe through the Interreg IIIc programme (see the InterMETREX and PolyMETREX Prospectus on the METREX web site).

The project partners, as a final exercise, submitted completed forms on *The Indicators of effective metropolitan spatial planning* that had evolved from the discussions at the partners meetings. Metropolitan regions and areas can consider their current practice in relation to best practice and set out their own way forward following the model set out on the detailed indicators. Full details of the revised benchmark are available on the website. However it is of interest to consider the following chart, especially as we are establishing the process and procedures for Regional Planning Guidelines.

Table 2 A **COMPETENCE** to plan and implement a strategy at Metropolitan level

| INDICATORS OF EFFECTIVE METROPOLITAN SPATIAL PLANNING PRACTICE | EFFECTIVENESS | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Minimum | Increasing | Maximum |
| 1 National Spatial Plan availability A National Spatial Plan or higher tier plan B Long term sectoral programmes C Topic policy guidelines | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 The status of the metropolitan planning body A Single legal authority B Joint formal planning mechanism C Advisory body | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 The formal scope of the planning authority A Spatial planning covering social, economic, transportation and environmental functions B Land use and transportation C Land use only | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4 Strategic planning responsibilities (social, economic, transportation and environmental functions) Social functions A Fully integrated with land use B Linked through a mechanism C Separate | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Economic functions D Fully integrated with land use E Linked through a mechanism F Separate | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Transportation functions G Fully integrated with land use H Linked through a mechanism I Separate | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Environmental functions J Fully integrated with land use K Linked through a mechanism L Separate | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5 Level of coherence of the area of the planning authority "Journey to work" commuting catchment area A >95% B 66-95% C <66% | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Public transport system area D >95% E 66-95% F <66% | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Housing market area G >95% H 66-95% I <66% | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Retail catchment area of the main metropolitan centre J >95% K 66-95% L <66% | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Hydrological catchment area M >95% N 66-95% O <66% | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6 Power to implement and safeguard a planning strategy A Full legal power including "call in" powers B Plan consideration amongst other factors C Comments and advice | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7 Level of influence on implementation resources A Plan primacy directing investment B Formal commitment from implementation partners C Separation of plan making & implementation (advice & recommendations) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Table 2 B CAPABILITY for informed decision making at the Metropolitan level

| INDICATORS OF EFFECTIVE METROPOLITAN SPATIAL PLANNING PRACTICE | EFFECTIVENESS | | |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | Minimum | Increasing | Maximum |
| 8 Professional Resources A Dedicated permanent professional team B Temporary dedicated resources C Ad hoc allocation of staff | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| 9 Survey and data collection A To agreed standards and capable of spatial analysis B To agreed standards C Reconciliation of existing data | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| 10 Preparation of forecasts and projections Demographic and household A Area specific, internally consistent and reconciled with wider contexts B Area specific C Pro rated from wider contexts | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Demographic and household A Area specific, internally consistent and reconciled with wider contexts B Area specific C Pro rated from wider contexts | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Transportation A Area specific, internally consistent and reconciled with wider contexts B Area specific C Pro rated from wider contexts | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| Retailing A Area specific, internally consistent and reconciled with wider contexts B Area specific C Pro rated from wider contexts | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| 11 Urban development capacity A Full capacity assessment including the potential for sites to arise (windfall sites) & the scope for intensification B Capacity assessment of existing allocations & known sites C Capacity assessment of existing formal allocations | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| 12 Preparation of strategic scenarios A Fully integrated scenarios B Linked scenarios C Separate scenarios | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| 13 Social issues A Assessment implications of urban and rural exclusion B Identification of areas of multiple deprivation C Assessment of client group changes | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| 14 Economic issues A Development of an economic futures statement B Spatial implications of economic forecasts C Assessment of implications of existing trends | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| 15 Housing issues A Market area analysis B Disaggregated analysis C Broad analysis of housing demand and supply | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| 16 Retail issues A Retail model B Catchment area approach C Whole area approach | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| 17 Transportation issues A Interactive policy option modelling B Requirements arising from land use based forecasts C Requirements from the extrapolation of existing flows | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |
| 18 Environmental issues A Modelling of impact on carrying capacities of the eco system B Impact assessment of major proposals C Assessment of impact of expected changes of conditions | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |

Table 2 C PROCESS Participation, Implementation, Monitoring and Review

| INDICATORS OF EFFECTIVE METROPOLITAN SPATIAL PLANNING PRACTICE | EFFECTIVENESS | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | Minimum | Increasing | Maximum |
| 19 Legal rights of involvement | | | |
| A Third party rights | | | <input type="text"/> |
| B Statutory consultees | | <input type="text"/> | |
| C Legal notification of plan | <input type="text"/> | | |
| 20 A pro-active inclusive approach | | | |
| A Equal opportunity to shape the strategy promoted for all members of the public | | | <input type="text"/> |
| B Participation focussed on significant "stakeholders" | | <input type="text"/> | |
| C Limited formal consultation | <input type="text"/> | | |
| 21 Stakeholder investment | | | |
| A Formal partnership and participation | | | <input type="text"/> |
| B Working groups | | <input type="text"/> | |
| C Reactive ad hoc liaison | <input type="text"/> | | |
| 22 Transparency | | | |
| A Decisions justified, documented and open to the public | | | <input type="text"/> |
| B Explanations for major stakeholders | | <input type="text"/> | |
| C The plan is the response | <input type="text"/> | | |
| 23 Implementation | | | |
| A Formal partnership programmes | | | <input type="text"/> |
| B Agreement in principle | | <input type="text"/> | |
| C Aspirational projects | <input type="text"/> | | |
| 24 Monitoring | | | |
| A A public annual monitoring report based on explicit policy targets | | | <input type="text"/> |
| B An annual report to the authority based on core indicators supplemented by soft indicators | | <input type="text"/> | |
| C A report to the authority on the general progress of the strategy | <input type="text"/> | | |
| 25A Review | | | |
| A A legal commitment to a regular 5 year review | | | <input type="text"/> |
| B A commitment to regular review | | <input type="text"/> | |
| C Review when required | <input type="text"/> | | |
| 25B Review | | | |
| A Less than 2 years since review | | | <input type="text"/> |
| B Review started | | <input type="text"/> | |
| C More than 5 years since review | <input type="text"/> | | |

InterMETREX Project 2000/2006

The European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) seeks to achieve a better urban balance across Europe and it is important that all of Europe's 100 or so larger metropolitan areas contribute collectively to this strategy through effective spatial planning and development. Every metropolitan region and area needs to address its weaknesses and support its strengths. The Revised Practice Benchmark is an aid to the achievement of this objective.

The intention will be to progressively extend the application of the Revised Benchmark across the wider Europe of the European Union and central and eastern European countries (CEEC) through future partnership projects under the provisions of the Interreg IIIC programme.

Footnote

¹METREX web site at <http://www.eurometrex.org>

Acknowledgement

This paper draws on information provided in the METREX web site at <http://www.eurometrex.org>