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Regionalisation processes

• Regionalisation processes occurring worldwide and fostering changes at the urban scale
• Economic global changes
• New relations between space and society
• Concepts such ‘city-region’ and ‘metropolitan region’ stir from rescaling processes (spatial, economic and state)
• New forms of metropolitan government and governance experiences
New questions of government and governance

• EU Cohesion policy
• ESDP (1999) and 2001 White paper on governance
• Regions as strategic references for ‘territorialisation’ of EU policies, according to subsidiarity principle
• EU structural funds → initiatives at urban and broader territorial scales

new geography of governance → ‘soft spaces with fuzzy boundaries’
New questions of government and governance

• 2007-2008 world financial crisis
• Greater focus on the urban dimension: Pact of Amsterdam 2016, Urban Agenda for EU

‘urban areas of all sizes can be engines of the economy which boost growth, create jobs for their citizens and enhance the competitiveness of Europe in a globalized economy’

(EU, 2016, p.3)
The Italian context

- Act 142 in **1990** introduced the Metropolitan City

Obstacles of territorial delimitation, several studies, tentative proposals

Failure!

METROPOLITAN REFORM

- Act 56 in **2014** enforced 10 Metropolitan Cities (Torino, Milano, Venezia, Genova, Bologna, Firenze, Roma, Napoli, Bari and Reggio Calabria)

- The territory is the one of the existing Province

In 2001 Metropolitan City included in the national Constitution
In Italy

• Traditional specific polycentric landscape
• Regional urbanisation processes → new forms of polycentrism
• Push towards bottom-up cooperation, supported by EU policy
• Strongly hit by the international financial crisis

• Budget cuts and reorganisation of territorial governing bodies
• Metropolitan Reform
### Italian Metropolitan Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan City</th>
<th>MC inhabitants 2015</th>
<th>N. municipalities</th>
<th>surface (skm)</th>
<th>density (inhabitant/skm)</th>
<th>Central city inhabitants 2015</th>
<th>N. of totally or partially mountain municipalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torino</td>
<td>2,291,719</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>6.827</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>896,773</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milano</td>
<td>3,196,825</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.576</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>1,337,155</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezia</td>
<td>858,198</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.473</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>264,579</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genova</td>
<td>862,175</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>586,655</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>1,004,323</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.702</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>386,181</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firenze</td>
<td>1,012,180</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.514</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>381,037</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>4,342,046</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5.363</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>2,872,021</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoli</td>
<td>3,118,149</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>2645</td>
<td>978,299</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bari</td>
<td>1,266,379</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.863</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>327,361</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reggio Calabria</td>
<td>557,993</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.210</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>183,974</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Italian Metropolitan Cities

• Inconsistence between the institutional design and the geographic, social and economic features

• Discrepancies in the planning field → MC duties: public services and mobility infrastructurers + planning tasks:
  • 3 year Strategic Plan (to be updated each year)
  • General Territorial Plan (for the whole territory)

Today only 7 MC have approved their Strategic Plan and only 4 have started drafting the Territorial Plan (the others keep the existing Provincial Plan).
Metropolitan Cities

- Other European countries adopted other criteria to address the metropolitan areas’ challenge
- Difficulties to match the processes of metropolisation and institutional boundaries
- In Italy 24 years of inaction, but the Metropolitan Reform ignores the ongoing regionalisation processes
The role of local actors

• Governance experiences involving public and private actors (from 1995 to 2013) - *Soft spaces of governance* (Allmendinger & Houghton)
• Voluntary cooperation
• Aim: exploiting the local resources for local development
• Mostly funded by EU
• Changed over time: few before 2000, numerous 2000-2006, decreasing after 2006
• Substituted by a number of regional initiatives
Roma Metropolitan City
Venezia Metropolitan City
Torino Metropolitan City
Final remarks

• The only possibility for the new government institutions of recognising the geographical and socio-economic specificities is to establish the ‘homogeneous zones’, a subdivision of the metropolitan territory, merely for administrative purposes.
Weaknesses of MC institutions

• The process has been developing slowly and bureaucratically
• Inability to grasp how far the urban dimension goes beyond the central city
• Weak capacity to deal with the asymmetrical and conflictive historical relation between the core and the rest of the metropolitan areas
• Central city does not cooperate so much with the other municipalities
• Issues of legitimacy, democracy and new citizenship
• A risk of an overriding role of the central cities due to the tendency of centralisation of policies for the cities