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A Top Down View of European Urbanisation?
Comparative studies of European cities (FUR) < l. 1992:
- Hall and Hay (1980)
- van den Berg et al. (1982)
- Cheshire and Hay (1989; 1995)
- Drewett, Schubert, Knight (1992)
- A spatial vision for Europe (J. Delors, 1989)

PROJECT:
- EU DG XII FAST /URBINNO Programme: Drewett et al. (1992) "The Future of European Cities: The Role of Science and Technology"

REPORTS:

»EUROPE 2000+« (1994)
ESDP (1999)

URBAN AUDIT > 1997
ESPON > 2002
## Urban life cycle

### Population change characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Development</th>
<th>Classification type</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Ring</th>
<th>FUR</th>
<th>Total growth</th>
<th>Total decline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Urbanisation</td>
<td>1 Absolute centralisation</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Relative centralisation</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Suburbanisation</td>
<td>3 Relative decentralisation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Absolute decentralisation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III De-surbanisation</td>
<td>5 Absolute decentralisation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Relative decentralisation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Re-urbanisation</td>
<td>7 Relative centralisation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Absolute centralisation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: van den Berg et al. 1982.

> 1985 (new patterns of urban change?)


The role, specific situation and potentials of urban areas as nodes in a polycentric development (2004)

The PENTAGON Area
Major urban areas in Europe 27 (76 MEGA) and their significance in European urban system (FUA)
**Challenge:**
– Central and Eastern Europe needs dynamic core areas appropriate for enhancing the global economic integration of the enlargement area.

**Chance:**
– Berlin, Warsaw, Prague, Vienna/Bratislava, and Budapest are cornerstones of the most dynamic area in Central and Eastern Europe.

**Choice:**
– Central Europe has a clear potential for a dynamic core area at the European level.
– South East Europe urgently needs very first steps towards city cooperation at the transnational level.
After the last EU enlargement in year 2007 about 70 major cities with more than 500,000 inhabitants dominate the European urban system. About 20% of the EU population in 27 member states live in these cities.

Approximately 120 mil. inhabitants or 40% of urban population in Europe live in 600 cities between 100,000 – 500,000 inhabitants which are the economic poles and nodes of polycentric and balanced development of competitive cities and regions in an enlarged EU.

Strengthening a polycentric and balanced system of metropolitan areas and urban networks is one of the main objectives in shaping the development of European urban system and territorial integration of the EU (ESDP, 1999; Territorial Agenda of EU, 2007, Europe 2020).
Why medium sized cities?

Usually forgotten in discussion about competitiveness

- Challenges of globalisation and trends of metropolisation
- High ranks of metropolises
- An important group of cities in Europe – 27+NO+CH

Source of data: Nordregio (2004), Espon project 1.1.1
Potential cross-border co-operation and integration areas in Central Europe:
- large areas of potential co-operation on the basis of similar urban settlement structure and common spatial and socio-economic development problems.

Source: INTERREG III B CADSES RePUS project “Strategy for Regional Polycentric Urban System in Central-Eastern Europe Economic Integration Zone” (2005-2007)
Development index of urban areas (LLS) with important urban centres in A, IT, SI, HU and number of population in NUTS 3 regions in Croatia

Source: INTERREG III B CADSES RePUS project “Strategy for Regional Polycentric Urban System in Central-Eastern Europe Economic Integration Zone” (2005-2007);
TOWN “morphological cluster” in Europe: Large cities (HDUC), medium and small towns (SMST), very small towns (VST)

More than 87% EU-27 inhabitants live in urban areas:

a) Large towns (850): (> 50,000 prebivalcev): 46% inhabitants,

b) small and medium size towns (8414) (5000 – 50,000 prebivalcev): 27% inhabitants,

c) Very small towns (< 5000 prebivalcev): 70,000 (19% prebivalstva);
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
<th>Distinctive characteristics</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morphological definition</td>
<td>Built up area (area with urban physical characteristics) of a minimum population size</td>
<td>Concentration of buildings (distinction from open spaces) and population (above minimal threshold)</td>
<td>Compact build-up area Distance between settlements and buildings Population Density of urbanised area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative definition</td>
<td>Area with urban administrative status</td>
<td>administrative duties and responsibilities and territory / boundary containing urban settlements</td>
<td>Local government administrative functions Historical attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional definition</td>
<td>Urban settlement (municipality) with concentration of jobs, services and other urban functions</td>
<td>Role of centre for region due to concentration of jobs and other urban functions attracting commuters and visitors</td>
<td>Jobs Other urban functions Commuting Centrality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban municipality (SI: 11 / DZ, 1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger area with functional relationship with one or more urban cores</td>
<td>Gravitational area of jobs, services and other functions located in urban core(s)</td>
<td>Home-work commuting Home-service commuting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Urban settlement (SI: 104 + 52 / SURS, 2003)**

**Urban municipality (SI: 11 / DZ, 1995)**

**Urban centre (SI: 3+12+45, SPRS, 2004)**
Correlation between TOWN RA2 polygons and SURS (2003) definition of urban settlements (104 + 52) in Slovenia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION (inh.)</th>
<th>DENSITY (inh. / sq.km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5000</td>
<td>VST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 50000</td>
<td>SMST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50000</td>
<td>large SMST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOWN: Morphological definition of towns in SI: 48 polygons (4 VM, 44 MSVM)
Types of micro-regional centers (2001) | Types of micro-regional centers (2011*)

Number, type and links (travel-to-work) between towns ("MRC - micro-regional centres") in Slovenia 2001 / 2011

2001: 51 MR

2011: 50 MR

Types of micro-regional center (MRC)
- LC
- NETW-LC
- AGLO-LC
- NETW-SMST-D
- NETW-SMST-S
- AGLO-SMST

Share of flow on jobs in destination
- < 1 %
- > 1 %

micro-regional border
NUTS 0 / NUTS 1 border

Share of flow on jobs in destination
- < 1 %
- > 1 %

micro-regional border
NUTS 0 / NUTS 1 border

* data for 2011 recalculated on the 2001 geography
SPRS: 50 urban centres (7 conurbations) = 61 towns/urban settlements

Vision of spatial development and urban network in Slovenia (2004): 12 years after?

Ljubljana, Maribor: > 50,000 prebivalcev

SOURS (2003)
The concept of polycentricity

- **Polycentric urban system**: several urban nodes linked through functional relations
- **Functional relations**: Intra-urban (micro) level / Inter-urban (meso or macro) level
- **Polycentricity in governance approaches**: Enhancement of mutual interests, complementarities, synergies and potentials for collaboration

- **Core City (CC)**: Capital cities in their administrative delimitation
- **Functional Metropolitan Area (FMA)**: Daily urban system (area of intensive commuting to work)
- **Metropolitan Region (MR)**: Wider economic region reflecting the territorial networks of a city’s economy

**Results:**
- Unequal in morphological & functional polycentrism.
- National command and control centers
- Competition between local authorities for business, property and infrastructure investments
- Lack of coordinated spatial planning at metropolitan level
INTRA-METROPOLITAN POLICENTRICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>FMA %</th>
<th>MR %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>58.76</td>
<td>59.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>42.81</td>
<td>36.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>37.12</td>
<td>35.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljubljana</td>
<td>30.76</td>
<td>35.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- **reciprocity <35%**
  - 200 - 500
  - 501 - 1000
  - 1001 - 3000
  - > 3000
- **reciprocity 35-65%**
  - 200 - 500
  - 501 - 1000
  - 1001 - 3000
  - > 3000
- **reciprocity >65%**
  - 200 - 500
  - 501 - 1000
  - 1001 - 3000
  - > 3000
NOTE: The histograms show also differences in the number of jobs due to establishment of new (smaller) municipalities from larger municipalities in LUR – e.g. Šmartno pri Litiji in year 2002 from Litija municipality, and in year 2006 Šentrupert from Trebnje municipality, Log-Dragomer from Vrhnika municipality, and Gorje from Bled municipality.
Ljubljana urban region (LUR) NUTS 3 (statistical / development region): City Municipality of Ljubljana + 25 LAU 2 municipalities

- Regional Spatial Development Concept of Ljubljana Urban Region - LUR (2010)
- Municipal Spatial Plan of the City Municipality of Ljubljana (2010)
Ljubljana: “Metropolitan European Growth Area” (MEGA)

Enhancement of the position of Ljubljana as the European capital city and the most important transport node in Slovenia at the cross-road of E5 and E10 corridors.

Strengthening of links and networks in the cross-border Alps-Adriatic region, Central Europe, South-east Europe, Adriatic, etc.

Improvement of the “weak MEGA” (ESPON 1.1.1, 2004) status in order to become centre of new European potential integration zone” (e.g. Alpe-Adria-Pannonia);

Source: Department of Spatial Planning, City Municipality of Ljubljana (2007)
THE CONCEPT OF POLYCENTRISM:
- From »central-place theory« to urban and regional competitiveness and cooperation
- Polycentricity is a policy option (not only in the ESDP!)

I. Polycentrism: two complementary aspects

MORPHOLOGICAL
mono-nuclear
hierarchical poly-nuclear

RELATIONAL
mono-directional

poly-nuclear
poly-nuclear
multi-directional

II. Polycentrism: two main processes

INSTITUTIONAL POLYCENTRISM

STRUCTURAL POLYCENTRISM

Polycentrism of cooperation
Polycentrism of flow

III. Polycentrism: different territorial scales

CONEXITY

SPATIAL PROXIMITY

At national, transnational and European levels...
Examples: building thematic and joint projects, actions, strategies, exchanges of students, air traffic...

IV. Polycentrism: four main types

Integrated monocentrism

Outcoming polycentrism

Integrated polycentrism

Metropolitan polycentrism

Cooperation and networking

- Inter-municipal
- Inter-regional
- Cross-border
- Inter-regional
- Trans-national
URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE

Key challenges & trends:

• The **sustainability of European cities** is currently threatened by the following: *social change, loss of cultural identity and heritage, insecurity and criminality, changing employment patterns, deteriorating infrastructure and built environment, urban sprawl, traffic congestion, poor air quality and noise pollution, and inefficient water and waste management*, the ageing population, immigration, energy efficiency, - and challenges of the financial and environmental crisis.

- Territorial capital – key challenge for territorial governance
- Territorial cohesion – polycentric, balanced and sustainable spatial development among territories
**Smart City:**

- 6 key development characteristics are defined through bundles of factors in a comprehensive way

- 31 factors are operationalised through selection of 74 indicators

"A Smart City is a city well performing in these 6 characteristics, built on the ‘smart’ combination of endowments and activities of self-decisive, independent and aware citizens."

www.smart-cities.eu
Smart City ranking results

Smart cities: Final rating and composition

87% coverage

Luxembourg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Living</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ljubljana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Living</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Europeanisation of Cities

- questions of institutional adaptation of member states and cities to the integration process, in particular regarding the behaviour and interests of actors in the context of changing domestic (bargaining) structures;

- understanding Europeanisation as a historical phenomenon, raising questions of belonging and identity, as a process of diffusion of transnational cultural norms, and on the adaptation of policies and policy processes;

- For some cities and city regions the EU offers new possibilities to position themselves in a highly competitive European urban networks. **Larger cities and urban regions** often concentrate on influencing policies affecting cities’ competencies, mainly by opening offices in Brussels in order to gain a more direct access to EU institutions.
- Other cities try to gain further powers in **national bargaining structures**, as hierarchical relationships seem to be questioned by the involvement in EU policies.
- Many cities use the additional resources provided by EU policies, programmes, **modernising urban politics and policies**, but also for coping with **structural problems**.
- For another category of cities the EU is just an additional ‘supra-local’ level of political regulation, which constrains the local room for manoeuvre.
Another approach to Europeanisation has been a step-by-step process, in which cities climb up a ladder depending on the quality and intensity of their activities and the degree of choice over them vis-à-vis the EU.

- Responding to EU directives and regulations
- Managing European information
- Communicating to the private sector and the public
- Maximising EU grants
- Facilitating urban regeneration
- Linking with other local organisations participating in the EU
- Participating in EU international networks and co-operating in joint projects
- Advising the EU on implementation issues
- Making urban policies more European
What is the appropriate level for action towards sustainable and resilient (small and medium sized) European cities – should this be the (inter)national, regional or the (intra)city level?

- Multi-level approach and cooperation is needed urgently!
- *International organisations* need to be responsible for recommendations, standards and monitoring as well as dissemination of information and benchmarking.
- Common but differentiated roles and responsibilities are needed between European countries.
- *Central government policy* is essential for success but implementation depends on particular *local governments* (municipalities) policies and other public and private actors.
- The *national urban policy* needs to address also the geographical, morphological and functional characteristics of urban areas and not only the administrative structure.
- Spatial and urban planning need to be strengthen at the *regional level*.
- *Cross-border cooperation* between cities and regions need to be supported by financial resources and projects of common interest.
- Change of *life-styles and consumer patterns* are urgently required.

**Institutional Context**
What are the skills needed to plan, manage and deliver sustainable and resiliente European cities?

- **Implementation of spatial planning regulation and other laws** and by-laws at the local level is the most important issue.

- Enhance the **political interest** over the complexity of urban sprawl issues.

- Greater understanding of the **science and technology** that need to be put at community service.

- **Training of municipal planners** how to introduce and “translate” anti-sprawl policies in land use plans and sectoral policies in order to strengthen the ability of local government to manage and deliver Sustainable City.

- **Local government** facilitates action through persuasion, education and provision of incentives to local inhabitants and businesses.

- Municipalities influence people’s day-to-day lives and can promote **behavioral changes and life-style patterns**.

- Development of **regional cooperation** (formal or informal) between municipalities in land use and building standards.

- **Public awareness** through the involvement of the civil society in environmental issues.

- Incorporating the environmental issues in the curricula of all **education levels**.

- Promotion of **spatial planning studies** at universities.

- The role of **international professional associations and networks** at the (inter)national level (ISOCARP; AESOP, IFHP, ENHR, IGU, RSA, etc).
Danube macro-region: “potential global integration zone” in Europe

Beside the INTERREG transnational cooperation areas the EU has started to apply another macro-regional approach, with the aims of coordinating EU policies and funding in similar regions in close cooperation with the countries and regions. One example of this approach is the Baltic Sea Strategy, adopted in June 2009. The similar strategy is currently being drafted for the Danube Area. The Baltic Sea Strategy and the Danube Strategy (2011) are macro-region territorial policy approaches with territorial cohesion and sustainability as important overarching policy objectives through horizontal and vertical cooperation as main ways to achieve these objectives.

Danube Area is a partnership involving 14 EU, accession and Third Countries with a budget of 4.3 bill. EUR available for cooperation activities until 2013 with the support of ERDF, IPA and ENPI financing instruments. No new funding, legislation and institution set the frame for a coordinating Danube Area strategy of already existing resources, instruments and networks of different legal status and of different tiers.

Source: www.interact.eu
Thank you for your attention!
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