

Metropolitan Area Strategic Plan (MASP) for Galway:

Governance Review

DRAFT

Executive Summary

1. Metropolitan Area Strategic Plans (MASPs) have been highlighted in the National Planning Framework (NPF) and in the Northern and Western Region, having regard to the strategic objectives and aims of the NPF. The regional designation of Galway for a MASP underpins support for the broader development aims of the NWRA as set out in its Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES having particular regard to implementation and monitoring). Within the strategic framework provided by the RSES, the Galway MASP is intended to provide a high-level strategy to deliver a sustainable growth path for the area along with an underpinning institutional framework to ensure coordination between the local authorities in the MASP area.
2. This report has been prepared to provide an overview of how city region and metropolitan area planning is implemented in other parts of the OECD and to make appropriate recommendations concerning the shared governance for the Galway MASP. 8 metropolitan areas, and Galway City and County were examined.
3. The most critical feature to city region and metropolitan area planning being undertaken in the areas examined, notwithstanding the differing nature of local and regional government structures and responsibilities, is the putting in place of agreed iterative engagements between the local level and the regional/national level. These are sustained over the long run and are often set within a very long term, open ended strategic vision for the city region and its wider metropolitan context.
4. The use of regional platforms through which national and regional objectives can be translated into the more localised responsibilities of the local government system seems to be reasonably common. These are then often underpinned by medium to longer term infrastructure and investment planning and, in several instances, longer term vision type statements of up to 50 years.
5. Local to regional transport planning is effectively a feature of most of the examples examined.
6. All effective forms of collaboration are clearly delineated by way of formal agreement, statutory obligation, or various terms of agreement/codes of practice.

7. The principal recommendations in the report suggest a socio-economic process should be at the heart of a long-term investment programme which would be informed by a socio-economic framework specifically applied to meet the growth needs of Galway as follows:

i) Existing structures (i.e., councils, Regional Assembly, etc., should remain focused on their existing remits but within a strategic framework that should be established for the Galway MASP). A new local political oversight drawn from the memberships of the local corporate policy groups in both Councils and from the Regional Assembly, under the shared chair of the Mayors of both Councils, should be put in place to lead political consideration of the following recommendations, if applied.

ii) A new statutory-based oversight and management group should be established that would be tasked with applying a long-term strategic direction for the area which would then inform the work of the unit set out in the following recommendation.

iii) A specialist socio-economic unit, consisting of strategic specialisms across a range of spatial, transport, health, education, cultural, environmental, climate action, amenity and wellness, and economic planning skills, should be put in place to cover both the city and county of Galway and to address long-term planning and investment for all sectors under this umbrella. It would include addressing strategic investment needs for Galway over at least a 20 year horizon and set within the longer term strategic view of the statutory group referred to above. This in turn should be underpinned by a Galway MASP Investment Plan which should have a 20 year horizon that would ultimately be approved by Government.

iv) The oversight and management group, under the chair of a Minister of State, consisting of the Chief Executives, Mayor and Cathaoirleach of the two Councils, the Presidents of the Universities, the Regional Chief Executive of the HSE, the Director/Cathaoirleach of the Regional Assembly, the Chief Executive of the Education and Training Board and other relevant bodies (including an Garda), to provide oversight and implementation of the long term planning should be empowered to issue direction of other state and local bodies in regard to the agreed 20 year investment programme that should be adopted by government.

v) As noted in the recommendations above, the national/local financial investment programme to be prepared should be signed off by Government.

Contents

Executive Summary	2
1. Introduction	6
1.1 Overview	6
1.2 Project Terms of Reference	6
1.3 Research methodology	6
1.4 Research limitations	7
2. Case Studies	9
2.1 Overview	9
2.2 Galway, Ireland	9
2.3 Pori, Finland	10
2.4 Aberdeen, Scotland	11
2.5 Cambridge, England	11
2.6 Aalborg, Denmark	12
2.7 La Rochelle, France	12
2.8 Leuven, Flanders, Belgium	13
2.9 Liverpool, England	13
2.10 Freiburg, Germany	13
2.11 Other Countries	14
3. International metropolitan areas-Lessons for Galway	15
3.1 Core elements of successful metropolitan strategic plans	15
3.2 Delivery of competitiveness, growth, sustainability, and liveability	15
3.3 Role of transport infrastructure	16
3.4 Effective forms of collaboration between local councils, both vertical and horizontal	16
3.5 Remit of engagement with other stakeholders	16
3.6 Cycles and lengths of time for successful metropolitan development	17

3.7 Financing / resourcing models	17
4. Recommendations for Galway MASP governance	18
Appendix 1: Core elements of successful metropolitan plans	20
Galway, Ireland	21
Pori, Finland	24
Aberdeen, Scotland	31
Cambridge, England	35
Aalborg, Denmark	41
La Rochelle, France	45
Leuven, Flanders, Belgium	51
Liverpool, England	55
Freiburg im Breisgau	59

DRAFT

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

Seán Ó Riordáin and Associates Ltd., (the consultant) have been commissioned by the Northern and Western Regional Assembly (NWRA) to complete a research project which examines a variety of metropolitan city areas within the OECD which may provide models of possible interest in relation to the governance of the Galway Metropolitan Area Plan. The report will be subject to public discussion and consultation in 2023 and it may help inform future direction of governance arrangements of the MASP Area and environs in the context of a review of the National Planning Framework.

1.2 Project Terms of Reference

Metropolitan Area Strategic Plans (MASPs) have been highlighted in the National Planning Framework (NPF) and in the Northern and Western Region Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy, having regard to the strategic objectives and aims of the NPF. The regional designation of Galway for a MASP is expected to support the broader development aims of the NWRA as set out in its Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES). Within the strategic framework provided by the RSES, the Galway MASP is intended to facilitate a sustainable growth process for the area along with an underpinning institutional framework to ensure collaboration and coordination between the local authorities in the MASP area. In that context, the authorities in Galway are embarking upon a metropolitan governance planning process as part of a new phase of collaboration between the two local authorities (Galway City Council and Galway County Council), the Regional Assembly (NWRA) and other key stakeholders.

Consequently, the research work to be undertaken for this report will consider case studies of metropolitan strategic planning from a range of metro areas that have some broadly similar features to Galway in terms of size, economic position, growth, and orientation. The research set out in the following report seeks to garner international insights that might be applicable to Galway. It captures observations that could inform the implementation of a governance model appropriate to the Galway Metropolitan Area Planning process.

1.3 Research methodology

Preparation of the report required agreement on a final methodology between the project steering group and the consultant at an initial inception meeting. This was presented as an inception report.

An initial workshop with the joint Planning SPC for Galway City and County was arranged as a part of the inception process.

The Report is to set out that the research would cover the following:

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

- Agreement on the selection of appropriate case studies
- Agreement on the scope of the desktop review
- Completion of a mapping of national, regional, and key stakeholders

On production of the draft report, it was agreed that the Consultant would then undertake a series of meetings with key stakeholders as well as a full workshop with the members of the Joint SPC, to take place in early 2023. A further workshop, where the draft report would be presented to steering group is to be arranged to enable sharing of insights from the desktop review, the case studies and preliminary consultation.

The research process, on commissioning was expected to deliver a report that captures recommendations relating to:

- o Core elements of successful metropolitan plans
- o Approach to Land use planning and metropolitan strategic planning
- o The role of transport infrastructure in regional development (GTS Review)
- o Competitiveness and participation
- o Effective form of collaboration (Governance) among local and regional tier government including recommendations on;
 - Political oversight
 - Executive oversight
 - Terms of reference
 - Governance structures
- o The cycles and timeframes for regional collaboration to succeed
- o Data and Monitoring applications for Galway MASP

This draft report is consequently structured with the above in mind. It also includes the detailed assessment of the agreed metropolitan areas examined.

1.4 Research limitations

Preparation of the research required access to a variety of primarily web based resources, much of which is clearly in a language pertinent to the area covered. Use of language translation was required

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

and may in part not fully appreciate the nuances applicable in the use of language, especially having regard to local political and cultural perspective. In addition, it is assumed that the web sites reviewed, primarily official sites of relevant local and regional authorities, are up to date. Comment and research is therefore restricted to these factors as this research is concluded.

DRAFT

2. Case Studies

2.1 Overview

As noted above, the case studies were agreed following discussion with the Project Steering Group, headed by the then Chief Executive of Galway City, his counterpart in Galway County Council and the former Director of the NWRA. Initial discussion with key national stakeholders and a short workshop with the members of the Joint SPC was also undertaken. The draft report can be further expanded to include other areas if required and indeed other key points for consideration by the Joint Committee and the Project Steering Group before the Final Research Report is fully completed.

Parameters for identification of relevant case studies were relatively broad as may be noted from Section 1.3 above. In effect, the decision was taken to examine the relevant planning systems in metropolitan areas in the OECD which would be of most immediate interest to the Steering Group.

The Parameters therefore include:

- i) Area and population, keeping in mind the potential growth of the Galway context
- ii) Minimalist and maximalist regional systems
- iii) Physical characteristics
- iv) Stage of economic development to be broadly similar to Galway
- v) Extent of University/tertiary education provision
- vi) Other characteristics the Consultant would consider as relevant to the research

8 metropolitan areas, and Galway City and County were examined, and findings are broadly set out in the following sub-sections and are more detailed, in line with the research parameters, in Appendix 1 to this Report.

2.2 Galway, Ireland

The system of local government in Ireland is relatively unique in the OECD given the highly disaggregated nature of the Irish Public Sector. It is only in very recent years that a national to local spatial planning hierarchy under the National Planning Framework has been put in place with an aligned institutional framework. This framework informs national investment planning under the National Development Plan process which is partly reflected at a regional level through the regional and spatial planning role of 3 regional assemblies. In the case of Galway and environs the relevant Assembly is the Northern and Western Regional Assembly which effectively is the intermediate planning layer between the NPF and the local planning of the City and County Councils of Galway.

Part of the unique nature of the system of public management in Ireland is the restricted mandate and spending capacity of local government. Unlike most of the rest of the OECD, local government has

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

very limited powers and often finds itself operating alongside siloed national government bodies which report directly to a specific national government ministry. The local government sector itself has multiple reporting pathways into central government.

As a consequence, local government, while having reasonably far-ranging planning policy responsibilities at local level, has limited roles in education, social and community care, healthcare and other person centred services which are generally considered to be core local government services elsewhere in the OECD. Consequently, the Irish local government system has a limited and arguably shrinking role in the provision of key infrastructure. That noted, one of the more interesting aspects of Irish local government system, from an international perspective, is the relatively recent renewal of local government in acting as the lead public authority at local level under the 2014 reforms of the Local Government Reform Act. In this new role other public bodies and Government, itself, increasingly look to local government to enable delivery of national policy at local level.

Given the development of this new role as the key local public sector enabler, the local authorities in Ireland, alongside the regional assembly structures, are increasingly a platform for looking to apply more integration at local and regional level, a development which is acknowledged in the National Planning Framework, particularly for Ireland's nascent city regions which may see the implementation of Delivery Boards that could be comparable to similar type structures found across the OECD and which are found in the various international case studies set out within this Report.

In addition, Galway itself has various local coordination processes such as a joint strategic policy committee between both local authorities which plays an active, if limited, role in the development of joint policy approaches to wider city and county planning needs. Galway, like several of the case study areas also have a public-private platform, the Greater Galway Forum, which consists of senior decision-makers from across the public sector arena and senior representatives from both the private sector, including industry, business generally as well as arts/culture. The Forum is seeking developing a long-term strategic perspective on the socio-economic development of the area broadly consistent with the Metropolitan Area.

2.3 Pori, Finland

A city and region with several similar characteristics to the Galway Area, the institutional setting is different in the range of responsibilities which the local and regional authorities of Finland have when compared to their Irish counterparts, especially in terms of service responsibilities at local authority level. Nonetheless the area like Galway has an advanced tertiary sector, an active port and is linked into the wider Finnish context through State led economic and spatial planning and regional

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

development where many features to the Galway context are similar. Rurality, accessibility, and urban regeneration being among such key features.

Pori can be noted as having, notwithstanding the central local role of the local authority and wide ranging regional and national policy framework which ultimately finds its expression delivery wise through a single entity, the local councils, in this case Pori City Council. The interesting aspect from an Irish perspective is that while the national policy framework is very disaggregated across government agencies etc., the ultimate focus on citizen led delivery through local government requires a means through which such disaggregation can be aligned and this occurs through the Regional structure which provides a unifying platform within which local authorities individually and collectively can work in meeting locally determined, by local elected politicians, citizen expectations. The regional policy framework is not that different to the RSES/MASP approach taken in Ireland, save with one critical difference, and that is in the range of policy responsibilities resting on the Pori Local Authority which are clearly more extensive than that applicable in Galway.

The regional development of Pori is coordinated in a regional cooperation group (the MYR), whose activities are coordinated by the regional development team of the Regional Authority.

2.4 Aberdeen, Scotland

Scottish local government has a wider area of social responsibility than is the case in Ireland, albeit that this maybe about to change under expected reforms of the Scottish Government in 2023 where social and education provision, currently part of the remit of local government, may be shifted into national platforms. That noted there are many broad similarities to local planning in Ireland, with Scotland having a national planning policy along with local authorities having local area plans and city development plans. Of interest is the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan under the umbrella of the Strategic Planning Authority for the Area, one of 4 covering much of the territory of Scotland.

The governance arrangements are of particular note, given the cross authority cooperation between the Aberdeen City Council and its surrounding neighbour, Aberdeenshire Council, through the Strategic Development Planning Authority for the joint area. It provides a model given the broader context of policy in Scotland, with Galway.

2.5 Cambridge, England

At face value the selection of Cambridge might raise a few eyebrows, especially given its geographical location. That noted there are many similarities given the importance of the tertiary education and research sector, the extent of advanced manufacturing and the continuous policy drive from the

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

national level. However, equally, it should be noted that the policy framework at national and regional level is hugely disaggregated with a multiplicity of agencies in and around the core region of Cambridge city region providing a complex institutional setting through which public services must negotiate to meet the needs of the residents and businesses of the area.

In that context what will be of interest to Galway is the Greater Cambridge Partnership, a joint agency between the local authorities within the Combined Authority Structure that oversees coordination, and which allows for focused strategic thinking in and around greater Cambridge itself. It is supported by a small bespoke planning unit which provides the necessary technical assistance to the local political structures while wider issues are dealt with by the Combined Authority which has an umbrella role for a wider range of local authorities over the full extent of the original County of Cambridgeshire.

The Executive Board of the Greater Cambridge Partnership comprises three elected members with full voting rights (one from each of the three partner Councils) and two non-voting members co-opted by the joint committee/Executive Board; one nominated by the Business Board and one nominated by the University of Cambridge. This Executive Board provides a platform for setting direction on a cross organisation basis and though it the strategic direction is formed for the constituent members including the local authorities.

2.6 Aalborg, Denmark

A partner city of Galway, the range of policy responsibilities of the city council will be similar to those of Pori and as in Finland, Danish institutional frameworks tend to be highly congested above the local government layer so that for the citizen in Denmark the most likely link with public administration will be via the local authority.

Of interest to Irish eyes will be the extent to which there are highly formalised iterative arrangements between the local government and the higher policy layers. Also of interest is the variety of platforms for citizen engagement including short term citizen assembly type arrangements to address specific policy initiatives but the policy process is generally led and determined at political level at both local and regional level, and particularly informed by national policy priorities.

2.7 La Rochelle, France

This example is, arguably, the city area most like that of Galway with its regional structures carrying much in common with the relatively minimalist role of regional structures which we find in Ireland. Of particular interest La Rochelle works closely with its neighbouring authorities (and has done so for over 50 years) delivering both policy and services on a joint basis. The City has its local planning framework which is set within the framework of an Intermunicipal Local Urbanism Plan which provides

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

the overall strategic direction for the local authority agglomeration platform across the various neighbouring local authorities. Local authority agglomerations in France are required by national planning legislation to adopt such plans which then set the strategic direction for socio-economic development. In addition, the Council has in place citizen assembly type arrangements along with a clear local political structure that gives direction across local authority boundaries but clearly is driven by local authority policy perspective given the local role of the elected members and professional staffs working through the AGGO, as it is called.

2.8 Leuven, Flanders, Belgium

Leuven is of interest given the multiplicity of state and federal structures which must be negotiated by the City Council and neighbouring municipalities in Flanders, not to mention the impact of living in an international multiple border context with several languages and a legacy of historical conflict, not unlike that of Northern Ireland. The local municipalities operate within a provincial system, responsible for their own immediate spatial planning and economic development but set within a national to local framework which is given expression through the regional planning of the Province. It has a specialised agency, called the Procoro, which operates as a separate technical assistance platform for the Provincial Authority as it considers regional planning. In addition, the role of the principal university, KU Leuven, is worth noting, as it has established a specialised unit to advise on local planning and transport issues, and thus plays a critical role in local/provincial planning affairs. Also worth noting is that a subsidiary company of the city of Leuven delivers urban regeneration, directly, or in partnership with the private sector.

2.9 Liverpool, England

In the case of Liverpool, the introduction of a combined authority structure under the direct leadership of an elected Mayor is aligned to the elected role within the City itself of a Mayor that has executive responsibility for the City administration alongside a separate ceremonial yearly Lord Mayor role. The Metropolitan Mayor of the Combined Area is working on adoption of a Strategic Plan which will set the overall vision for the region. A separate joint council/public service/private business grouping, Team Liverpool, has already adopted a Charter and the Team Liverpool Plan which is focused on the Metropolitan Area. It has in place the Liverpool Plan which sets out six priority action areas for the City. Their intention is to align shared resources to transform the City in regard to health, education, neighbourhoods, economy, culture, and climate.

2.10 Freiburg, Germany

One of the world leaders in long-term sustainable planning and implementation, Freiburg is of interest on a number of fronts. Its successful transition to a city region which is among the most innovative in

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

the European Union is underpinned by a complete shift towards public transportation over the past three decades. In addition, the regional administrative structures, whilst not entirely the same as those in Ireland, hold several common features, particularly in regard to spatial planning. Housing delivery will also be of interest to an Irish authority. From the Lander level (effectively national level in Ireland) to the administrative regional districts (effectively the NWRA equivalent) to the Kreise (County Council) and City Council levels, coordination is delivered through the administrative regional structure known as the Regierungsbezirk. At this level regional spatial direction is determined in line with national/Lander priorities.

2.11 Other Countries

While the suggested city regions put forward from the initial consultation process, there are examples from North America and Australasia. These include, for example, Boston where a Metropolitan Area Planning Council, has been put in place by the State of Massachusetts. It is akin to the regional authorities that existed in Ireland pre the 2014 local government reforms. Its mission is to promote what it styles smart growth and regional collaboration through a regional strategy. There is also another State body, the Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Body which is responsible for coordination of mass transport. There are 22 members on this Board, 12 of whom are municipal nominees including the Mayor of Boston. Finally, there is the Metro Mayors Coalition, made up of the Mayors of 14 communities in Greater Boston. It is a voluntary forum where members exchange information and create solutions to common problems.

In another example, that of Brisbane¹, while scale is a significant difference relative to Galway, the City Council and its neighbours have formed an umbrella council, South East Queensland, which provides a platform for regional based service provision and extends well beyond the footprint of Brisbane Metropolitan Area. This collaborative platform and supporting strategic plan, in turn, is set within the overall framework of the Government of Queensland under the democratic leadership of the State Premier and its Parliament.

Various other examples such as local to regional government in New Zealand are derivations of the system in Brisbane which has provided the main model for local and regional government reconfiguration in that part of the world.

¹ Brisbane City Council is one of the largest local authorities in the Southern Hemisphere and is under the leadership of an Executive, directly elected, Mayor.

3. International metropolitan areas-Lessons for Galway

3.1 Core elements of successful metropolitan strategic plans

The most critical core element found in the various examples, notwithstanding the differing nature of local and regional government structures and responsibilities is the putting in place of agreed iterative engagements between the local level and the regional/national level. These are sustained over the long run and are often set within a very long term, open ended strategic vision for the city region and its wider metropolitan context. In a number of the examples there are specific structures put in place to advise, either solely on the spatial direction of the relevant location or in addition to (critically) the long term investment planning of the area. This is of particular note in the UK examples given the relatively significant central government constraints on the local government system. It is perhaps given most expression in France through their metropolitan governance arrangements in the larger city regions but even in smaller scale city areas such as La Rochelle, the use of agglomeration powers which respect the corporate individuality of each local authority but also allows for economies of scale etc., through the local government led agglomeration bodies.

Core areas covered across pretty much every area strategic plan examined will be those set out in the RSES but critically will also include culture, health, education at all levels, and addressing the challenge of climate change.

3.2 Delivery of competitiveness, growth, sustainability, and liveability

As noted in 3.1 above the use of a form of regional platform through which national and regional objectives can be translated into the more localised responsibilities of the local government system seems to be reasonably common. These are then underpinned by medium to longer term infrastructure and investment planning. In several, as noted above, these in turn are further set within a longer-term broad framework, with several of these been in place for a number of decades, interesting given that most of the areas concerned will see a reasonably regular turnover of political ideologies as a consequence of mayoral elections.

So, the translation into local delivery, of national and regional objectives, underpinned by substantive targeted investment within a local long-term framework and with iterative engagement between governance layers, many very complex, yet critical, to creating a competitive city region/metropolitan area. Putting in place a resource through which this can be facilitated and ultimately implemented is also a requirement. Local political leadership is a common but not wholly necessary characteristic. Broad partnership across sectors are increasingly found in such examples, but it must be understood

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

that in most examples, at the level of the citizen it is generally the local authority which leads actual delivery, with the exception of the UK examples.

3.3 Role of transport infrastructure

Local to regional transport planning is effectively a feature of most of the examples examined. In some cases, the local to regional framework will be directly responsible for actual provision, most notably of local bus and tram services but also in some exception instances, of regional heavy rail. There is a clear understanding that transformation of city/metropolitan areas require long term integrated investment in public transportation, local traffic regulation and infrastructure planning and that this in turn has to be a cornerstone on wider investment in housing, education, etc.

3.4 Effective forms of collaboration between local councils, both vertical and horizontal

All effective forms of collaboration are clearly delineated by way of formal agreement, statutory obligation, or various terms of agreement/codes of practice. At local level in all cases the local authority is the leading public body and is acknowledged as such. This also applies at regional level. The key therefore is to have agreement across the layers of government from local to federal in some instances such as Germany, but with the region/province taking a role in facilitating this iterative engagement.

3.5 Remit of engagement with other stakeholders

In all examples the role of the local and regional authority is seen as the platform for citizen and sector engagement. In several examples, as will be noted from the above examples, there are in place, sometimes, informal arrangements but generally formal bodies, consisting of public and private sector interests that prepare long term perspectives on the future of the relevant areas. These provide a long term vision of the relevant area and are transposed into medium to short-term plans generally within the remit of the existing statutory planning processes. National, or in the case of federal countries, State/Province Objectives, and policy priorities, in all instances, is required to be embedded into local and regional planning. These are used to set the context for the local/regional engagement process which will generally be a statutory obligation when it comes to local policy and implementation planning.

In addition, several have gone down the road of putting in place citizen assembly type arrangements which allow for a wider community process of engagement but in all cases the primary leadership rests at local or regional levels, and ultimately at national/federal level. Once a policy direction is adopted there is very limited scope it seems for change unless external shocks occur.

3.6 Cycles and lengths of time for successful metropolitan development

Broadly for the examples highlighted there are broadly similar short to medium frameworks from 3 to 12 years to twenty years with longer term vision type statements of up to 50 years. In investment planning terms these are aligned to the relevant medium-term frameworks but are clearly set within multi annual budgeting processes. In no case has an annual budgetary cycle been applied, for all aspects of spending, day to day and capital, which, of course, is not the case in Ireland, particularly for day-to-day spending.

3.7 Financing / resourcing models

As noted above, Ireland is pretty unique in regard to the continued use of annual budgetary planning to underpin even long-term investment. Of particular note is that, unlike the iterative financial planning applied to investment planning in all the examples above, there is limited engagement in national budgeting for local and regional government in Ireland. This is not the case elsewhere. In addition, and unique to Ireland at least from what has been reviewed, is the extent to which bespoke spending and thus grant aid is used, even on relatively small scale programmes. With over 500 different spending platforms in Ireland the country stands out as separate from the norm.

The extent of levels of local to national spending is varied across the examples above. In general. There is a variety of local discretionary taxes but which are increasingly less so given the extent to which there is iteration in budgetary terms from national to local and vice versa. Some countries have relatively liberal regimes in allowing local income taxation of up to 20% of incomes to be collected at the local/regional level. However, these are within agreed parameters, multi annual in nature and subject to national/federal priorities. Unsurprising, given the financial obligations applying to most countries of the Economic and Monetary Policies of the European Union.

4. Recommendations for Galway MASP governance

As noted earlier in this report, local public service provision in Ireland, and Galway City and County Councils specifically, plays a very limited but growing role relative to the other case study local government systems. That acknowledged, there is increasing convergence across all the studies undertaken, which indicate that several have had to put in place intervening structures to apply a long-term strategic perspective to their areas. Such platforms are not that dissimilar, albeit more structured, to the existing socio-economic planning platforms already in place in Ireland, including the RSES, as well as the developing role of the Greater Galway Forum. Indeed, there are clear parallels between the *to be* developed thinking on the Delivery Board Structures of the National Planning Framework and the type of longer-term socio-economic planning found across the OECD. Critical aspects to such platforms is the link between the multi-sectoral planning of such examples with long-term underpinning investment plans which reach across layers of government in almost all instances.

Galway is relatively, but not entirely, unusual in the use of multiple annual funding platforms, many of which have a limited relationship to the spatial and economic planning of the MASP Area, and many of which are driven by national exchequer priorities which can be very separate from the coordinated approach that should be taken within the envelope of the National Planning Framework and National Development Plan. Also of note is the fact that much of the capital investment that is linked to the National Development Plan is actually heavily siloed across Government Departments, which contrasts hugely with the processes found across the case study examples.

In light of the above there is a clear need to establish some degree of coordination/collaboration at a level relevant to meeting the needs of one of Europe's most dynamic development areas. In addition, and arguably more importantly, the lack of a platform, other than the Galway Forum, that is charged with long-term development of the Galway Area is a notably absence when compared to other case study areas. There is a need to address the long-term multi sectoral development of Galway and to do so with haste.

The opportunity to put such a platform in place does exist with the development of a more substantive role for a platform such as the Galway Forum but, in turn, long-term strategic thinking is then needed to underpin, as is the case in the other case study areas, a long-term socio economic investment strategy that is bespoke to Galway. This is clearly absent under current arrangements.

Putting in place arrangements such as those in the various case studies in this review will require considerable re-configuration of arrangements, not just in Galway but also at regional and national level and would have to have a substantive re-orientation of national to local funding. A more focused

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

professional platform would also likely be required to provide the necessary socio-economic scenarios and integrated policy environment necessary to meet the long-term needs of Galway.

Consequently, if the lessons of the case studies are to be applied the principal recommendations which would ideally be followed include:

i) Existing structures (i.e., councils, Regional Assembly, etc., should remain focused on their existing remits but within a strategic framework that should be established for the Galway MASP). A new local political oversight drawn from the memberships of the local corporate policy groups in both Councils and from the Regional Assembly, under the shared chair of the Mayors of both Councils, should be put in place to lead political consideration of the following recommendations, if applied.

ii) A new statutory-based oversight and management group should be established that would be tasked with applying a long-term strategic direction for the area which would then inform the work of the unit set out in the following recommendation.

iii) A specialist socio-economic unit, consisting of strategic specialisms across a range of spatial, transport, health, education, cultural, environmental, climate action, amenity and wellness, and economic planning skills, should be put in place to cover both the city and county of Galway and to address long-term planning and investment for all sectors under this umbrella. It would include addressing strategic investment needs for Galway over at least a 20 year horizon and set within the longer term strategic view of the statutory group referred to above. This in turn should be underpinned by a Galway MASP Investment Plan which should have a 20 year horizon that would ultimately be approved by Government.

iv) The oversight and management group, under the chair of a Minister of State, consisting of the Chief Executives, Mayor and Cathaoirleach of the two Councils, the Presidents of the Universities, the Regional Chief Executive of the HSE, the Director/Cathaoirleach of the Regional Assembly, the Chief Executive of the Education and Training Board and other relevant bodies (including an Garda), to provide oversight and implementation of the long term planning should be empowered to issue direction of other state and local bodies in regard to the agreed 20 year investment programme that should be adopted by government.

v) As noted in the recommendations above, the national/local financial investment programme to be prepared should be signed off by Government.

Appendix 1: Core elements of successful metropolitan plans

DRAFT

Galway, Ireland

<p>City and Metropolitan Area</p>	<p>Galway City Council Galway County Council Northern and Western Regional Assembly (NWRA)</p>
<p>Population</p>	<p>City: (2022) 83,456 County: (2022) 193,000 Region: 900,937</p>
<p>Area</p>	<p>City: 54.2 KM Sq County: 6,096.8 KM Sq</p>
<p>Location</p>	<p>West Coast of Ireland some 206 kilometres west of Dublin.</p>
<p>Approach to Land use planning and metropolitan strategic planning</p>	<p>City/County land use planning is set within the context of the National Planning Framework and set out under the City and County Development Plans adopted by the respective councils under the Planning and Development Acts 1963-2022, sub region planning is provided for under the umbrella of the NWRA in the form of the Galway Metropolitan Area Plan (the MASP) and Regional Planning is set out though the Northern and Western Region Assembly Functional Area in the form of a Statutory Regional Spatial and Economic Strategy (RSES) 2032.</p>

<p>The role of transport infrastructure in regional development (GTS Review)</p>	<p>City and environs public transport is bus based and managed by the national transport company, Bus Éireann. Rail provided by the national rail company, Irish Rail. Port is under the remit of Galway Port, an independent State-owned Company.</p> <p>Regional Transport planning is set within a national framework but delivered by a combination of regional based state agencies working in cooperation with the regional and local authorities.</p>
<p>Competitiveness and participation</p>	<p>No single body has active responsibility for either competitiveness or participation in either of the authority's jurisdictions. In the leadership/enabling role of the local authorities there is an indirect role for both Councils, while participation through local platforms such as the Public Participation Networks, facilitated through local government structures are in place. The Galway Forum provides a high-level engagement platform for various sectors across the City and County.</p>
<p>Effective form of collaboration (Governance) among local and regional tier government</p>	<p>The principal levels are driven by national policy with local/regional political direction through the local authorities and regional assemblies.</p>
<p>Political oversight</p>	<p>Political oversight in both Galway city and County Councils is provided through the</p>

	<p>elected members of both local authorities supported by professional staff in both councils. A joint strategic policy committee involving membership drawn from both councils and wider social partners is in place to provide a platform for discussing local planning policy development across the City and County. There is provision for a level of regional oversight through the Regional Assembly, which consists of nominated local government members from the constituent local authorities in the Assembly Area.</p>
<p>Executive oversight</p>	<p>Executive level oversight is provided by the Chief Executives and Management teams of both Councils supported by professional planning, engineering, and related skills staff.</p>
<p>Terms of reference</p>	<p>There are various local and regional documents including corporate plans, business strategies etc. In addition, there is a local to regional planning hierarchy encompassing local to national priorities of a short-, medium- and long-term nature. These include: Local Area Plan, City and County Development Plans and Regional Spatial and Economic Plans. Professional oversight is provided by the national Office of the Planning Regulator.</p>
<p>Governance structures</p>	<p>The Department for Housing, Local Government and Heritage is responsible for regional planning at national level and</p>

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

	<p>coordinates the policies underpinning planning, implementation and monitoring of all aspects of regional planning policy. The Department of Transport is responsible for policy on transport while development of transport infrastructures is placed with Transport Infrastructure Ireland and the National Transport Authority.</p>
<p>The cycles and timeframes for regional collaboration to succeed</p>	<p>The RSES covers the years to 2032 while the City and County Development Plans cover the years to 2029 and 2028 respectively. The Galway Forum, which is a non-statutory Body, is looking to Galway over the next 50 years</p>
<p>Data and Monitoring for Galway MASP</p>	<p>There is an extensive range of data collated at the regional level under the framework of the RSES in the form of the Regional Assembly's Regional Development Monitor.</p>

Pori, Finland

<p>City and Metropolitan Area</p>	<p>Pori, Finland</p>
--	-----------------------------

	<p>Sub-region: Pori Sub-Region Region: Satakunta, Finland</p>
<p>Population</p>	<p>City: 83,297 (2022) Sub-Region: 137,545 Region: 216,752</p>
<p>Area</p>	<p>City: 2,062 KM Sq Sub-Region: Region: 8,412 KM Sq</p>
<p>Location</p>	<p>West Coast of Finland some 241 kilometres north-west of Helsinki.</p>
<p>Approach to Land use planning and metropolitan strategic planning</p>	<p>Similar to Ireland with City planning, sub region planning (akin to the MASP) and Regional Planning similar to Ireland’s RSES Frameworks but having a longer time frame up to 2050.</p>
<p>The role of transport infrastructure in regional development (GTS Review)</p>	<p>City public transport is bus based and managed by the city council owned bus company Porin Linjat since 1976. Regional Rail provided by the National Transport Authority, VR Group which is State owned.</p> <p>In Finland there is a National Transport System Plan under the remit of the Finnish Transport Infrastructure Agency. It covers rail and road and waterway development.</p>

	<p>Regional Transport planning is set within a national framework but delivered by a combination of regional state agencies working in cooperation with the regional authorities (see Governance below).</p>
<p>Competitiveness and participation</p>	<p>The Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment takes the lead for co-ordination, while sectoral ministries each prepare regional strategies. National urban policy is</p> <p>General policy approach</p> <p>Recent policy changes include more interactive co-operation and dialogue between the state and the regions (which are of recent origin). The reforms came into force in 2021. As a consequence, at the national level, regional development is mainly focused on strengthening the resilience of regions in order to tackle the effects of abrupt negative or positive structural changes.</p> <p>An inter-ministerial Rural Policy Council is also in place. The minister responsible for rural policy chairs the council, and the minister responsible for regional policy is the vice-chair. Among the tasks of the</p> <p>Rural Policy Council is to improve the structures and practices of rural policy and rural development on the basis</p> <p>of networks and partnerships in a way that supports a place-based policy approach.</p> <p>Employment in the City amounts to approx. 40,000 people with the Pori City Council being</p>

	<p>the biggest employer with over 6,000 employees. The Council owns a large number of subsidiaries in education, transport (Bus and Port), utilities generally and the tertiary education providers. These also employ several 000,s.</p> <p>In regard to local infrastructure, such as education facilities, sports and recreation, and culture the facilities are delivered and owned by the Council in each municipality and are made available to local teams and communities on an on-going basis. Shared used of such facilities are the norm with a municipal stadium and other facilities being used by differing sports teams in different codes, for example.</p>
<p>Effective form of collaboration (Governance) among local and regional tier government</p>	<p>The principal levels are driven by national policy and local political direction through the local municipalities and regional structures. There is an agreement setting out arrangements between the municipalities.</p>
<p>Political oversight</p>	<p>Political oversight in the city and surrounding municipalities is provided through the Mayor and his/her deputies supported by professional staff.</p> <p>Pori elected representatives provide oversight at City level and nominate 15 members of the Council to the 83-member Regional Structure. Other member municipalities also nominate members on a proportionate population basis.</p>

<p>Executive oversight</p>	<p>Executive level oversight is provided by the indirectly elected Mayor and Management team consisting of executive councillors in the City, supported by professional staff. Similar arrangements apply in the surrounding municipalities. At regional level an executive group of the nominated members are supported by a number of sector specific teams under the direction of a professional director. A specific unit for regional planning is included in these teams and consists of 28 staff specific to the regional development remit of the regional assembly. The sub-regional role is effectively similar to the MASP in Ireland but under the direction of specifically nominated elected members from the 15 city members of the Regional level, supported by the services of the regional development team and colleagues from the planning service of the city, in so far as this can be identified.</p>
<p>Terms of reference</p>	<p>There are various local and regional documents which will be familiar to an Irish reader including corporate type plans, business strategies etc. In addition, there is a local to regional planning hierarchy encompassing local to national priorities of a short-, medium- and long-term nature. These include: Satakunta Regional Plan 2050, the Satakunnan Regional Programme 2022-2025 and the</p>

	<p>Smart Specialisation Strategy 2021-2027.</p> <p>These are delivered through the Regional Authority, the MYR and at local municipal level there are aligned plans for physical and spatial development underpinned by local implementation plans such as the Pori 2030 Strategy, and the Porin valtuustosopimus 2021–2025 (the Council Contract), among others.</p>
<p>Governance structures</p>	<p>The Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment is responsible for regional development at national level and coordinates the planning, implementation and monitoring of all aspects of regional development. They have regional centres known as Centres for Economic Development, Transport, and the Environment. There are 15 such centers which work alongside the 6 Regional Authorities.</p> <p>Regional Transport Planning is the responsibility of the 6 Regional Authorities who serve as regional development authorities in the regions (which confusingly for Irish eyes, are styled in Finland as counties). These authorities’ work alongside the state ELY Centres and contribute to regional development by carrying out the central government’s implementation and development tasks in the regions according to the Programme for Government.</p>

<p>The cycles and timeframes for regional collaboration to succeed</p>	<p>Regional planning is based on the Municipalities Act, the Regional Development Act, the Land Use and Construction Act and the County Distribution Act. The regional authorities draw up regional plans and programs, annual implementation plans. Unions participate in the implementation of measures in cooperation with municipalities, other authorities, and provincial and national actors. The Regional Authorities act as the regional development authorities of their provinces. In Satakunta, the regional development unit is responsible for the preparation of the regions strategic development guidelines in cooperation with various state authorities, municipalities in the region, universities and colleges, and other parties involved in the development of the region. Both national and European Union regional development funding is directed to regional development in Satakunta via the regional authority. The funding decisions for projects are prepared by the regional development team. The regional development of Pori is coordinated in a regional cooperation group (the MYR), whose activities are coordinated by the regional development team of the Regional Authority.</p>
<p>Data and Monitoring for Galway MASP</p>	<p>There is an extensive range of data collated at the regional level and through, so far as can be determined, through the MYR and the Centre</p>

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

	<p>for Economic Development, Transport, and the Environment. It is underpinned by an open data policy. That noted there seems to be relatively little difference in the type of data collected but the timing of such data is, it appears more regular.</p>
--	---

DRAFT

Aberdeen, Scotland

Metropolitan Area	Aberdeen, Scotland
--------------------------	---------------------------

Population	<p>City: 198,000</p> <p>Metropolitan Area (Strategic Planning Area): 489,815</p>
Area	<p>City: 69 Sq KM</p> <p>Strategic Planning Area: 186 Sq KM</p>
Location	<p>Northeast Scotland approx. 150 Km north east of Edinburgh</p>
Approach to Land use planning and metropolitan strategic planning	<p>Broadly similar to local planning in Ireland, having local area plans and a city development plan but also of interest is the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan under the umbrella of the Strategic Planning Authority. It is one of 4 such plans in Scotland covering approx. 32% of Scotland.</p>
The role of transport infrastructure in regional development (GTS Review)	<p>Nestrans is the Transport Partnership for Aberdeen City and Shire</p> <p>Its purpose is to develop and deliver a long-term regional transport strategy to 2040 and take forward strategic transport improvements that support and improve the economy, environment, and quality of life across Aberdeen City and Shire.</p>

<p>Competitiveness and participation</p>	<p>The North East Transport Consultative Forum (NETCF) was set up and is used to consult on the work of Nestrans. The Forum consists of a wide range of interested stakeholders representing a balanced cross-section of economic, environmental and community interests, along with transport operators and interest groups.</p>
<p>Effective form of collaboration (Governance) among local and regional tier government</p>	<p>The "Strategic Development Planning Authority" (SDPA) was designated by Scottish Ministers on 25 June 2008 under the Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006.</p> <p>The Designation Order required Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Councils to jointly prepare and keep under review a strategic development plan for a strategic development plan area. The terms of reference agreed by the two Councils required that, prior to the start of work on a strategic development plan, the SDPA would take forward work on a structure plan commenced by the two Councils in early 2007.</p> <p>The Aberdeen City and Shire Structure Plan was approved by Scottish Ministers in August 2009. Since then, work has focused on its implementation, monitoring and the preparation of the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Plan which was approved by Scottish Ministers on 28 March 2014.</p>

<p>Political oversight</p>	<p>The SDPA Membership on establishment consisted of six appointees from both Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Councils. In addition, four members each from the 2 councils along with 4 members appointed by the Minister for Transport following public competition for the positions now sit on a separate board for Nestrans.</p> <p>The Chair and Vice Chair of the SDPA rotate on a 2 yearly cycle. Statutory guidance from the Scottish Government on SDPAs is contained in Circular 2/2008. Local planning oversight remains as in place.</p>
<p>Executive oversight</p>	<p>Current staffing provision is for 3 people on the Strategic Authority's staff, 1 team leader and 2 planners. These are supplemented by staff from Nestrans which include 9 multi skilled people under a director on the Executive team.</p>
<p>Terms of reference</p>	<p>As noted earlier these are set out at Government level under a designation order requiring the 2 local authorities to come together to deliver the strategic plan under the umbrella of the strategic planning authority.</p>
<p>Governance structures</p>	<p>A Code of Corporate Governance, agreed at the Strategic Planning Authority is in place and is used by it and related bodies such as Nestrans</p>

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

	as the guiding platform for the delivery of their responsibilities.
The cycles and timeframes for regional collaboration to succeed	The current plan was adopted in 2014 and updated in August 2022. A performance framework was finalised in February 2022.
Data and Monitoring for Galway MASP	<p>A Planning and Performance Framework 2018 – 2019 was agreed for Nestrans and the Strategic Planning Authority. This is in addition to the regular performance reporting which takes place on improvement which is published by each individual local authority every year in Scotland.</p> <p>The baseline monitoring report for the Nestrans 2040 strategy was approved by the Nestrans Board in February 2022. Nestrans manage and maintain the Aberdeen Sub Area Model (ASAM), which is a multi-modal strategic model that is used to appraise and inform regional policies and projects. It also provides strategic forecast data for the North East.</p>

Cambridge, England

Metropolitan Area	Cambridge, England
--------------------------	---------------------------

<p>Population</p>	<p>City: 145,700 Shire County: 706,823 Greater Cambridge Partnership: 283, 277 Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority: 852,523</p>
<p>Area</p>	<p>City: 40.7 Sq KM Combined Authority: 3,389 Sq KM</p>
<p>Location</p>	<p>The City (a district council in UK local government terms) is 89 km north of London.</p>
<p>Approach to Land use planning and metropolitan strategic planning</p>	<p>There are a variety of institutional arrangements for Cambridge and the wider combined authority area. The non-metropolitan county includes a county council and 5 district councils including the city council. These all sit under the umbrella of the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Combined Authority. Between the Combined Authority and the County Council and Cambridge is the Greater Cambridge Partnership, effectively the unit which will be of most interest to the Galway context. It covers national funding arrangements, policy implementation, project delivery in both transport and housing.</p>
<p>The role of transport infrastructure in regional development (GTS Review)</p>	<p>The Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC) was adopted by Cambridgeshire County Council on 4 March</p>

	<p>2014. The strategy seeks to ensure that constituent local councils delivery integrated transport policies. The strategy has two main roles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It provides a detailed policy framework and programme of schemes for the area, addressing current problems, and is consistent with the Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 2011-26. It is part of how the County Council manages and develops the local transport network of the County as a whole, and 2. It supports the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, taking account of future levels of growth in the area. It details the transport infrastructure and services necessary to deliver this growth <p>The strategy contains details of the major schemes proposed in the short, medium, and longer term. The programme is subject to regular review given the extent of growth and development in the area.</p>
<p>Competitiveness and participation</p>	<p>The City Deal is the primary platform for underpinning the competitiveness of Great Cambridge which is acknowledged as among the most competitive internationally.</p> <p>Outside of the institutional arrangements local consultative for a continue their respective roles within the policy processes of the individual local authorities. Partnership and collaboration in the context of the Greater</p>

	<p>Cambridge partnership remains within the framework of the Councils, the UK Government with some input from the Business Board which is a participative forum for local business interests. The Greater Cambridge Greater Peterborough Local Enterprise Partnership is also associated with the framework.</p>
<p>Effective form of collaboration (Governance) among local and regional tier government</p>	<p>The Greater Cambridge Partnership is a delivery body for the city deal between 4 partners in Cambridge. These are: Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council and the University of Cambridge. The deal signed with UK central government (Ministry of Housing) has provided for additional local development powers and investment, worth up to £500 million over 15 years. These funds will be dispensed on vital improvements in infrastructure, supporting and accelerating the creation of 44,000 new jobs, 33,500 new homes and 420 additional apprenticeships.</p> <p>Beyond the Partnership is the Combined Authority. It is an umbrella body with a directly elected mayor overseeing economic development and public service coordination across the seven constituent authorities in Cambridgeshire.</p>
<p>Political oversight</p>	<p>The Greater Cambridge Partnership Joint Assembly as noted above formally established</p>

	<p>by Cambridge City Council, Cambridgeshire County Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council. The Partnership is effectively a joint advisory committee of the three Councils, established under section 102(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972. The Joint Committee, styled as the Greater Cambridge Assembly, comprises three elected members from each of the partner council; three co-opted members nominated by a separate but aligned Business Board and three co-opted members nominated by the University of Cambridge.</p> <p>The role of the Joint Assembly is to advise the Executive Board, acting as a forum for discussion with a wider range of members and stakeholders across the Greater Cambridge area, so that the Executive Board benefits from a wider range of expertise in making its decisions.</p>
<p>Executive oversight</p>	<p>Oversight of the Partnership is clearly set out under agreement with the UK Government. The Partnership has an Executive Board that reports to the Assembly. Standing Orders have been adopted. The Executive Board is supported by a secretariat based within the County Council.</p> <p>There is a separate Greater Cambridge Partnership Senior Management Team which oversees delivery of the overall Cambridge City Deal, as well as the management of individual projects within the Deal. There is also a specific transport projects management team.</p>

<p>Terms of reference</p>	<p>Terms of Reference are in place setting out the specific roles of the constituent bodies and combined role of the Assembly and Executive Board.</p>
<p>Governance structures</p>	<p>The Executive Board comprises three elected members with full voting rights (one from each of the three partner Councils) and two non-voting members co-opted by the joint committee [Executive Board]; one nominated by the Business Board and one nominated by the University of Cambridge. Standing Orders also provide for the appointment/nomination of a substitute member from each partner body. Nominations are submitted to the Executive Board for approval.</p> <p>The Executive Board is the decision-making body, responsible for ensuring the objectives of the Greater Cambridge City Deal are met. The Executive Board is responsible for commissioning projects funded by money provided through the City Deal and for overall control of that programme of investments.</p>
<p>The cycles and timeframes for regional collaboration to succeed</p>	<p>The initial target date for the Deal is 2030. In addition, normal local and county wide spatial planning continues within the existing institutional settings of the constituent councils</p>

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

	and under the framework provided by the Combined Authority.
Data and Monitoring for Galway MASP	<p>Of interest to Galway is the creation of Cambridgeshire Insight, which is a shared research knowledge base for the Cambridgeshire and Peterborough area. It provides an extensive range of data and performance markers for the Partnership area, enabling the Assembly and Executive Board to overview delivery of the Deal as well as the outcomes arising from the deal, aligned to the overall corporate objectives of the Partnership.</p>

Aalborg, Denmark

Metropolitan Area	Aalborg, Denmark

<p>Population</p>	<p>City/Municipality: 219,487 (2021) Region (North Denmark): 580,000 (2022)</p>
<p>Area</p>	<p>City: 1,137.40 Sq KM Region:</p>
<p>Location</p>	<p>North West Denmark</p>
<p>Approach to Land use planning and metropolitan strategic planning</p>	<p>According to the Espon Review examined for this analysis (ENSURE – European Sustainable Urbanisation through port city Regeneration) the Minister for Industry, Business and Financial Affairs sets the overall guidelines in national planning reports under the Danish Planning Act. The Minister, as is the case in Ireland in terms of the Office for Planning Regulation, must object to municipal plans where they are inconsistent with overall national interests determined by central Government.</p> <p>The Regional Authority for North Denmark has prepared a regional economic plan to cover the region to 2040, underpinned by shorter term plans to 2023 and soon to be released 2027, while the Municipal Authority of Aalborg has a twelve year municipal plan in place to 2035, subject to 4 yearly reviews.</p> <p>In turn, the Municipal Plan is detailed in 10 planning areas.</p>

<p>The role of transport infrastructure in regional development (GTS Review)</p>	<p>Nordjyllands Trafikselskab (NT) is an administration company that plans public transport in North Jutland. It is owned by Region North Jutland and the 11 North Jutland municipalities. It has a number of regionally driven transport and infrastructure plans and strategies, again framed within the regional planning framework of the Region and its municipalities. Aalborg Municipality oversees city bus routes and timetables through the Aalborg Municipality's department for public transport. Trains are provided by the State Rail Company.</p>
<p>Competitiveness and participation</p>	<p>Competitiveness is a matter at local level for the City Municipality and while at regional level there was a role for the regional authority, this has been reduced with a move towards more central leadership through a national development agency. The scope for local business engagement has also been reduced.</p> <p>There are platforms for citizen engagement including short term citizen assembly type arrangements to address specific policy initiatives but the policy process is generally led and determined at political level at both local and regional level, and particularly informed by national policy priorities.</p>
<p>Effective form of collaboration (Governance) among local and regional tier government</p>	<p>There is exceptionally strong collaboration between the local authorities within the North Denmark Region and at national level through</p>

	<p>Local Government Denmark. Iterative policy development has long been a feature of the local to national policy relationship but it should be noted that broadly similar conditions now apply in Denmark as in Ireland in regard to national policy direction as well as financial oversight. In certain respects, local government in Ireland has a higher degree of freedom in application of national policy than is the case in Denmark. Compacts between Local Government Denmark and the National Authorities provide the platforms for local action underpinned by central resources as well as local income taxes.</p>
<p>Political oversight</p>	<p>As noted above there is a highly structured national to local framework in planning and economic development in Denmark which is applicable to all municipalities. Relevant ministries agree to policy delivery through the local municipal structures. The Mayor plays an executive role supported by executive/director level politicians supported by administration headed by a chief executive who is directly accountable to the elected body.</p> <p>Equally at regional level, where the primary focus is on health care, the direction and executive leadership is through political structures supported by recruited executives accountable to the authorities' members.</p>
<p>Executive oversight</p>	

	As noted above political leadership in Denmark is considerably greater than in Ireland but they do operate under greater supervision in terms of national policy implementation and held accountable in instances where national priorities are not being achieved.
Terms of reference	The arrangements are all set within the local to national local government framework.
Governance structures	The arrangements are all set within the local to national local government framework.
The cycles and timeframes for regional collaboration to succeed	As noted above local planning is set within a twelve-year rolling framework subject to 4 yearly reviews. Regional delivery is set within a longer-term strategy and implemented through 3 year rolling programmes and plans.
Data and Monitoring for Galway MASP	Have been unable to identify detailed data other than at regional level.

<p>Metropolitan Area</p>	<p>La Rochelle, France</p>
<p>Population</p>	<p>City: 77,205 (2019) Agglomeration Community of La Rochelle: 171,811 (2018)</p>
<p>Area</p>	<p>City: 28.43 Sq KM Agglomeration Community of La Rochelle (AGGLO): 327 Sq KM</p>
<p>Location</p>	<p>On the Bay of Biscay in the west coast of France</p>
<p>Approach to Land use planning and metropolitan strategic planning</p>	<p>The City has its local planning framework which is set within the framework of the Intermunicipal Local Urbanism Plan which provides the overall strategic direction for the AGGO municipalities. Known as the PLUI it was approved by the supervising inter municipal Council on December 19, 2019, and subsequently modified March 4, 2021. The city area has a long-standing history of inter commune planning dating over 50 years. It now covers some 28 municipalities since 2014 when 10 joined the existing syndicate. Such agglomerations in France are required by national planning legislation to adopt such plans.</p>

<p>The role of transport infrastructure in regional development (GTS Review)</p>	<p>The City launched its first multi-year investment program in 2016 to deliver the priority needs it identified. Broader regional planning for transport is set within the framework of the PLUi and the regional transport planning at Regional level. Local bus services are provided by the municipal structures.</p>
<p>Competitiveness and participation</p>	<p>What is called the Local Development Council has been in place since 2008. This is now undergoing renewal to play a role similar to a local citizens assembly, replicating the experience of the assembly set up in Paris. The new assembly commenced in September 2022. It also has 82 citizen members. The assembly will look at:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Projects for the area, 2. Prospective and planning documents (Local Intermunicipal Urban Plan, Territorial Climate Air Energy Plan, etc.), and 3. Local policies to promote sustainable development.
<p>Effective form of collaboration (Governance) among local and regional tier government</p>	<p>The city, and its' associated AGGLO municipalities, is set within the Department of Charente-Maritime, which itself, is placed in Nouvelle-Aquitaine, the largest region of France. The region sets broad spatial and economic development strategies, not unlike those in Ireland, which are transposed into local and departmental contexts by thew</p>

	<p>relevant city/municipal authorities and Departments. In the case of the AGGO there is a statutory obligation under national French legislation to have in place the intermunicipal plan to bridge the gap between the municipalities and the Department to ensure consistency across the planning hierarchy which traditional has been very centralised, and largely remains so.</p>
<p>Political oversight</p>	<p>In the City there is a Mayor (a former prime minister of France) and elected council supported by a city administration. This applies to the other constituent municipalities of the AGGLO. The AGGLO itself is made up of 28 municipalities, from which 82 representatives are selected to sit on the AGGLO Council. It is called the Community Council. In addition to regulatory bodies, it has working groups and commissions.</p> <p>The Community Council decides policy on actions and operations of community interest to be implemented. The 82 members, include a President, 15 Vice-Presidents and Councillors. It meets once a month. Its meetings are public.</p> <p>An executive layer, called the Community Office is made up of 38 members including the President, 15 Vice-Presidents, 16 councillors and 6 Mayors from the municipalities.</p>

<p>Executive oversight</p>	<p>An Independent office, called the Mediator, is in place to facilitate the resolution of disputes between users of public services and the AGGLO. An ombudsman like office, it helps local citizens to avoid recourse to the administrative judicial system and the Prefect which sits in La Rochelle, keeping conflict to a manageable level, especially in regard to inter municipal issues.</p>
<p>Terms of reference</p>	<p>The Local Inter-municipal Urban Plan (PLUi) is the key strategic document that reflects the political plan for the planning and development of the La Rochelle agglomeration. It covers development up to 2050.</p>
<p>Governance structures</p>	<p>As the member municipalities are within a sub-regional context, scale is achieved in the delivery of various municipal services through the AGGLO. So, the AGGLO on behalf of the local councils oversees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Around 1,200 homes produced per year Regulation of some 17,236 companies Provision of 1,000 ha of business parks Provision for 15,000 students Maintaining of 230 km of cycling facilities Maritime planning for 70 km of coastline Regulation of 22,300 ha of agricultural land, and has responsibility for some 6,000 ha recognized for their ecological interest (nearly 20% of the AGGLOs territory).

The cycles and timeframes for regional collaboration to succeed	As noted above local planning continues within each municipality but set within the 2050 PLUi.
Data and Monitoring for Galway MASP	The AGGLO has set up an Data Observatory to support its elected officials and departments as they prepare their plans and strategies. It provides detailed, objective, and shared knowledge of the conurbation centred on La Rochelle and its surrounding environment.

DRAFT

Leuven, Flanders, Belgium

<p>Metropolitan Area</p>	<p>Leuven, Flanders, Belgium</p>
<p>Population</p>	<p>City: 101,032 (2021) Province Flemish Brabant: 1,146,175</p>
<p>Area</p>	<p>City: 57.51 Sq Km Province Flemish Brabant: 2,118 Sq Km</p>
<p>Location</p>	<p>25Km east of Brussels</p>
<p>Approach to Land use planning and metropolitan strategic planning</p>	<p>The city council lays down its vision for the long-term development of the city in the City spatial structure plan. The first such plan was adopted in 2004 with the second adopted in 2017. Leuven is internationally regarded for its ongoing greening plans and is a lead city for European Innovation.</p> <p>At provincial level the provincial spatial planning commission, or Procoro for short, plays the critical role in the development of spatial planning policy.</p> <p>The Procoro will also advise the provincial council as it amends/adopts its spatial structure plan. Such plans date back over a number of decades with the current plan in place to be updated in 2023.</p> <p>Procoro bundles and coordinates the responses from the public inquiry required for such plans.</p>

	<p>In addition, it guides on implementation of the plan and of any provincial urban planning regulations. Currently the Province is implementing the 2020-2025 VLAAMS-BRABANT Strategic Plan. It sets the conditions within which the Leuven Structure Plan is implemented.</p> <p>In addition, the Autonomo Gemeentebedrijf Stadsontwikkeling Leuven is a subsidiary of the city of Leuven. It delivers urban regeneration, directly, or in partnership with the private sector.</p> <p>The City and region are also a part of the TTR-ELAt (Top Technology Region/ Eindhoven-Leuven-Aachen Triangle) which gathers six regions located at the intersection of Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium. There is a long history of cross-border co-operation in the area, with economies of scale (critical mass) and scope (exploiting knowledge complementarities) being the main rationales for the TTR-ELAt.</p>
<p>The role of transport infrastructure in regional development (GTS Review)</p>	<p>Regional transport planning takes place at the level of the Province with services delivered by the Flemish Government, while rail services are delivered through the federal government ownership of Belgian railways.</p> <p>The Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KU Leuven), the largest university in Belgium, plays a critical role in leading regional development initiatives including Transport and Mobility Leuven, as the</p>

	<p>largest shareholder (the city has three universities, KU Leuven, University Colleges Leuven-Limburg and LUCA School of Arts. KU Leuven was founded as a Catholic University in 1425, making it one of Europe's oldest universities, and it is currently Belgium's largest and highest ranked university).</p>
<p>Competitiveness and participation</p>	<p>Responsibility rests with the Flemish Government under the federal arrangements applicable to Belgium.</p>
<p>Effective form of collaboration (Governance) among local and regional tier government</p>	<p>Responsibility rests with the Flemish Government under the federal arrangements applicable to Belgium.</p>
<p>Political oversight</p>	<p>Elected every 6 years, Leuven has 47 municipal councillors (mayor and aldermen included). At Provincial level the Provincial Council has 36 directly elected (for 6 years) members. It also has an executive grouping of councillors including a chairman, 2 vice chairs and another 7 councillors who are Council Committee Chairs.</p>
<p>Executive oversight</p>	<p>At Provincial level, the representative or "commissioner" of the federal and Flemish government supervises the local authorities, and it is to the Commissioner that public complaints in regard to planning and development may be addressed. The</p>

	<p>Commissioner is supported by a quasi-judicial group called the deputation. The deputation is the day-to-day administration of the province. The deputation prepares the decisions of the provincial council and implements them afterwards.</p> <p>In addition, the deputation has a number of specific federal and Flemish tasks, such as handling environmental permits in accordance with the procedure of the environmental permit decree.</p> <p>The deputation also acts as an administrative court in a number of specific cases.</p>
<p>Terms of reference</p>	<p>Terms of reference for each of the councils and bodies referred to above are clearly established under the Civil Administration Codes of Federal and Regional levels in Belgium.</p>
<p>Governance structures</p>	<p>Regional oversight is provided on behalf of the Federal Government through the Administrative structures noted above. Comprehensive oversight and policy direction is provided through the Provincial Council level.</p>
<p>The cycles and timeframes for regional collaboration to succeed</p>	<p>An open timeframe applies to the overall structural plan with subsequent implementation plans applied on a 3-5 yearly cycle.</p>
<p>Data and Monitoring for Galway MASP</p>	<p>No specific differences noted between the performance criteria set out in the RSES for the NWRA/MASP.</p>

Liverpool, England

<p>Metropolitan Area</p>	<p>Liverpool, England</p>
<p>Population</p>	<p>City: 486,000 (2021) Combined Authority: 1,564,000 (2020)</p>
<p>Area</p>	<p>City: 111.8 Sq KM Combined Authority: 720 Sq KM</p>
<p>Location</p>	<p>Bordering the Irish Sea on the Northwest of England</p>
<p>Approach to Land use planning and metropolitan strategic planning</p>	<p>Liverpool City Council is a Metropolitan Borough Council so essentially has the same powers of a District Council in England. It is an independent corporate entity with its own directly elected Mayor and a ceremonial annual Lord Mayor. The Liverpool Local Plan 2013–2033 was adopted by the Council on the 26th January 2022.</p> <p>At Combined Authority level the constituent metropolitan borough authorities (Liverpool City, Knowsley, Sefton, Wirral and Saint Helens, and the Borough of Halton make up the Authority.</p> <p>The Metropolitan Mayor of the Combined Area is working on adoption of a Strategic Plan which will set the overall vision for the region. The new</p>

	<p>corporate plan is committed to alignment of service areas across the local authorities of the region. Spatial planning and regional economic development will be a central platform of the forthcoming regional strategy.</p> <p>In addition is the Team Liverpool Grouping, consisting of the principal public service players and leading business in the City of Liverpool. It has in place the Liverpool Plan which sets out six priority action areas for the City. Their intention is to align shared resources to transform the City in regard to health, education, neighbourhoods, economy, culture, and climate.</p>
<p>The role of transport infrastructure in regional development (GTS Review)</p>	<p>Transport planning takes place at the level of the Combined Authority. Services are provided through contracted out arrangements through Merseytravel, a business unit of the Authority.</p>
<p>Competitiveness and participation</p>	<p>Neighbourhood Fora are in place across designated areas of the City to input into local area planning under the 2011 Localism Act. To date 6 have been put in place. The broad objective is that local communities in the City help choose where new homes, shops and offices should be built, have a say on what those new buildings should look like and grant planning permission for the new buildings' communities want to see go ahead. In this the Council is obliged to work with the relevant forum.</p>

<p>Effective form of collaboration (Governance) among local and regional tier government</p>	<p>Formalised arrangements are in place for oversight of the local authority planning arrangements through the Combined Authority and under the supervision of the Metropolitan Mayor.</p>
<p>Political oversight</p>	<p>As noted above the City has its own directly elected mayor with executive responsibilities operating within the umbrella of the Combined Authority. There is also a regional Leaders Group through which Council Leaders and Mayor engage but without a formal designation.</p>
<p>Executive oversight</p>	<p>Executive oversight is provided under the Combiner Authority role.</p>
<p>Terms of reference</p>	<p>Council responsibilities including the Combined Authority are set out with in the local government legislative framework provided by Central Government in the United Kingdom.</p>
<p>Governance structures</p>	<p>As noted, these are in line with England wide local government arrangements, with broadly similar reporting to the City Council and the Combined Authority as would be the case in the Irish Local Government Statutory Reporting Framework.</p>

<p>The cycles and timeframes for regional collaboration to succeed</p>	<p>There is no specific time frame for the Liverpool Plan but there are annual reporting arrangements to the full City Council. Equally the Combined Authority Strategy has yet to indicate a timeframe. In regard to the City Development Plan the timeframe effectively is for 11 years to 2033 albeit that the process commenced in 2013.</p>
<p>Data and Monitoring for Galway MASP</p>	<p>Accountability for the delivery of the plan will be done through an Annual State of the City Report produced by the Team Liverpool Group. The City Council has a land use monitoring service which covers planning and housing and related land uses. It publishes reports on an on-going basis.</p>

Freiburg im Breisgau

<p>Metropolitan Area</p>	<p>Freiburg im Breisgau, Freiburg District, Germany</p>
<p>Population</p>	<p>City: 232,000 (2021) Regierungsbezirk (Government District): 2,285,000 (2021)</p>
<p>Area</p>	<p>City: 153.07 km² Regierungsbezirk: 9,347 km²</p>
<p>Location</p>	<p>South West of Germany bordering France and Switzerland</p>
<p>Approach to Land use planning and metropolitan strategic planning</p>	<p>The Government District includes 1 Kreisfreie Städte (City Council) of Freiburg and 9 Kreis (Counties) wrapped around the City. The Kreis include some 295 towns and communities including 19 large district towns which has a municipality status.</p> <p>The Regierungsbezirk is a Lander (German State, in this case Baden-Württemberg) administrative framework so each Kreis and the City Council are supervised within the Freiburg Government District. There are four such districts within the Baden-Württemberg Lander (population is over 11 million).</p> <p>The City is regarded as a world leader with an integrated planning process in place for over the 30 years. The city centre has particularly</p>

	<p>benefitted from the sustainable processes in place. It is almost entirely car free, while the city is positioned through detailed long term scenario planning modelling to absorb economic and social shocks due to the integration of its investment programme, replicated at district and lander level with federal government support. Some 70 plus City Officials under the direct leadership of the directly elected Mayor, Martin Horn, look forward on a consistent basis, changing as changes occur, whether local or international, always alert to the impact of what is occurring around and within the City but always with a clear focus on meeting the long-held ambition of a green sustainable and economically independent city region.</p> <p>The Administrative Region has responsibility for bundling and coordinating region necessary service which includes regional economic and transport planning. It does so in alignment with the City and the neighbouring Kreis. It also has responsibility for the LEADER Programme.</p>
<p>The role of transport infrastructure in regional development (GTS Review)</p>	<p>The Council owns VAG is the municipal transport company. Vag is responsible for operating the local tram network as well as local bus services. It also owns 50% of the regional rail service. No person in the city is more than 400m from a tram stop and all local transport services up to a 50km radius operate to a clockface service. A night taxi system, primarily targeted at women following a murder, has been in operation since the end of</p>

	<p>2017. Every night from 10 p. m. to 6 a. m., women can use it for all journeys within and outside of the city. It is understood that the maximum taxi rate is 5-7 euro with the City Council providing a balancing subsidy to the taxi provider.</p> <p>Regional transport planning is the responsibility of the Regierungsbezirk working with the councils, most specifically the City Council.</p>
<p>Competitiveness and participation</p>	<p>One of the most competitive Cities in Europe with a large-scale advanced manufacturing and research economy, participation layers are in place to continuously embed local and external perspectives into the long-term planning of the city. A Green City Office under the direction of the Mayor provides for the embedding of citizen, business, and external perspectives into the planning process at local level.</p>
<p>Effective form of collaboration (Governance) among local and regional tier government</p>	<p>From the Lander to the administrative regional districts to the Kreise and City levels, coordination is delivered through the administrative regional structure.</p>
<p>Political oversight</p>	<p>The City Council is headed by a directly elected Executive Mayor. 48 city councillors make up the council. They are directly elected for five years.</p> <p>There is a regional assembly and Governor in place at the Regional level. This is a State level</p>

Northern and Western Regional Assembly

	organisation and so the Governor is a State appointee.
Executive oversight	The Mayor has the executive role.
Terms of reference	As noted above the State provides oversight and agrees strategic planning processes which are led out at local level by the relevant Mayor and Council.
Governance structures	As above
The cycles and timeframes for regional collaboration to succeed	The Perspective Plan Freiburg 2015-2030 was developed under the umbrella of the 2040 Landuse Plan.
Data and Monitoring for Galway MASP	An annual statistical yearbook on Freiburg is published by the Council, supplemented by a comparative statical data base covering the constituent councils of the Government District.