

# Collaboration Matters – Cooperation for TOD in City Regions

Annette Kroen

School of Global Studies, Social Science and Planning, RMIT University

**Abstract:** This paper deals with governance models for transit-oriented development (TOD). TOD is a concept of mixed-used, medium to higher density development around public transport that is gaining importance in Australia. In the last few years it has been discussed in all large Australian cities and the first examples have been built.

To understand how metropolitan governance can help implement TOD, two overseas city regions will be examined and then will be compared to what is happening in Melbourne. In Bonn (Germany) there is an informal regional cooperation involving collaboration, among other things, on TOD. In Denver (USA) the citizens voted for an extension to the light rail network over a 12 year time frame. A regional planning organization is involved in TOD, and furthermore NGOs and other organisations are important players. In Melbourne the Transit Cities program aims to promote TOD and involves both state and local governments. The paper draws on interviews conducted in 2006 and 2007 and compares the three cities against a background of recent literature on metropolitan governance and TOD. It will critically assess the structures and highlight how Australian cities could learn from the experiences.

## Introduction

This paper investigates the interrelation between collaboration, metropolitan governance and the implementation of transit-oriented development, an approach of medium to high density mixed-use urban development concentrated around public transport. This form of development is gaining widespread, although by no means complete, acceptance in many (western) countries around the world (Cervero et al., 2004; Newman, 2005; Prëtsch et al., 2005).

The importance of collaboration has gained recognition in planning over the last few decades. Since the 1970s it has become clear that spatial planning has to involve the public and the relevant stakeholders. Various critiques of planning but also changes in governance have led to more cooperative approaches and research has found that for most metropolitan problems purpose-oriented networks of cooperation are formed (Kübler, 2005; Benz, 2001).

The large cities of the 21st century can be regarded as metropolitan areas that are characterised by urban sprawl, functional specialisation and spatial mobility. Their future strongly relies on public governance capacity to direct economic development and counterbalance competitiveness with social cohesion and liveability at the metropolitan level (OECD, 2001).

Also of critical importance for metropolitan areas and urban development in general is the environmental imperative raising questions of how urban development can be designed more sustainable. The details of this debate cannot be explored in this paper for reasons of space, but transit-oriented development will be examined as one example of a more sustainable form of urban development<sup>1</sup>. TOD is furthermore a good example to demonstrate the necessity of collaboration for metropolitan governance because it is a concept that has to be coordinated at the regional level while it is implemented at the local level. In addition to this, a range of various public and private actors are involved in the development, adding to the need for coordination and cooperation (Cervero et al. 2004, Dittmar and Ohland 2004).

To consider the possibilities of regional collaboration and coordination for TOD this paper looks at three examples: Bonn, Denver, and Melbourne. The three cases were selected because of their differences in institutional organisation and cooperation structures in relation to TOD and urban planning. The paper draws back on interviews conducted in 2006 and 2007 and compares the three cities against a background of recent literature on metropolitan governance and the potential for collaboration in implementing TOD.

## Metropolitan Governance

“Governance in its broadest sense is about steering society” (Kübler, 2005, p. 8). This means governance is the act of governing. There are two main classical views on how governance is best achieved in political and administrative science, the model of ‘coordination through hierarchy’ and the model of ‘coordination through markets’. These two conflicting models have dominated the debate on the role of the state and the principles of public administration since the 1970s. A third model emerged in the mid 1990s, the model of ‘coordination through negotiation’ that presumes that coordinated behaviour more often comes from consent and cooperation, rather than from hierarchical constraints or market-based competition (Kübler, 2005; Scharpf, 1997).

---

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion about sustainable urban form and the sustainability of TOD see Williams, 2005; Handy et al. 2005; Cervero et al., 2004; Williams et al., 2000.

This third model of governance can also be connected to the debate about the shift 'from government to governance' (Kooiman, 2003; Le Galès, 1998; Rhodes 1997). In this debate the term governance "refers to a change in the meaning of government, referring to a new process of governing" (Rhodes, 1997, p 15). It highlights the change from more hierarchical political and societal structures to structures where decisions at the local, regional, national and global level all involve an increasing multitude of both governmental and non-governmental actors. Reasons for this change are seen in the 'overload' of government and the 'ungovernability' of complex modern societies (Pierre and Peters, 2006).

Metropolitan governance is governance on the level of a metropolitan area. It can be defined as the question of how "governments, corporate actors and residents (...) can be associated for the purpose of controlling or regulating the behaviour within and performing functions or providing services" for a defined metropolitan area (Norris, 2001, p. 535 after Kübler, 2005). One reason for the debate about metropolitan governance is the ongoing suburbanisation in city regions which leads to a discrepancy between the functional urban space and the institutional boundaries. That means residents and also businesses are acting on a regional scale with working in one municipality and living in another etc. while institutions cover limited areas like one municipality or even a region but that might not cover the actual functional relations.

As with the governance debate described above after Kübler (2005) three views on how metropolitan governance should be handled can be distinguished (see also Swanstrom, 2001; Feiock, 2004).

The 'metropolitan reform view' sees the main problem for good metropolitan governance in the fact that the institutional boundaries do not match the spatial scale of the economic and social interconnections. Thus metropolitan reformers suggest either the annexation of suburbs by the central city or the creation of metropolitan governments (Lowery, 2000; Hawkins et al., 1991, Wood, 1958). The dilemma of this approach is the ongoing urban growth and also the unpredictability of growth. Additionally the different scales that are needed for different issues, like waste, transport etc. make it difficult to find the right boundaries for a regional institution.

The 'public choice view' rejects the thought that institutional consolidation is the way to deal with metropolitan problems (Tiebout, 1956; Ostrom et al., 1961; Peterson, 1981). The proponents of this position argue that the existence of several local districts creates a market-like situation, in which citizens can choose the municipality that matches their needs best. They claim that competition between local governments to attract residents leads to an effective delivery of area-wide services and an effective allocation of public resources. The problem of this approach is that in reality local governments are often competing for businesses rather than for residents because the tax regulations give no incentive for attracting residents. Furthermore, the model produces or supports urban sprawl, because it presumes that there are no constraints, geographic or otherwise to the expansion of urban settlements

Over the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the debate on metropolitan governance was largely dominated by the dispute between those two schools of thought. However, no compelling evidence for either position has been demonstrated so far (Keating 1995). This led to the development of a new approach in the 1990s, drawing on empirical research that found that metropolitan problems are often dealt with by "purpose-oriented networks of cooperation involving municipalities, governmental agencies from various levels, as well as private service providers" (Kübler 2005: 10). This approach has been labelled 'new regionalism' and it argues that effective metropolitan governance is rather a result of negotiation processes between a variety of policy-relevant actors, than of institutional consolidation, hierarchy or competition (Savitch and Vogel 2000; Wheeler, 2002; Wood and Valler, 2004).

Whether this new regionalism is happening, and how it is occurring will be examined through the three case studies with regards to transit-oriented development. Firstly, however, we will examine very briefly the concept of transit-oriented development.

### **Transit-Oriented Development**

Transit-oriented development (TOD) is a form of medium to higher density mixed-use urban development concentrated around public transport nodes, mostly train stations. Proponents see several benefits of TOD like for example the potential to reduce car dependence, the opportunity to increase the public transport patronage, and enable more efficient use of land which can curb urban sprawl (Cervero et al., 2004, Belzer and Autler, 2002). It is argued that TOD can increase housing, transport and even employment choices, by improving accessibility, and support community development and liveability objectives through place-making strategies (Arrington, 2005).

TOD has to perform two important functions, which could be referred to as the place and the node function. The station or stop is on the one hand a node on the bigger public transport network and on the other hand a place for people to stay, shop etc., and thus TOD has to be both a node and a good place in its own right (Dittmar and Ohland 2004; Bertolini 2005). The place and the node function are equally important, but the main focus of this paper will rest on the node function, because of the importance of planning for TOD at the system-wide scale and the importance of coordination on a regional level (Belzer and Autler 2002).

Many different actors, with a wide range of concerns are involved in TOD. Case studies suggest that successful TOD typically involves well-crafted collaborations between the many individuals, organizations, and institutions with different goals, priorities and interests in outcomes (Cervero, Ferrel and Murphy, 2002; Arrington, 2005). The implementation of TOD requires the integration of transport and land use planning and strong collaborations between different public sector and private sector agencies (Renne 2005, Dittmar and Ohland 2004). In western countries TOD often does not occur without some form of deliberate government policy and intervention, because factors such as land prices and site assembly problems often mean that urban development will disperse rather than concentrate (Ibrahim and McGoldrick 2003). The government as regulator can prohibit unwanted forms of development, but it cannot force the private sector to invest in desirable developments, and therefore may have to resort to a range of strategies including financial incentives and direct involvement in the development process. This means that relations and collaboration between the many possible participants in the process and a commitment to a shared outcome are of high importance to the final outcome.

The next section will look at the three case studies and their metropolitan governance with regards to TOD. The key actors, cooperation structures and at programs for TOD will be examined and explored which arrangement seems to work best for TOD on a regional scale. So, we will look at and see which arrangements seem to make more sense for planning TOD.

### **Bonn: Informal cooperation for TOD**

In many European cities, the concept of orientating development around public transport did not fall out of fashion to the extent it did in Australia and North America. Nevertheless, many European cities today have cores with strong public transport systems, but are surrounded by car-dependent suburbs, unserved by adequate public transport (BBR 2000, Batty et al. 2002). Thus, recent times have seen a renewed interest in concentrating new urban development around public transport.

This trend can be seen in the city region of Bonn, where the central city has a good public transport network but the dispersed settlement pattern and the lesser quality of public transport in the surroundings lead to congestion caused by commuters working in Bonn (RAK 2006a). Bonn is located in Western Germany at the river Rhine close to Cologne. A bit over a million people are living in the city region with Bonn being the largest city with about 300.000 inhabitants. The region is quite heterogenous with an urbanised and dense conurbation along the Rhine and a thinly populated rural surrounding countryside. A growth of 100,000 residents until 2030 is expected (RAK 2006b). In comparison to Denver or Melbourne this might seem a small number, but compared to other regions in Germany where many areas and especially larger cities are actually losing inhabitants it is a relatively large number (BBR, 2000).

### ***TOD in Bonn***

Transit-oriented development is not necessarily understood in Bonn in the terms it is defined in the US, but it is seen as a possibility to offer more transport choices and concentrate urban development at certain public transport nodes. The regional concept comprises sustainable development along rail lines or adequate bus lines to decrease the need for automobile travel, and the spatial vision for the region is a 'decentralised concentration'. This means that urban development is concentrated not only in the major city but also in medium-sized centres that are of importance for their surroundings. An attempt is made to prevent urban sprawl by concentrating the urban development in these cities. Naturally, the smaller towns are still allowed to develop, but the major development is supposed to take place in the medium and larger cities, and there especially at public transport stations (RAK, 2006a).

### ***Key actors***

The main instigator of TOD in the region is the RAK (Regionaler Arbeitskreis Entwicklung, Planung und Verkehr Bonn/Rhein-Sieg/Ahrweiler, regional working group development, planning and transport Bonn/Rhein-Sieg/Ahrweiler). The RAK is a voluntary cooperative grouping of the municipalities in the region. It was founded in 1991 because of the decision to shift the Federal parliament and seat of government from Bonn to Berlin. The main concern at that time was to cope with the expected structural change together, because it was anticipated that the region would lose inhabitants and also businesses (Stein 2006). Through the RAK the municipalities developed a regional concept and commissioned an analysis of the regional housing market to understand better what the future would bring. The concept contains among other things the concentration of urban development along rail lines (RAK 2006a). Through this the RAK became the main actor promoting TOD. Other actors are the municipalities themselves and developers. The public transport agencies like the rail agency or the bus providers are not interested in transit-oriented development and do not see it as their task (interview 2006).

### **Cooperation structures**

As described above the RAK is the main cooperation structure for the region. The particularity of it is that it is a voluntary cooperation which means that while the members try to reach consensus there is still the possibility for each member not to take part in a certain project or decision (RAK, 2005).

The decision-making is organised in the way that the RAK only makes recommendations and the politicians in each municipality still have to decide if they apply this recommendation to their community. In some cases it has happened that a few municipalities did not support a recommendation from the RAK but this is very rare (Trommer interview, August 2006). With this decision-making structure, the command and control function is still with the municipalities but decisions about future urban development are taken collaboratively. This structure has the advantage that the municipalities are more open to a membership in the RAK because they do not have to give up their independence and autonomy, but it has the disadvantage that the decisions of the RAK are not binding. Projects of the RAK so far have been the housing analysis, the regional concept, a joint real estate website and a regional retail concept.

The RAK also works together with and involves other players in the region like developers, the chamber of commerce, the state and district organisations and the citizens (Stein interview 2006). In some cases the municipalities work together bilaterally but most of the discussions and cooperation go through the RAK.

### **TOD program**

Transit-oriented development in Bonn is supported by the concept of decentralised concentration as explained above, but no special TOD program exists. However, the 'impulse program' from 1996 to 1999 has helped to establish some transit-oriented developments and has the transit orientation as one criterion for sustainable housing (Isselmann interview, 2006). Within the impulse program 1996-1999 numerous new housing projects have been established on the basis of quality guidelines for sustainable housing that contained urban design, social and ecological criteria. They are primarily in proximity to the rail, and have a good accessibility to kindergartens, schools and shops.

Furthermore, in 2000 a competition has been conducted, where an 'impulse award' has been offered from the RAK. The minimum criteria for a development to be able to receive this award are low energy houses, proximity to public transport, cost saving building and living (ILS/RAK 2002). Thus there are no special incentives for TOD, but the municipalities and also the regional planning authority see it as an important objective.

It can be concluded that in Bonn TOD is seen as an important element of sustainable development but is integrated with other elements. The region sees the advantage of cooperation and negotiation and applies it to regional topics.

### **Denver: Multiple players taking care of TOD**

In the United States transit-oriented development received a renewed interest in the 1990s, both because of the growing interest in New Urbanism and because of growing problems with congestion and urban sprawl (Cervero et al., 2004; Lund, 2003). The Denver region is no exception in these regards. Denver lies on the western side of the American Great Plains at the foot of the Rocky Mountains. It is the capital of Colorado and growth is fast in both Colorado and Denver (Murray, 2002). The number of 2.7 million inhabitants is projected to grow to 3.9 million by 2030 (DRCOG, 2005). So far growth has mainly taken place in the form of low-density developments and the problems with this have yielded a growing interest in transit-oriented development (DRCOG, 2005).

In 2004 the program FasTracks was voted for in a state-wide election. FasTracks is a 12-year-plan of the Regional Transportation District Denver (RTD) to build and operate high speed rail lines in nine corridors, expand and improve bus service and park and ride throughout the region. With this the voters chose to invest about 4.7 billion US\$ in transit, which meant a 0.4% increase in sales and use tax for them (RTD, 2004a, 2004b).

### **TOD in Denver**

Currently TOD is an important topic in Denver. Part of this interest comes from the problems of growth and sprawl and part of this from the new construction of light rail in Denver. The general enthusiasm for TOD in some parts of the United States created the impression in Denver that this is a suitable concept to solve some of the current problems. Moreover, the construction of light rail has produced new TOD opportunities, and with more lines to be build over the next 10 years, there will be even more potential for TOD over the next 10 to 20 years (RTD, 2007). But so far the knowledge about transit-oriented development is not very developed and thus the interest to learn more about TOD is huge. Therefore several workshops about the benefits of TOD and how it can be done have been held in Denver and several regional players try to educate and inform about TOD (interview 2006).

### **Key actors**

Key actors for TOD in Denver are the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG), RTD, a non-profit organisation TransitAlliance and the Urban Land Institute (ULI).

DRCOG is involved in TOD through its role as metropolitan planning organisation (MPO) and as regional planning agency by state statute. As the MPO for the Denver region DRCOG has access to transport funding which they can spend on station area plans for example. They developed the Denver region's long-range growth plan Metro Vision 2030 (DRCOG, 2005). It identifies among other things where growth is expected and where transportation investments should be made over the next 25 years. In order to support the development of TOD, DRCOG dedicated staff explicitly to it. Their TOD manager tries to bring people together and to educate municipalities about TOD. Furthermore, DRCOG has a website and an e-newsletter to help sharing information and to announce TOD events. They are committed to furthering the discussion between its members, developers, elected officials and other stakeholders in the TOD process (DRCOG, interview 2006).

RTD as the regional transit agency is more involved in the development of the actual rail lines and issues with stations, but they realised a growing interest in TOD while they were building the South East rail line that opened in November 2006 (Sirois, interview 2006). Therefore RTD created the position of a TOD manager who is the point of contact for developers and local jurisdictions who are interested in planning around stations. RTD sees as its main task to organise and carry out the transit and does not see itself as building TOD, but they try to facilitate transit-oriented development and to work with local governments along the rail lines. Furthermore they are working together with the other regional agencies (Sirois, interview 2006).

TransitAlliance is a coalition of elected officials, business groups, environmental and other public interest organisations. It promotes a balanced, multi-modal transportation network through educational work, workshops etc. (TransitAlliance, 2007). Together with the ULI they had a critical role in bringing FasTracks past.

The ULI is a think tank of the land use and real estate industry. It is a research and education organization supported by its members with the mission to investigate what constitutes sound real estate development projects and practices and what land use trends and issues are emerging. District Councils are ULI at the local level and the ULI Colorado is one of ULI's largest District Councils (ULI, 2007). It has been actively involved in promoting Smart Growth and FasTracks and is now interested in helping to promote TOD.

### **Cooperation structures**

The formal cooperation structure for the region is DRCOG with its 52 local government members. But there are also several informal and voluntary cooperation structures which are mostly project or target oriented. Several coalitions have been established for issues like the new airport, a scientific district etc. This is said to be caused by the mentality of the Denver region that favours coalitions for certain projects more than ongoing cooperation. The Denverites are said to prefer to know for what they are cooperating and to have the possibility to stop this cooperation when the goal is achieved (Utter, interview 2006).

Examples for this can also be found in the TOD and public transport field, like the coalition for FasTracks where several groups promoted the program. Another example is the alliance of DRCOG and ULI for TOD workshops (see below). Most of the stakeholders are actually talking about getting a TOD coalition together in the near future and first foundations of this can already be seen (Sirois, interview 2006; DRCOG, interview 2006; Utter, interview 2006). Cooperation and communication is already happening, as DRCOG announces in its TOD newsletter and the website the activities from other actors and vice versa. Furthermore the organisations are participating at each other's events or organise events together. At the moment it can be said that cooperation and information is certainly happening in Denver, although not necessarily in a coordinated way.

### **TOD program**

No special program has been defined to promote and fund TOD so far, but the education about TOD is thriving. Several workshops have been held that can be seen as promoting TOD through education and discussion.

DRCOG, together with the ULI, has conducted three 'TODay' workshops that dealt with the topics of TOD phasing, financing and distinctiveness. They were aimed at local governments to bring them into contact with local, regional and national private-sector TOD experts (DRCOG, 2007). RTD performs 'TOD corridor' workshops for the new rail lines. They have held one so far for the West Corridor that will be built next. The goal of the workshops is to get stakeholders together and activate them to think about the whole corridor and to find out possibilities for TOD (Sirois interview 2006). Additional to this TransitAlliance conducts 'Citizens' Academies' that discuss the complexities of combining transportation and community development. The program has seven sessions with different topics and presentations. Cornerstone of the program is that

participants have to take their new knowledge and put it in action with a personal action plan that they will implement upon completing the academy (TransitAlliance, 2007).

In conclusion, it can be said that there is no overall regional program for the promotion and funding of TOD, or a tradition of facilitating TOD, but that there are several smaller workshops to inform about the concept and several players promoting it.

### **Melbourne: Cooperation for individual TODs**

In Australia the starting point for TOD can be compared to the situation in the United States. Although most of the Australian cities kept their rail and tram systems transit-oriented development lost its importance with the increased reliance on cars in the post-war era (Forster, 2004). The concept has received new interest recently, which corresponded with concerns about urban sprawl and the popularity of new urbanism inspired urban growth and redevelopment patterns (Buxton and Scheurer, 2005). In Melbourne Transit Cities, a state program, funds thirteen municipalities to improve their rail orientation and city structure.

Melbourne is located in the south-east of Australia on Port Philip Bay and is the second largest city in Australia. 3.6 million residents are living in the metropolitan area in a comparatively low density, with denser inner suburbs and low-density outer suburbs (DSE, 2006). Melbourne is expected to grow for another million inhabitants by 2030 (DOI, 2002). The anticipated growth and environmental problems have sparked an interest in denser and more sustainable development and the Victorian State government published 'Melbourne 2030 - a growth management strategy' in 2002 (DOI, 2002). Melbourne 2030 attempts to manage growth by a twin strategy: An urban growth boundary places greater controls on outward expansion, while an activity centre policy aims to capture more new residents and jobs in strategic locations within the established urbanised area.

#### ***TOD in Melbourne***

Melbourne 2030 promotes an increase of development around activity centres, although many of these could not be considered transit-oriented, but it also puts emphasis on transit-oriented development as a strategy to focus growth in already developed areas. Another objective mentioned in Melbourne 2030 is to increase the share of public transport by 2020 to 20% (DOI, 2002).

TOD is understood as a mixed-use development of shops, businesses and residential development which is very similar to the American definition. The main challenge is seen in "getting the residential" into the station areas, especially the higher density residential development (Watkinson, interview 2007). For the Transit Cities program the main task at present is to create a high quality public open space to turn the areas into more attractive locations.

#### ***Key actors***

The key players for TOD in the Melbourne metropolitan area are the State Department of Sustainability and Environment (DSE), the State Department of Infrastructure (DOI), VicUrban the state's 'sustainable urban development agency' and the local councils.

DSE and DOI are both managing the Transit Cities program, with DSE being the lead agency and managing the program and design. DOI is managing the implementation side that means actual infrastructure improvements like bus stops or foot bridges. This happens in part through VicUrban which is associated with DOI (Carthew, interview 2007).

VicUrban is managing four Transit Cities projects. As VicUrban is a state agency it has been given certain powers for some Transit Cities a private developer does not have, like land acquisition powers which help to move the development forward more quickly (Watkinson, interview 2007). The main task for VicUrban at the moment is to coordinate and plan strategies and master plans, thus here it is more a preparer for development than a developer.

The local councils are the ones who have to move the master plans forward and to implement them in their areas. They have to develop and agree with the plans and to find developers who build the planned developments and also they have to interact with the citizens.

#### ***Cooperation structures***

There is no formal or informal cooperation structure for planning or TOD on the metropolitan level. For Transit Cities individual cooperation between the respective local government and the state via DSE and DOI is happening. For each Transit City exists something like a project group or an advisory committee with different members like the local council, DSE, DOI, VicUrban, the most important commercial developer etc. Furthermore there are technical working groups looking at certain projects and the Transit Cities councils meet on a general manager level and on a place manager level (Turner, interview 2007).

## **TOD program**

Melbourne is the only city over the three examined examples with a designated TOD program. The Victorian state has introduced Transit Cities in 2001 as a program to promote TOD around a selection of strategic rail hubs (DSE 2007). These areas are all principal activity centres, that means they are already important mixed use hubs of retail, businesses and transport.

The objective of Transit Cities is to consolidate, diversify and densify existing nodes around major rail stations, and to offer residents and businesses the possibility to locate near high-performing public transport with easy access to a range of shops, services and job opportunities. It also intends to encourage more housing choice by meeting increasing demand for housing suitable for one- and two-person households (DSE, 2007).

The program has channelled considerable public investment into some of its key sites so far, although the amount of funding is differing. For most of the Transit Cities the master planning and some improvement of public space is accomplished and the implementation phase is starting. Private development has not commenced yet in most of the sites, but several permits have been granted. The main difficulties for implementation so far are the prices, because often it is possible to buy a house a bit further away for the same price as an apartment in the transit city location (Van Boxtel, interview 2007).

Transit Cities is a lot about redevelopment, the state is upgrading station precincts, improving connections and working out master plans with the local councils. It is not that much about public transport, although all areas are station precincts and connections between the station and the surrounding areas are considered. But it does not look with a regional or system-wide view on the station and Transit City activities and service and infrastructure improvements for public transport are not coordinated.

Concluding it can be said that the starting point exists, but a lot more implementation, collaboration and coordination has to happen for more success.

## **Conclusions**

In this paper three different approaches to metropolitan governance and transit-oriented development were described, one with an informal, voluntary cooperation in Bonn, one with a regional planning agency and coalitions of regional players in Denver and one with individual cooperation on a local base in Melbourne. The approaches are summarised in tables 1 and 2.

**Table 1: Approach to (region-wide) Transit-oriented development in the Case Studies**

	<b>Bonn</b>	<b>Denver</b>	<b>Melbourne</b>
	New TOD along existing lines	New lines and new TODs	Changing existing development to TOD
Reasons for TOD vision	Crisis (shift of Parliament seat) Congestion/Sustainability	Crisis in economic development Congestion/ Sustainability	Growth, sprawl, boosterism Congestion/ Sustainability
Understanding of TOD	Concentration of urban development Offering mobility choices More about sustainable development than the TOD concept	Mixed-use high-density development Popular concept related to new urbanism movement	Mixed-use high-density development Concept developed after American understanding of TOD
Key Players (regional)	Informal regional working group of the municipalities (RAK)	Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) Regional Transportation District (RTD) TransitAlliance (TA) Urban Land Institute (ULI)	DSE DOI VicUrban
TOD program	No TOD program, but spatial vision of a decentralised concentration and an 'impulse program' and 'impulse award' for sustainable housing with the criterion of proximity to public transport	No TOD program, but educational TOD workshops from DRCOG and ULI, TA, and RTD. Plus FasTracks as a program to fund new public transport infrastructure.	TOD program from the State: 'Transit Cities' - 13 selected locations that get government funding. Aim: to consolidate, diversify and densify existing nodes around major rail stations.

Regarding TOD it can be said that, while the understanding or definition of TOD might be a bit different, the reasons for the emergence of a TOD 'vision' are quite similar with congestion as problem and a more sustainable development as goal. In Denver and Bonn a crisis supported the emergence and in Melbourne TOD is used in some locations to counteract economic downturn.

While there are no official TOD programs in Bonn and Denver, it is supported in Bonn in relation to sustainable housing and the regional spatial vision of decentralised concentration, and in Denver through educational workshops. The TOD program in Melbourne is related to Melbourne 2030, but concentrates on the thirteen Transit Cities.

In Bonn and Denver the improvement of public transport is reason or tool to implement and improve TOD, while in Melbourne this is not used and coordinated as much (Scheurer/Kroen 2005). The Denver approach also suggests that it is helpful for TOD that the transit agency supports TOD and tries to improve the conditions for it.

Thus to support the Transit Cities program more it would be good to coordinate and parallel the improvement of public transport which is not happening at the moment. Furthermore, more education about TOD and a stronger linkage to Melbourne 2030 as the regional concept would be helpful; at least these approaches have brought considerable support in the other case studies.

**Table 2: Cooperative and administrative Arrangements in the Case Studies**

	<b>Bonn</b>	<b>Denver</b>	<b>Melbourne</b>
	'Informal cooperation for TOD'	'Several players managing TOD'	'Cooperation for individual TODs'
Cooperation structures	Regional working group develops and gives recommendations to municipalities that do or do not apply them	DRCOG with 52 members mainly for regional planning Coalitions for certain projects like the airport, or the new regional transit system TOD coalition contemplated	Project working groups in the individual transit cities with DSE, DOI, local council etc.
Regional Structure	Loose informal regional arrangement with limited powers Formal State planning on a larger area Local autonomy	Formal arrangement with limited powers Local autonomy	No metropolitan planning level State planning for metropolitan area No constitutional status of local governments

Regarding Metropolitan Governance and cooperation structures there are more differences to be found in the case studies, which is natural as they are located in different countries with different planning and administrative traditions. Nevertheless a comparison seems possible as they are all Western countries and the traditions are not too dissimilar.

The cooperation structures in the case studies are quite diverse with Bonn having an informal working group, Denver a regional council of governments and at the same time informal coalitions, and Melbourne having individual working groups or committees for each Transit City.

The Bonn strategy has the advantage of a high degree of consensus established within the region and the willingness to participate which comes from the absence of compulsion. The disadvantage is that decisions are not binding for each municipality. In Denver the huge engagement and enthusiasm for TOD gets bundled in coalitions, while there is no truly coordinated approach yet. Melbourne promotes TOD through an specific program, but this is only true for some stations, and cooperation takes only place for the individual transit city not a metropolitan level.

The regional administrative structures are also different. In the Bonn region state planning exists on a regional level, that is larger than the Bonn area and furthermore a part of the region belongs to another state and therefore to another regional plan. The RAK works on the Bonn regional level with no real power and the local autonomy is very high. In Denver a formal arrangement for regional planning with limited powers is existent be found on the metropolitan level and the municipalities have their autonomy. Melbourne however, has no metropolitan planning level, but the state is planning for the metropolitan area. The local governments do not have much power and no constitutional status.

In Victoria at the present time there appear to be few examples of regional cooperation that resemble the ones in Bonn or Denver. While much of the land use planning system is implemented by local government,

it is the state government which controls the agenda, sets strategic goals, and establishes the regulatory planning systems.

As this level seems to help finding consensus and implementation TOD in Bonn and Denver it should be considered to introduce an intermediate level of planning for metropolitan issues. In recent times there have also been some calls from within the Australian planning profession for a return to regional planning (Spiller, 2004; 2006), and the Office of Urban Management in Queensland can be seen as one example for this, although it still is a state agency (OUM, 2007).

A structure with a little more independence from state government might be able to involve other players to a greater degree, enable a more cooperative and less hierarchical approach to develop, and deal more effectively with issues of truly regional significance. The examples regarded in this paper support this line of thought, and the regional level seems to be a better level for mediating between the interests of the local and the state level.

## REFERENCES

- Arrington, G. B. (2005) *US Experiences, Challenges and Prospects for Transit Oriented Development – Issues for Melbourne*, address to Department of Sustainability and Environment, Friday July 8th 2005, (Melbourne)
- Batty, M., Chin, N. and Besussi, E. (2002) *State of the Art Review of Urban Sprawl Impacts and Measurement Techniques* report from the project SCATTER - Sprawling Cities And Transport: from Evaluation to Recommendations (London)
- BBR – Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (2000) *Raumordnungsbericht 2000* (Bonn)
- Belzer, D. and Autler, G. (2002) *Transit oriented development: Moving from rhetoric to reality*. (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy)
- Benz, A. (2001): Vom Stadt-Umland-Verband zu ‚Regional Governance‘ in Stadtreregionen *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kommunalwissenschaft*, 40 (2) pp. 55-71
- Bertolini, L. (2005) Cities and Transport: Exploring the Need for New Planning Approaches in L. Albrecht and S. J. Mandelbaum (ed.) *The Network Society: A new Context for Planning* (London/New York: Routledge), pp. 67-80
- Buxton, M. and Scheurer, J. (2005) *The Expanding Urban Frontier: Urban Form in Melbourne's Growth Corridors* (Melbourne: RMIT Publishing)
- Cervero, R et al. (2004) *Transit-Oriented Development in the United States. Experiences, Challenges and Prospects*, TRCP Report 102, (Washington D.C.: TCRP)
- Cervero, R., Ferrell, C. and Murphy, S. (2002) *Transit-Oriented Development and Joint Development in the United States: A Literature Review*, TCRP Research Results Digest Nr. 52 (Washington D.C.: TCRP)
- Dittmar, H. and Ohland, G. (2004) *The New Transit Town. Best Practices in Transit-Oriented Development*. Washington (DC): Island Press
- DOI - Department of Infrastructure (2002) *Melbourne 2030. Planning for Sustainable Growth*. (Melbourne)
- DRCOG – Denver Regional Council of Governments (2005) *Metro Vision 2030 Plan* (Denver)
- DRCOG (2007) <http://www.drcog.org/>, last accessed in June 2007
- DSE - Department of Sustainability and Environment (2007) [www.dse.vic.gov.au/transitcities](http://www.dse.vic.gov.au/transitcities), last accessed June 2007
- DSE (2006): *The Melbourne Atlas* (Melbourne)
- Feiock R.C. (ed.) (2004) *Metropolitan Governance: conflict, competition, and cooperation* (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press)
- Forster C (2004) *Australian Cities. Continuity and Change*. (Melbourne: Oxford University Press)
- Handy, S., Cao, X. and Mokhtarian, P.L. (2005) Correlation or causality between the built environment and travel behaviour? Evidence from Northern California, *Transportation Research Part D*, 10 (6), pp. 427-82.
- Hawkins, B. W., Ward, K. J. and Becker, M. P. (1991) Governmental Consolidation as a Strategy for Metropolitan Development, *Public Administration Quarterly*, Summer pp. 253-267
- Ibrahim, M. F. and McGoldrick, P. J. (2003) Shopping Choices with Public Transport Option (Aldershot: Ashgate)
- ILS, RAK (2002) *Standort Wohnen, Region Bonn/Rhein-Sieg/Ahrweiler, Wohnungsbauprojekte der Impulsauszeichnung* (Dortmund: ILS)
- Keating M. (1995) Size, efficiency and democracy: Consolidation, fragmentation and public choice in D. Judge et al. (eds.) *Theories of Urban Politics* (London: Sage), pp. 117-134
- Kooiman, Jan (2003) *Governing as Governance* (London: Sage)
- Kübler D. (2005) *Problems and Prospects of metropolitan governance in Sydney: toads ‚old‘ or ‚new‘ regionalism?*, City Futures Research Centre, Research Paper No. 2, (Kensington: UNSW)
- Les Galès (1998): Regulations and Governance in European Cities, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, pp. 482-506
- Lowery D. (2000) A Transaction Costs Model of Metropolitan Governance: Allocation vs. Redistribution in Urban America, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10 pp. 49-78
- Lund, H. (2003) Testing the Claims of New Urbanism - Local Access, Pedestrian Travel, and Neighboring Behaviors, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69 (4), pp. 414-429
- Murray, M. (2002) City profile Denver, *Cities*, 19 (4), pp. 283–294
- Newman, P (2005) *Transit-Oriented Development: An Australian Overview*, Keynote Transit Oriented Development – Making it Happen, Conference, Fremantle (WA), Australia, 5-8 July 2005
- Norris, D.F. (2001) Whither Metropolitan Governance?, *Urban Affairs Review* 36 (5) pp. 532-550
- OECD (2001): *Cities for Citizens. Improving Metropolitan Governance* (Paris: OECD)
- Ostrom, V., Tiebout, C. And Warren, R. (1961) The Organization of Government in Metropolitan Areas: A Theoretical Inquiry, *American Political Science Review* 55 pp. 831-842
- OUM (2007): <http://www.oum.qld.gov.au/>, last accessed in June 2007
- Peterson, P. (1981): *City Limits* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

- Pierre, J., Peters, B. G. (2006) Governance, accountability and democratic legitimacy in: A. Benz and I. Papadopoulos (Eds.) *Governance and Democracy. Comparing National, European and International Experiences* (London: Routledge)
- Prëtsch H et al (2005) *Ergebnisse und Hinweise für die Planungspraxis aus dem Projekt BAHN.VILLE – schienengestützte Siedlungsentwicklung und Verkehrsverknüpfung in deutschen und französischen Regionen.* (Aachen)
- RAK (2005) *Konzertierte Eigenständigkeit“ -die Rheinischen Regeln für freiwillige interkommunale Kooperation* (Bonn: RAK)
- RAK (2006a) *Von der „Ich- zur Wir-Region“: Die Region Bonn/Rhein-Sieg/Ahrweiler,* (Bonn: RAK)
- RAK (2006b): *Mehr oder Weniger? Wohnraumentwicklung unter veränderten Rahmenbedingungen,* Beiträge zur Regionalentwicklung 5 (Bonn: RAK)
- Renne, J. (2005) *Transit-Oriented Development in Western Australia: Attitudes, Obstacles and Opportunities* Transit Oriented Development – Making it Happen, Conference, Fremantle (WA), Australia, 5-8 July
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997) *Understanding governance: policy networks, governance, reflexivity, and accountability* (Buckingham; Philadelphia: Open University Press)
- RTD (2007) <http://www.rtd-fastracks.com>, last accessed in June 2007
- RTD (2004a) *FasTracks Plan* (Denver: RTD)
- RTD (2004b) *FasTracks Financial Plan* (Denver: RTD)
- Savitch, H. V. and Vogel, R. (2000): Paths to New Regionalism, *State and Local Government Review* 12 pp 158-168
- Scharpf, F. (1997) *Games Real Actors Play - Actor-Centered Institutionalism in Policy Research* (Boulder,CO: Westview Press)
- Scheurer, J. and Kroen, A. (2005) *A Marriage of Convenience? Rail-Supportive Transport Policies and Urban Consolidation in Station Precincts in Australia and Europe,* Paper presented to the State of Australian Cities Conference, Griffith University, November 2005, Brisbane.
- Spiller, M. (2004) *Rethinking Metropolitan Governance in the Quest for a Sustainable Sydney,* Paper presented to the Joint Conference of NCOSS and Shelter NSW – Bursting at the Seams, Social Sustainability and Sydney's Future, November 2004, Parramatta.
- Spiller, M. (2006) *Metropolitan Planning Policy – The Implementation Trilogy,* Paper presented to the Planning for Australia's Major Cities Seminar, convened by SGS Economics and Planning and UNSW City Futures, Museum of Sydney, May 30, 2006.
- Stein, U. (2006): Planning with all your Senses – Learning to Cooperate on a Regional Scale, *DISP*, 162 (3/2005), pp. 62-69
- Swanstrom, T. (2001) What we argue about when we argue about regionalism, *Journal of Urban affairs* 23 (5), pp. 479-496
- Tiebout, C. M. (1956) A pure theory of local expenditures, *Journal of Political Economy* 44, pp. 416-424
- TransitAlliance (2007) [www.transitalliance.org](http://www.transitalliance.org), last accessed in June 2007
- ULI (2007) [www.uli.org](http://www.uli.org), last accessed in June 2007
- Wheeler, S. M. (2002): The New Regionalism: Key Characteristics of an Emerging Movement, *Journal of the American Planning Association* 68 (3) pp. 267-278
- Williams, K., Burton, E. and Jenks, M. (2000, Eds) *Achieving Sustainable Urban Form* (London: Spon Press)
- Williams, K. (ed.) (2005) *Spatial Planning, Urban Form and Sustainable Transport* (Aldershot: Ashgate)
- Wood, A. and Valler, D. (2004) *Governing local and regional economies: institutions, politics, and economic development,* (Burlington: Ashgate)
- Wood, R. C. (1958) Metropolitan Government 1975: An Extrapolation of Trends. The New Metropolis: Green Belts, Grass Roots or Gargantua? *American Political Science Review* 52 (1): pp. 108-122

#### Interviews:

- Melbourne: Peter Watkinson, May 2007
- Kevin van Boxtel, May 2007
- Phil Turner, May 2007
- Stephen Carthew, May 2007
- Denver: Marilee Utter, June 2006
- Bill Sirois, June 2006
- DRCOG, June 2006
- Bonn: Sigurd Trommer, August 2006
- Ursula Stein, July 2006
- Michael Isselmann, July 2006