Copenhagen is often referred to by both academic and professional planning literature, as an example of a ‘with leading the way’ where integration of land use and transport planning has manifested as transit-oriented developments (TOD). The famous Finger Plan (Egnsplan) of 1947 has shaped urban development pattern drastically in the Greater Copenhagen region creating ‘beads on a string’ developments. The TOD concept has also permeated through subsequent planning document in a consistent fashion. The Ørestad development is an example of a maturation of TOD principles from the S-Train phases (Knowles et al., 2012, Cervero, 1998). Recent plans such as Loop City and the Metro Ring expansion confirm the TOD conducive environment is present in Greater Copenhagen.

“Greater Copenhagen’s saving grace, however, has been its Finger Plan, an almost universally accepted norm for organizing the region’s physical growth. It is difficult to overstate the symbolic significance of the Finger Plan” - (Cervero, 1998, 152)

My research is interested in finding out how and what have led to the success in a change of strategies based on my observations on the barriers experienced and solutions implemented in Greater Copenhagen region. The interview will be divided up into two phases, one to determine the barriers experienced and the latter to discuss the process of how TOD has evolved into planning strategy over the last decades (±60 years). We will begin with a set of questions establishing the boundary of the discussion but the interview will be flexible according to your response.

**General**

1. Please describe your job function and brief professional background.
2. Please describe your involvement in the TOD project(s) (Duration, phase and scope of involvement, positive/negative experiences)
3. Who, according to you are the crucial stakeholders involved the TOD projects you have experienced?

**Implementation barriers to TOD in Greater Copenhagen**

In the Netherlands, critical barriers were determined to be fragmentation of governance and lack of transit-oriented culture. In my initial study of Copenhagen and its TOD efforts (Knowles et al., 2012, Cervero, 1998), I have come across literature that referred to implementation barriers such as the following;

a) Financial barriers such as high construction costs and budgeting issues, for example with the Ørestad funding projections.

b) Political and formal institutional barriers such as ‘institutionally split’ land use and transport developments and a ‘non-streamlined institutional landscape’ (Cervero, 1998, 134).

c) Socio-cultural and informal institutional barriers such as controversies regarding major investments and aversion of private investments inititally.

4. Do you recognise these barriers? If not, what other barriers were there?
5. What was the most critical barrier you have experienced?
6. How were these barriers overcome? (eg. by the introduction of policy/legislation)

---

1 This interview is a co-production of knowledge and will remain anonymous. The questions listed are for your reference. Our conversation will be recorded and a redacted transcript will be used for my eventual analysis.
Institutional incentives

“Ørestad has helped to improve Copenhagen’s international competitiveness by expanding its CBD and developing highly accessible sites for office, media, retailing and leisure activities. The large investment in mass transport infrastructure in the central parts of Greater Copenhagen has increased its accessibility and encouraged commuting from a much wider area” (Knowles et al., 2012, 260)

The introduction of institutional change (such as switching from a social democratic welfare-oriented perspective to a neo-liberal entrepreneurial agenda) (Andersen and Jørgensun, 1995; Majoor, 2008) are often accompanied by a set of incentives (such as the multiple investment in public transport infrastructure, coherent and consistent regional plans as well as wide spread public support) that help to promote TOD within the metropolitan region. Please discuss the pull/push factors (legal, socio-cultural, political) that have led to change that you have observed within your personal and professional capacity.

7. Were you aware of any significant incentives introduced that have made an impact to TOD in Greater Copenhagen? Please list and elaborate on some.
8. How and when were they implemented?
9. How were these incentives selected and decided upon?
10. Were these measures new or unique to the Danish/regional planning system?

The success of Greater Copenhagen

Looking at the chain of events that occur in creating and implementing a successful TOD strategy, some have describe being able to achieve success as nothing short of serendipitous. Greater Copenhagen’s success has been accredited to a almost religious belief in a regional vision (the Finger Plan) coupled with great public participation solidifying a political base across all scale levels.

11. Do you think that Copenhagen can be called a TOD success story?
12. Please define why you perceive Copenhagen to be a successful in TOD?

Glossary

Transit oriented development (TOD)

Transit oriented development (TOD) refers to strategies that coincide in their general objectives to improve sustainability of urban environments, increase spatial accessibility and generate economic vitality through focusing and maximising upon urban development around transit locations and connecting current and planned development with a transportation network (Belzer and Autler, 2002, Cervero, 1998, Dittmar and Ohland, 2004, Curtis et al., 2009)

Implementation barriers

Implementation barriers have been experienced in varying degrees across most TOD projects. This research defines the success of a project by being able to create synergy (create added value or spin off) through integration (spatial and functional) of urban development and public transport. An extensive EU research, PLUME (CEC, 2005) compared transport and spatial planning projects across Europe and determined the following simplified classification for barriers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Barriers (PLUME)</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Competency of regulations and legislative framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Availability and distribution of funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional and Territorial</td>
<td>Conflict between and within organisational and operational boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and Cultural</td>
<td>Framing and perception issues, acceptability and awareness in professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical and Technological</td>
<td>Physical and technological roadblocks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional incentives**

Institutional incentives are defined as measures (legal, financial or socio-cultural) (Commission of the European Communities, 2005) embedded within an institutional field (Lin et al., 2001) that help to overcome the implementation barriers by making a course of action or choice attractive (remunerative incentive) or inspiring (moral or repulsive incentive) to a stakeholder or actor in the project (Clark and Wilson, 1961).
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