

SPATIAL PLANNING, METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT AND GOVERNANCE IN THE MAJOR CITIES IN SPAIN

Rafael de Miguel Gonzalez

Department of Geography and Planning. Universidad de Zaragoza.

The urban dimension of the fact supramunicipal was before the subject of interest to planners of managers. From the earliest writings of Patrick Geddes at the beginning of last century, the creation of the Regional Planning Association of America in the early twenties and the Regional Plan of New York in 1929 to formulate a theory of the metropolitan government by Victor Jones in 1942 or 1958 by Robert Wood spent several decades. In Spain, the General Commissariat for the Management of Urban and around Madrid (1944) and the Management Corporations of Greater Grand Bilbao and Valencia (both 1946) were established as a town planning commissions plurimunicipales for monitoring the plans of agglomeration, as also happened in 1953 with the District of Barcelona for the management plan this year. However, in 1960 was renamed the Commission on Urban and Common Services, Barcelona and other towns, which for the first time in Spain joined, the scale of the metropolitan urban planning, management of certain inter-urban services. Subsequently the creation of COPLACO for the monitoring of the Plan of the metropolitan area of Madrid 1963 and the Metropolitan in Barcelona in 1974, following the submission of the progress of the Metropolitan Plan (adopted in 1976), assumed the maintenance of the unit bodies Management and Metropolitan Government to administer a supra-urban planning, although in the case of Barcelona (Metropolitan or Metropolitan Corporation of Barcelona) remained the metropolitan management of urban services such as transport or water supply. Something similar happened in Valencia with the 1961 Act on the Southern Plan that increased management powers to the Administrative Corporation of Greater Valencia.

Such linkage to the metropolitan government's urban planning of the central administration (and sometimes the process of annexation of neighboring towns), only extended to the management of services in Barcelona and Valencia, had no room after the restoration of democracy: the law on urban planning and the local regime. The jurisprudence of both issues leaves no doubt that the urban planning and management of each municipality are for local corporations. However, article 43 of the Act of 1985 governs the Local Rules contained in

the metropolitan area that resulted in the creation of the Metropolitan Consell de l'Horta in 1987, the same year that dissolved the Metropolitan Corporation of Barcelona, and created The Metropolitan Transportation and the Metropolitan Environment.

Following the dissolution of the Metropolitan Corporation of Barcelona in 1987, ended four decades of supra bodies of urbanism, but have survived in Barcelona and Valencia on others for transportation management, water and waste services. On the other hand, the frame of reference space of urban planning has been regulated in the adoption of the laws of the autonomous regional planning that have created supra-planning tools. The territorial plans handled so far in cities around Spain have been those of Bilbao, Vitoria, San Sebastian, Alicante, Granada, Cadiz, Segovia, Salamanca and Valladolid, understood as regional plans or plans of the environment of a provincial capital, except Territorial Plan Partial Metropolitan Bilbao. The plans of the largest cities such as Madrid, Barcelona, Valencia, Seville, Zaragoza and Malaga have spent more than a decade of studies, proposals and models, the participation of several hundred professionals, spent several million euros, but have not reached a formality final administrative approval. These documents have not had neither the utility nor the application in the normal terms, but in another order has served to foster a debate territorial or be laying the groundwork for a new metropolitan governance.

There is some academic consensus that the metropolitan spatial planning in Spain is in a crisis on theoretical and methodological by which the planning documents produced in recent years, they are unable to provide answers or solutions to territorial disputes arising the system of settlements in large cities, and growing more aggravated as a result of processes such as suburbanization and metropolization.

Looking at the production of metropolitan planning in Spain in the last twenty years, it is found that many plans have been developed in the Spanish mainland and in the forty-five years earlier, which does not necessarily mean that this fever editorial planning has had a direct translation on the optimal physical organization of the metropolitan territory. Among other issues because the concept of metropolitan plan is neither legal nor methodological, nor operationally defined clearly. We talked about the plan metropolitan basis of the guidelines supra overall plans for urban management of the central cities, but especially from the articulation of plans, strategies and guidelines for a space derived from the laws of the autonomous regional planning.

However, it should show some light of the current metropolitan plans or documents in his state of progress, that somehow have had some positive results over the territory. Despite the contradictions pointed out, it is clear that expectations raised by the presentation and dissemination of these plans has become a kind of power in the shadows, whose influence has been undeniably positive outcome in the process of drafting overall plans in review As well as strategic plans supra-territorial in nature.

Likewise, the very process of planning and development supramunicipal has acted as a mechanism of metropolitan governance, as it has served to the debate, participation and consultation between different administrations, but also between the public and private enterprises, social partners , Civil society, and so on., Allowing collective thinking and decision-making in land issues.

In Madrid, the publication of the progress of the Regional Plan of Territorial Strategy (in versions 1995 and 1997) has enabled certain municipalities revise their forecasts in

the municipal planning, for example those identified with units of space development and regional balance of According to the guidelines of the Regional Plan, for example with the reservation of land for location of equipment metropolitan. It has also been able to make progress in defining and sector-specific regulation of the open spaces of natural interest and rural areas and in the management of some areas of regional interest.

In Barcelona the Metropolitan Spatial Plan 1998 has helped to guide the urbanization process to activate the areas and reduce the impact on rural and natural crown. The amendment to the municipal planning following the guidelines and measurements of the progress of the Plan has been very prominent in some cases (Sabadell and Mataro, for example). Also some infrastructure specified by the plan are being implemented as the proposed extension of the metro and suburban rail. Similarly the drafting of the Strategic Plan *Metropolitano de Barcelona* has followed the guidelines and objectives of the work of the Spatial Plan Partial. In Bilbao the Territorial Plan Partial Bilbao 1994 has had a major influence on local planning, including the town center. The existence of a consortium Bilbao Ria 2000 has enabled the management of outstanding projects identified in a territorial reorganization plan as the metropolitan strategic and selective like this: new port investments in public works and roads, new centralities in the axis of the estuary, etc. . Zaragoza in the draft guideline Partial spatial planning in the metropolitan area produced a territorial model that was adjusted to the General Plan de Zaragoza, which houses more than 85% of the metropolitan population.

For its part, the Spanish decentralization has been a slow process that started with the 1978 Constitution and that has been perceived as a transfer of power from the central government to autonomous regions, but is awaiting a second decentralize them to the municipalities. In any case it was very difficult to maintain an institutional coexistence between the metropolitan and regional level, in addition to provincial and local (in the broad sense) which explains the process of removing the bodies metropolitan Spaniards in the eighties. How good will that put the legislator in Article 43 of Law 7 / 1985 of the Regime Local Bases in Spain, which regulates the metropolitan areas as «local entities comprising the municipalities of large urban agglomerations whose population centres exist economic and social links that require joint planning and coordination of certain services and construction », however clashed against a dynamic recovered with articles 137 and 140 of the Constitution, the secular municipal autonomy.

So now the debate has been virtually closed metropolitan. In Madrid, the formation of an autonomous region has almost single-to coincide with the city-region functional, so in practice the Community of Madrid exerts its territorial and sector policies at the Metropolitan. In Valencia, Law 8 / 1999 of December 3, removed the Metropolitan Area de l'Horta, but the Law 2 / 2001 of creating and managing metropolitan areas of the Valencian Community has opted for metropolitan sectoral entities linked to a particular public service, «resurrecting» for the second time the Metropolitan Area de l'Horta. The functional area of Bilbao metropolitan that reflecting the guidelines of Land Management 1994, and that is assumed in the Spatial Plan Partial, has been left with little expansion of the real metropolitan city, which tends to approach the provincial level of the Provincial Council of Biscay. In Seville and Zaragoza, has opted for a model of metropolitan management in transport by a consortium of transportation.

Just subtract the fragmented management of the metropolitan area of Barcelona. On the one hand is betting on the new *veguería*, dividing the province of Barcelona in two. Moreover,

since the so-called Metropolitan Area of Barcelona aims for a metropolitan government for a number of smaller municipalities. Both options would lead to a new level of divergence of metropolitan government, the intended by the autonomous region and claimed by local authorities, who returns to lead a new institutional confrontation.

In any case, it seems obvious that create local institutions metropolitan is not the future of urban planning and territorial management in Spain, and less after the Judgments of the Constitutional Court 61/1997 and 164/2001 which have helped to clarify the framework in the field of Companies town and country planning. This does not preclude further work to the benefit of a metropolitan management more flexible, more operational and more consensual, not in line with the government but on that of metropolitan governance.

In the academic field, while it became obsolete speeches of the metropolitan government, other voices arose pioneers in the definition of institutional governance, but also in the governance of large cities or *métápolis*, understood that difficulties were neither technical nor economic but social and political issues. If urbanism as a discipline of speech in the city has gone above and freeing of dogmatism now has a number of useful flexible and varied, governance should be translated as «a system of government that articulates political, economic and social actors, in a process of setting up collective preferences can induce an active membership of citizens» (Ascher, 2004).

Have been left out of the traditional concepts of metropolitan areas as functional in the sense of applying the statistical criteria for the Metropolitan Statistical Areas, or any other attempt to delimitation of a very complex called City region, diffuse city, urban or simply *métápolis*. And also have become outdated metropolitan areas as corporate governance in the comprehensive line of the writings of the fifties and sixties. But if the first case, the analytical reconstruction of the postindustrial city, and even their planning, has almost overwhelmed by the countless bibliographical production in recent years, in the second, the organization of actions on that city region, is in the process of finding an intellectual legitimacy through good governance.

In 1998 the Foundation of European cities published work «Challenges for urban governance in the EU» which drew its main advantages: greater democracy, greater participation, greater legitimacy, greater efficiency, greater collective identification. In 2000 the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development presented the report «Cities for Citizens: improving governance in metropolitan areas» as a presentation of arguments and metropolitan governance. The opinion of the Economic and Social Committee on «Metropolitan areas: socio-economic implications for the future of Europe» (2004) notes that metropolitan areas are the key territories for the conduct of the practice of governance. The informal meeting of Ministers of Urban and Regional Planning (urban development and territorial cohesion) held in Bristol in December 2005, ended with the so-called Bristol Accord, which defines the so-called sustainable urban communities, one of whose attributes is the adoption of governance systems that combine a strategic leadership with effective participation of citizens and organizations. The last reference to the EU institutions on metropolitan governance has occurred in May 2007, during the Conference in Leipzig which has resulted in two documents, the Charter of Leipzig on European Sustainable Cities and the Territorial Agenda of the European Union (Towards a more competitive and sustainable various regions). Both documents spoke of the need to strengthen the territorial governance.