CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Territorial development, planning reform and urban governance: the case of Ireland's second-tier cities
Authors	Brady, William M.
Publication date	2016-11-02
Original Citation	Brady, W. (2016) 'Territorial development, planning reform and urban governance: the case of Ireland's second-tier cities'. European Planning Studies, 24(12), pp. 2217-2240. doi:10.1080/09654313.2016.1248906
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	10.1080/09654313.2016.1248906
Rights	© 2016, Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group. The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published and is available in European Planning Studies 24(12), 02 November 2016. http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/09654313.2016.1248906
Download date	2026-09-07 21:32:44
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/3392

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Territorial Development, Planning Reform and Urban Governance: The Case of Ireland's Second-Tier Cities

William M Brady

UCC Centre for Planning Education & Research,
University College Cork
Ireland
T12 YN60

w.brady@ucc.ie

00 353 21490 4348

Abstract

The increased emphasis within Europe on the role of second-tier cities has implications for the ways in which these urban centres are considered within national spatial planning strategies. In centralised, monocentric states like Ireland, there has been a general ambivalence towards urban policy for cities outside the capital city, and historically this has prevented the development of a strong, diversified urban hierarchy undermining prospects for balanced regional development. This paper examines the extent to which a new found emphasis on Ireland's second-tier cities which emerged in the 'Gateways' policy of the National Spatial Strategy (NSS, 2002) was matched by subsequent political and administrative commitment to facilitate the development of these urban centres. Following a discussion of the position of second-tier cities in an international context and a brief overview of recent demographic and economic trends, the paper assesses the relative performance of Ireland's second-tier cities in influencing development trends, highlighting a comprehensive failure to deliver compact urban growth. In this context, the paper then discusses the implications of current development plans for the second-tier cities and proposals for Irish local government reform for securing compact urban development.

Keywords

Second-tier cities, Metropolitan governance, National Spatial Planning, Ireland, Territorial Development, Urban concentration.

Introduction: Second-Tier Cities and Metropolitan Governance

There has been significant interest in the role of second-tier cities and in particular in their contribution to national economic performance in recent years (Markusen, Lee, DiGiovanna 1999; Newton, 2012; Parkinson, 2014; Camagni, Capello, Caragliu, 2014). As part of a re-territorialization of nation-states caused by new geographies and new economies of production and consumption at global and local levels, cities and city regions have assumed greater importance as economic and functional spaces (Jacobs, 1984; Ohmae, 1993; Scott and Storper, 2003). This has evolved as the process of economic globalisation has taken on an explicit territorial character based on spatial agglomeration, which tends to encourage concentration of economic activity, people and politics around existing and emerging urban centres. This is largely explained by the existence of agglomeration economies whereby physical proximity, economic synergies and institutional density in the urban arena reinforce and intensify the comparative and competitive advantage of certain urban locations (Henderson, 1985; Glaeser, 2008; Camagni and Capello, 2014).

The role of the city region as an organisational element in the economic space of developed countries has been recognised increasingly in recent decades, from academic circles to policy-making communities. It has been suggested for example that combinations of an urban core or cores, linked to semi-urban and rural hinterland by functional ties, is an appropriate scale for the implementation of development and planning policies (Rodriquez-Pose, 2008). For Janssen-Jansen & Hutton (2011, p. 7) "Metropolitan-based local economic regions are increasingly important as metropolitan areas have often greater economic and cultural resonance than current administrative local government units". The city and the city region (broadly characterised here for the purpose of this paper as 'metropolitan areas') is being conceptualised therefore as a space in which development and territorial policies are increasingly articulated and as a suitable scale for organising economic growth and managing development. Metropolitan areas, it is argued, have assumed greater roles in national and international development and are now understood as "locomotives of the national economies within which they are situated" (Scott and Storper, 2003, p. 581).

This emphasis in academic and policy making circles has been accompanied by increased focus on the idea of metropolitan governance (Cox, 2010; Diamond, 1997; Newton, 2012) as an important concern as part of territorial rescaling and local government reform. The concept of metropolitan governance here refers to the structures, governing arrangements, decision-making systems and institutions which combine to articulate a series of policies and actions in respect of a territorially defined urban constituency that may or may not have a formal administrative or legal recognition. It is used as a way to characterise the way in which cities have reacted to the challenges of increased globalisation, inter-urban competition and place-based strategies aimed at securing urban success in an increasingly fragmented and complex economic and political arena.

These economic and governance processes are connected, and have emerged in response to a combination of external and internal forces, described by Tosics (2007). In response to external influences, urban areas have increasingly attempted to pursue an economic dynamism to secure future success within an increasingly competitive global and integrated economy. This entrepreneurial governance is considered to be more responsive to the objective of mobilising local

resources to ensure that urban areas benefit from increasingly competitive free markets. Metropolitan regions in Europe have increasingly concerned themselves with how to represent their cities as dynamic, assertive and competitive actors within Europe's economic space and this has encouraged thinking around scale, governing arrangements, critical mass, institutional and administrative relations, quality of life, environmental and placed-based considerations. Secondly, internal forces such as urban and suburban sprawl, social divisions, urban poverty, environmental awareness, accessibility and public transport prioritisation, the urban renewal/brownfield land agenda and city liveability have all served to exert pressure on traditional governing norms and encouraged a fresh examination of the efficacy of traditional modes of governance and administrative-territorial arrangements . These twin forces reflect an acknowledgement that historically-fragmented urban governing structures largely defined by legally-prescribed municipal boundaries are not necessarily conducive to effective metropolitan governance and contemporary urban development strategies.

In a recent ESPON study of over 150 European capital and second-tier cities in 31 countries, a number of policy messages for local, national and European policy-makers were identified as being key to supporting second-tier cities (ESPON, 2013). It highlighted the contribution of second-tier cities to national economies and recommended that governments invest more in the second tier of Europe's urban hierarchies. The study presented evidence that decentralising responsibilities, resources and powers by encouraging and stimulating high performance across a number of cities rather than concentrating investment in the capital produces national economic (as well as democratic) benefits. This increased focus on second cities has emerged in response to the contention that while successful capitals are important to their respective national economies, there is "a risk that they dominate the rest of the urban system to the extent that the national economy becomes spatially and structurally unbalanced" (ESPON, 2013, p. 58). This approach reflects trends in European spatial policy contained in the European Spatial Development perspective (ESDP) (Committee on Spatial Development) which had been adopted by EU member states in 1999. This involved re-orienting the role and function of the peripheral urban centres away from one of subordinate and hierarchical relationships in national terms, towards an approach based on a self-reliance, mobilisation and direct participation in European and global economies.

This also reflects what Parkinson, Meegan, Karecha (2015, p. 1064) identify as a policy concern around over-concentration, whereby "Capital cities can reach a point where diseconomies make them less competitive because of the negative externalities caused by unregulated growth and diminishing marginal returns." Parkinson's work presents strong evidence which demonstrates that decentralising resources, powers and responsibilities throughout a number of cities rather than solely on the capital city produces a range of national benefits. The report found for example evidence in Germany, Austria, Italy, Spain, the Nordic states, and in the former unitary states across eastern and central Europe, that the second-tier cities outperformed their capitals. This study provide valuable insights into the way Europe's cities are governed and administered and emphasises in particular the emerging importance in public policy terms of the second tier of the urban hierarchy.

In centralised, monocentric states like Ireland, there has been a general ambivalence towards urban policy at the second tier and this has traditionally prevented the development of a strong and

diversified urban hierarchy and regional balance. Parkinson's comprehensive studies however suggests that this might be damaging in respect of national economic performance and indicated that "they (second-tier cities) can achieve many of the agglomeration effects of capitals, provided they have the right infrastructure, facilities, capacity and powers. They can lift the performance of their regions, reduce inter-regional inequalities and promote social cohesion." (Parkinson et al 2015, p. 1064). Furthermore, it suggests that decentralisation of responsibilities to second-tier cities is only possible if matched by corresponding powers and resources and that cities in less centralised countries where economic resources are dispersed perform better at a local and national scale.

This paper is concerned with exploring the extent to which these territorial -economic forces are manifesting at the metropolitan scale in second-tier cities in Ireland. Ireland's second-tier grouping includes four urban centres - Cork, Limerick, Galway and Waterford. Although the population and economic characteristics of these cities varies considerably, and there are important local differences as urban entities, they are treated in this paper collectively in order to provide insights into the nature of change across the urban hierarchy of the state. Using settlement policy and development activity as a proxy for testing spatial policy at the national level, it assesses the effectiveness of the state's attempt to pursue a spatially-coherent development policy for its second-tier cities. Ireland's National Spatial Strategy put forward what can be understood as an integrated spatial-economic framework. This involved ensuring that its second-tier cities performed to a certain level in respect of development activity and specifically, population growth. Hence, population change within the second tier of the urban hierarchy became a key part of its spatial-economic strategy in favour of regional development. Therefore, the economic performance of these urban centres was being linked in part to their ability to accommodate urban population growth. As such, by assessing the effectiveness of the state's efforts to promote particular demographic outcomes, a fundamental feature of the NSS can be assessed.

Following a brief overview of the state's recent urbanisation trends, the paper identifies how Ireland's National Spatial Strategy initiated an explicit policy context for the country's second-tier cities. Using demographic data, it then measures the relative performance of the second-tier cities by examining the degree of concentration of settlement and development activity in these locations against what was designated in the NSS. This is supplemented by a review of how the individual local authorities in those locations have since reordered their settlement and zoning regimes following legislative reforms aimed at addressing continued dispersal of development patterns. Finally, it offers some brief reflections on the challenges associated with introducing territorial policies aimed at promoting second-tier-cities.

Urbanisation and Urban Policy in Ireland

Ireland is experiencing a reordering of its demographic and settlement profile that has occurred without any discernible management framework in public policy terms. The state has become increasingly urbanised in the last 20 years, with an increase in the overall urban share of population, a corresponding decrease in rural share and an increase in the number of places now classified

officially as urban settlements.[1] The substantial population increases at a national level since the 1990s has been closely associated with the process of urban expansion as population has increasingly concentrated in urban areas or within the functional reach of the principal urban centres. There has also been a corresponding increase in the urbanisation of economic activity, as the locational character of international mobile investment and the importance of agglomeration economies has further consolidated the role and importance of urban areas in economic terms. Despite this, it is difficult to discern any particular government policy that acknowledges the challenge of urbanisation or identifies the need for an urban policy agenda.

The relative share of urban and rural population growth between 1991 and 2011 is illustrated in Table 1. Overall, the state experienced very strong population growth during this period, with an increase of 30% (1,062,533) in the twenty years after 1991. Both urban and rural populations expanded in the 20 year period, with the urban population expanding by 41.6% (836,182) and the rural population expanding by 14.9% (226,351). The relative share of total growth is predominantly urban in nature with the majority (78.7%) of total growth has been located in urban areas.

INSERT Table 1 HERE

Caption: Table 1 Urban and Rural Population change in Ireland 1991 – 2011

Source: CSO (1991, 2002, 2011)

The underperformance of the state's second-tier urban centres is illustrated in Table 2. Using the CSO measure which captures the city and the physically-contiguous built up area, these figures provide an indication of the scale of growth experienced in the built-up areas, as distinct from their wider regional hinterlands. Between 1991 and 2011, the four combined cities added only 75,791 persons (7.1% of national growth), whilst the towns of 10,000 and over added an extra 394,003 persons (37.1% of national growth). [2] During this period, the only location to record significant, above-average growth was Galway which experienced a 51% increase (25,025), which in fact accommodated more population growth than Cork city and suburbs during the same period. This data also allows for an examination of the relative impact of the NSS in respect of the share of growth in the various urban centres - covering both pre (1991-2001) and post (2001-2011) time periods. These are discussed in the latter part of this paper.

[1] In 1901, only 28% of the country's population resided in urban areas (settlements with over 1,500 persons). By 1961 the state's population recorded for the first time an urban majority (CSO, 2011, 16 and the aggregate urban population reached 62% in 2011.

[2]The category of 'Towns of 10,000 and over'' captures two different settlement types; the traditional county or market towns which are distributed widely across the territory and the commuter towns which are generally located within the catchments of the principal urban centres.

INSERT Table 2 HERE

Caption: Table 2 Population Trends in Ireland's Five Cities and Key Towns 1991-2011

Source: CSO (1996, 2011)

The increased pattern of concentration of Ireland's population in locations within or close to urban areas has been accompanied by a corresponding urbanisation of economic activity, with a clear pattern of co-location of jobs and population. An examination of census figures in 2006 and 2011 showed that while the total number of people at work in Ireland declined by 6.4%, there were employment increases in all Irish cities apart from Waterford [See Table 3]. These figures provide an employment figure for the cities and their immediate environs and include the net gains/losses on account of persons travelling in and out of the cities in question. This data illustrates the general economic resilience of three of the second-tier cities, with Limerick and Cork in particular managing to facilitate growth following the economic recession which took hold from 2008 onwards. These two cities' performance during this period contrasts sharply with that of Waterford, which experienced a 9.7% decrease in people at work and a reduction of 8.9% of % change in workers travelling into the city & suburbs.

INSERT Table 3 HERE

Caption: Table 3 Total persons at work and the number of persons commuting to the Irish cities and suburbs, 2006-2011

Source: Census of Ireland [2006, 2011]

The regional distribution of economic activity shown in Figure 1 shows a clear correlation between urbanisation and productivity. The regional breakdown of Gross Value Added (GVA) (a measure in economics of the value of goods and services produced in an area minus the cost of materials and services) illustrates an interesting set of trends.[3] Firstly, regions containing a large urban centre generally performed stronger than rural regions without a major urban centre. Secondly, the two largest urban regions, Dublin and the South West (anchored by Cork), consistently produced above state-average productivity figures, both over 130% of the national average in 2011. Thirdly, in the rest of the state, the regions with the lowest GVA were those without a major urban centre – Mid-East, Border and Midlands, while the Mid-West, South-East and West, anchored by Limerick, Waterford and Galway respectively performed relatively well. However, the results also suggest that there is a widening of the gap between Dublin and the second-tier cities in economic terms with indications of the ongoing dominance of the capital city and the underperformance of the second-tier cities.

[3] GVA is used here to reflect general patterns of economic activity as it is the only economic measure calculated at a regional scale in Ireland. GVA, however, only provides a broad signpost of economic activity because of the way in which transnational firms tend to report exaggerated levels of output from their Irish operations as a way of transferring taxable revenues from other jurisdictions to reduce tax liabilities. As a result, this measure tends to reflect regional concentrations of foreign investment as opposed to pure economic activity. These patterns of foreign direct investment however also reflects the general regional economic profile of the state and the location and concentration of employment.

INSERT Figure 1 HERE

Caption: Figure 1 Indices of GVA per person 2001-2011 at Basic Prices (State=100)

Source: CSO 2011

This pattern of increased urbanisation in demographic and economic terms has not been accompanied by any change in the way that Ireland's urban areas are governed, and cities remain relatively powerless actors on the national stage. According to Bannon (2004, p. 27) in Ireland, "large-scale urban and metropolitan growth has been viewed as an inevitability and it has taken place in the absence of any pro-active, coherent urban policy". In addition, one of the defining features of Irish administration is its highly centralised nature (Callanan and Keogan, 2003), which is characterised by a high concentration of political, administrative and financial power in Dublin, with a very weak framework at regional and municipal levels of government. Regional and local governance is effectively a devolved function of central government, and local government functions are constrained by limited competencies and a constrained local funding regime.

Ireland's National Spatial Strategy – an emerging urban policy?

The publication of the National Spatial Strategy 2002 – 2020 (NSS) represented an important moment for spatial planning in Ireland**,** and was a significant milestone in the development of an urban policy framework. It introduced an explicit recognition of the importance of cities as agents of regional development and as critical ingredients of national economic policy. The identification of a series of 'national gateways'[4] at the city scale reflected an attempt to introduce a strategy of concentrated de-concentration, whereby the second-tier cities in particular would be prioritised and supported as the major non-Dublin centres for economic and demographic expansion. This was presented as a means of achieving regional balance in respect of the overall distribution of activity across the state and a way to address the ongoing dominance of Dublin nationally. The strategy "emphasises the importance of capitalising upon the strengths of and investment in Ireland's existing major urban areas" (Government of Ireland, 2002, p. 36) setting out a regional policy agenda that relied on establishing a strong second tier within the urban hierarchy.

The challenges presented by the continued concentration of population and economic growth in the Greater Dublin Area during the 1990s led to a recognition that there was a need for a regional dimension to Ireland's economic and physical development strategy (Walsh, 2004, 2009; Davoudi and Wishardt, 2005). Rapid population growth, combined with substantial increases in employment activity in and around the main urban centres, resulted in major pressures for housing and associated commercial development. In the absence of a strong physical planning framework for controlling rapid expansion, suburban and exurban locations absorbed much of the urban generated development activity, leading to long distance commuting (Williams and Shiels, 2002). This encouraged a pattern of development that was environmentally, socially and economically

[4] The NSS introduced the concept of Gateways as a key element of its spatial strategy. 'Existing Gateway' locations, defined by urban regions with a population of over 100,000 included Cork, Limerick, Galway and Waterford, whilst 5 New gateways were identified in locations had relatively small existing populations. This research identifies the grouping of Existing Gateways as the second-tier of Ireland's urban hierarchy.

problematic as urban growth was being accommodated increasingly in rural areas and locations remote from places of employment and service centres.

One of the key elements of the spatial strategy therefore would be "bringing people and their jobs closer together, reducing the commuting distances which have emerged over the last decade" (DELG, 2001, p. 12). The favoured strategy was a "targeted approach based on the focussed strengthening of a small number of centres" (Government of Ireland, 2001, p. 20). The regional economic structure would be enhanced through a concentration of activity, resources and investment which would in turn encourage agglomeration economies and critical mass. The urban cores would function as 'gateways' within the city-region structure, providing a nucleus from which economic activity would flow and permeate outwards.

The four second-tier cities were identified in the NSS as 'national' gateways' along with the Greater Dublin Area (GDA). According to the NSS, these gateways would drive regional economic growth and create a more balanced spatial structure for the territory using the concepts of potential, critical mass and exploiting opportunities for expansion and development. It was considered that balanced national growth could be "… secured with the support of a small number of nationally significant centres, whose location and scale support the achievement of the type of critical mass necessary to sustain strong levels of job growth in the regions" (Government of Ireland, 2002, p. 39). This involved strengthening the critical mass of the existing gateways and implied substantial growth of economic activity and population.

The NSS also concerned itself with the issue of where development should occur *within* those gateway zones. It highlighted the economic, social and environmental problems caused by long distance commuting and emphasised that the trend of house building in areas distant from urban centres was contributing to increased car dependency and was limiting the impact and effectiveness of public investment in services and utilities. As a result, efforts needed to be made to "…renew, consolidate and develop its existing cities, towns and villages – i.e. keeping them as physically compact and public transport friendly as possible and minimising urban sprawl... Urban land needs to be used carefully, sensitively and efficiently – with the aim of reducing dereliction and under-utilisation. Where greenfield development is necessary it should take place through the logical extension of existing cities, towns and villages" (Government of Ireland, 2002, p. 11). Urban and rural settlement patterns therefore should align with the policy of concentration and accord with the overarching aim of developing selected number of centres to achieve a critical mass necessary to ensure economic success.

Performance of Ireland's Second-Tier Cities

Assessing the impact of a spatial strategy on any part of the settlement hierarchy involves a broad overview of those centres' performance against what was outlined or prescribed in that policy document. For the purpose of this paper, this means assessing the effectiveness of national gateway status which had a particular spatial intention based on a policy of *population concentration*. The

lack of measurable indicators in the NSS regarding specific growth targets[5] means that a simple linear assessment of the NSS is not practical and in any case, as Counsell, Haughton, Allmendinger (2012, p. 15) argue, it is unfair to regard these strategic plans as 'documents of conformity' and suggest instead that "…strategic planning success can never be evaluated simply through conformity to a rigid end-document… the issue is more, whether the planning process overall helped progressive ideas and practices to move forward substantially or not." Hence, it is appropriate to determine whether it encouraged a new policy approach to the spatial distribution of population growth. The most effective way of assessing this is by examining the key demographic and settlement changes between 2002 and 2011.

The following section addresses population change and distribution in the four second-tier 'gateway' cities and for practical and analytical purposes, employs three different definitions of the cities' respective populations.

- Firstly, the '***legal city'*** describes the official record of population within the legally-defined urban jurisdictions providing the official city population that is governed by the urban authorities[6];
- Secondly, the '***city and suburbs'*** definition refers to the CSO returns for each city's effective built-up area (often described as *city and environs*), thus allowing for a representation of the actual urban footprint in demographic terms;
- Thirdly, '***city region'*** refers to CSO POWSCAR[7]-derived data for each city and hinterland where more than 20% of the 2011 resident population in employment commute to the city[8].

Using these three different classifications allows for an analysis of the distribution of growth within the four gateways, from the urban core to the wider functional area.

Table 4 summarises population change between 2002 and 2011. At *city region* level, recorded growth for the second-tier cities of 18.1% was ahead of the implied growth outlined in the NSS of approximately 14.3%[9], but it is important to point out that much of the population growth in this

5 The NSS produced an estimate of potential population growth for each 'gateway and surrounding catchment' for 2020 on page 49. However, no standardised definition for these units was used; instead, the NSS used the various understandings of each 'city and surrounding catchments as defined in local land use and transport strategies'.

6 The 'legal city' unit simply captures the administrative city unit and does not reflect a demographic or economic reality, which in all cases extends beyond these boundaries. However, its analytical value in the context of this paper relates to centrality. The 'legal city' zones represent in all cases the core of each urban gateway, and in policy terms, these core zones were identified as a focus for growth and development within each gateway.

7 Central Statistics Office (CSO) Place of Work, School or College - Census of Anonymised Records (POWSCAR)

8 There are numerous ways in which a city region unit may be defined, but it was considered practical to use a standardised measure of the urban areas' commuting catchment to reflect the functional reach of the various cities. This was the same unit used in the review of the gateways and hubs (Gateways|Hubs Development Index 2012) under the NSS in 2012 (Future Analytics, 2013). In order to be able to measure consistently and compare historical data, the 2011 'city-region' definition was taken as the territorial city region for the 2002 and 2006 census.

9 The NSS presented a projection of population change based on an assumption of economic growth and used baselines for each city region, taken from the respective local land use and transportation strategies. The projections were based on a 20 year forecasting period; the implied population change figures used here is based on a calculation of ten years of projected annual growth. In addition, the comparison here between actual 'city region' growth and that implied by the NSS concerns different territorial units. As a result, the relative population change rather than absolute change is of interest here.

period occurred outside the core gateway zones that formed the basis of these designations, and which were expected to accommodate the higher rates of development. The data on the location of growth within the city-regions illustrates this pattern. For example, the overall growth rate of the *legal cities* in the four gateways over the period was only 3.7%. When the *city and suburbs* figures are examined, the second-tier cities grew by 8.3% which provides a more realistic expression of core urban growth at this level of the hierarchy. The wider city-regions, however, recorded a growth rate of 18.1%. This suggests very weak growth in the core urban areas with 78% of all growth was accommodated outside the city and suburbs. These results also show particularly strong population growth in Galway with 24.8% growth across the city-region (ahead of implied NSS growth), compared with that of Waterford which experienced a 13.6% growth (below implied NSS growth).

INSERT Table 4 HERE

Caption: Table 4 Population Change 2002-2011 in the Main Cities

Source: CSO [2002, 2006, 2011]

The pattern of growth within the second tier suggests that the functional areas of the four cities are expanding but alongside the relative diminution of their respective urban cores. In all four cities, the share of population located in the *legal cities* as a percentage of the city-region total has declined (from 37.6% to 33%), meaning that 67% of the population of four gateway city regions now reside outside urban jurisdictions. This has implications in terms of fragmented governance patterns, as well as the social and environmental costs associated with long distance commuting. In the case of Limerick and Cork, the respective *legal city* populations were no more than 30% of their overall city region. Even applying a more generous interpretation using the *city and suburbs'* definition, their relative share of population has also declined between 2002 and 2011, with only 46.3% of the second-tier city region populations now located within these zones. Critically, none of the cities have recorded an increase in the share of the population located within either their legal cities or within the city and suburbs zones. The four cities therefore were experiencing an outward expansion of their urban catchments instead of delivering a pattern of concentrated growth considered to be important for achieving sustainable patterns of development.

The spatial composition of Ireland's gateway cities is also noteworthy in the context of recent population changes. The figures for the *city and suburbs* reveal a wide divergence in the density and compactness between the second-tier cities and Dublin (See Table 5). The average density of the second tier-city and suburbs' is 1,310 persons per square kilometre whereas the equivalent figure for Dublin is 3,498. It is interesting to note also that Dublin's area (city and suburbs) is equal to that of the four second-tier cities combined, but it accommodates more than double the population. This illustrates a clear division between the capital cities and the four second-tier cities in terms of population density, a key indicator of urban compaction, and a widely accepted indicator of sustainability. The second-tier cities appear to be expanding, but at densities which will constrain their ability to secure sufficient critical mass and support the provision of services and urban forms of public transportation.

INSERT Table 5 HERE

Caption: Table 5 Area and Density of Ireland's Urban Centres 2011

Source: CSO [2011]

It appears therefore, that Instead of strengthening of the core gateway zones advocated by the NSS, the development patterns that followed its publication displayed a continuation, and an acceleration, of the trends of dispersal. This had implications for how growth and development is managed within those territories and the absence of strong governing or oversight structures meant that the policy of concentration depended largely on cooperative rather than statutory decision-making frameworks.

When the statistics for population change between 2002 and 2011 within the four gateways is examined, further evidence of de-concentration emerges (See Table 6). This highlights in particular the continued decrease in importance of the core gateway zones relative to both the smaller urban centres and the rural hinterlands associated with the respective city regions. Significantly, the core urban areas (city and suburbs) of the four cities combined recorded a modest 8.3% increase in population between 2002 and 2011, compared to a growth rate of 35% in the smaller settlements of 1,500+ within the four gateways.

INSERT Table 6 HERE

Caption: Table 6 Population Size and Share 2002-2011 in Ireland's Urban Centres, Towns and Urban and Rural Areas

Source: CSO [2002, 2011]

Although some of the non-core urban growth is located in planned settlements close to the urban cores (satellite or commuter towns) and may be considered to be *coordinated metropolitan* growth or as part of a joint spatial strategy within a city region, a significant amount of growth is also occurring in locations at a considerable distance from the cores (Table 7), and which cannot be defined as either coordinated or consistent with policy. In addition, the rural parts of these city-regions (settlements below 1,500 and the open countryside) experienced an overall growth rate of 25%, stronger than the city-regions' total (18%), the urban settlement average (15%) and the city & suburbs total (8%) (Table 7).

In the Limerick gateway for example, Limerick city and suburbs recorded 10% growth between 2002-2011, with the remaining main urban centres of Shannon and Ennis experiencing growth rates of 10% and 13% respectively. By contrast, growth rates of on average of 100% occurred in the smaller settlements located away from the urban core such as Sixmilebridge, Newport and Ballina. Across the city region, growth outside formal settlements within mainly un-serviced rural areas at 17% outperformed growth in the urban locations which grew by only 15%. In Cork, the city and environs experienced only 7% population increase between 2002-2011, with 54% increases across the metropolitan towns of Blarney-Tower, Carrigaline, Cobh, Passage-West, Carrigtwohill, Midleton and Cobh and 30% growth in the outer 'Ring Towns' located within the city region. It is important to

acknowledge that the towns located along the suburban rail corridor (Cobh, Mallow, Carrigtwohill and Midleton) recorded stronger average growth rates of 82% and in Cork, some of the non-core growth within the metropolitan area is in effect planned rail-oriented growth in line with the established sub-regional planning strategy. However, the analysis also shows that the rural population in this zone expanded by 20,147 in the ten year period, equivalent to a growth rate of 26%. This compares against an overall urban growth rate in Cork city region of 15% and only 7% in the city and suburbs. The rural areas' growth represented 34% of all growth in the city region.

INSERT Table 7 HERE

Caption: Table 7 Location of Population Change 2002-2011, Second-Tier Cities

Source: CSO [2002, 2011]

These trends suggests considerable deviation from targeted growth strategies and was contrary to the principles set out in the settlement strategies of national and regional planning policy and the respective development plans which advocated the strengthening of the urban centres by establishing critical mass and concentrating services in support of sustainable urban development patterns.

Data on house completions also helps to illustrate the nature of growth in the second-tier cities and their constituent county councils. Table 8 below highlights clearly the difficulties experienced in locating residential development within the established urban centres. Notwithstanding the fact that the city areas may have been expected to record lower housing numbers than their constituent county areas because of the nature of the development challenges, constrained administrative boundaries and land availability, the divergence in development activity remains stark. For example, in each instance, the number of single housing units (one-off residential dwellings) permitted and completed in each county council area exceeded the total number of houses completed in the entire second-tier city. This would suggest the absence of strong incentives for local authorities to collaborate effectively in managing housing supply and a tendency for competitive metropolitan housing markets across local government boundaries. These undermine efforts established at a national level to promote spatially coherent urban development patterns at the level of the second-tier cities. The pattern of house completions across the four second-tier cities and their wider constituent counties in the years following the publication of the NSS highlight perhaps the full extent of what Tosics (2007) characterised as a functional urban area disparity. In essence, fragmented governance at a local level, combined with the lack of effective sub-regional and metropolitan-scale governing structures undermined strategic policy aims which favoured concentration over dispersal.

INSERT Table 8 HERE

Caption: Table 8 House Completions 2002-2011 by House Type and Local Authority

Source: Department of the Environment, Community & Local Government [2002-2011] Housing Statistics Database 2002-2011

One of the key drivers behind the NSS was the economic, social and environmental problems caused by long distance commuting and it advocated land use policies which would encourage sustainable

development patterns that minimised commuting distances. This was to be achieved by supporting the development of compact settlements and by concentrating both future employment and population growth in locations that would minimise travel, and support public transportation. The change in commuting patterns since the NSS is illustrated in Table 9 below through an analysis of the average journey times within the city regions. This highlights a clear continuation of the trend of longer average commuter times and indicates a settlement pattern based on increasing average distances between peoples' homes and places of work and education. Across the four cities, there was a 2.3% increase in those whose commuting journey was under 30 minutes and a 23.2% increase in the number whose commuting journey was over 30 minutes. [10]

INSERT Table 9 HERE

Caption: Table 9 Change in Commuting Patterns [by journey time] 2002-2011 in Second-Tier City Regions

Source: CSO [Census of Ireland: 2002, 2011]

The rapid growth experienced in Ireland in the last 20 years brought with it extensive demands on the planning and development system, and a particular challenge was facilitating growth and guiding development to locations that were designated as core growth areas. The government's 2010 review of the NSS (DEHLG, 2010) included an acknowledgement that many of the principal objectives of the NSS, and in particular its attempts to direct development to the key urban centres, were being undermined by inappropriately located zonings, fragmented development patterns and development-driven housing regimes. It specifically highlighted the underperformance of city and town centres, the continuation of pre-2002 trends of urban generated suburban, exurban and rural sprawl, car-dominated and unsustainable commuting patterns and an ongoing failure to coordinate settlement patterns with service and employment provision. The subsequent review of Gateway and Hub performance in the Gateways|Hubs Development Index (Future Analytics, 2013) confirmed in more detail that the pattern of development in the core urban centres had generally been characterised almost universally by a failure to reach agreed targets for population growth with a general tendency for excessive growth in non-core locations.

[10] The anomalous case of Limerick, which exhibited a 4.8% reduction in the number of journeys over 30 minutes, may be explained by the closure of a single major employer (Dell) which as a very substantial regional employer would have led to a significantly lower amount of regional scale commuting.

Planning Reform, Urban Governance and the Second-Tier Cities

The research here would suggest that the introduction of the NSS did not succeed in arresting the pre-2002 pattern of imbalanced growth or strengthening the second-tier national gateways. The data presented in Table 2 provides a clear demonstration that the NSS did not succeed in promoting a stronger urban system in Ireland; in fact the level of growth in the post-NSS period (1991-2001) accommodated in the urban centres was below that in the pre-NSS period (2001-2011). The proportional share of national growth declined in all cities, and, for the second-tier cities, decreased from 11.1% to 4.8%. This can be attributed to the ambiguous implementation framework and weak governance structures. The NSS Review (Government of Ireland, 2010: 7) acknowledged that local structures of control and coordination were inadequate and indicated that "Strong and successful Gateways need to be able to transcend administrative boundaries and have a clear vision of their future development and a strong strategic leadership to deliver that vision aided by effective governance arrangements." However, there was no practical indication as to how the problems presented by those administrative boundaries were to be solved.

One of the key weaknesses of the NSS was the expectation that a national strategy could be largely be implemented by local interests. Breathnach (2013, p. 6) suggested that the absence of a strong regional tier of government, combined with the fragmented administrative landscape at the urban level and the limited powers at local government level meant that the gateways "…lacked all of the ingredients for the forging of effective urban-regional developmental governance." Furthermore, the lack of political support for the policy of coordination and concentration which manifested itself most clearly with the government's decentralisation programme indicated a weak commitment at an early stage (Walsh, 2009; Meredith and Egeraat, 2013). This reflected also a general preoccupation with national rather than regional policy issues (McFeely, 2016). Essentially, the absence of an urban policy agenda for the second-tier cities undoubtedly affected the impact of the gateway aspirations and there was very little institutional or political space within urban leadership within those cities could emerge.

The status of the NSS within the planning hierarchy was also undermined by legislative ambiguity. Under the Planning and Development Act 2000 (PDA 2000), planning authorities operating at a local level were required only to 'have regard' to the provisions of superior plans including the NSS. This created an inherent structural fragility in the operation of the planning hierarchy and served to separate development planning at a local level from national strategic objectives. Despite the existence of a strong and clear hierarchy of planning policies, the lack of a formal mechanism to ensure consistency and integration between the various levels resulted in significant deviations from national aspirations and regional objectives.

As a direct government reaction to the effects of overdevelopment and evidently unsustainable development patterns, the Irish government introduced the Planning and Development Amendment Act 2010 (PDA, 2010). The principal objectives of this Act were to amend the Planning Acts of 2000 – 2009 with specific regard given to supporting economic renewal and sustainable development. The Act envisaged a closer alignment of the National Spatial Strategy with Regional Planning Guidelines, Development Plans and Local Area Plans. The Act strengthened the vertical relationship between

plans in Ireland by clarifying previous legislative requirements by making it a legal requirement for development plans to '*be consistent*' with, rather than *'have regard to'* superior planning documents. The centrepiece of the legislation however was the *Core Strategy* provision which required Development Plans to include relevant information and to demonstrate explicitly how policies and objectives of the statutory development plan are consistent with national and regional planning policy.

Essentially, it attempted to enshrine the concept of evidence-based planning and strengthen the land zoning process. This measure, along with the proposed strengthening of the regional tier and the introduction of a planning regulator, represented an attempt to improve the planning and development regime by relying on enhanced oversight, coordination, and evidence. It did not however involve an alteration to the structures or competencies of local government and did not involve any changes to established urban governance structures. The issue of fragmentation and competition and the wider urban governance challenges were not addressed. The analysis here examines the implementation of the core strategies in the four gateways and assesses the extent to which this legislative reform is likely to result in a development regime that supports the strategic principles and targeted measures of the NSS. As part of the analysis, each local authority's Core Strategy and Settlement Strategy was examined and growth targets were extracted. For each defined tier of the hierarchy, the total number of housing units projected across each tier was recorded. [11]

INSERT Table 10 HERE

Table 10 Settlement Hierarchies [2011 onwards]

Source: Development Plan Core Strategies in each Local Authority

Interestingly, the amount of growth allocated to the top tier of the hierarchy across Ireland's four second-tier cities is extremely diverse, ranging from 17% in the case of Cork City to 66% in the case of Galway City (See Table 10). Across the four gateways, 73% of growth in each combined county and city is allocated outside the core urban areas. Although the urban allocation of 27% is small, particularly relative to the scale of growth in the non-urban locations, it still represents a major planning challenge in the context of accommodating housing growth within the established built up areas of those cities. This will necessitate strategic growth management within those city regions that prioritises compact and sustainable forms of developments and which controls greenfield suburban expansion. In a single metropolitan housing market extending across administrative boundaries, this requires coordinated planning and zoning measures which manages the supply-demand dynamic in a way that supports an integrated approach to demand management.

[11] In cases where there were two separate Core Strategies and Settlement Hierarchies within a single county [in all four cases] the total City Council figure was allocated as the top of the unified settlement hierarchy. The former top tier of the settlement hierarchy for the constituent county council hierarchies' then became the second tier of the unified settlement hierarchy.

The story of housing provision in the second-tier cities and their constituent counties over the last four years, and throughout the post NSS period, suggests that managing metropolitan housing markets across administrative boundaries remains highly problematic. Proper management of urban housing markets involves the coordination of policy, land zoning and development management practices to ensure that the supply of zoned lands in one location doesn't undermine the effective housing demand in another. Housing trends for the gateway cities in the last four years illustrate the over performance of the non-urban locations, which is in turn likely to be shaping the effective demand in those urban centres. Despite national level policies to address the provision of urban generated housing in rural areas and recent legislative reforms, in the last four years 56.4% of all houses constructed nationally in the period 2011-2014 have been single dwellings that have not been part of a housing scheme and most likely were built outside established urban areas. This is compared with a figure of 30.8% between 2002 and 2011. This highlights that the pattern of housing provision in Ireland has become more unsustainable despite legislative reform.

Conclusion

This paper presents evidence which demonstrates that the implementation of Ireland's National Spatial Strategy for the gateway cities, as an urban policy measure, proved to be largely ineffective as it relied on a loose and informal governance framework at the urban level. It also shows that the recent legislative reforms appear to have had little influence in promoting more sustainable residential development patterns in the national gateways. As a result, within the second-tier cities, there appears to be a divergence of economic and settlement patterns, which has potential long term sustainability implications. An increasingly global and competitive economic context is encouraging further concentration of employment in urban areas. At the same time, those urban areas are not accommodating sufficient levels of population growth to service the expanding economic base and support service provision.

The onset of the economic recession from 2008 undoubtedly impacted the delivery of the NSS and the second-tier cities. Although the cities (apart from Waterford) proved to be quite resilient in terms of employment levels, the fiscal crisis constrained the government's ability to deliver the kind of infrastructure necessary to accommodate urban growth in those cities. Large scale infrastructure spending outlined in the National Development Plan 2007-2013 to support the gateway cities did not materialise, as the Gateway Innovation Fund was suspended as the impact of the credit contraction took hold.

While an increased emphasis on the regional planning tier in recent years may address the governance void at regional level, the economic, physical and functional reality at a metropolitan scale has largely been ignored in policy, legislation and governance reforms. It seems unlikely that Ireland's new National Planning Framework can deliver more effective regional balance and a stronger urban hierarchy without a corresponding focus on governance issues in the second-tier cities. Recent experiences in Ireland's key gateway cities would suggest that these 'soft spaces of governance' are not conducive to making hard decisions.

The findings here would also support the assertions of Allin & Walsh (2010, p. 25) who question the capacity of recent legislative reforms to address the dominant governance culture characterised by institutional fragmentation and competition. In addition, the data would largely support the view put forward by Breathnach (2014) that Ireland's experience under the NSS has generally prohibited the type of proactive urban governance at city-region level which is necessary for the development of a stronger urban system. The experience of Ireland's second-tier cities certainly points towards Tosics' characterisation (2007, p. 2) of functionally unified urban areas which lack democratic accountability and his contention that these metropolitan areas are an 'economic and social reality even in those countries where the administrative and political systems do not recognize this yet'.

This according to Tosics (2011, p. 3) is a common problem for many European countries where territorial borders of administrative units are extremely outdated to the extent where the 'economic city' has extensively outgrown the 'administrative city'. At present, these largely rely on the kind of 'collaborative urban place governance strategies' seen only in Cork, and while CASP is correctly regarded as an effective collaborative spatial planning tool (Counsell and Haughton, 2009), its capacity to accommodate those difficult decisions is clearly limited (Allmendinger et al, 2013; Brady & O'Neill, 2013).

The recent revisions to urban governing arrangements, as evidenced in the amalgamation processes in Limerick and Waterford under the Irish government's *Putting People First* project, would suggest that Ireland is likely to continue to overlook the needs of cities and the requirement for explicit city-based governance. Here, the *county* entity has been deemed to be the standard local government unit and the standard template for revised arrangements. The reform process has thereby ignored the role and potential of urban government and administration. It is entirely possible for example that following the current review of local government structures in the cases of Cork and Galway that there will soon be no second tier of urban government in Ireland, with Dublin being the only city with any meaningful structure for urban governance. This is a monocentric vision of urban government with little recognition of the need for city level governing units at the second tier. This represents a further centralisation and dilution of urban administration and suggest a policy trajectory that ignores the emerging political, economic and cultural impulses that are driving change and reforms across urban and regional contexts in Europe.

The post NSS housing and demographic context interrogated in this paper provides clear evidence that spatial initiatives which promote nationally important territorial and economic solutions cannot be the sole responsibility of local actors, unless there is an institutional architecture in place at the sub regional or regional level that promotes strategic commitment around metropolitan development aspirations. It suggests that decentralisation of responsibilities to second-tier cities is only possible if matched by corresponding powers and resources and that cities in less centralised countries where economic resources are devolved perform better at a local and national scale.

In a reflection on current and imminent spatial planning challenges, Albrechts (2010, p. 1116) encourages "… new ways of thinking that change the way resources are used, (re)distributed and allocated, and the way the regulatory powers are exercised". In Ireland, a first step would be to institute a national spatial planning agenda which reflects these realities in urban and regional settings, understands the importance of these dynamics in national economic terms and which

support the basic ingredients of balanced regional development without promoting dispersal. This however needs to be underpinned by a formal recognition at government level that Ireland's prospects for more balanced and efficient territorial and economic development will ultimately fail without embedding a central role in governance terms for its second-tier cities.

References

Albrechts, L. (2010). More of the same is not enough! How could strategic spatial planning be instrumental in dealing with the challenges ahead? *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 37 (6), 1115–27.

Allin, S. & Walsh, C. (2010). Strategic Spatial Planning in European City-Regions: Parallel Processes or Divergent Trajectories? Working Paper Series, 60, *National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis (NIRSA)*, National University of Ireland: Maynooth.

Atkins, W.S. (2001). *Cork Area Strategic Plan [CASP] 2001-2020*, Cork: Cork County Council and Cork City Council.

Bannon, M. (2004). Irish Urbanisation: Trends, Actions and Policy Challenges, *Planning and Environmental Policy Research Series- Working Papers*. Department of Planning and Environmental Policy, University College Dublin, Dublin: University Press.

Bannon, M. J. (2012). 'Metropolitan dominance - the challenge in achieving balanced territorial development'. In: Van Den Berg, L. Braun, E. and Van Der Meer, J. eds. *National Policy Responses to Urban Challenges in Europe*, Abingdon, Oxon: Ashgate Publishing.

Brady, W. & O'Neill, C. (2013). Local government reform in Ireland: An opportunity for metropolitan planning. *Administration*, 61 (3), 29 – 62.

Breathnach, P. (2013). Regional governance and regional development: implications of the Action Programme for Effective Local Government. *Administration*, 61, 51 – 73.

Breathnach, P. (2014). Creating city-region governance structures in a dysfunctional polity: the case of Ireland's national spatial strategy. *Urban Studies*, 51, 2267 – 2284.

Callanan, M. and J. F. Keogan, Eds. (2003). *Local Government in Ireland: Inside Out*, Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

Callanan, M, Murphy, R, Quinlivan A (2014). The Risks of Intuition: Size, Costs and Economies of Scale in Local Government *The Economic and Social Review* 45 (3), 371-403.

Camagni , R. and Capello, R (2014). Second-Rank City Dynamics: Theoretical Interpretations Behind Their Growth Potentials *European Planning Studies*. 23 (6), 1041-1053.

Camagni , R. Capello, R & Caragliu, A. (2014). The Rise of Second-Rank Cities: What Role for Agglomeration Economies?. *European Planning Studies*, 23, (6) 1069-1089.

Central Statistics Office (CSO). (1996). *Census of Ireland*. Cork: CSO.

Central Statistics Office (CSO). (2002). *Census of Ireland*. Cork: CSO.

Central Statistics Office (CSO). (2006). *Census of Ireland*. Cork: CSO.

Central Statistics Office (CSO). (2011a). *Census of Ireland*. Cork: CSO.

Central Statistics Office (CSO). (2011b). Profile report – Door to door. Cork: CSO.

Central Statistics Office (CSO) (2011c). Place Of Work, School or College Census of Anonymised Records [POWSCAR]. Cork: CSO.

Central Statistics Office (CSO) (2011d). Indices of GVA per person at Basic Prices.

Central Statistics Office (CSO) (2011e). Profile 10 Door to Door – Commuting in Ireland

Cork City Council (2015). *Cork City Development Plan 2015-2021*. Cork: Cork City Hall.

Cork County Council (2015). *Cork County Development Plan 2015-2021*. Cork: Cork County Hall.

Counsell, D. Haughton, G. & Allmendinger, P. (2012). Growth Management in Cork Through Boom, Bubble and Bust. *European Planning Studies*. 2, (1), 46-63.

Cox, K.R. (2010). The Problem of Metropolitan Governance and the Politics of Scale. *Regional Studies*. 44 (2), 215-227.

Davoudi, S. and Wishardt, M., (2005). The Polycentric Turn in the Irish Spatial Strategy. *Built Environment*. 31, (2), 122 – 132.

Department of the Environment, Community & Local Government (2002-2011). Housing Statistics Database 2002-2011. Dublin: Custom House.

Diamond D. R. (1997). *Metropolitan Governance: Its Contemporary Transformation*. Jerusalem: The Floersheimer Institute for Policy Studies.

ESPON (2013). *Second Tier Cities and Territorial Development in Europe: Performance, Policies and Prospects*, ESPON & European Institute of Urban Affairs. Liverpool: John Moores University.

Future Analytics (2013). *Gateways and Hubs Development Index 2012*, Dublin.

Galland, D. (2012). Is regional planning dead or just coping? The transformation of a state socio-spatial project into growth-oriented strategies. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 3, 536-552.

Galway County Council (2015). *Galway County Council Development Plan 2015-2021*. Galway: Galway County Hall.

Galway City Council (2011). *Galway City Council Development Plan 2011-2017*. Galway: Galway City Hall.

Glaeser, E. L. (2008). Cities, *Agglomeration and Spatial Equilibrium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Glaeser, E.L. (2011). *Triumph of the City.* London: MacMillan.

Government of Ireland (2001). *The National Spatial Strategy -Indications for the Way Ahead: Public Consultation Paper.* Dublin: The Stationery Office.

Government of Ireland (2002). *The National Spatial Strategy 2002-2020*. Dublin: The Stationery Office.

Government of Ireland (2004). *Sustainable Rural Housing: Consultation Draft of Guidelines for Planning Authorities*. Dublin: The Stationery Office.

Government of Ireland (2007). *National Development Plan 2007-2013.* Dublin: The Stationery Office.

Government of Ireland (2010). *Implementing the National Spatial Strategy: 2010 Update and Outlook Harnessing Potential, Delivering Competitiveness, Achieving Sustainability*. Dublin: The Stationery Office.

Government of Ireland (2010), *Planning and Development (Amendment) Act*, Stationary Office: Dublin.

Government of Ireland (2015). *Planning Policy Statement*. Dublin: The Stationery Office.

Haughton, G., Allmendinger, P., Counsell, D. & Vigar, G. (2010). *The New Spatial Planning: Territorial management with soft spaces and fuzzy boundaries*, London: Routledge.

Haughton, G. and Allmendinger, P. (2013). 'Spatial Planning and the New Localism', *Planning Practice & Research*. 28, (1), 1-5.

Janssen-Jansen, L & Hutton, T (2011). Rethinking the Metropolis: Reconfiguring the Governance Structures of the Twenty-first-century City-region. *International Planning Studies.* 16, (3), 201-215.

Keogan, J. (2003). Reform in Irish Local Government. In M. Callanan & F. Keogan, (eds). *Local Government in Ireland: Inside Out*, Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

Limerick County Council (2011). *Limerick County Development Plan,* 2010-2016, Variation No. 1, County Hall: Limerick.

Limerick City Council (2011) *Limerick City Development Plan 2010-2016,* Variation No. 2, City Hall: Limerick.

Mahon, A.P. (2012). *The Final Report of the Tribunal of Inquiry into Certain Planning Matters and Payments [Mahon Report].* Dublin*:* Dublin Castle.

Markusen, A. R., Lee, Y.S, & DiGiovanna, S (1999). *Second Tier Cities: Rapid Growth Beyond the Metropolis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

MacFeely, S (2016). Opportunism over strategy: a history of regional policy and spatial planning in Ireland, *International Planning Studies*, DOI:10.1080/13563475.2016.1162403

Meredith, D. & Van Egeraat, C. (2013). Revisiting the National Spatial Strategy ten years on. *Administration*. 60, (3), 3–9.

Newton, K. (2012). Metropolitan Governance SYMPOSIUM, Southampton, UK oi:10.1057/eps.2011.42; published online 13 January 2012.

Ohmae, K. (1993). The rise of the region state. *Foreign Affairs.* (72), 78–87.

Parkinson, M. Hutchins, M. Simmie, J. Clark, G. Verdonk, H. (2004). Competitive European Cities: Where do the Core Cities Stand?. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Parkinson, M., Meegan, R., Karecha, J., Evans, R., Jones, G., Tosics, I., Gertheis, A., Tonko, A., Hegedus, J., Illes, I., Sotarauta, M., Ruokolainen, O., Lefevre, C. & Hall, P. (2013) Second Tier Cities and Territorial Development in Europe: Performance Policies and Prospects Executive Summary and Final Report, Luxembourg: ESPON.

Parkinson, M. & Meegan, R. (2013). Economic place making: policy messages for European cities, Policy Studies. 34(3), 377–400.

Parkinson, M., Meegan, R. & Karecha, J. (2014). UK city-regions in growth and recession: How are they performing at home and abroad? ESRC Secondary Data Analysis Initiative Project Working Paper. Liverpool: European Institute for Urban Affairs, Liverpool John Moores University.

Parkinson, M. Meegan, R. & Karecha, J. (2015) 'City Size and Economic Performance: Is Bigger Better, Small More Beautiful or Middling Marvellous? *European Planning Studies*. 23, (6), 1054-1068.

Rodriguez-Pose, A. (2008). The rise of the "city-region" concept and its development policy implications. *European Planning Studies.* 16, (8), 1025-1046.

Scott, A.J. & Storper, M. (2003). Regions, globalization, development. *Regional Studies.* 37, 579–93.

Scott, M. (2006). 'Strategic spatial planning and contested ruralities: Insights from the Republic of Ireland'. *European Planning Studies*. 14, (6), 811–29.

Tosics, I. (2007). City-Regions in Europe: The Potentials and the Realities. Special Outlook: The Role of Public Transport Cooperation. Metropolitan Research Institute, Budapest. Paper prepared for the EURA conference The Vital City WS13 Urban Form, Transport and Sustainability Glasgow 12-14 September 2007.

Tosics, I. (2011). Sustainable land use in peri-urban areas: government, planning and financial instruments. In S. Pauleit, S. Bell, and C. Aalbers, (eds), Peri-Urban Futures: Land Use and Sustainability, Berlin: Springer.

Walsh, J. (2004). Spatial Planning for Territorial Cohesion: Linking the Urban and Rural Domains, Paper Prepared for Workshop No. 2 on Territorial Cohesion: Meeting New Challenges in an Enlarged EU, NUI: Maynooth.

Walsh, J. A. (2007) 'Regional development: Trends, Policies and Strategies'. In: B. Bartley, & R. Kitchin, (eds.) Understanding Contemporary Ireland. Dublin: Pluto Press.

Walsh, J. (2013). The National Spatial Strategy: Rationale, process, performance and prospects. *Administration*, 60 (3), 13-40.

Walsh, J. A., (2009). Space and Place in the National Spatial Strategy for the Republic of Ireland. In: S. Davoudi and I. Strange, (eds.) *Conceptions of Space and Place in Strategic Spatial Planning*. New York: Routledge.

Waterford City Council (2013). *Waterford City Development Plan 2013-2019.* City Hall: Waterford.

Waterford County Council (2011). *Waterford County Development Plan 2011-2017.* County Hall: Waterford.

Williams, B. & Shiels, P. (2002). The Expansion of Dublin and the Policy Implications of Dispersal. *Journal of Irish Urban Studies*. 1, (1), 1-21.

Williams, B. Walsh, C. and Boyle, I, (2010). The Development of the Functional Urban Region of Dublin: Implications for Regional Development Markets and Planning. *Journal of Irish Urban Studies.* 7, (9), 5-30.

Tables

Table 1 Urban and Rural Population change in Ireland 1991 – 2011

	1991	2002	2011	1991-2011
State Population	3,525,719	3,917,203	4,588,252	1,062,533
Aggregate Urban Population	2,010,700	2,334,282	2,846,882	836,182
Aggregate Rural Population	1,515,019	1,582,921	1,741,370	226,351
Pop Change (Absolute)	-14,924	391,484	671,049	1,062,533
Pop Change (%)	-0.4	11.1	17.1	30.1
Urban Pop Change (Absolute)	8,526	323,582	512,600	836,182
Urban Pop Change (%)	0.4	16.1	22	41.6
Rural Pop Change (Absolute)	-23,450	67,902	158,449	226,351
Rural Pop Change (%)	-1.5	4.5	10.0	14.9
Urban Population Change as Share of population growth (%)	N/A	82.7	76.4	78.7
Rural Population Change as Share of population growth (%)	N/A	17.3	23.6	21.3

Source: CSO (1991, 2002, 2011)

Table 2 Population Trends in Ireland's Five Cities and Key Towns 1991-2011

	Population 1991	Population 2001	Population 2011	Absolute change 1991-2001	% change 1991-2001	Absolute change 2001-2011	% change 2001-2011	% share of national growth 1991-2001	% share of national growth 2001-2011
Dublin city & suburbs	915,516	1,004,614	1,110,627	89,098	10	106,013	10.6	22.8	15.8
Cork city & suburbs	174,400	186,239	198,582	11,839	7	12,343	6.6	3.0	1.8
Limerick city & suburbs	75,436	86,998	91,454	11,562	15	4,456	5.1	3.0	0.7
Galway city & suburbs	50,853	66,163	76,778	15,310	30	10,615	16.0	3.9	1.6
Waterford city & suburbs	41,853	46,736	51,519	4,883	12	4,783	10.2	1.2	0.7
Second-Tier Cities	342,542	386,136	418,333	43,594	13	32,197	8.3	11.1	4.8
All Cities & Suburbs	1,258,058	1,390,750	1,528,960	132,692	11	138,210	9.9	33.9	20.6
Towns 10,000 or over	336,411	551,863	730,414	215,452	64	178,551	32.4	55.0	26.6

Source: CSO (1996, 2011)

Table 3 Total persons at work and the number of persons commuting to the Irish cities and suburbs, 2006-2011

Urban Area	Persons at work 2006	Persons at work 2011	Change in persons at work 2006-2011	*% change in persons at work* 2006-2011	Workers travelling into the city & suburbs 2006	Workers travelling into the city & suburbs 2011	Change in workers travelling into the city & suburbs	*% change in workers travelling into the city & suburbs*
Dublin city & suburbs	455,375	469,987	14,612	*3.2*	104,865	117,764	12,899	*12.3*
Cork city & suburbs	86,316	92,150	5,834	*6.8*	31,909	36,519	4,610	*14.4*
Limerick city &suburbs	35,977	40,464	4,487	*12.5*	15,984	20,086	4,102	*25.7*
Galway city & suburbs	40,859	41,402	543	*1.3*	18,931	20,560	1,629	*8.6*
Waterford city & suburbs	25,838	23,332	-2,506	*-9.7*	11,685	10,646	-1,039	*-8.9*
Ireland Total	**1,930,042**	**1,807,360**	**-122,682**	**-6.4**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**	**N/A**

Source: Census of Ireland [2006, 2011]

Table 4 Population Change 2002-2011 in the Main Cities

	City Legal Change 2002-2011 (%)	*City & Suburbs* Change 2002-2011 (%)	*City Region* Change 2002-2011 (%)	Implied NSS change 2011 (%)	*City Legal* as proportion of City Region 2002	*City Legal* as proportion of City Region 2011	*City & Suburbs* as proportion of City Region 2002	*City & Suburbs* as proportion of City Region 2011
Cork	-3,832 (-2.1)	12,343 (6.6)	59,418 (17.5)	52,000 (14.9)	36.3	29.9	55.0	49.9
Limerick	3,083 (4.7)	4,456 (5.1)	30,650 (16)	24,000 (10.2)	28.1	25.7	43.3	41.1
Galway	9,697 (14.7)	10,615 (16)	36,965 (24.8)	23,000 (15.8)	44.2	40.6	44.4	41.3
Waterford	2,138 (4.6)	4,783 (10.2)	11,624 (13.6)	22,500 (18.9)	52.2	48.1	54.7	53.1
All Second-Tier Cities	11,086 (3.7)	32,197 (8.3)	138,657 (18.1)	121,500 (14.3)	37.6	33.0	50	46.3
Dublin	31,831 (3.2)	106,013 (10.6)	243,182 (17.2)	332,500 (21.7)	35.9	32.2	71.0	66.9
All 5 Cities	42,917 (3.1)	136,088 (10.2)	381,839 (17.5)	454,000 (19.0)	35.9	32.2	63.6	59.7

Source: CSO [2002, 2006, 2011]

Table 5 Area and Density of Ireland's Urban Centres 2011

	City & Suburbs km²	Population	Population Density person per km²
Cork	164.56	198,582	1,206.75
Limerick	56.84	91,454	1,608.97
Galway	53.42	76,778	1,437.25
Waterford	44.34	51,519	1,161.91
All Second-Tier Cities	319.2	418,333	1,310.73
Dublin	317.49	1,110,627	3,498.15
All 5 Cities	637	1,528,960	2,401.57

Source: CSO [2011]

Table 6 Population Size and Share 2002-2011 in Ireland's Urban Centres, Towns and Urban and Rural Areas

	Population 2002	% of State Population 2002	Population 2011	% of State Population 2011	Absolute change 2002-2011	*% change 2002-2011*
Dublin city and suburbs	1,004,614	*25.6*	1,110,627	*24.2*	106,013	*10.5*
Cork city and suburbs	186,239	*4.7*	198,582	*4.3*	12,343	*6.6*
Limerick city & suburbs	86,998	*2.2*	91,454	*2*	4,456	*5.1*
Galway city & suburbs	66,163	*1.7*	76,778	*1.7*	10,615	*16*
Waterford city & suburbs	46,736	*1.2*	51,519	*1.1*	4,783	*10.2*
Second-Tier Cities	386,136	*9.9*	418,333	*9.1*	32,197	*8.3*
All Cities and Suburbs	1,390,750	*35.5*	1,528,960	*33.3*	138,210	*9.9*
Towns 10,000 or over	551,863	*14.*	730,414	*15.9*	178,551	*32.3*
Towns 5,000 – 9,999	228,629	*5.8*	297,182	*6.4*	68,553	*30*
Towns 3,000 – 4,999	89,321	*2.3*	119,705	*2.6*	30,384	*34*
Towns 1,500 – 2,999	106,738	*2.7*	170,628	*3.7*	63,890	*60*
Towns total	976,551	*24.9*	1,317,929	*28.7*	341,378	*35*
Urban Total	2,367,301	*60.4*	2,846,889	*62*	479,588	*20.3*
Rural Total	1,549,902	*39.6*	1,741,363	*37.9*	191,461	*12.3*

Source: CSO [2002, 2011]

Table 7 Location of Population Change 2002-2011, Second-Tier Cities

		2002 pop	2011 pop	*% change 2002-2011*
Cork City Region	City and Suburbs	186,239	198,582	*7*
	Towns 1500+	74,768	101,696	*36*
	City/Towns Ratio	71|29	66|34	
	Combined Urban	261,007	300,278	*15*
	Combined Rural	77,867	98,014	*26*
	City Region	338,874	398,292	*18*
Limerick City Region	City and Suburbs	83,147	91,454	*10*
	Towns 1500+	39,554	49,884	*26*
	City/Towns Ratio	68|32	65|35	
	Combined Urban	122,701	141,338	*15*
	Combined Rural	69,253	81,266	*17*
	City Region	191,954	222,604	*16*
Galway City Region	City and Suburbs	66,163	76,778	*16*
	Towns 1500+	17,145	27,242	*59*
	City/Towns Ratio	79|21	74|26	
	Combined Urban	83,308	104,020	*25*
	Combined Rural	65,640	81,893	*25*
	City Region	148,948	185,913	*25*
Waterford City Region	City and Suburbs	46,736	51,519	*10*
	Towns 1500+	11,238	13,583	*21*
	City/Towns Ratio	82|18	79|21	
	Combined Urban	63,947	65,102	*2*
	Combined Rural	21,505	31,974	*49*
	City Region	85,452	97,076	*14*
All second-tier cities	City and Suburbs	388,258	418,333	8
	Towns 1500+	142,705	192,405	35
	City/Towns Ratio	73|27	68|32	
	Combined Urban	530,963	610,738	15
	Combined Rural	234,265	293,147	25
	City Region	765,228	903,885	18

Source: CSO [2002, 2011]

Table 8 House Completions 2002-2011 by House Type and Local Authority

House Type	Local Authority	House Completions 2002-2011	%
Cork			
All Units		**60,686**	100
Single house	County	18,218	36.1
	City	695	6.8
Multi-unit scheme	County	32,245	63.9
	City	9,528	93.2
Total Cork County		**50,463**	83.2
Total Cork City		**10,223**	16.8
Galway			
All Units		**35,151**	100
Single house	County	14,272	55.4
	City	591	6.3
Multi-unit scheme	County	11,503	44.6
	City	8,785	93.7
Total Galway County		**25,775**	73.3
Total Galway City		**9,376**	26.7
Limerick			
All Units		**20,811**	100
Single house	County	5,874	38.3
	City	388	7.1
Multi-unit scheme	County	9,479	61.7
	City	5,070	92.9
Total Limerick County		**15,353**	73.8
Total Limerick City		**5,458**	26.2
Waterford			
All Units		**14,864**	100
Single house	County	3,935	40.0
	City	236	4.7
Multi-unit scheme	County	5,897	60.0
	City	4,796	95.3
Total Waterford County		**9,832**	66.1
Total Waterford City		**5,032**	33.9
Total Second-Tier County		**101,423**	77.1
Total Second-Tier City		**30,089**	22.9

Source: Department of the Environment, Community & Local Government [2002-2011] Housing Statistics Database 2002-2011

Table 9 Change in Commuting Patterns [by journey time] 2002-2011 in Second-Tier City Regions

	all journeys 2002	journeys under 30 mins	journeys over 30 mins	all journeys 2011	journeys under 30 mins	journeys over 30 mins	% change under 30 mins	% change over 30 mins
Cork	210,259	159,920	50,339	228,353	163,421	64,932		
%		76.1	23.9		71.6	28.4	2.2	29.0
Limerick	123,289	92,823	30,466	125,156	96,151	29,005		
%		75.3	24.7		76.8	23.2	3.6	-4.8
Galway	95,860	74,494	21,366	109,162	75,810	33,352		
%		77.7	22.3		69.4	30.6	1.8	56.1
Waterford	51,612	42,620	8,992	52,729	43,025	9,704		
%		82.6	17.4		81.6	18.4	1.0	7.9
All Second-Tier Cities	481,020	370,086	111,234	515,400	378,625	137,075		
%		76.9	23.1		73.5	26.6	2.3	23.2
Dublin	906,716	544,058	362,658	968,727	578,064	390,663		
%		60.0	40.0		59.7	40.3	6.3	7.7

Source: CSO [Census of Ireland: 2002, 2011]

Table 10 Settlement Hierarchies [2011 onwards]

Local Authority	Tier No.	Settlement Hierarchy Tier	No. Of Planned Units	% of Total Planned Growth
Cork City	**1**	Total City	15,445	17.4
Cork County	**2**	Main Towns	56,716	63.8
	3	Villages	8,919	10.0
	4	Rural/Open Countryside	7,827	8.8
		Total County	73,462	82.6
		Total City and County	88,907	100
Cork City Council (2015). *Cork City Development Plan 2015-2021* **Cork County Council (2015). *Cork County Development Plan 2015-2021***				
Galway City	**1**	Total City	8,591	65.8
Galway County	**2**	towns and villages	3,189	24.4
	3	Countryside	1,270	9.7
		Total County	4,459	34.2
		Total City and County	13,050	100.0
Galway City Council (2011) Galway City Council Development Plan 2011-2017. **Galway County Council (2015) Galway County Council Development Plan 2015-2021.**				
Limerick City	**1**	Total City	13,513	43.4
Limerick County	**2**	Main Towns	11,432	36.7
	3	Smaller town and villages	1,948	6.3
	4	Tier 6 and open countryside	4,222	13.6
		Total County	17,602	56.6
		Total City and County	31,115	100.0
Limerick City Council (2011) *Limerick City Development Plan 2010-2016* **Limerick County Council (2011) *Limerick County Development Plan,* 2010-2016, Variation No. 1**				
Waterford City	**1**	Total City	4,800	20.5
Waterford County	**2**	Primary Centre	4,825	20.5
	3	Secondary Centre	5,992	25.0
	4	District Centre	5,584	24.0
	5	Other Centres	2,334	10.0
	6	Countryside	0	0.0
		Total County	18,735	79.5
		Total City and County	23,535	100.0
Waterford City Council (2013). *Waterford City Development Plan 2013-2019* **Waterford County Council (2011). *Waterford County Development Plan 2011-2017***				

Source: Development Plan Core Strategies in each Local Authority