



Bundesministerium  
für Verkehr, Bau  
und Stadtentwicklung



NATIONALE  
STADT  
ENTWICKLUNGS  
POLITIK

# 5 Years after the LEIPZIG CHARTER – Integrated Urban Development as a Prerequisite for a Sustainable City

Integrated Urban Development in the EU Member States and its Candidate Countries





**5 Years after the LEIPZIG CHARTER –  
Integrated Urban Development as a Prerequisite for a Sustainable City**

Integrated Urban Development in the EU Member States and its Candidate Countries

# Content

<b>A message from the Minister</b> .....	6
<b>Introduction</b> .....	8
<b>1 LEIPZIG CHARTER: integrated urban development as a prerequisite for sustainable European cities</b> .....	10
<b>2 Challenges for an integrated urban (district) development in Europe</b> .....	12
<b>3 Integrated urban (district) development policy as an instrument of sustainable urban development</b> .....	16
<b>4 Five years after the LEIPZIG CHARTER – developments in Europe</b> .....	19
<b>5 Integrated urban development in the 27 member states of the EU, its candidate countries and in Norway and Switzerland</b> .....	22
<b>A Countries with comprehensive national programmes for integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods)</b> .....	23
Belgium .....	23
Denmark .....	25
Finland .....	26
France (with case study Lyon – Pentes de la Croix-Rousse) .....	28
Germany .....	30
Ireland .....	32
Italy .....	33
The Netherlands (with case study Amsterdam – Nieuw-West) .....	35
Sweden .....	38
Switzerland .....	39
United Kingdom .....	41
<b>B Countries with national or regional programmes or with national guidelines for integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods)</b> .....	42
Austria .....	42
Bulgaria .....	44
Cyprus .....	45
Czech Republic .....	46
Hungary .....	47
Iceland .....	48
Latvia .....	49
Lithuania .....	51
Malta .....	52
Montenegro .....	53
Norway .....	54
Poland .....	55
Portugal .....	56
Romania (with case study Timișoara) .....	58
Slovenia .....	60
Spain .....	62

C	Countries with predominantly local approaches to integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods) .....	64
	Croatia .....	64
	Estonia .....	64
	Greece .....	65
	Luxembourg .....	66
	Macedonia .....	67
	Serbia .....	68
	Slovakia .....	69
	Turkey .....	70
<b>6</b>	<b>Contrasts:</b>	
	<b>integrated urban (district) development in Brazil, China, India and the USA</b> .....	<b>72</b>
	Brazil .....	73
	China .....	75
	India .....	77
	USA .....	79
<b>7</b>	<b>The state of urban (district) development in Europe: summary and conclusion</b> .....	<b>82</b>
	<b>References</b> .....	<b>85</b>
	<b>Imprint</b> .....	<b>87</b>

# A message from the Minister

Our towns and cities are key places and players when it comes to tackling the major challenges that society faces. So it is imperative that we make use of the strategies and energies that exist in these urban areas if we want to develop them in a sustainable manner – in other words reducing their climate change impact, improving their energy efficiency, making them adaptable, promoting social justice, enhancing their economic efficiency and ensuring a high quality of design.

One of the prerequisites for successful urban sustainability is a comprehensive cooperative approach that draws all stakeholders together: citizens, public authorities, trade associations, industry and academia. Thus, under the German EU Council Presidency in 2007, we joined forces with our European neighbours to adopt the LEIPZIG CHARTER on Sustainable European Cities as a policy framework.

Five years later, it is time to take stock. The questions to be answered are: To what extent is use being made of the principles on which we agreed in the LEIPZIG CHARTER? Which key issues of the LEIPZIG CHARTER have we implemented? What are the issues where we have to cooperate even more efficiently if we are to deploy our scarce resources in an optimum manner? What tasks still lie ahead of us? In October 2012, we will stage an international conference, which we have deliberately entitled “Urban Energies”, and at which we will discuss these and other questions with national and international partners.

The present study provides an overview of the numerous strategies that the states of the European Union and other countries have so far adopted in their search for answers to the questions raised by the LEIPZIG CHARTER. These answers are as diverse as the towns and cities themselves. But the study also shows that, despite all the differences, there are common trends. As resources grow increasingly scarce, integrated approaches to urban development policy are becoming more and more important. Because cooperation makes us strong. In addition, the examples are an impressive demonstration that the principles of the LEIPZIG CHARTER have already found their way into the practices of local authorities with remarkable success.



I hope all readers find this study interesting and informative.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Peter Ramsauer', written in a cursive style.

Dr Peter Ramsauer, Member of the German Bundestag  
Federal Minister of Transport, Building and Urban  
Development

# Introduction



Five years after adopting the “LEIPZIG CHARTER on Sustainable European Cities” during the German EU Presidency in the first half of 2007, the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development (*Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung – BMVBS*) – through the Federal Institute for Research Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (*Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung – BBSR*) within the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (*Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung – BBR*) – commissioned the German Institute of Urban Affairs (*Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik – DIfU*) to study the extent to which the Charter has had an impact on integrated urban (district) development in the 27 Member States of the EU, its six candidate countries Iceland, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey as well as in the two EFTA-states, Norway and Switzerland.

One of the study’s objective is to present the German “National Urban Development Policy” initiative in a more international perspective. This will be achieved by comparing the 33 countries’ challenges and strategies regarding integrated urban (district) development, in particular with the contrasting perspectives of similar approaches in China and the United States as well as in two of the BRISE countries (Brazil and India).

The study is based upon, and updates, the DIfU background paper created in preparation of the German EU presidency in 2007 “Integrated Urban Development – a Prerequisite for Urban Sustainability in Europe”. In terms of method, this study consisted essentially of analysing the documents relative to integrated urban (district) development in the countries covered. Additionally, three case studies were completed in Amsterdam (Netherlands), Lyon (France) and Timișoara (Romania), going into detail through interviews with representatives of the local governments and neighbourhoods.

The exploration of the key LEIPZIG CHARTER elements (Chapter 1) is followed in the present study report by an examination of the key challenges for urban development in Europe (Chapter 2), a presentation of the instrument that is integrated urban (district) development and its elements (Chapter 3) as well as a reflection on the development of this strategic approach throughout the EU presidencies since 2007 (Chapter 4). Approaches in EU Member States, its candidate countries and in Norway and Switzerland (Chapter 5) are put in contrast with a presentation of urban development policy challenges and solutions in Brazil, China, India and the USA (Chapter 6). Finally, the study’s key findings will be summarized in Chapter 7.

1 LEIPZIG CHARTER:  
integrated urban development  
as a prerequisite for sustainable  
European cities

Over the last ten years, integrated urban (district) development has become increasingly important in many EU Member States. This evolution was notably influenced by the adoption of the “LEIPZIG CHARTER on Sustainable European Cities” at the Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban Development and Territorial Cohesion in Leipzig on 24 and 25 May 2007 during the German EU Presidency (first half of 2007). The document mentions, among other, that: “The Ministers commit themselves (...) to use the tool of integrated urban development and the related governance for its implementation” (LEIPZIG CHARTER: 1). This is followed by a clear recommendation of “making greater use of integrated urban development policy approaches” (ibid.: 2).

Among other elements, the LEIPZIG CHARTER declares that “all dimensions of sustainable development should be taken into account at the same time and with the same weight. These include economic prosperity, social balance and a healthy environment” (ibid.: 1 f.). A holistic approach is essential in order to reveal the potential of European cities in terms of cultural and architectural qualities, social integration and economic development. At the same time however, it also states that “demographic problems, social inequality, social exclusion of specific population groups, a lack of affordable and suitable housing and environmental problems” (ibid.: 2) are also part of the challenges faced by urban development. Two key, interrelated questions in the LEIPZIG CHARTER therefore stick out, which should be addressed with integrated urban development approaches:

1. How can local economic growth, international and interregional economic competitiveness and the closely related goal of creating new employment opportunities as durable pillars of European cities’ viability and a means of securing their future be achieved?
2. How can, in the course of this process, population segments and urban neighbourhoods risking isolation from local economic development, the urban labour market and the socio-spatial fabric be involved in the desired development in order to maintain and thus strengthen cities as social and spatial entities?

Since 2000, all the EU presidencies have emphasized these two aspects as cornerstones of sustainable urban development and were expressed prior to the adoption of the LEIPZIG CHARTER in resolutions adopted by the Informal Council of Ministers for Urban Development. This was caused by the challenges that European cities had been facing for more than twenty years and the need to take advantage of their development potentials.

## 2 Challenges for an integrated urban (district) development in Europe

The European city is not only a geographical context but also a successful spatial, social, political and values system and model. Over time, it has grown to become a place of identification for social and cultural diversity, has always fuelled social integration of different population groups, become a place of collectively organized public services, a centre for economic growth whilst adapting to its local environment. To preserve these qualities, European cities must address various trends with strategies focused on the future.

### Adapting strategies for economic growth

Given the financial and economic crisis, cities and metropolitan areas need to become more effective again by using appropriate growth strategies. These include the three “Europe 2020” priorities: “Smart Growth” (development of a knowledge- and innovation-based economy), “Sustainable Growth” (promoting a greener, resource-efficient and more competitive economy) and “Inclusive Growth” (promoting an economy with higher employment levels and social and territorial cohesion) (EU Commission 2010).

### Climate change and fighting its effects

Strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (mitigation) and taking measures to adapt to climatic changes (adaptation) need to be considered when dealing with climate change. By 2020, the EU must have reduced its greenhouse gas emissions by 20% in comparison to 1990 levels, increased the share of renewable energy to 20% of the total energy consumption and increased energy efficiency by achieving a 20% savings on energy consumption. This must be implemented in particular in sectors with heavy emissions and high savings potential such as housing, transport, trade and industry. (Architectural) adjustments to climate change in cities and neighbourhoods are necessary as they may be increasingly affected by heavy rain, storms, heat waves and drought (cf. BBSR 2010). Cities therefore need to develop and implement concepts for energetic restructuring in the sectors of energy (supply), building (increase energy efficiency), transport, infrastructure as well as an optimized urban structure.

### Handling demographic change

The demographic change has tied together the challenge of responding adequately to the proportional increase of old and very old people (age-compatible urban and neighbourhood development, upgrading accommodation units, adapting services and mobility offers, etc.) and the need to deal with the relative decrease in the number of young and educated people of working age (innovative inclusive training strategies, partnerships between education institutions and economic agents, etc.). It will also be important to address the increasing differentiation of lifestyles (individualization, fragmented families, etc). Finally, immigrants or people from migrant backgrounds will have to be better integrated in the (urban) society and urban labour markets (promotion of ethnic economy, language support, participation, etc.).

### Ensuring socio-spatial cohesion

Integration issues of people from migrant backgrounds, as well as closely related goals of innovative training strategies, are directly linked to the challenge of ensuring social and territorial cohesion in cities and urban societies. As these issues require courses of action that go beyond the structural/technical measures as well as a strong link between urban planning, social and economic topics, the interaction of different levels (city, neighbourhoods) and a variety of actors from government, civil society, economy, are therefore often at the heart of integrated strategies for urban (district) development. These elements are therefore important in this study. There is a particular focus on deprived neighbourhoods which are the spatial consequence of social differentiations resulting from globalization in Western Europe since the early 1990s.

These socio-spatial and socio-economic developments are rooted in deep, structural economic changes which include the following processes: de-industrialization with a simultaneous growth of new and flexible industries as well as a growing service economy, resulting in a divide between a highly skilled knowledge economy (e.g. research, consulting) and a low-skilled, service-oriented segment (e.g. catering, personal services). In particular for countries with low economic growth, changes related to qualification requirements of the labour market have led to a sustained, high (long-term) unemployment level, especially among non- or low-skilled (male) workers. In several countries, immigrants are disproportionately affected by unemployment or work in low-pay sectors of the labour market. In the growing service sector – and also in the low-pay sector –

women are over-represented, increasing their share in the economically active population. For many highly-skilled young people, access to safe and well-paid segments of the labour market has increasingly become a problem (cf. Swianiewicz/Atkinson/Baucz 2011: 6). These polarizations – employment versus unemployment, low wages versus good salaries, secure versus insecure employment opportunities – have widened the income gap which could lead to different consumption opportunities, notably in the housing market. Affordable accommodation is for the most part located in less attractive neighbourhoods where lower-income households are moving in so as to find reasonably priced housing, whereas households with higher incomes tend to look for places to live in “better” neighbourhoods. Such small-scale segregation processes have amplified social and spatial inequality in urban areas (cf. Franke/Löhr/Sander 2000; Dohnke/Seidel-Schulze/Häußermann 2012).

Since the late 1980s, urban (district) development in Central and Eastern European countries has not only been affected by globalization but also by the consequences of the transformation process. Following the market liberalization, companies and, to a large extent, public housing stocks were privatised, a process which also saw the state withdraw from the housing supply. Although lower incomes, unemployment and poverty of certain social groups are part of the consequences of the transformation, socio-economic segregation in Central and Eastern Europe, and thus socio-spatial fragmentation of urban areas, has so far proven to be far less pronounced than in most Western European countries. In cities, economic challenges as well as urban renewal imperatives and shortages in housing provision seem to be the main areas of concern.

Nevertheless, deprived neighbourhoods – albeit in different forms and proportions varying from country to country – have emerged in cities throughout all the EU countries as a result of restructuring processes. These include:

- former industrial urban areas suffering primarily from economic difficulties and from the problem of large derelict buildings and land,
- neighbourhoods which are exposed to significant environmental problems such as noise pollution near major roads,
- central urban areas with stagnant or declining economic growth and decreasing attractiveness partly due to the competition on “green field”,
- residential areas suffering from inadequate urban structures – above all residential and living environment surroundings –, as well as
- residential areas which concentrate social problems in addition to urban development and economic difficulties, and who thereby remain further disadvantaged.

These severely deprived neighbourhoods are usually characterized by a mixture of complex, interrelated problems. These include (cf. Franke/Löhr/Sander 2000: 247 f.; Ministerio de Vivienda 2006: 1 ff.):

- urban problems: urgent need of rehabilitation with regards to energy efficiency, disinvestment, vacancy, deterioration, etc.,
- local economic problems: declining retail, inadequate (local) employment opportunities etc.,
- insufficient utility, social and cultural infrastructure (e.g. lack of meeting places for young people),
- socio-economic problems: low education/training level of the local population, above-average unemployment and reliance on public assistance, loss of purchasing power, poverty, etc.,
- socio-structural problems: social segregation, above-average proportions of population with a migrant background, etc.,
- social problems: concentration of low-income households, conflicts between different ethnic groups, unstable family structures, children and teenagers with school problems, lack of a sense of belonging, isolation, hopelessness and lack of prospects, widespread drug and alcohol abuse, lack of social networks, etc.,
- environmental problems: lack of green and open space, noise and exhaust pollution, etc.

Deprived neighbourhoods can compromise cities' attractiveness and therefore also their competitiveness, ability to integrate as well as public security. Furthermore, many children and teenagers in these urban areas suffer from limited opportunities regarding (further) education and access to the labour market, which, in view of demographic trends in many European countries, is particularly problematic.

At least since the late 1990s, it has been observed with a growing concern that the cities of Europe are not only places where economic, social and spatial development is most distinct, but also bear the brunt of social polarization and socio-spatial division. The European Commission has underlined these correlations in several publications since 1999. EU presidencies, especially those of France in 2000, the Netherlands in 2004 and Great Britain in 2005, have also pointed this out. The *Lille Action Programme* sets economic development and overcoming discrimination and exclusion as essential aspects of sustainable urban development (Lille Priorities 2000; EU Commission 2000). They were also adopted at the heart of the *Rotterdam Urban Acquis* (BZK 2005: 2) and addressed in the 2005 *Bristol Accord* under the British EU Presidency (ODPM 2005a: 7; Swianiewicz/Atkinson/Baucz 2011: 8). The same applies to the conclusions of the Finnish presidency in 2006, where not only the importance of economically powerful cities at regional scale is emphasized, but also social cohesion and participatory governance (MIF 2006). Adopted during the German EU Presidency in 2007, the LEIPZIG CHARTER finally ensured the instrument of integrated urban (district) development special attention.

### 3 Integrated urban (district) development policy as an instrument of sustainable urban development



The background paper for the LEIPZIG CHARTER, “Integrated urban development as a prerequisite for successful urban sustainability” (BMVBS 2007), suggested that integrated approaches should be understood as a spatial, temporal and thematic coordination and integration of different policy areas for action and sectoral planning, through which precise goals should be defined by (financial) instruments. An early and full implication of all relevant stakeholders for sustainable urban development – including those beyond the political and administrative realm, such as the civil society and economic actors, and especially the local population – also plays a prominent role. The issues at stake include:

- moving away from a strictly “top down” approach in favour of strengthening “bottom up” approaches and the interaction between the two,
- orientation of the objectives, strategies, measures and projects in specific areas keeping in mind city-wide and (in some cases) regional approaches,
- a stronger focus of sectoral policies and action fields on problems and potentials which can be identified in urban areas, such as the problem of socio-spatial exclusion which affects all policy areas.

In practice, integrated approaches to urban (district) development are carried out in a specific area-based approach, bringing together resources and requiring the intense involvement of a wide range of stakeholders, including those beyond the political and administrative realms, as well as fitting administrative and organizational structures. This entire process should be based upon an integrated development plan.

### Area-based approach

An area-based approach provides not only a basis for the identification of problems and potentials of individual urban areas (neighbourhoods), but also for communication and cooperation between all actors involved. It is at the same time both the starting point and focus of integrated approaches to the urban (district) development. Only an area-based approach can provide the opportunity of overcoming target-group-related, and therefore limited, sectoral policies.

### Pooling resources

A prerequisite for the success of integrated urban (district) development is the multi-disciplinary collaboration of political and administrative control levels (EU, national, regional, local). National programmes should be better coordinated, EU funding programmes integrated to national settings, local budgets from different subject areas linked one to another and brought in line with funding programmes. The integration of non-governmental resources – in particular of private companies and foundations – is increasingly playing an important role. Pooling resources also means improving cooperation content-wise between different authorities or administrative areas – by all means in the interaction of the different levels of the EU, national state, region and local authority (“multi-level governance”; cf. also Swianiewicz/Atkinson/Baucz 2011: 7). Overall, a more efficient use of the scarce resources at hand should be achieved by combining them, in particular given the current financial crisis context (cf. EU Commission 2010).

### Activation and participation, empowerment

Equally important is the inclusion of local residents and entrepreneurs in urban (district) development. Not only are they experts of the situation on the ground, its problems and potentials, but their everyday life also creates their community’s development. Tools supporting participatory processes therefore need to be continually refined and developed in order to meet the specific requirements of participation, particularly of children, teenagers and inhabitants with immigrant backgrounds as well as local entrepreneurs. The same is true for strategies and instruments supporting activation and empowerment. Furthermore, social institutions, associations and local initiatives should also be extensively involved at neighbourhood level to strengthen civil engagement.

Successful activation and participation relies on the assumption that all parties involved (politicians, administrators, organizations, interest groups, local residents, economic actors, etc.) have sufficient room to manoeuvre – this also means that cities need to move beyond their sovereign position (“from government to governance”). Experiences in many EU Member States have already shown that inhabitants are increasingly willing to take responsibility for the development of their own town or neighbourhood. Precisely in the case of immediate, small-scale living environments – neighbourhood, district or village – there tends to be a very large commitment.

## Network-oriented administration and organization

The administration and organization of an integrated urban (district) development should address both the problems' complexity and potentials on site. It is important to coordinate cross-departmental collaboration at the administrative level, facilitate communication with and within the local population, to create a network between administration and neighbourhood entities as well as include (local) economic, education/training and other relevant agents in the planning and implementation of projects and activities.

## Integrated development concept

Ideally, the implementation of an integrated urban development should be based upon an integrated development concept which would include a presentation of the strengths and weaknesses of the whole city and neighbourhoods, (attainable) goals for various areas, the possibility of using combined public and private financial resources as well as a network of policy areas and actors in the political and administrative realm ("planning from a single source") which also includes citizen, economic actors' and others' participation.

Such an integrated urban development policy would be an appropriate tool to promote efficient urban areas, attenuate socio-spatial exclusion patterns and develop deprived people and disadvantaged neighbourhoods' potentials for social and spatial integration.

# 4 Five years after the LEIPZIG CHARTER – developments in Europe

From the very start, the LEIPZIG CHARTER was considered as a strategic step towards realizing the European sustainable development strategy with the main objectives of “economic prosperity”, “social equity and cohesion” and “environmental protection” (cf. ER 2005a and 2006). Five years later, it is also necessary to include the three “Europe 2020” priorities induced by the financial and economic crisis: “smart growth”, “sustainable growth” and “inclusive growth” (cf. EU Commission 2010).

Since the German EU Presidency in the first half of 2007, the process initiated by the LEIPZIG CHARTER was further developed by the latter EU presidencies and implementation instruments. The “First Action Programme for the Implementation of the Territorial Agenda of the European Union (AP1)” was thus launched during the Portuguese EU Council Presidency (second half of 2007). Running until 2011, it supported the European member states and institutions in their implementation stages of the Territorial Agenda and the LEIPZIG CHARTER, as well as summarised the various activities under one same roof. Additionally, the “Network of Territorial Cohesion Contact Points (NTCCP)” was established as a communication tool.

Following the “First Action Programme (AP1)”, the Slovenian EU presidency in the first half of 2008 presented an interim report on the “Coordination between Territorial and Urban Development”. In light of the Territorial Agenda and the LEIPZIG CHARTER, it was created to serve as a basis for further consultation by forthcoming EU Presidencies (MOP 2008a).

During the French EU Presidency in the second half of 2008, the ministers in charge of urban development adopted the *Marseille Statement* in which they renewed the LEIPZIG CHARTER demands and the promotion of an integrated urban development policy emphasized by the cohesion policy. Specifically, the document pointed out that given the “financial economic and social crises”, the strategy of a “sustainable and cohesive urban development” should be fostered in order “to maintain new growth without creating any territorial and social disparities” (MS 2008: 2).

The essential idea of the LEIPZIG CHARTER – economic growth and overcoming social and spatial discrimination – is explicitly expressed in the *Marseille Statement*: “Cities will have to deal with the tensions and risks of fragmentation (...) while simultaneously searching for excellence, integrating new sections of the population and showing solidarity with the most vulnerable people” (MS 2008: 3). A sustainable and inclusive urban development can only be achieved with a multi-sectoral, integrated approach (ibid.).

In particular, it should improve deprived groups’ access to (further) education and employment as well as provide affordable housing and good transport mobility. “Such an integrated approach helps prevent the social inequalities that might represent a hindrance to innovation, economic prosperity and our ability to live together.” (ibid.) Likewise, a multi-level approach to participatory governance is emphasized: neighbourhood, city and (urban) region must be taken into account just as much as the national and European levels (ibid.: 4).

Against this background, the *Marseille Statement* draws special attention to the implementation of the LEIPZIG CHARTER with a focus on deprived neighbourhoods “where the future of the cities is at stake, for a large part” (MS 2008: 4). The ministers decided to prepare by the end of 2011 and under French leadership a “Reference Framework for European Sustainable Cities [RFSC]” in order to implement requirements of the LEIPZIG CHARTER into local practice (<http://www.rfsustainablecities.eu/>). The RFSC “serves to spread integrated urban development approaches in Europe and to provide all stakeholders involved with a tool helping them to assess urban development objectives, methods and measures in the context of the LEIPZIG CHARTER and sustainable development. The Reference Framework is a web application and mainly addresses local stakeholders.” (BBSR online 2012) Among other areas, it can work on “strategies for sustainable development”, “testing and evaluating integrated approaches”, “deprived neighbourhoods” and “monitoring” (ibid.).

Adopted during the Spanish EU Presidency in the first half of 2010, the *Toledo Declaration* reiterates the importance of integrated approaches to urban development as a strategic instrument fitting the “Europe 2020” strategy to achieve a sustainable, socially inclusive and intelligent growing city (cf. EU Commission 2010). Above all, this would require the implementation of the organizational structures of multi-level governance presented in the LEIPZIG CHARTER in order to also use existing resources more efficiently in the face of the current financial crisis (TD 2010: IV ff.; TRD 2010: 4). Criteria for success include openness in political life and administration as well as the intense activation and participation of local residents and other actors (TRD 2010: 4). New partnerships between government, real estate and finance, local population and other stakeholders must also be built (TRD 2010: 9). Overall, it has been found in the *Toledo Declaration* that the objectives of the LEIPZIG CHARTER have not yet been put into practice, partly as there is still no common understanding of integrated urban (district) development. The core elements of this approach were therefore reminded (cf. TRD 2010: 5 f.):

- a holistic approach, running through all relevant topics and policy areas,
- horizontal networking within the levels involved (EU, nation-state, region, local authority, neighbourhood), vertical networking between these levels,
- strategic planning at citywide level by means of an integrated urban development concept,
- linking the integrated approach to an area-based approach/spatial perspective,
- linking the integrated approach to the aim of inclusion.

Among others, it addresses the challenges of demographic change as well as of inclusion and social cohesion and counteracts the threat of deepening social polarization with its socio-spatial consequences. The “Europe 2020” strategy formulates, among other, the objectives of increasing employment levels, reducing school dropout rates and lower poverty risk (EU Commission 2010: 8 f.). In detail, it addresses the integration of immigrants, educational opportunities, need-based social services, improvement of built/urban structures, etc. (TRD 2010: 2 f.). Regarding climate change, the targets part of an integrated urban (district) development include increasing energy efficiency of the built structures and improve links to public transport systems, especially in deprived neighbourhoods (TRD 2010: 1 f.). From an economic perspective – and taking into account the economic crisis context –, it is necessary to provide for employment growth and mitigate recession impacts, especially in deprived neighbourhoods (TRD 2010: 3). These should not be considered as a “problem” but rather as spaces with social and physical potential which need to be developed (TRD 2010: 7).

The continuous development of integrated approaches to urban (district) development at EU level meets a heterogeneous spectrum of policies, programmes, projects and activities in the different member states or EU candidate countries. This can be attributed to the fact that there is no single urban model in Europe – environments, problems and potentials differ not only from country to country, but also from city to city. On top of this, urban policy has a different relevance in the various EU member states, its candidate countries as well as in Norway and Switzerland, and is therefore not supported to the same extent at national level. The following comparative presentations of integrated urban (district) development shows a strongly summarized state of developments since the adoption of the LEIPZIG CHARTER early 2007.

5 Integrated urban development  
in the 27 member states of the EU,  
its candidate countries and in  
Norway and Switzerland

To meet the occasionally large differences in approaches to integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods), this study classifies the countries into three groups, according to the role of the national level as a potential “engine” for integrative processes:

- Group A compiles descriptions of countries with comprehensive national programmes for integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods).
- Group B includes countries with national or regional programmes or with national guidelines for integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods).
- Group C presents countries with predominantly local approaches to integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods).

The presentations of the countries are based on the following questions to ensure that they remain comparable:

- Which policies, national programmes and/or regional or local approaches to integrated, area-based development of deprived neighbourhoods are implemented a) at national level and/or b) at regional level and/or c)

in each city? How important is the national level as a driving force?

- What are the main objectives?
- Following the implementation of integrated, area-based approaches to the development of deprived neighbourhoods, have new forms of cross-political or inter-departmental cooperation at national, regional and/or local level emerged (“multi-level governance”)? What role do “top down” and “bottom up” approaches play?
- To what extent have the different political fields of deprived neighbourhoods’ development been integrated?
- To what extent are the various financing possibilities at hand used for, or focused on, integrated urban (district)?
- How important are activation, participation and empowerment in integrated approaches to the development of deprived neighbourhoods?
- What significance is given to the cooperation between administration, business, residents and other (local) actors?
- What is the role of a social-/area-based approach in integrated approaches to the development of deprived neighbourhoods?

## A Countries with comprehensive national programmes for integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods)

### Belgium

A densely urbanised country, Belgium has launched integrated urban development programmes at national and regional level since the early 1990s. The Federal Government and the three Regions have each developed their own approaches but all promote a sustainable development of the metropolitan areas, social cohesion, upgraded public spaces and increased security. From the start, they have sought to reverse migration trends out of central urban areas and thus strengthen their economy. Only recently has urban depopulation been stopped and instead turned into a considerable demographic growth, especially among the immigrant population. While special attention is still being paid to coping with the concentration of problems in deprived neighbourhoods, regional programmes are focus today more on the development of city centres and urban renewal.

To coordinate “on the ground” this multi-level approach of federal, regional and local programmes – and often in combination with European grants –, cities have created special services to integrate the different approaches into a single, comprehensive urban development programme. Between the national and regional levels, agreements are made by the Interministerial Conference Housing and Urban Policy.

At national level, the *Federal Big City Policy (Grootstedensbeleid/Politique des Grandes Villes)* was launched in 2000 to support cities most affected by deprived neighbourhoods. From 2000 to 2012, approximately 800 million euros were made available to 17 cities and municipalities throughout the country. The current city-contracts subsidized by the federal state (*Sustainable Cities contracts*) mainly seek to strengthen social cohesion, foster housing renovation, fight against climate change and reduce the “ecological

footprint” as well as to promote cities’ attractiveness. (cf. EUKN 2011: 11; MVIV 2010: 42; Ville Durable; Vranken et al. 2001: 28).

Other initiatives of the federal urban development policy are programmes for mediation between offenders and victims of small nuisances, employment of young unemployed beneath 26 years in communal projects, integration of regularized asylum seekers and a transversal coordination of sectorial policies oriented to cities on the federal level.

In Flanders, the *Stedenfonds (Urban Fund)* was launched in 2003 as a lever to (further) develop innovative measures, pilot projects as well as to develop complementary and integrated actions with and between different policy sectors. Since 2007, the Flemish Region has also signed contracts with 13 major cities (*City contracts, 2007–2012*). Their objective is to strengthen and improve strategic urban development projects as well as to provide a more coherent regional support. In 2012, an evaluation process took place to let the city contract evolve to more durable and negotiated city programmes. The Flemish government also supports a series of urban renewal projects (*Decree on supporting Urban Renewal Projects*): project subventions support the implementation of sustainable urban renewal projects, conceptual grants help improve urban renewal projects in the urban design, participation process, public-private partnerships as well as a durable energy vision. Urban policy in Flanders furthermore supports innovative citizens partnership projects with a yearly call (cf. Thuis in de stad; EUKN 2011: 11; MVIV 2010: 51, 59; Vranken et al. 2001: 29 f., Burgers 2004: 92 f.; Loopmans et al. 2004: 69).

The Brussels Capital Region started in 1994 urban renewal programmes called *Contrats de quartiers (District Contracts)* that aimed to develop cooperation between the metropolitan area and local authorities in addressing deprived neighbourhoods. Each year, four-year contracts are signed with four new neighbourhoods. The first *contrat de quartier* was signed in 1994, followed by a second round in 1997 and since 1999, new contracts have been signed every year. In addition to the constructional and urban development priorities such as improving the supply of housing, public space and social and cultural infrastructure, the implementation of *Contrats de quartiers* gave citizen mobilisation and participation as well as appropriate management and organisational structures a more prominent role (cf. *Contrats de Quartiers Durables*; EUKN 2011: 11; MVIV 2010: 39, 59; Noel 2009).

For many years, Wallonia has implemented an integrated urban development policy through urban renewal actions. These take the form of a global and concerted planning, aiming at restructuring, improving or rehabilitating deprived neighbourhoods in order to maintain or to promote development of the local population. The objective is also to promote its social, economic and cultural functions while respecting its cultural and architectural characteristics. The ambition of this *neighbourhood project (projet de quartier)* is to be concretely achieved through actions on housing (construction, renovation), development of public and green spaces as well as the creation of (local) businesses. Since 1994, Wallonia has established a focus on deprived neighbourhoods and urban centres areas that were identified as *Zones d’Initiatives Privilégiées (ZIP – preferred initiatives areas)*. The aim of this programme is to allow specific budgets to increase the conversion of deprived neighbourhoods (including neighbourhoods where the physical and progressive degradation of housing leads to the desertion of their inhabitants and to the rise of social problems). In urban renewal actions, the intervention rate of Wallonia in housing has increased from 75% to 90%. In addition, the *neighbourhood project* is a framework document that allows the integration of other actions, either public (especially requalification of brownfields) or public-private partnership such as “urban revitalisation operations”. Since 2009, and for the first time, the Walloon government has a Minister of the City (cf. EUKN 2011: 12; De Brabander 1998: 51).

## References

- Bruxelles, Villes Durable [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.villedurable.be> (Accessed: 5/2012).
- Burgers, Jack, and Jan Vranken (Eds.) (2004): How to make a successful Urban Development Programme. Experiences from nine European countries. Antwerpen: 91–93.
- Contrats de Quartiers Durables [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.wijken.irisnet.be>
- De Brabander, Guido (1998): Belgium. In: Euricur – European Institute for Comparative Urban Research, Erasmus University Rotterdam (Ed.): National Urban Policies in the European Union. Responses to urban issues in the fifteen member states. Eds.: Leo van den Berg, Erik Braun, Jan van der Meer. Rotterdam: 36–54.
- EUKN – European Urban Knowledge Network (2011): Urban Development in Europe. A Survey of National Approaches to Urban Policy in 15 Member States. The Hague.
- Loopmans, Maarten, Sarah Luyten and Christian Kesteloot (2004): Urban policies in Belgium: a puff-pastry with a bittersweet aftertaste? In: Euricur – European Institute for Comparative Urban Research, Erasmus University Rotterdam (Ed.): National Urban Policies in the European Union. Eds.: Leo van den Berg, Erik Braun, Jan van der Meer. Rotterdam: 68–69.



MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.

Noel, Françoise (2009): La Politique de revitalisation des quartiers: à la croisée de l'action urbanistique et sociale. In: Piéree Dejemeppe et al.: Bruxelles [dans] 20 ans. Bruxelles.

This in de stad [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.thisindestad.be> (Accessed: 5/2012).

Vranken, Jan, Pascal de Decker and Inge van Nieuwenhuyze (2001): National City Contexts, Urban Development Programmes and Neighbourhood Selections. The Flemish (Belgian) Background Report. A working paper for UGIS. Antwerpen.

Large sections of this text were written by the Belgian POD (Programma-torische Federale Overheidsdienst) Maatschappelijke Integratie, Armoedebe-strijding, Sociale Economie en Grootstedenbeleid.

## Denmark

In Denmark, the urban redevelopment agenda takes into account issues of urban renewal (regeneration and up-grading of old town areas, modernisation of the housing stock), increasing energy efficiency of buildings, and above all social cohesion and development of deprived neigh-bourhoods. Different political strategies have been engaged, namely housing and land policy, cultural heritage preser-vation, fight against climate change and reducing social exclusion (cf. EUKN 2011: 31 ff.; MVIV 2010: 152 ff.).

The urban development policy at national level being a shared responsibility between several ministries (depend-ing on programmes in the fields of construction, housing, environment, integration, social and/or interior), an inter-ministerial *Urban Committee* was created in 1993. The main legal basis for urban development is the Planning Act, ac-cording to which Danish municipalities are required to es-tablish a comprehensive urban development plan (*Kom-muneplan*) as well as local plans. Urban development plans range from strategic guiding principles and “classic” urban development concepts to specific usage definition – all of which include participation as the norm (cf. EUKN 2011: 32 ff.).

In Denmark, integrated approaches to urban development are found particularly in connection to renewal of deprived neighbourhoods. These are primarily addressed at public housing estates with a high share of social housing dating from the 1960s through to the 1980s, as well as older inner-city residential neighbourhoods (mainly in Copenhagen). In both types of areas, an above-average share of unem-ployed and recipients of government transfer are part of the main issues. In recent years, the proportion of refugees and immigrants in the resident population of social hous-ing areas has greatly increased – in several places, this has been assorted to social tensions. Several older inner-city residential neighbourhoods are faced with serious architec-tural and urban deficits. Both types of areas usually suffer

from a negative image (cf. EUKN 2011: 32; Franke/Strauss 2005: 14; Skifter Andersen 2002: 8 f.; 2010: 115 ff.).

In response to the emergence of these spatially concen-trated challenges, the integrated area-based programme *Kvarterløft* was launched in 1996 at national level (expiring in 2007). The core idea of the programme was the cross-sectoral combination of different aids addressed at target groups and specific areas in an integrated strategy with a strong involvement of the local community. *Kvarterløft* dis-tinguished itself by succeeding in implementing the three principles cross-sectoral approach, cooperation between local administration and residents, local entrepreneurs and other actors as well as their involvement in neighbour-hood development (cf. Leonardsen et al. 2003: 8). The programme implementation was divided in three phases: participatory planning, participatory implementation and consolidation (ibid.: 13 f.). Approximately 160 million euros from state and municipal funds for the first and second round of the *Kvarterløft* programme were made available to the twelve participating areas (ibid.: 7). Alongside *Kvarterløft*, the *Områdefornyelse* (“Area Renewal”) and *Partnerskabsprojekter* (“Partnership Projects”) programmes were initiated in 2004. Although being granted less funds, these programmes were designed to further pursue – in principle – the *Kvarterløft* strategy. From 2007 onwards, the *Kvarterløft* and *Områdefornyelse* integrated urban development initiatives were conducted under the common denomination *Områdeløft* (City of Copenhagen 2007: 4).

In October 2010, *Områdeløft* was replaced by a new “Ghetto Strategy” (*ghetto-strategi*). A particular focus of the new ap-proach was to achieve greater diversity in the social struc-ture in the 29 programme areas. Amongst other policies, this was to be implemented through a socially fair assign-ment policy of housing companies, a greater diversity of housing for sale and to rent as well as cutting allocations for immigrants from non-EU countries and refugees in deprived neighbourhoods. The architectural and urban

projects included residential environment improvements in order as to increase attractiveness of deprived neighbourhoods, measures for renovation and modernisation as well as strategic dismantling of housing. In the field of social integration – among other activities and projects for the disadvantaged and to promote social support for children and young people – were for example put on the agenda bilingual day care facilities and full-time schools. A great importance was given to language training, also for parents. Training, employment and placement in the regular labour market were key aspects, which is why Job Centres have been established in all deprived neighbourhoods. These measures and projects were supported by a reinforced police presence, increased CCTV in public spaces and an acceleration of law enforcement processes in all neighbourhoods concerned (Social- og Integrationsministeriet n.d.).

An integrated programme in which all the challenges of (deprived) neighbourhoods are addressed is considered an essential condition for a successful urban (district) development (MVIV 2010: 166). The center-left government in office since September 2011 agreed in November 2011 upon a new framework for action which focuses on large investments for redevelopment measures.

## Finland

The key issues of an integrated urban development policy in Finland include the improvement of economic competitiveness, employment security and strengthening of the labour market, improving the quality of public spaces, residential areas and the urban environment as well as issues of mobility and connecting different districts. In doing so, the LEIPZIG CHARTER is considered as an important guideline and reference for the implementation of appropriate approaches at national, regional and local level (cf. MVIV 2010: 216; Sisäasiainministeriö 2007). This is accompanied at national level by a central steering committee –

## References

- BMVBS – Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (Ed.) (2012): Sicherung tragfähiger Strukturen für die Quartiersentwicklung im Programm Soziale Stadt. Reihe Forschungen, Heft 153. Berlin.
- City of Copenhagen. The Technical and Environmental Administration (Ed.) (2007): Områdeløft in Copenhagen. Copenhagen.
- EUKN – European Urban Knowledge Network (2011): Urban Development in Europe. A Survey of National Approaches to Urban Policy in 15 Member States. The Hague.
- Franke, Thomas, and Wolf-Christian Strauss (2005): Management gebietsbezogener integrativer Stadtteilentwicklung. Ansätze in Kopenhagen und Wien im Vergleich zur Programmumsetzung „Soziale Stadt“ in deutschen Städten. Difu-Materialien 8/2005. Berlin.
- Leonardsen, Lykke, Lasse Matthiessen, Jakob Klint, Gertrud Jørgensen, Gerdt Larsen and Kim Spiegelberg-Larsen (2003): The Danish Neighbourhood Regeneration Programme. Kvarterløft in Copenhagen. The Copenhagen report of the ENTRUST study. August 2003 [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://ensure.org/entrust/cases/copenhagen/> (Accessed: 3/2005).
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Skifter Andersen, Hans (2010): Contextualising ethnic residential segregation in Denmark: welfare, housing and immigration. In: Roger Andersson, Hanna Dhalmann, Emma Holmqvist, Timo M. Kauppinen, Lena Magnusson Turner, Hans Skifter Andersen, Susanne Søholt, Mari Vaattovaara, Katja Vilkkama, Terje Wessel, Saara Yousfi (2010): Immigration, housing and segregation in the Nordic welfare states. Department of Geosciences and Geography, Faculty of Science, University of Helsinki: 81–123.
- Skifter Andersen, Hans (2002): Can Deprived Housing Areas Be Revitalised? Efforts Against Segregation and Neighbourhood Decay in Denmark and Europe. *Urban Studies* 39 (4) 2002.
- Socialministeriet (2010): Ghettoen tilbage til samfundet. København.
- Social- og Integrationsministeriet (n.d.): De 32 initiativer i regeringens ghetto-strategi [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.sm.dk/data/Dokumentertilnyheder/2010/Oversigt%20over%20initiativer%20i%20ghettostrategien.pdf> (Accessed: 2/2012).

the interdepartmental *Finnish Committee for Urban Policy* –, which is responsible for strengthening the network of Finnish cities, coordinating approaches to integrated urban development, monitoring the implementation of various policies, ensuring cooperation between national administrations and urban areas as well as generally developing a platform for exchange of experiences (cf. TEM 2011).

At national level, Finland launched in 2008 the *Lähiöohjelma* area-based suburban revitalisation programme and implemented it in 12 cities (45 neighbourhoods) until 2011. In

collaboration with local governments, the Third sector and local residents, the overall goal of this programme was to improve the districts' competitiveness, clean up their image, reinforce local identity and prevent segregation and discrimination (cf. Ympäristöministeriö 2008: 5 ff.). For this purpose, city districts were apprehended as strategic focus points for an integrated urban development, and political action of the local practice was taken into account. The objectives included improving living conditions in the neighbourhoods, residents' participation, building networks, differentiating the social structure and housing types on offer, integrating different population groups, strengthening the local economy and improving infrastructural facilities, job creation and employment opportunities, education and training, rehabilitation and modernisation of existing buildings, improving the urban environment, open and public spaces, increasing the sense of security, improving transport links (local public transport, cycling) as well as improving public relations (cf. Ympäristöministeriö 2008: 9 ff.). At local level, the City of Helsinki started in 2006 a similar approach under the title "Renaissance of the suburbs" (*Esikaupunkien Renessa*; cf. Helsingin kaupunki). The extension of the *Lähiöohjelma* programme or similar approaches is currently under consideration.

In addition to this programme, there is a large number of policies relevant to urban development in Finland at national level. This includes, for example, a metropolitan policy (*Metropolipolitiikka/Suurten kaupunkiseutujen*) launched in 2007 by the Ministry of the Interior which, in addition to issues of economic competitiveness, labour market, urban land use and mobility planning, also addresses topics including municipal housing policy, segregation and immigration. It also integrates into the policy approach the experience acquired in implementing the EU Community Initiatives *URBAN I* and *II* in the Helsinki-Vantaa region (cf. Sisäasiainministeriö 2006: 32 ff.). Meanwhile, the metropolitan policy was extended to medium-sized towns and cities. It is also planned at national level to implement quasi-contractual agreements with various metropolitan areas based on "letters of intent" for urban development-related projects (cf. Valtiontalouden tarkastusviraston 2011: 7 ff.). Moreover, an increase from 5% to 10% of the share of the urban dimension within the use of EU structural funds is currently being considered in order as to strengthen the metropolitan areas.

The regional level also plays an important role in Finland. As most Finnish cities are relatively small, urban policy in Finland tends in many places to be part of regional or rural policy approaches. Regions where are located larger cities are considered particularly important. Here, within the framework of the *Centre of Expertise Programme* and the *Regional Centre Programme*, a special emphasis has been set on the protection of international economic competitiveness through an integrated "policy mix", with the government channeling investments in metropolitan areas through regional development strategies (cf. OSKE, RCP).

## References

- Helsingin kaupunki – kaupunkisuunnitteluvirasto: Esikaupunkien Renessanssi [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.esikaupunki.hel.fi/> (Accessed: 2/2012).
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- OSKE – Osaamiskeskusohjelma: Centre of Expertise – The key to successful cooperation [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.oske.net/en/centres\\_of\\_expertise/](http://www.oske.net/en/centres_of_expertise/) (Accessed: 2/2012).
- RCP – Regional Centre Programme: Expertise – Specialisation – Co-operation – Networking – Vitality – Welfare [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.intermin.fi/intermin/hankkeet/aky/home.nsf/pages/indexeng> (Accessed: 2/2012).
- Sisäasiainministeriö – Sisäasiainministeriö/Alueiden ja hallinnon kehittämisosasto (2007): Mitä Leipzigin prosessin jälkeen: eurooppalaisten yleisperiaatteiden hyödyntäminen Suomen kaupunkien kehittämisessä. Muistio OV/26.10.2007 [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.tem.fi/files/18187/leipzigin\\_peruskirjan\\_hyodyntaminen\\_26102007.pdf](http://www.tem.fi/files/18187/leipzigin_peruskirjan_hyodyntaminen_26102007.pdf) (Accessed: 2/2012).
- Sisäasiainministeriö – Sisäasiainministeriö/Alueiden kehittäminen (Ed.) (2006): Suurten kaupunkiseutujen Poliittikkakokonaisuus. Helsinki.
- TEM – Työ- ja elinkeinoministeriö (2011): Kaupunkipolitiikan yhteistyöryhmä. 3.11.2011 [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.tem.fi/files/31099/Kaupunkipolitiikan\\_yhteistyoryhman\\_asettamispaatos.pdf](http://www.tem.fi/files/31099/Kaupunkipolitiikan_yhteistyoryhman_asettamispaatos.pdf) (Accessed: 2/2012).
- Valtiontalouden tarkastusviraston (Ed.) (2011): Kaupunki- ja metropolipolitiikka. Tuloksellisuustarkastuskertomus 224/2011. Helsinki.
- Ympäristöministeriö – Ministry of the Environment (Ed.) (2008): Lähiöstä kaupunginosiksi. Lähiöohjelma 2008–2011. Ympäristöministeriön Raportteja 17/2008. Helsinki.

## France (with case study Lyon – Pentès de la Croix-Rousse)

In France, integrated approaches to urban renewal seek to promote inner city centres, modernize the existing building stock, achieve a greater social mixing of the urban population and improve living conditions in deprived neighbourhoods. In general, they focus on development within cities and minimising land use for housing development in the suburbs. In particular, housing policy, sustainable development and reducing social exclusion are interrelated (MVIV 2010: 225 f.)<sup>1)</sup>.

An explicitly integrated urban development policy has been established at national level by the *Ministère de la ville*. Co-ordinated by this ministry, the *Politique de la ville* focuses primarily on improving living conditions in deprived neighbourhoods as well as reducing socio-spatial inequalities in urban areas (Ministère de la ville 2011b). Approximately 2,400 districts are concerned, including 751 “sensitive” deprived urban areas (*zones urbaines sensibles – ZUS*). It mainly addresses large housing estates (*grands ensembles*) built during the 1960s and 1970s in (big) cities’ suburbs. These are characterised by an architectural uniformity, mono-functionality and lack of infrastructure. Originally conceived as modern “dormitory towns”, the *banlieues* now concentrate disadvantaged population groups, many of which with immigrant backgrounds (Ministère de la ville 2011a and 2011b; see also Neumann 2006: 2 ff. as well as *stadt + raum*, undated: 26 f.).

The complex problems in these areas – as well as in deprived inner-city neighbourhoods – are addressed in the context of the *Politique de la ville*. Established in the 1980s with various focus points, it is implemented through an integrated and comprehensive policy approach. It is based on *Contrats Urbain de Cohésion Sociale (CUCS)* which run for a maximum of three years and are agreed upon by the government and municipalities involved. In most cases, local authorities such as the “*Région*”, the “*Département*” or the inter-municipal body are involved in the *CUCS* based on their respective competences. However, these are not supported financially at first as they form the basis for co-ordinating and strengthening the mainstream resources from government and for applications to specific measures and additional funds from government programmes and municipal budgets. On the basis of local action plans, they focus on improving deprived neighbourhoods through

activities and projects in education and youth work, training and employment, housing and living environment, health, local economy, culture, security and crime prevention (cf. *CUCS*) – all with a socio-spatial approach. They also include third parties such as housing and business associations as well as residents in the local implementation of the *Politique de la ville* (cf. Ministère de la ville 2011a and 2011b).

At national level, all the ministries involved are members of the *Comité interministériel des villes (CIV)* – interministerial committee for cities). This committee is called upon twice a year under the auspices of the Prime Minister to decide on programme developments and financial allocations (Ministère de la ville 2011a). It is organised by the General Secretariat of the *CIV (SG-CIV)* which also oversees the programme implementation of two government agencies: *Agence Nationale pour la Rénovation Urbaine (ANRU)*, National Agency for Urban Renewal) and *Agence Nationale pour la Cohésion Sociale et l’Égalité des Chances (ACSE)*, National Agency for Social Cohesion and Equal Opportunities). *ANRU* coordinates the pooling of resources for urban renewal through the *Programme National de Rénovation Urbaine (PNRU)*; urban renewal programme with a 40 billion euros budget for 530 districts) and the *Programme National de Requalification des Quartiers Anciens Dégradés (PNRQAD)*; programme for the regeneration of deprived city historical centres). The agency also serves as a contact point for the local implementation level. *ACSE* brings together at state level the fields of activity of social work, education, crime prevention, economy and employment as well as integration, working closely with *ANRU*. The monitoring and assessment of the *Politique de la ville* is carried out thanks to the *Observatoire National des Zones Urbaines Sensibles (ONZUS)* (cf. MVIV 2010: 227 ff.; Ministère de la ville 2011a and c).

### Implementation of the *Politique de la ville*: the case study of Lyon – Pentès de la Croix-Rousse

Pentès de la Croix-Rousse is a former working class neighbourhood in Lyon’s city centre with a high structural density and a large population. Its topographical situation (plateau on top of a hill) has led to two different trends. A strong gentrification process in the northern part of the area has reshaped the local economy and led to a significant population displacement. The hillside location – accessible by narrow streets and steep stairs – is characterised by the traits of deprived neighbourhoods: lower incomes, high share of precarious workers and unemployed, welfare

1) Parts of the article that do not refer to other sources are based on in-situ interviews carried out with local administrative and neighbourhood stakeholders.

recipients, single parents and foreigners with uncertain residence permit status as well as insecurity notably due to drug trafficking in the neighbourhood. Pentes de la Croix-Rousse is the most important immigration area in the Rhône-Alpes department. At the same time, the area is home to a young middle class – many from the art and theatre scene.

The area is also confronted to architectural and urban problems. In many of the comparatively tall buildings (original storey height of 4 meters or more), owners have built in additional floors. This has led to a population increase in Pentes de la Croix-Rousse without new construction. The cramped, narrow streets are a cause for traffic problems, and for some population groups such as older people, the area is difficult to access because of its topography. Social mixing in this neighbourhood is therefore determined to a large extent by its geographical features. There is a high resident turnover, with approximately 60% of the local population being replaced every five years. Although there has been no detailed study as to understanding which population groups migrate the most, local actors observe that noise (entertainment district) and/or safety problems (drugs) are the main reasons for young families to leave the neighbourhood. One of the strongest potentials of Pentes de la Croix-Rousse is a strong community spirit as well as its large number of civic and social institutions and local organisations.

For the implementation of the *Politique de la Ville* in Lyon, a *CUCS* was agreed to between the French State, the Rhône-Alpes region, the *Département du Rhône*, the Greater Lyon (*Grand Lyon; Communauté urbaine de Lyon*) and the city of Lyon (*Ville de Lyon*). Based on individual programmes, target objectives have been set for the 10 selected areas in Lyon. For Pentes de la Croix-Rousse, these are:

- preservation of the social structure notably through social housing policy,
- development of Pentes de la Croix-Rousse into a liveable neighbourhood,
- development of the local economy,
- considering the needs of vulnerable groups.

From the perspective of local actors, the crucial issue is to maintain the current social structure and mixing as well as to prevent gentrification with its likely displacement effects. Overall, it is also important to overcome the negative image of Pentes de la Croix-Rousse as a first step for local residents' individual development opportunities.



In terms of organisation, the programme is mainly implemented by local, on-site offices in each area (*Missions*; cf. *CUCS*: 97). According to interviewees, the office in Pentes de la Croix-Rousse and all the *Mission Quartiers Anciens* responsible for old neighbourhoods in Lyon are de facto the most important pooling authorities in the city (political and administrative spheres, stakeholders, financial resources). This is due to the fact that the administrative structure and tasks are divided between the metropolitan area (primarily construction and infrastructure), the city of Lyon (social issues etc.) and the nine city districts (*arrondissements*). There is therefore not much joint work – rather, each administrative area remains responsible for its various fields of activity.

The implementation of the *CUCS* is guided by a steering committee which includes representatives of the city of Lyon, *Grand Lyon*, the Rhône-Alpes region and the Rhône department as well as of the respective districts. It holds a

meeting twice a year (cf. CUCS: 96). The organisation of a cross-departmental coordination is however the task of the *Direction du développement territorial*, which is also responsible for the implementation of the CUCS in Lyon. An inter-departmental and cross-stakeholder committee meets once a year (*Programmation*) to judge of policies' and projects' relevance suggested by the *Mission*.

Furthermore, volunteer district councils (*Conseils de quartier*) were also established in these areas, composed of residents and other actors involved in the local development, including local contact people for the administration. In the case of Pentes de la Croix-Rousse, the local government refers to the *Conseil de quartier* in the context of formal participation with five to six meetings per year in their planning process. Meetings between the *Mission* and local initiatives, associations and stakeholders are also regularly held to identify needs and adjust projects in the area if necessary. In general, a distinction must be made between the more intensive involvement of professional actors or institutions/organisations and the participation of neighbourhood residents. Although the relatively intense mobilisation and participation processes in Pentes de la Croix-Rousse have more of "pioneering" role for the city, there is still in Lyon a strong potential for development in this domain.

However, at a time where the administration's plans have not yet been completed and to go beyond a mere municipal information policy, an increased neighbourhood participation is needed. Overall, local stakeholders would like to move from traditional top-down approaches to more participatory governance structures, keeping the management and financing of the *Politique de la Ville* in Lyon in mind.

In conclusion, the French approach to deprived neighbourhoods is done in a complex and integrative way thanks to the CUCS partnership contract which takes into account almost all of the LEIPZIG CHARTER elements. At the same time, this complexity can also become a weakness insofar as competences between the State and local authorities as well as between local authorities themselves need to be

clarified. The diversity of stakeholders and levels involved in the CUCS, and the fact that additional financing facilities can only be developed on the basis of these agreements, lead to a high risk for effects of renewal and participation processes to remain unfulfilled because of lengthy approval processes.

## References

- Badinter, Robert (2011): La politique de la ville: bilan et voies d'évolution des politiques de rénovation et de revitalisation urbaines. Promotion. École Nationale D'Administration. N.p.
- CUCS – Contrat Urbain de Cohesion Sociale de Lyon 2007–2009. Lyon 2007.
- DPSA/Grand Lyon (2008): Politique de la ville: les principaux repères. Lyon.
- durch stadt + raum. Verein für raumbezogene Sozialforschung im Auftrag der Arbeiterkammer Wien (n.d.): Städtestrategien gegen Armut und soziale Ausgrenzung. Herausforderungen für eine sozialverträgliche Stadterneuerungs- und Stadtentwicklungspolitik [Internet]. Wien. URL: [http://wien.arbeiterkammer.at/pictures/d22/Stadtstrategien\\_gegen\\_Armut.pdf](http://wien.arbeiterkammer.at/pictures/d22/Stadtstrategien_gegen_Armut.pdf) (Accessed: 3/2012).
- Lefèvre, Christian (2004): France: metropolitan areas as new "reference territories" for public policies. In: Euricur – European Institute for Comparative Urban Research, Erasmus University Rotterdam (Ed.) (2004): National Urban Policies in the European Union. Eds: Leo van den Berg, Erik Braun, Jan van der Meer. Rotterdam: 74–75.
- Mairie de Lyon (Ed.) (n.d.): Projet de Quartier Lyon Croix-Rousse. 2007–2009 Vers un Quartier où l'on vit mieux ensemble. Lyon.
- Ministère de la ville (2011a): "Politique de la ville": Taking action for the social cohesion of cities [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.ville.gouv.fr/?politique-de-la-ville-taking> (Accessed: 3/2012).
- Ministère de la ville (2011b): Qu'est-ce que la politique de la ville? [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.ville.gouv.fr/?l-essentiel-de-la-politique-de-la> (Accessed: 3/2012).
- Ministère de la ville (2011c): Les missions du SG CIV [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.ville.gouv.fr/?missions,199> (Accessed: 3/2012).
- MVIV – Gobierno de España – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Neumann, Wolfgang (2006): Gesellschaftliche Integration gescheitert? Stadtpolitik in Frankreich vor Herausforderungen in einer neuen Dimension. In: Deutsch-Französisches Institut (Ed.): Aktuelle Frankreich-Analysen Nr. 21. Januar 2006. Ludwigsburg.
- opment (Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung – BMVBS), the Conference of Ministers of Building and Urban Development (Bauministerkonferenz – ARGEBAU), the German Association of Towns and Municipalities (Deutscher Städte- und Gemeindebund – DstGB)

## Germany

In Germany, there are many forms of integrated urban development, both throughout the different programmes of the federal, state and local governments and in many cities' and municipalities' independent strategies. In 2007, the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development

and the German Association of Cities (Deutschen Städtetag – DST) launched an overall framework, the National Urban Development Policy (*Nationale Stadtentwicklungspolitik – NSP*). It aims to bring together actors and interested parties around the topic of the city and is therefore considered as a communication platform, covering current social and urban trends, picking distinctive action and solution approaches (including innovative pilot projects) and serving on the whole as a basis for experience exchange. Issues of civic engagement, new forms of collaboration and participation, social cohesion, innovative economic development, climate protection, building and architectural culture (*Baukultur*) and regional cooperation are more specifically on the agenda (cf. NSP online). A central body for monitoring this policy approach is the committee under the direction of the Minister which, alongside partners of the *National Urban Development Policy*, is also attended by stakeholders from business, academia, associations and other social groups. A working group with representatives of the federal, state and local authorities has furthermore been established to address further development and communication of the *National Urban Development Policy* approaches – for example by the means of events.

Regarding integrated urban (district) development, the Federal and *Länder* governments have a central role. Every year, the Federal Government closes financial support contracts with the *Länder* for investment purposes which are complemented by *Länder* and local governments. These programmes<sup>1)</sup> are aimed at supporting cities in coping with their tasks and challenges (cf. Städtebauförderung online). Among other things, this includes the federal-Länder programme Urban Restructuring in West Germany (*Stadtumbau West*) initiated in 2004 which supports municipalities of the old federal states on the basis of integrated development concepts for the urban management of demographic and economic change (conversion of former industrial and military sites, adapting neighbourhoods to current standards and requirements, etc.; cf. Stadtumbau West online).

1) The urban development assistance helped implement programmes such as the *Urban Rehabilitation and Development Measures (Städtebauliche Sanierungs- und Entwicklungsmaßnahmen)*, *Protection of the Urban Architectural Heritage (Städtebaulicher Denkmalschutz)*, *Social City – investment in neighbourhoods (Soziale Stadt – Investitionen im Quartier)*, *Urban Restructuring in the New Federal States (Stadtumbau Ost)*, *Urban Restructuring in the Old Federal States (Stadtumbau West)*, *Active City and District Centres (Aktive Stadt- und Ortsteilzentren)*, *Small Cities and Municipalities – Supralocal collaboration and network programme (Kleinere Städte und Gemeinden – überörtliche Zusammenarbeit und Netzwerke)* (cf. VV-Städtebauförderung 2012).

Also in the context of urban development, the federal-Länder programme *Urban Restructuring in East Germany (Stadtumbau Ost)* was launched in 2002 with the aim of increasing the attractiveness of East German towns and cities by strengthening their centres, reducing the excess supply of housing as well as taking into account the processes and effects of shrinking cities. On the basis of integrated urban development concepts and comprehensive public participation, this includes identifying new uses for residential, industrial, transportation and military sites, designing open spaces, adapting urban infrastructures to current needs as well as regenerating and upgrading existing buildings. Above all, the dismantling of buildings and infrastructure no longer required still plays a relatively important role in East German municipalities (cf. Stadtumbau Ost online).

Since 1999, a more integrated approach has been developed with the *Federal-Länder Districts with Special Development Needs – the Socially Integrative City* programme (*Stadtteile mit besonderem Entwicklungsbedarf – Soziale Stadt*), further developed in 2012 into the *Social City – Investing in the Neighbourhoods* programme (*Soziale Stadt – Investitionen im Quartier*). It aims to improve living conditions in deprived neighbourhoods through an integrated approach and to break the “downward spiral” of negative social, economic, urban, infrastructure and ecological developments observed in many places. This is to be achieved through innovative forms of network- and spatial-oriented management, an intensive activation and participation of local actors – primarily local residents – and by integrating different funding sources. More precisely, it will address the improvement of housing conditions, the living environment and public space as well as social infrastructure, open spaces and playing areas. Until 2011, structures strengthening the local economy and promoting health, mobility and local culture were promoted as well as those supporting the availability of education and training opportunities and the integration of immigrants (BMVBS 2011d: 26 f.). The *Social City – Investing in the Neighbourhoods* programme should also contribute through urban investments to improving living standards and diversity of use, enhancing intergenerational equity and integrating all (local) population groups (cf. VV-Städtebauförderung 2012: Art. 4). The implementation of the programme was and is based on integrated development concepts jointly prepared and adapted by local authorities and stakeholders.

Although many municipalities, whose autonomy is enshrined in the constitution, have implemented independent models and programmes for integrated urban (district) development – such as Hamburg, Leipzig and Munich –, the above-mentioned programmes still remain the most

powerful engine for the dissemination of integrated approaches at local level (cf. BMVBS/BBSR 2009).

## References

BMVBS/BBSR – Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (BMVBS) and Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung (BBSR) im Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (BBR) (Eds.) (2009): Integrierte Stadtentwicklung in Stadtregionen. BBSR-Online-Publikation, Nr. 37/2009. Bonn (Eds.: Thomas Franke, Franciska Frölich-von Bodelschwingh, Wolf-Christian Strauss, Lars Wagenknecht, Ulrich Dilger).

NSP online – Nationale Stadtentwicklungspolitik [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.nationale-stadtentwicklungspolitik.de/cln\\_031/sid\\_451AC5BABB44BD5C30CD5AE8B34828Fo/DE/Home/homepage\\_\\_node.html?\\_\\_nnn=true](http://www.nationale-stadtentwicklungspolitik.de/cln_031/sid_451AC5BABB44BD5C30CD5AE8B34828Fo/DE/Home/homepage__node.html?__nnn=true) (Accessed: 5/2012).

Stadtumbau Ost online [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.stadtumbau-ost.info/> (Accessed: 5/2012).

Stadtumbau West online [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.stadtumbauwest.de/> (Accessed: 5/2012).

VV-Städtebauförderung 2012 – Verwaltungsvereinbarung Städtebauförderung 2012 über die Gewährung von Finanzhilfen des Bundes an die Länder nach Artikel 104 b des Grundgesetzes zur Förderung städtebaulicher Maßnahmen (VV Städtebauförderung 2012) vom 16.12.2011/4.4.2012.

## Ireland

In 2003, the Irish government adopted the 2002–2020 *National Spatial Strategy (NSS)*. This national planning framework is under the responsibility of the Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government. It seeks to achieve a balanced social, economic and structural development of the urban and rural areas of Ireland by an integrated approach. The different regions should be developed competitively, according to their respective strengths and performances. A network of key spatial development priorities – gateways (nine large and medium cities) and hubs (18 towns) – has been identified for which their attractiveness in terms of living and working conditions should be improved. The implementation of the strategy is carried out through national, regional and local (framework) plans (*NDP – National Development Plan 2007–2013, Regional Planning Guidelines, Integrated Planning Frameworks*) (Department of the Environment and Local Government n.d.).

At national level, the implementation of the strategy will be supported and accompanied by the *Revitalising Areas by Planning, Investment and Development (RAPID)* initiative launched in 2001 by the Irish government. Managed by the Department of the Environment Community and Local Government, this programme aims to focus available remaining *NDP* state funds (mainstream support) on the 52 most disadvantaged urban areas and provincial towns in Ireland. The *RAPID* programme disposes only to a limited extent itself on resources that can be used for small projects to improve the architectural and social infrastructure in target areas (e.g. construction of playgrounds, improving road safety, support of health initiatives). In each area, a cross-sectoral Area Implementation Team (AIT) has been established to develop an implementation plan of the programme including a participation of state agencies, local partnerships as well as residents (cf. Fahey et al 2011: 26; Fitzpatrick/Associates 2006; Pobal).

This area-based approach is a response to Ireland's dynamic yet unequal economic development in the 1990s, whereby not all regions and urban areas of the country benefited from its positive effects. Areas of dereliction, lacking infrastructure and investment, and marked by unemployment and poverty are found in particular in Dublin and its surrounding region (Greater Dublin), which is home to approximately 40% of the country's population. Most of these areas are in city centres and peripheral areas.

At local level, implementing the *NSS* has played a key role in urban renewal, mainly in deprived neighbourhoods and in government-subsidised housing. As such, urban renewal in Ireland seeks to achieve an integrative approach and does not limit its scope of action simply to structural measures, but also takes into account issues such as employment and training, social cohesion, school and education, crime prevention, local economy (Instituto Universitario de Urbanística de la Universidad de Valladolid 2010: 34). Deprived areas being often located close to important and central city areas, it is expected that their development will contribute to the overall urban quality (cf. Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government/ Forfás 2006: 122).

The development of deprived neighbourhoods in Ireland relies on years of experience. Since the late 1990s, *Integrated Area Plan (IAP)* based on a concept elaborated by the Ministry for Housing and Urban Regeneration have been developed with the participation of residents and local initiatives (cf. Bannon 2004; Entrust 2003). Local partnerships (with residents, social agencies and institutions, local administrations, etc.) are established for the development and implementation of an *IAP*. These should mobilise local interests and stakeholders as well as initiate bottom-up processes in the district endorsed by the government



(cf. Entrust 2003: 13). Urban regeneration in deprived areas has also been for a long time supported and accompanied by tax incentives for private investment in housing construction or rehabilitation (cf. Norris/Gkartios 2009; Fahey et al 2011: 26 f.). Introduced in the early 1980s, these tax advantages have in the meantime been abolished (MVIV 2010: 340).

- In Ireland, key elements for successful integrated urban renewal are (MVIV 2010: 352):
- Involving local stakeholders, residents and economic actors,
- Participation of commercial, educational and social services,
- Providing private, affordable and social housing,
- Focusing on urban development measures.

## References

Bannon, Michael J. (2004): Irish Urbanisation: Trends, Actions and Policy Challenges. PEB (Planning and Environmental Policy Research Series) Working Paper 04/03 [Internet]. Dublin. URL: <http://www.ucd.ie/gpep/research/archivedworkingpapers/2004/04-03.pdf> (Accessed: 2/2012).

Department of the Environment and Local Government (n.d.): The National Spatial Strategy 2002 – 2020. People, Places and Potential. Summary Guide. Dublin.

Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government/Forfás (2006): Implementing the NSS. Gateway Investment Priorities Study. Final Report. Dublin.

Entrust (Ed.) (2003): Urban Regeneration in the City of Dublin: Partnership structures and integrated area planning. Final Draft of the Dublin Case Study [Internet]. Dublin/Maynooth. URL: <http://www.ensure.org/entrust/cases/dublin/index.htm> (Accessed: 2/2012). N.p.

Fahey, Tony, Michelle Norris, Desmond McCafferty and Eileen Humphreys (2011): Combating Social Disadvantage in Social Housing Estates: The policy implications of a ten-year follow-up study. Combat Poverty Agency, Working Paper Series 11/02.

Fitzpatrick and Associates (2006): Evaluation of the RAPID (Revitalising Areas Through Planning, Investment and Development) Programme. Dublin.

Instituto Universitario de Urbanística de la Universidad de Valladolid (Ed.) (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in Europe. Summary Document. Valladolid.

MVIV – Gobierno de España – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.

Norris, Michelle, and Menelaos Gkartios (2009): Fiscal Incentives for Property Led Urban Regeneration in Ireland: a longitudinal review of impacts. Paper presented to the European Network for Housing Research Conference: Changing Housing Markets: Integration and Segmentation. Working group 11 – Metropolitan housing policies: balancing between housing and urban challenges. Prague, 28.6.2009 – 1.7.2009.

Pobal: RAPID [Internet]. N.p. URL: <https://www.pobal.ie/Funding%20Programmes/Rapid/Pages/Background.aspx> (Accessed: 2/2012).

## Italy

Until the 1980s, urban renewal in Italy consisted mainly of restoring individual elements of the city. It was not until the 1990s that an integrated approach to urban renewal was increasingly adopted and implemented (Sartorio 2009: 397 f.), taking into account the concept of urban development pushed forward by the European Union and pursuing a holistic approach with a particular focus on economic and social cohesion. This new integrated approach addresses specifically the renovation of old buildings, the modernisation of the housing stock, social and economic revitalisation of deprived neighbourhoods (including through experimental and innovative management and participation procedures) as well as supplying infrastructure and basic services (MVIV 2010: 356 f.). This new approach was experimented in Italian cities in the context of the *URBAN I* (1994–1999) and *URBAN II* (2000–2008) Community Initiatives (Sartorio 2009: 398 ff.; Sept 2008).

In Italy, there is still no explicit urban development policy at national level (MMR 2009: 28; Nicis/EUKN 2008: 45).

However, supporting urban renewal and development through integrative programmes has since the 1990s been first implemented by the administration of *Cer* (*National Housing Committee*), later by the *Dipartimento per il Coordinamento dello Sviluppo del Territorio* (*Department for the Coordination of Regional Development of the Ministry of Public Works*) and now by the *Ministero delle Infrastrutture e dei Trasporti* (*Ministry for Infrastructure and Transport*). Meanwhile, several successive programmes have been initiated and implemented. Since these programmes promote innovative integrated approaches to urban development and change, they are commonly referred to as *Programmi Complessi*.

The *Programmi di riqualificazione urbana* (*Priu*) and the *Programmi di recupero urbano* (*PRU*) were part of the first generation of integrated programmes launched in 1994. They addressed the redevelopment of derelict public housing as well as deindustrialized and derelict urban areas. Social and economic initiatives were also implemented in

addition to urban development and infrastructural measures. Furthermore, the first public-private partnerships were also experimented (MVIV 2010: 360).

Launched in 1997 and now in its third round, the *Contratti di Quartiere* aim to reduce social exclusion and improve quality of life in the social housing stock. The *Contratti* guidelines emphasise amongst other things the relevance of social and employment policies, operations to improve the urban infrastructure as well as local accessibility and mobility. Participation of neighbourhood residents is also conferred great importance (cf. MVIV 2010: 360; Zajczyk et al 2005: 19 ff.; Mingione et al 2001: 9 f.; Bevilacqua et al 2000: 28 f.).

Started in 1998, the *Programmi di recupero urbano e di sviluppo sostenibile (PRUSST)* seek to achieve sustainable economic and social development of urban areas and larger regional scales rather than urban districts.

*Urban Italia* (2001–2007) and *Porti & Stazioni* (since 2002) belong to the second generation of integrated urban development programmes. Compared to earlier programmes, they put a greater emphasis on the social and economic revitalisation of cities and deprived neighbourhoods. The top 20 urban renewal programmes which had not been granted funding from *Urban II* have been added in the *Urban Italia* programme. The measures implemented include rehabilitation, new construction, training and educational support, social and cultural activities as well as resident participation. More than two-thirds of the funds associated with *Urban Italia* were provided by private investors and local public bodies (cf. Sept 2008). Besides its central funding priority on transport infrastructure, the *Porti & Stazioni* programme supports the regeneration of neighbourhoods in the vicinity of port facilities and railway stations in economic decline, affected by social exclusion as well as urban and environmental problems (see MVIV 2010: 360 f.).

The latest generation of *Programmi Complessi* promotes innovative methods of urban and regional development as well as strengthening the role of cities as catalysts of sustainable regional networks for competitiveness and cohesion. The two main programmes are *Sviluppo integrato sistemi territoriale multi azione (SISTeMA)* and *Piano strategico/Piano urbano della mobilità (PS-PUM)*. The more recent programmes are no longer aimed at the promoting public investment but rather focus on supporting towns in establishing strategic plans adapted to their local conditions (MVIV 2010: 357).

In conclusion, it can be said that the national programmes in Italy evolved from having a sectoral approach (especially concerning the urban renewal of the housing stock in the early 1990s) to promoting an integrated, neighbourhood-based urban development (Colantonio/Dixon 2009: 47). This evolution took place in the context of an increasingly widening gap since the 1980s between richer and poorer population groups. Spatially, this is reflected in the divide between the North and South of the country, but is also to be observed within Italian cities. Reasons for this process are to be found in an increased suburbanization, income segregation, gentrification, polarization and marginalization. As a result, there has also been an increase in the number of deprived neighbourhoods which can be found in several types of areas. These are frequently located in old inner city neighbourhoods or historic centres, in former workers' neighbourhoods cut off from the rest of city by geographic barriers (rail, port and industrial areas), in mono-functional (large) social housing estates on the outskirts of the city, as well as in deindustrialized areas and former harbour sites (cf. Borlini et al 2005: 3 f.; Sept 2008; Colantonio/Dixon 2009: 47 ff.; Evangelisti 2010).

Factors for a successful integrated urban (district) development in Italy are considered to be the following (MVIV 2010: 383):

- combining building and socio-economic planning,
- stronger interrelationship between urban and infrastructure planning,
- full involvement and participation of all stakeholders, from planning to evaluation.

## References

- Bevilacqua, Lina, Valeria Fascione, Giuseppe Leonello and Antonio Lopes (2000): Case Study Report Pomigliano d'Arco. Evaluation of Local Socio-Economic Strategies in Disadvantaged Urban Areas (ELSES). Reggio Calabria.
- Borlini, Barbara, Francesco Memo, Silvia Mugnano and Francesca Zajczyk (2005): Large Housing Estates in Italy. Success and fail factors of policies. RESTATE report WP8. Utrecht.
- Colantonio, Andrea, and Tim Dixon (2009): Measuring Socially Sustainable Urban Regeneration in Europe. Oxford Institute for Sustainable Development (OISD), School of the Built Environment, Oxford Brookes University. Oxford.
- Evangelisti, Francesco (2010): Urban regeneration in city centres: the case of Bologna (Italy). Vortrag im Rahmen der "High Level Conference on Urban Sustainability and Integrated Urban Regeneration in Europe" am 26./27. April 2010 in Madrid [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.sepes.es/files/multimedios/eu2010/27\\_SALA%20A\\_01\\_Francesco%20Evangelisti\\_EN.pdf](http://www.sepes.es/files/multimedios/eu2010/27_SALA%20A_01_Francesco%20Evangelisti_EN.pdf) (Accessed: 4/2012).

MMR – Ministry for Regional Development of the Czech Republic (2009): „Assessment Report” on the Implementation of the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities (Czech Presidency) [Internet]. Prag. URL: <http://www.eukn.org/dsresource?objectId=166461> (Accessed: 4/2012).

MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.

Nicis/EUKN (2008): European survey: Levers of public action for the development of sustainable cities. Appendix 1: Answers to the first part of the questionnaire. November 6th, 2008 (French Presidency) [Internet]. The Hague. URL: <http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/corporate/doc/AppelOffre/European%20survey%20EN.pdf> (Accessed: 3/2012).

Sartorio, Francesca (2008): Stadterneuerung in Italien – die erfolgreiche Entwicklung verschiedener lokaler Ansätze: Genua und Turin. In: Uwe Altröck, Ronald Kunze, Elke Pahl-Weber, Ursula von Petz and Dirk Schubert (Eds.): Jahrbuch Stadterneuerung 2008. Schwerpunkt „Aufwertung im Stadtumbau“. Berlin: 397–408.

Sept, Ariane (2008): Urbanistica in Movimento. Die Italienische Stadtplanung und das europäische Programm URBAN. Arbeitshefte des Instituts für Stadt- und Regionalplanung, Technische Universität Berlin.

Zajczyk, Francesca, Silvia Mugnano, Barbara Borlini, Francesco Memo and Petra Mezzetti (2005): Large Housing Estates in Italy. Policies and Practices. RESTATE report 3d I. Utrecht.

## The Netherlands (with case study Amsterdam – Nieuw-West)

The Netherlands have also developed integrated approaches to urban development focusing traditionally on deprived neighbourhoods. Particularly in major cities, various (integrated) urban (district) regeneration strategies have been experimented since the 1970s to address these specific problems (Burgers et al 2001: 11)<sup>1)</sup>.

The most relevant example was the *Grotestedenbeleid* programme (Metropolitan Policy/GSB) for the development of deprived neighbourhoods, launched in three stages from 1994 until 2009. Initially limited to Amsterdam, Utrecht, The Hague and Rotterdam, the programme was extended to 27 medium-sized cities in the course of its implementation. *Grotestedenbeleid* linked urban development to social and economic goals and policies. Its key elements were the pooling of resources, decentralisation and an increased flexibility of local authorities' organisational structures (including local neighbourhood management with its own budget), public participation, monitoring and a local approach.

In the first programme period (1994 – 1999), the main areas of concern were employment and the economy, the well-functioning of the social and (residential) built fabric, health and education. Local authorities were given appropriate funds to implement projects in these sectors. The second period (1999-2004) focused on programmatic long-term agreements between the state and local authorities based on municipal development plans. These were developed for a period of ten years and addressed urban and social development as well as economic and employment

issues. In the third and last phase (2005–2009), the main topics were complemented by the new model of the “strong city” (*Krachtige Stad*) addressing security, integration and naturalisation of ethnic minorities. Pooling of resources and a definition of the agreements between the government and local authorities over objectives and results was pushed forward. At the same time, municipalities were given more leeway to set their own priorities when formulating long-term development plans (cf. Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations 2004).

*Grotestedenbeleid* was completed in 2007 by the even more area-based integrated programme *Wijkaanpak*. It was originally intended to run until 2017 but was interrupted after the change of national government in June 2010. In the meantime, *Wijkaanpak* had been implemented in 40 districts in 18 communities. The programme's core element was a financial contribution compulsory for all housing associations in the Netherlands. This tax allowed housing companies with investments in deprived *Wijkaanpak* areas to foster development initiatives. Approximately 2.5 billion euros from the housing industry's contributions as well as 300 million euros of public funds were made available for the programme implementation. In addition to the 40 primary districts funded, a further 34 areas facing similar problems were supported between 2008-2010 with a total of 60 million euros of state funds (40+ Wijken; cf. WWI 2009).

As with *Grotestedenbeleid*, contractual agreements between national and local authorities also had a central role in the *Wijkaanpak* programme. Area-based and integrated local action plans (*Wijkactieplan*) served as foundation for the programme's implementation. They addressed and defined goals in domains for action considered crucial at national level such as housing/living, working, learning and

1) Parts of the article that do not refer to other sources are based on in-situ interviews carried out with local administrative and neighbourhood stakeholders.



growing up (education/training), integration and security (cf. VROM 2007, Gemeente Eindhoven 2008). Furthermore, the programme also aimed to engage residents and other local actors such as entrepreneurs in local partnerships (cf. VROM 2008, WWI 2010b: 2 f.).

### Programme implementation at local level: the case of Amsterdam – Nieuw-West

For its implementation in five Amsterdam districts with 60 to 100 projects per neighbourhood, the *Wijkaanpak* programme was systematically adapted to the specific situation of the city (*Charter Amsterdamse Wijkaanpak 2008–2018*). It took into account existing integrated neighbourhood development approaches such as the local *Koers Nieuw West* programme. Running from 2007 to 2010, this programme served as a framework for the integrated development of the Nieuw-West district on the basis of a con-

tract between the district's administrative and political levels (*Stadsdeel*) as well as local housing associations. These contracts established guidelines addressing the economy, learning and growing up, integration, participation and employment, housing and living, art and culture as well as sports (programme volume: approximately 37 million euros; cf. Blom/van der Gugten/Dieters 2010: 10).

Nieuw-West consists for the most part of housing developments from the 1950s. Some of these were built after the garden-city principle and later additions included large housing estates. Approximately 90% of the 54 000 housing units are owned by large housing companies. It is located close to the town centre and features cheap rents, which is why its population has an above-average share of young people and a majority with immigrant backgrounds. The large number of social and civic initiatives and organizations reflects a strong community development. These qualities contrast starkly with several challenges typical of deprived neighbourhoods: urban deficiencies, social problems such as unemployment and income poverty, high dropout rates, social tensions, crime and perceived insecurity. Nieuw-West suffers overall from a strong negative image.

After the cut of state funding in the *Wijkaanpak* programme in 2010, the city of Amsterdam maintained and developed alternative resources to carry on its implementation. Its budget is now smaller but is funded by the municipality, private companies and includes contributions from housing companies in each area. The latter have taken an increasingly important role as many housing companies do not limit themselves to maintaining and improving the residential environment, but are also engaged in social and socio-economic issues (social work, supporting the local economy, etc.) as well as developing education infrastructure in parts of Nieuw-West. Since the beginning of the financial crisis, most housing companies are confronted to the problem of having fewer resources, meaning that they are now hardly able to sustain their integrated strategies addressing constructional measures. In some cases however, certain local economic approaches will continue to be supported such as the *Garage Notweg* project in Nieuw West. This business incubator supports entrepreneurial independence in the sector of services and art, and also makes its premises available to the housing industry as well as contributing to certain projects.

Most of the social and socio-economic projects are financed by the municipal fund *Wijkaanpak*. One of its main challenges is to maintain the Nieuw-West achievements whilst taking into account the lower financial contribu-

tions. Part of the solution has been to concentrate *Wijkaanpak* exclusively on the district's most deprived "focus areas". A further municipal programme approach has recently been developed as a response to these changing conditions. Funded only by the district (*Stadsdeel*), it seeks above all to include the local population as well as to foster a stronger cooperation between such stakeholders involved as banks and companies are the focus.

In order as to implement the programmes, a staff office at the administrative level in Amsterdam (*Programmabureau*) was set up as an internal organisational unit. Its main task is the inter-ministerial coordination on housing, public safety, economic and social development issues. Various homeowners' associations contribute as consultants (cf. Amsterdam.nl). In Nieuw-West, the programme implementation is supervised by a higher-ranking programme manager and four area managers. An additional nine district offices (*Buurthuis*) have been established on site, supported by public utility organisations. Their main community work duties include mobilising and advising local residents. Finally, the technical college and the University of Amsterdam (department of social affairs) – which both accompany the programme's implementation process – , established four local offices (*Boot*) for residents to access and from which students carried out practical work in deprived neighbourhoods.

The LEIPZIG CHARTER has only had a limited importance for the programme's implementation in Amsterdam as many of its aspects or elements are already (major) elements of the urban policy. The integrative approach is thus considered compulsory at municipal/administrative level – or as an interviewee put it: "No urban renewal without a view on social and socio-economic issues!". Especially under the *Wijkaanpak* programme, many projects were successfully implemented. It also led to the emergence of several functioning structures for cooperation between actors, particularly between cities and housing associations. An other experience showed that many actors returned to their core business activity when funds were no longer available. Some project partners proved difficult to convince of the importance and usefulness of local policy for an integrated area-based (community) work. In general, however, it was "not so much about changing the areas from the ground up, but rather changing what seemed obvious at policy and administrative level".

In light of this experience, a number of suggestions were expressed by the stakeholders interviewed on how to improve the integrated approach to neighbourhood development. Amongst these, it was suggested to establish a reliable

long-term programme perspective (8-10 years), an institutionalisation of the co-operation and network structures (e.g. through contracts), maintaining an integrated budget for planning as well as social and economic measures and projects, emphasise on the need for community work, consolidate achievements and local politicians'/administration's implication as well as change the understanding they have of their roles towards a stronger disposition for cooperation (creative *governance* rather than persistent *governments*). Furthermore, the documentation of successful achievements in integrated neighbourhood development and the overall exchange of experiences should be reinforced.

## References

- Amsterdam.nl: Overzicht rollen [Internet]. N.p.  
URL: <http://www.amsterdam.nl/@216330/pagina/> (Accessed: 5/2012).
- Blom, Stella, Martin van der Gugten and Mia Dieters (2010): Programma-evaluatie Koers Nieuw West. Sociaal-economisch kopprogramma voor de Westelijke Tuinsteden in Amsterdam. Amsterdam.
- Burgers, Jack; Thea Dukes, Jasper Hoes, Sako Musterd, Richard Staring and Ronald van Kempen (2001): Urban Development Programmes, Urban Governance, Social Inclusion & Sustainability. National and City Contexts, Urban Development Programmes and Neighborhood Selection. The Dutch Background Report. A Working Paper for UGIS. Amsterdam.
- Charter Amsterdamse Wijkaanpak 2008 – 2018. N.p.
- Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (2004): Working together on the strength of the city. Urban Policy III 2005 – 2009. Den Haag.
- Visitatiecommissie Wijkaanpak (2011): Doorzetten en Loslaten. Toekomst van de Wijkaanpak. Deel 1: Eindrapportage + Deel 2: Rapportages Rijksoverheid en 18 Gemeenten. Den Haag.
- VROM – Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer (2008): Landelijke Alliantie Krachtwijken. Den Haag.
- VROM – Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer (2007): Actieplan Krachtwijken. Van Aandachtswijk naar Krachtwijk. Den Haag.
- WWI – Minister voor Wonen, Wijken en Integratie (2010): Voortgangsrapportage Wijkanaanpak 2010. Den Haag.
- WWI – Minister voor Wonen, Wijken en Integratie (2009): Kamerbrief – Budget 40+ wijken, 2e tranche (19.10.2009). Den Haag.

## Sweden

In Sweden, where local authorities have a high degree of autonomy notably in terms of planning, urban development was and still is supported at national level by a large range of (integrated) funding programmes. Until 2007, this policy included the *Local Investment Programme (LIP)* for sustainable urban development with the aims of improving buildings' energy efficiency, reducing pollution, increasing biodiversity, qualitative design of residential areas as well as employment promotion. Until 2012, climate change projects were promoted through the *Climate Investment Programmes (KLIMP)*. Additional funds for the implementation of environmentally friendly (building) engineering solutions have been allocated in the years 2008–2010 in connection to major investment projects in Malmö, Stockholm and Umeå (cf. MVIV 2010: 632).

Beyond the urban focus, the integrated development of deprived neighbourhoods is also being promoted in Sweden as part of agreements between the national and local level. These are mainly municipal housing projects from the 1960s-1980s in the outskirts of Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö. Amongst other issues, these areas are confronted to a disproportionately high percentage of immigrants. District development projects therefore mainly focus on education and employment, and (re-)integration (of immigrants) into the labour market, whilst high building standards mean that no need for action in this field is required (cf. EUKN 2009; MVIV 2010: 632).

Local development agreements between the government and separate local authorities were already at the centre of the integrated support programme *Storstadspolitiken* (city policy) implemented between 1998–2010. It defines five key characteristics for action: area-based, inter-departmental cooperation, mobilisation and participation of local actors, focus on employment promotion and evaluation of different fields of action and programme priorities (cf. BMVBS 2012: 19; Ministry of Justice 2006). The programme's goal was to promote the integration of immigrants as well as the economic competitiveness of deprived neighbourhoods. Areas of action focused on employment, language training, education, health and safety as top priorities (Euricur 2004: 86). This allowed for a greater focus on social issues (rather than on buildings).

Areas of action, objective targets and implementation plans for the integrated development of deprived neighbourhoods were initially designed for a period of three years in the context of local development agreements. Amongst the requirements to take part in the programme, local authorities were expected to contribute financially at an equivalent amount than that granted by the government funding, as well as focus on the mobilisation and participation of the area's residents, including other local actors such as police, housing associations, schools and local businesses (Andersson/Palander 2001: 31; Öresjö et al. 2004: 21). Between 2004–2008, no more state funds were granted to the subsidised areas and a greater focus was put on the development and consolidation of alternative resources. In 2008, the approach by development agreements was resumed. In this latest round of programmes running until 2010, 38 deprived neighbourhoods from 21 municipalities took part in the programme, which was based on an urban development law that became effective on July 1st 2008. The programme was managed by the Swedish Ministry of Labour (cf. EUKN 2011: 109; Regeringskansliet 2012).

Overall, it appears that the Swedish government is a crucial trigger for local approaches to area-based integrated development of deprived neighbourhoods. However, the main actors for implementing the state policy remain local authorities and district administrations. Independent integrated development approaches in different topics are also carried out at local level, such as in the case of the *2009–2020 Environmental Programme for the City of Malmö* which takes into account issues relating to urban adaptation to climate change, energy efficiency, sustainable transport, sustainable improvement of the residential environment and public participation (Malmö Stad n.d.).

## References

- Andersson, Roger, and Camilla Palander (2001): National and City Contexts, Urban Development Programmes and Neighborhood Selection. A Swedish Background Report. A Working Paper for UGIS. Uppsala.
- BMVBS – Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (Ed.) (2012): Sicherung tragfähiger Strukturen für die Quartiersentwicklung im Programm Soziale Stadt. Berlin.
- EUKN – European Urban Knowledge Network (2011): Urban Development in Europe. A Survey of National Approaches to Urban Policy in 15 Member States. The Hague.
- EUKN – European Urban Knowledge Network (2009): “In Swedish deprived neighbourhoods problems are not directly visible” [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.eukn.org/Interviews/2009/%E2%80%9CIn\\_Swedish\\_deprived\\_neighbourhoods\\_problems\\_are\\_not\\_directly\\_visible\\_%E2%80%9D](http://www.eukn.org/Interviews/2009/%E2%80%9CIn_Swedish_deprived_neighbourhoods_problems_are_not_directly_visible_%E2%80%9D) (Accessed: 4/2012).
- Malmö Stad (n.d.): Environmental Programme for the City of Malmö 2009 – 2020.
- Ministry of Justice (2006): Fact Sheet. Metropolitan Policy. Stockholm.
- Öresjö, Eva, Roger Andersson, Emma Holmquist, Lars Pettersson and Christina Siwertsson (2004): RESTATE. Restructuring Large-scale Housing Estates in European Cities: Good Practices and New Visions for Sustainable Neighborhoods and Cities. Large Housing Estates in Sweden. Utrecht.
- Regeringskansliet. Government Offices of Sweden (2012): Urban Development [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.sweden.gov.se/sb/d/2188/a/15847?setEnableCookies=true> (Accessed: 4/2012).

## Switzerland

Since the late 1990s, integrated approaches to urban (district) development have become increasingly important in Switzerland. In view of the ongoing urbanization and the challenges it poses, essentially in the cities (such as suburbanisation, urban sprawl, functional spatial differentiation, transport and environmental pollution, increase in social problems, increasingly restricted budget), the *Federal Agglomeration Policy (Agglomerationspolitik des Bundes)* was launched in 2001 at national level. The aim of this multilevel policy approach is to increase cities' economic attractiveness and improve quality of life for their residents. This will be achieved in particular through an improved vertical and horizontal cooperation between federal, cantonal and local authorities as part of new governance structures. A *Tripartite Agglomeration Conference (Tripartite Agglomerationskonferenz – TAK)* has been created as an information and coordination platform to coordinate their cooperation, set thematic priorities and adjust implementation activities. Other key elements of the *Federal Agglomeration Policy* include supporting model and pilot projects (among others: *Traffic and Urban Planning Agglomeration Programmes – Agglomerationsprogramme Verkehr und Siedlung, Urban Projects Programme – Programm Projets urbains*), developing a monitoring system (Monitoring Switzerland's urban area – *Monitoring urbaner Raum Schweiz, MuR*), taking part in European programmes and community initiatives as well as exchanging experiences between programme stakeholders (ARE/SECO 2011: 7 ff.; Tobler 2009).

Integrated strategies were implemented for the first time over the period 2003–2007 as part of the *Federal Agglomeration Policy* in relation to a project supported by different departments. As part of the national *Sustainable Neighbour-*

*hood Development programme (Nachhaltige Quartierentwicklung – NaQu)*, four neighbourhoods in (large) Swiss cities were selected as test models to improve living conditions based on a territorial approach, combining top-down and bottom-up strategies (cf. BFE/ARE/BWO 2004: 4 ff.). The experience gained was used in the following *Sustainable Neighbourhood Development II (NaQu II)* project, which was tested from 2009 to 2010 in six pilot neighbourhoods. The aim was to develop a flexible, web-based instrument called *Sustainable Neighbourhoods by SméO (Nachhaltige Quartiere by SméO)* to be used by Swiss towns and cities as a support for assessment and decision making in neighbourhood planning and renewal using sustainability criteria. On the basis of concrete projects, 18 municipalities will be testing it until late 2012 (ARE/BFE 2011: 29 ff.).

Launched in 2008, the interdepartmental programme *Projets urbains – Social integration in neighbourhoods* is another national programme also part of the *Federal Agglomeration Policy*. It was created in response to the Swiss Federal Office for Migration identifying shortcomings in the social integration of immigrants in several residential areas resulting in an exacerbated socio-spatial fragmentation (BFM 2007: 19 ff.). After an initial pilot phase (2008–2011) with eleven districts taking part, a second phase (2012–2015) will provide expertise, financial and technical support in ten programme areas, helping them with the complex challenges of urban development in deprived neighbourhoods. Each year, 500,000 Swiss francs (approximately 420,000 euros) of funding are granted by the federal government. Without exceeding 200,000 Swiss francs (170,000 euros), up to half of the project costs can be covered for the entire term of the *Projet urbain*. The projects are all located

in small and medium-sized cities and towns, which, in contrast to larger municipalities, have not yet developed the experience and tools for an integrated neighbourhood development. The area-based, integrated approach of the *Projets urbains* programme provides the programme areas with a collaborative, participatory neighbourhood development vision and the creation of an integrated development concept or action plan involving all relevant actors. The plans should be based on the neighbourhoods' potentials and integrated to holistic approaches. The aim is also to promote new organizational and management structures at local level, for example with interdepartmental cooperation. At federal level, the programme is supervised by an interdepartmental steering group, constantly monitored by an external evaluation and complemented by a biannual exchange of experiences between participating municipalities and cantons (ARE 2011; Maury 2009; MVIV 2010: 664 ff., 670; BFM 2007: 40 ff.).

Regardless of these programmatic approaches, similar local integrated urban development strategies have been implemented since the late 1990s at territorial and local level in certain (large) Swiss cities (including Bern, Geneva, Winterthur, Zurich; cf. City of Zurich 2005).

The key elements to an integrated urban (district) development in Switzerland are involving all key stakeholders – administration, public institutions, property owners, civil society – in the process, combining short- and long-term neighbourhood development goals, broad citizen participation as well as supporting local policies (MVIV 2010: 674).

## References

- ARE – Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung (2011): „Projets urbains“: Bund unterstützt Projekte für Entwicklung von Wohngebieten [Internet]. Ittingen. URL: <http://www.are.admin.ch/dokumentation/00121/00224/index.html?lang=de&msg-id=42570> (Accessed 7/2012).
- ARE/BFE – Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung (ARE)/Bundesamt für Energie (BFE) (Eds.) (2011): Nachhaltige Quartiere. Herausforderungen und Chancen für die urbane Entwicklung. Bern.
- ARE/SECO – Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung (ARE)/Staatssekretariat für Wirtschaft (SECO) (Eds.) (2011): Evaluation und Weiterentwicklung der Agglomerationspolitik des Bundes. Bericht zuhanden des Bundesrats. Bern.
- BFE/ARE/BWO – Bundesamt für Energie (BFE), Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung (ARE), Bundesamt für Wohnungswesen (BWO) (Eds.) (2004): Nachhaltige Quartierentwicklung. Vier Pilotprojekte. Bern.
- BFM – Bundesamt für Migration (2007): Bericht Integrationsmassnahmen. Bericht über den Handlungsbedarf und die Massnahmenvorschläge der zuständigen Bundesstellen im Bereich der Integration von Ausländerinnen und Ausländern per 30. Juni 2007. Bern.
- Maury, Josianne (2009): Vom “Projet Urbain” zur nachhaltigen Quartierentwicklung. In: Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung (ARE), Eidgenössisches Departement für Umwelt, Verkehr, Energie und Kommunikation (UVEK) (Eds.): forum raumentwicklung. Heft 2/2009. Bern: 19 – 21.
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Stadt Zürich – Stadtentwicklung Zürich/Präsidialdepartement (Ed.) (2005): Bericht über den Legislatorschwerpunkt „Lebensqualität in allen Quartieren“ 2002 – 2006. Zürich.
- Tobler, Georg (2009): Städte und Agglomerationen: ein politisches Schwerpunktthema der Zukunft. In: Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung (ARE), Eidgenössisches Departement für Umwelt, Verkehr, Energie und Kommunikation (UVEK) (Eds.): forum raumentwicklung. Heft 2/2009. Bern: 5–7.



## United Kingdom

One of the most important approaches to integrated urban (district) development in England was the *New Deal for Communities* which ran from 2001 to 2011 and primarily addressed deprived neighbourhoods in the deindustrialized towns north and west of the country (Liverpool, Hull, Newcastle, Birmingham, Manchester, cf. ODPM 2006a: 112 ff.). The programme emerged from the 1990s' *Single Regeneration Budget (SRB)* which combined programmes from five different ministries addressing economic development and employment, education and training, housing, integration of ethnic minorities, crime reduction and generally promoting quality of life "at first hand" in deprived neighbourhoods (Atkinson, 2003: 2 ff.; ODPM 2006b: 82 f.).

*Local Strategic Partnerships* were central to the development of the *New Deal for Communities*. These included government agencies, local organizations, institutions and businesses, community organisations as well as local governments and citizens and together established neighbourhood development concepts (ODPM 2006a: 83 ff.). The promotion of local neighbourhood management structures enabled the mobilisation and networking of residents and other local actors, and instituted a contact point for local authorities and neighbourhood level to exchange (ibid.: 18 ff.; ODPM 2006b: 73 f.). Issues notably included crime and unemployment reduction, improving education, health and housing conditions as well as the urban environment (MVIV 2010: 174). On the grounds of the *New Deal for Communities*, the following items have been identified as key elements for a successful integrated approach to the development of (deprived) neighbourhoods in England (ibid.: 187):

- integrating neighbourhoods on a wider spatial and economic scale, economic development from the district's perspective,
- pooling resources,
- (spatially) concentrating resources,
- integrative management (topics and stakeholders), inclusion of third parties and their resources in local partnerships,
- long-term development orientation programmes (10 - 15 years).

Since 2011, the government has less developed financial support services – including in the context of socio-spatial development – rather than self-help and citizen empowerment. Under the slogan of *Big Society*, the government argues that civil society groups should take on more tasks which used to be the state's responsibility (Rasonyi 2011).

The *Big Society* is based on the three strategic pillars: strengthening of local communities (decentralisation of decision-taking powers to the level of municipalities and districts), the principle of competition in the provision of public services as well as mobilisation, participation and empowerment of citizens (Cabinet Office 2012).

Overall, there has been an emergence of a new "scope for local initiative and responsibility" (Rasonyi 2011) – such as in the case of education, health care, environment and participation (Löpfle 2011). However, it is still unsure whether the sense of community promoted in deprived neighbourhoods can be established solely on civic engagement and whether all the elements of an integrated development of deprived urban areas can be covered (see ORF; Rasonyi 2011). The financial institution *Big Society Capital* was founded in order as to support this new approach and develop the social sector. Its capital is of approximately 480 million euros (£400 million), of which no owner can be allocated more. An additional 290 million euros (£200 million) have been provided by the four largest UK banks. Furthermore, civil commitment will be supported by the *Community First* fund which has as primary goal to foster local residents' competence, especially in deprived neighbourhoods (Cabinet Office 2012).

In Scotland, urban development and regeneration at regional level is supported by the *Regeneration Strategy* which also focuses on deprived neighbourhoods. It deals with issues of social cohesion, housing, economic and infrastructure development. Various programmes and funds are available for activities and projects in each area with a strive to pool resources. At local level, the focus is to develop local partnerships, as was done in England until 2011. Glasgow has identified eight areas for urban renewal in which integrated approaches to development have been implemented with the support from the regional level (The Scottish Government 2011). In Wales, where integrated development of deprived urban areas is funded by the regional *Communities First* programme launched in 2007, the focus is also on the development of local partnerships (Welsh Assembly Government 2007; 2012). The same goes for Northern Ireland, where the creation of *Neighbourhood Partnerships* for integrated area development is the main focus. This is achieved under the *Neighbourhood Renewal* programme in 36 disadvantaged districts, 15 of which in Belfast alone (cf. Northern Ireland Executive, Department for Social Development 2012).

A relevant example of municipal integrated development approaches is the city-wide *Greater London Authority Strategic Plan 2010–2012*. It covers a broad spectrum of targets in different policy areas: improving economic competitiveness, reducing social inequalities (also in terms of health), accessibility to affordable housing, improving safety in public spaces, environmental improvement, increased efficiency in the transport sector, improving governance and citizen participation (Greater London Authority 2011).

## References

Atkinson, Rob (2003): *Urban Policy and Regeneration: bringing the fragments together?* In: N. Ellison and C. Pierson (Eds.): *New Developments in British Social Policy*. London.

Cabinet Office: *The Big Society Capital* [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/content/big-society-capital> (Accessed: 2/2012).

Greater London Authority (2011): *The Greater London Authority Strategic Plan 2010–2012*. Update for 2011–12. Final version, 6 June 2011.

Löpfle, Philipp (2011): *Das grösste soziale Experiment des Jahres*. Tagesanzeiger online [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.tagesanzeiger.ch/ausland/europa/Das-groesste-soziale-Experiment-des-Jahres/story/11272237> (Accessed: 2/2012).

MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): *Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union*. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.

Northern Ireland Executive, Department for Social Development: *Neighbourhood Renewal* [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.dsdni.gov.uk/index/urcdg-urban\\_regeneration/neighbourhood\\_renewal.htm](http://www.dsdni.gov.uk/index/urcdg-urban_regeneration/neighbourhood_renewal.htm) (Accessed: 4/2012).

ODPM – Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2006a): *State of the English Cities. A Research Study*. Volume 1. London.

ODPM – Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2006b): *State of the English Cities. A Research Study*. Volume 2. London.

ORF – Großbritannien: *Cameron will Bürger für Sozialdienste einspannen. "Big Society": Weniger Staat, weniger Ausgaben?* [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://oe1.orf.at/artikel/2513905> (Accessed: 2/0012).

Parkinson, Michael (2004): *United Kingdom: the changing landscape of English urban policy*. In: Euricur – European Institute for Comparative Urban Research, Erasmus University Rotterdam (Eds.): *National Urban Policies in the European Union*. Eds.: Leo van den Berg, Erik Braum, Jan van der Meer. Rotterdam: 87–89.

Rásonyi, Peter (2010): *Die sparsame "grosse" Gesellschaft*. Vage Vision des neuen Premierministers David Cameron für die Zukunft Grossbritanniens. NZZ online [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.nzz.ch/nachrichten/politik/international/die\\_sparsame\\_grosse\\_gesellschaft\\_1.6882414.html](http://www.nzz.ch/nachrichten/politik/international/die_sparsame_grosse_gesellschaft_1.6882414.html) (Accessed: 2/2012).

The Scottish Government (2011): *Achieving A Sustainable Future. Regeneration Strategy*. Edinburgh.

Welsh Assembly Government: *Communities First* [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://wales.gov.uk/topics/housingandcommunity/regeneration/communitiesfirst/?lang=en> (Accessed: 4/2012).

Welsh Assembly Government (2007): *Communities First. Guidance 2007*. N.p.

## B Countries with national or regional programmes or with national guidelines for integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods)

### Austria

Urban development and renewal in Austria are mainly local communities' responsibility. So far, federal and state governments only play in this field a subordinate role. This is reflected in the fact that Austria has neither launched a national funding programme for integrated urban development nor pursued at federal states' level of corresponding approaches (MVIV 2010: 21 f.).

At the local level, strategies of integrated urban development in the cities of Graz and Vienna have been field-tested using EU Structural Fund grants (including *URBAN I and II, Objective-2*). In Graz, these approaches focus primarily on resolving problems in deprived neighbourhoods due to unbalanced economic and social structures, unused brown-field sites, poor public transport connections and the need for energetic optimization of existing buildings (former

*URBAN II* area in the west of Graz) as well as the initiation of a concerted development of the southern districts and their surrounding communities ("*Regional Competitiveness Styria 2007–2013*" EU programme).

In contrast, approaches in Vienna are characterised by a strong emphasis on community development. They draw upon 30 years' experience in decentralised area-based consultation and social support in redevelopment areas in the context of Vienna's *gentle urban renewal* policy. From 2002 to 2005, so-called *Grätzelmanagements* (neighbourhood managements) in two programme areas of the city (*Objective 2*, funding period 2000–2006) served as pilot projects for a "socially oriented urban renewal" in the sense of integrative urban district development strategies (*Gebietsbetreuung 2007*; Kohout/Vevera 2010; Förster 2004: 12 ff.,

24 f.). The main goal of this neighbourhood renewal approach was to counter social and economic problems through an area-based mobilisation and participation of local residents as well as other relevant actors (mainly local businesses) and the networking of local institutions, services and businesses. Primarily, this not only meant development but also implementation of projects and actions by actors in the neighbourhood (cf. GMo2 2003: 1 f.). Based on the German joint federal-state programme *Social City*, this is implemented by adjusting funds and involving residents into deciding of their use.

Building on the experience gained from these two pilot projects, the “new economic neighbourhood management” (*Grätzelmanagement Wirtschaft neu [GMW]*, as part of the *MINGO* project [“move in and grow”]) was established in 2008 under the 2007–2013 EU Structural Funds (*Regional competitiveness and employment*) in deprived neighbourhoods of six Viennese boroughs. Its purpose was to develop and implement a structural improvement of the areas in partnership with business projects and initiatives. The focus was on maintaining the current economic situation for local companies, promoting an ethnic economy and protecting local amenities in the neighbourhoods. The *GMW* accompanied these measures by targeted place marketing. The neighbourhood management team was also in charge of coordinating the programme and of an “interface management” between city council, intermediate area and implementation at local level (Wirtschaftsagentur Wien; Kohout/Vevera 2010).

The orientation of Vienna’s disadvantaged neighbourhoods’ urban renewal takes into account a specific background. Although Austria enjoys relatively favourable economic conditions – whereby issues such as youth and/or long-term unemployment are less important than in many other European countries –, there are nonetheless problematic development trends in the big cities. This is particularly the case in the region of Vienna where the effects of increasing economic restructuring in Austria are particularly felt in the subsequent changes of labour market requirements. Whilst the extent of social polarization is relatively low in Vienna and other cities, socio-spatial segregation and concentration of disadvantaged populations in certain residential areas have led to the emergence of disadvantaged neighbourhoods. An increase of functional urban problems in such areas is to be noted, particularly in Vienna. In these areas, the local populations which already endure many disadvantages (inadequate education and skills, problem-income situation of many households, fewer opportunities for access to the labour market) also suffer from a less efficient local economy and inadequate

housing and living environment (Steiner et al. 2003: 4; Gebietsbetreuung Stadterneuerung im 2. Bezirk 2007: 12 f.; Rehberger 2009: 94).

The increased cooperation on urban issues in the European context (with the LEIPZIG CHARTER as central pillar) has significantly increased awareness among federal, regional and local stakeholders in Austria regarding the need for better coordination in the field of urban development. The Austrian Conference on Spatial Planning (ÖROK) has therefore – for the first time – explicitly taken up this policy field in the updated Austrian Spatial Development Concept 2011 and considers it as a specific area of action (4.2 – Development of an Austrian Agglomeration Policy).

## References

- Förster, Wolfgang (2004): Stadterneuerung – Der Wiener Weg. In: Robert Sterk and Harald Eisenberger: *Wiens sanfte Erneuerung*. Wien: 9–25.
- Gebietsbetreuung – Gebietsbetreuung Stadterneuerung im 2. Bezirk (Ed.) und Gebietsbetreuung Stadterneuerung im 20. Bezirk (2007): *Grätzelmanagement in Wien – ein Erfahrungsbericht*. Im Auftrag der Magistratsabteilung 25 [Internet]. Wien. URL: [http://www.gbstern.at/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Stadterneuerung/Mediathek/Downloads/Bericht\\_GM\\_2007.pdf](http://www.gbstern.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Stadterneuerung/Mediathek/Downloads/Bericht_GM_2007.pdf) (Accessed: 3/2012).
- GMo2 – Grätzelmanagement Volkert- und Alliiertenviertel (Ed.) (2003): *Statut des Grätzelmanagements*. 1. Änderung vom April 2003. Wien.
- Kohout, Ingrid, and Wolfgang Vevera (2010): *Grätzelmanagement in Wien*. Vortrag bei der 47. Tagung des Deutsch-Österreichischen URBAN-Netzwerks am 4. und 5. März 2010 in Bremen [Internet]. Wien. URL: [http://www.deutscher-verband.org/cms/fileadmin/medias/URBAN/Netzwerktagungen/47\\_Tagung/Graetzelmanagem.pdf](http://www.deutscher-verband.org/cms/fileadmin/medias/URBAN/Netzwerktagungen/47_Tagung/Graetzelmanagem.pdf) (Accessed: 3/2012).
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): *Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union*. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Rehberger, Edith Maria (2009): *Parallelgesellschaften – Das Scheitern der Integration von ethnischen Gruppen? Ethnische Segregation in Wien*. Diplomarbeit an der Universität Wien [Internet]. Wien. URL: [http://othes.univie.ac.at/4828/1/2009-05-11\\_0205300.pdf](http://othes.univie.ac.at/4828/1/2009-05-11_0205300.pdf) (Accessed: 3/2012).
- Steiner, Karin, Thomas Kreiml, Doris Muralter and Regina Erben-Hartig (2003): *Evaluierung des Pilotprojektes „Grätzelmanagement Rund um den Wallensteinplatz“ im 20. Bezirk*. Endbericht. Wien.
- Wirtschaftsagentur Wien: *Grätzelmanagement* [Internet]. N.p. URL: <https://www.mingo.at/de/services/graetzelmanagement> (Accessed: 3/2012).

## Bulgaria

In the early 2000s, the first steps to prepare an integrated national urban policy in Bulgaria were launched with the *National Strategy and Action Plan on Poverty Reduction and Social Inclusion in Urban Areas* and the *National Programme for Improving the Living Conditions of Ethnic Minorities* under the *United Nations Development Programme (UNDP; UNDP 2005a; UNDP 2005b)*.

Adopted in 2005, the *National Regional Development Strategy (NRDS)* for the 2005–2015 period established integrated urban development as a key priority for a sustainable and balanced regional policy. To deal with the economic, environmental and social challenges in large metropolitan areas, the strategy focuses on urban redevelopment, historical and cultural heritage protection and development, measures to promote entrepreneurship and local employment as well as developing and supplying public services adapted to demographic change. Furthermore, the strategy pursued an area-based approach by specifically targeting the redevelopment of old industrial areas and the improvement of the urban environment in deprived neighbourhoods (NRDS 2005: 77 f.).

The *Operational Programme “Regional Development” 2007–2013 (OPRD)* to apply for funding from the European Structural Funds draws on the priorities of the *NRDS* and places sustainable and integrated urban development as one of its five priority axes. This is achieved against the background of the LEIPZIG CHARTER. Its focus is on strengthening economic prosperity, labour market and employment in the cities, promoting gender equality, social inclusion and regeneration in urban areas as well as protecting and improving the urban environment. The creation and implementation of integrated urban development and renewal plans should also contribute to governance and empowerment in the cities. A particular area of focus is the redevelopment of large housing estates and neighbourhoods with a high share of Roma population (Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works 2010: 93 ff.).

The area-based focus of the national urban development policy is a result of Bulgaria’s economic stabilization since the late 1990s, although this economic consolidation is spatially uneven nation-wide. In general, cities benefit more than rural areas of economic growth. Even if living standards have improved, particularly in cities, poverty in respect of EU standards remains a problem. Socio-economically deprived neighbourhoods have developed especially in areas where disproportionately poor and unemployed ethnic minorities (notably Roma) are concentrated. Housing and living conditions in these areas are inadequate and insuffi-

cient, partly occupied by illegal dwellings and residential buildings, which also lack technical equipment, with water supply and heating sometimes entirely omitted. Public space is also highly neglected. In addition to these neighbourhoods where temporary housing is concentrated, large housing estates on the outskirts of cities are often in poor conditions and considered areas in high need for development (cf. UNDP 2005a; CoNet Local Support Group, Sofia Municipality n.d.).

At local level, there are tangible experiences in regard to integrated urban development, as in the case of the capital city Sofia. As a result of the European exchange and learning programme *CoNet – Cohesion Network (URBACT)* which ran from April 2008 to May 2011, the city created a *Local Action Plan (LAP)* for the Krasna Polyana district. It is one of the most densely populated and deprived neighbourhoods of Sofia with a 25% population share of Roma. The main objective of the LAP is the integration of this population group. In order to achieve this goal, their access to education, health and social services must be improved, as well as the quality of living and social conditions through a municipal infrastructure programme. Representatives of the Roma population, NGOs and other civil society actors are involved in the design of the district development process. To support the development and implementation of the LAP, a cross-sectoral working group – managed by the deputy mayor responsible for social affairs – was established in the local administration (CoNet 2011; 2008a; 2008b; CoNet Local Support Group, Sofia Municipality n.d.).

### References

- CoNet – Cohesion Network (Ed.) (2011): *CoNet’s Guide to Social Cohesion. Integrated Approaches in Disadvantaged Neighbourhoods* [Internet]. Berlin. URL: [http://www.weeberpartner.de/files/CoNet\\_s\\_Guide\\_to\\_Social\\_Cohesion\\_01.pdf](http://www.weeberpartner.de/files/CoNet_s_Guide_to_Social_Cohesion_01.pdf) (Accessed: 3/2012).
- CoNet – Cohesion Network (Ed.) (2008a): *Social Cohesion in Neighbourhoods across Europe. Baseline Study* [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/CoNet/documents\\_media/CoNet\\_Baseline.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/CoNet/documents_media/CoNet_Baseline.pdf) (Accessed: 3/2012).
- CoNet – Cohesion Network (Ed.) (2008b): *The CoNet Partner Cities Project Planning, Questions and Answers. Baseline Study – Annex* [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/CoNet/documents\\_media/CoNet\\_Baseline\\_Annex.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/CoNet/documents_media/CoNet_Baseline_Annex.pdf) (Accessed: 3/2012).
- CoNet Local Support Group, Sofia Municipality (n.d.): *Sofia Municipality – Krasna Polyana District: English summary of the Local Action Plan (LAP). Improving inclusion of Roma Minority in Krasna Polyana district – Challenge for Sofia municipality* [Internet]. N.p. EU-KOM – Kommission der Europäischen Gemeinschaften/Phare (2006): *Beautiful Bulgaria II: Temporary Employment and Vocational Training. BG 9914, Summary* [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/fiche\\_projet/document/bg9914-beautiful\\_bulgaria\\_ii.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/fiche_projet/document/bg9914-beautiful_bulgaria_ii.pdf) (Accessed: 3/2012).

Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works, Directorate General "Programming of Regional Development" (2010): Operational Programme "Regional Development" 2007–2013 [Internet]. Sofia.  
URL: <http://www.eufunds.bg/document/465> (Accessed: 3/2012).

NRDS – National Regional Development Strategy of the Republic of Bulgaria for the Period 2005–2015 (2005) [Internet]. Sofia.

URL: [http://www.espon-interstrat.eu/admin/attachments/NRDS\\_2005\\_-\\_2015\\_Bulgaria\\_summary\\_En.pdf](http://www.espon-interstrat.eu/admin/attachments/NRDS_2005_-_2015_Bulgaria_summary_En.pdf) (Accessed: 3/2012).

UNDP (2005a): UNDP Bulgaria Country Programme 2006–2009 [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.undp.bg/publications.php?id=1926> (Accessed: 3/2012).

UNDP (2005b): Support to the Formulation of a National Programme for Improving the Living Conditions of Disadvantaged Ethnic Minorities in Urban Areas [Internet]. Sofia.  
URL: [http://www.undp.bg/focus\\_areas.php?id=75](http://www.undp.bg/focus_areas.php?id=75) (Accessed: 3/2012).

## Cyprus

In Cyprus, integrated approaches to urban development have increasingly gained importance. Due to the absence of a specific spatial development plan for the island, the *Strategic Development Plan 2007–2013* constitutes the main framework for spatial development at national level. Its strategic goal is to provide a sustainable social and territorial cohesion within and between both urban and rural areas of Cyprus by avoiding regional disparities and social exclusion, by promoting a lively countryside and by revitalising the areas along the Buffer Zone and within traditional city centres. This goal, apart from improving the attractiveness of rural areas, is to be achieved mainly through integrated urban development and will consist of creating quality public spaces as well as social and cultural infrastructures, improving education and training and ensuring sustainable, efficient and affordable public transport. Issues dealing with elements of urban renewal, social intermix as well as special attention to disadvantaged population groups, improving living conditions in the neighbourhoods, strengthening the local economy and enhancing declining city centres will be highlighted as a core area of integrated urban development (cf. MVIV 2010: 109 ff.; Nicis/EUKN 2008: 20; Planning Bureau of Cyprus 2006).

So far, various (urban development) projects deriving from the Operational Programme "Sustainable Development and Competitiveness" are under way. Several other development approaches include elements of an integrated urban development implemented in collaboration between national and local level. These include the *Listed Buildings Restoration Programme*, the *Buffer Zone Revitalisation Programme* and the *Programme for the Reconstruction, Radical Improvement and Renovation of Government Housing Estates for Refugees*, which focus on urban regeneration, upgrading of deprived urban areas as well as preserving architectural heritage. The implementations of these programmes are usually area-based and include residents' and other stakeholders' participation (MVIV 2010: 115 ff.).

An integrated and place-based approach, using a community-led local development methodology based on a strong participatory process, is being used in the case of the *Limassol Wine Villages Local Development Pilot Project: the contribution of heritage to local and regional development* since 2011, which falls into the *Council of Europe's Local Development Pilot Projects Programme (LDPP)*. The aim of this bottom-up approach is to demonstrate an effective way of public participation that allows the expression of citizens' knowledge and preferences in neighbourhood development, founded on multilevel governance. The Limassol LDPP is expected to contribute to the improvement of planning procedures and participatory practices in Cyprus, and will be further experienced in urban contexts.

The legal basis for spatial planning and urban development in Cyprus is the *Town and Country Planning Law* which, since 2008, has integrated principles of the LEIPZIG CHARTER. Local planning processes are also set according to this law. *Local plans* – which define local authorities' legally binding development frameworks – are established after reaching broad consensus through extensive consultation processes including public and thematic discussions with citizens as well as other local actors, stakeholders and representatives of local politics and administration. The Local Plan Preparation procedure has been further enriched since 2007 with the widening of public participation opportunities. Local plans are aligned with the LEIPZIG CHARTER principles (da Costa 2011: 120 ff.; MVIV 2010: 127; MMR 2009: 22; Nicis/EUKN 2008: 31 ff.).

Beyond these legal regulations and government programmes, integrated approaches to urban development at local level are also (independently) implemented in Cyprus. In addition to urban renewal policies, the four main cities – Nicosia, Limassol, Larnaca and Paphos – have developed strategies which include projects and activities to improve the cultural and social infrastructure (cultural centres, care facilities for children and elderly) as well as the residential environment, to strengthen the local economy and to up-

grade the area's image. Their goal, amongst others, is to achieve, in terms of social and demographic issues, a more varied population structure in the neighbourhoods and to increase the districts' attractiveness as a whole. As an example of this, Nicosia's area-based approaches have experienced new forms of governance, implemented community work as well as emphasized the importance of empowerment and local population participation (cf. MVIV 2010: 113 ff.; EUKN 2011; URBACT SURE 2008: 36; Nicosia Municipality; Nicis/EUKN 2008: 74).

## References

da Costa, Eva (2011): Urban Agglomeration Development Plans in Cyprus: A Participative Review Process. In: Maart Griesel and Frans van de Waart (Eds.) (2011): Multilevel Urban Governance or the Art of Working Together. Methods, Instruments and Practices. The Hague: 120–126.

EUKN (2011): Urban Regeneration Projects in Nicosia [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.eukn.org/Dossiers/EU\\_presidencies/Polish\\_Presidency/The\\_Urban\\_Dimension\\_of\\_Cohesion\\_Policy\\_the\\_past\\_present\\_and\\_future/Key\\_Publication\\_2011\\_The\\_Urban\\_Dimension\\_of\\_Cohesion\\_Policy/Sustainable\\_Case\\_Studies/Urban\\_Regeneration\\_Projects\\_in\\_Nicosia](http://www.eukn.org/Dossiers/EU_presidencies/Polish_Presidency/The_Urban_Dimension_of_Cohesion_Policy_the_past_present_and_future/Key_Publication_2011_The_Urban_Dimension_of_Cohesion_Policy/Sustainable_Case_Studies/Urban_Regeneration_Projects_in_Nicosia) (Accessed: 3/2012).

EUKN (2010): Planning System [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.eukn.org/Cyprus/cy\\_en/EUKN/Cyprus\\_Urban\\_Policy/Planning\\_system](http://www.eukn.org/Cyprus/cy_en/EUKN/Cyprus_Urban_Policy/Planning_system) (Accessed: 3/2012).

MMR – Ministry for Regional Development of the Czech Republic (2009): „Assessment Report” on the Implementation of the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities (Czech Presidency) [Internet]. Prag. URL: <http://www.eukn.org/dsresource?objectid=166461> (Accessed: 4/2012).

MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.

Nicis/EUKN (2008): European survey: Levers of public action for the development of sustainable cities. Appendix 1: Answers to the first part of the questionnaire. November 6th, 2008 (French Presidency) [Internet]. The Hague. URL: <http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/corporate/doc/AppelOffre/European%20survey%20EN.pdf> (Accessed: 3/2012).

Nicosia Municipality (n.d.): Nicosia Master Plan. Priority Projects [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.nicosia.org.cy/english/enniaio\\_proteraitotitas.shtm](http://www.nicosia.org.cy/english/enniaio_proteraitotitas.shtm) (stand:3/2012).

Planning Bureau of Cyprus (2006): Strategic Development Plan 2007–2013. Nicosia.

URBACT – SURE (2008): SURE Baseline Study. Socio-economic approaches of Urban REhabilitation [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/SURE/outputs\\_media/SURE\\_baseline\\_study\\_FINAL.pdf](http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/Projects/SURE/outputs_media/SURE_baseline_study_FINAL.pdf) (Accessed: 3/2012).

## Czech Republic

Adopted in 2010 by the Government, the principles of urban policy in Czech Republic have been devised by the basic framework document which establishes general directions for a comprehensive urban development strategy at national level, leaving room for regions to design and adapt their own policies and instruments. It defines six principles, followed by strategic guidelines and development activities:

- Principle 1:  
The regional nature of urban policy
- Principle 2:  
Polycentric development of the population pattern
- Principle 3:  
A strategic and integrated approach to urban development
- Principle 4:  
Promotion of urban development as development poles in a territory
- Principle 5:  
Care for the urban environment

- Principle 6:  
The deepening of cooperation, the creation of partnerships, and the exchange of experience in sustainable urban development

Further aspects of urban policy can be found in other documents, in particular the *Regional Development Strategy of the Czech Republic* running up to 2013, the *National Strategic Reference Framework of the Czech Republic 2007–2013*, the *Sustainable Development Strategic Framework*, the *Spatial Development Policy of the Czech Republic 2008* as well as other sectoral policies and concepts.

Urban policy intentions and actions are conceived and implemented at national, regional and local level. The Ministry of Regional Development (MMR) is responsible for the creation of a basic urban policy framework at national level. The ministry's task is to ensure that methodology and programme are interconnected with the plans and recommendations of the EU institutions to the Czech environment.

The ministry created in 2006 the Working Group for the Co-ordination of Urban Policy, taking into account advice

from the NUTS 2 regions, the Association of Regions of the Czech Republic, the Union of Towns and Municipalities of the Czech Republic, the Czech Chamber of Architects as well as other relevant ministries. The working group deals with issues relating to urban development and reinforces the cooperation amongst partners.

The ministry stresses an integrated approach in Czech urban policy as a key point of urban development. The working group thus elaborated the methodology for *Integrated Urban Development Plans (IUDP)*. This work formed the guidelines for the preparation, evaluation and approval of the *IUDPs* in 2007. *IUDPs* are a very effective way of coordinating city policies within the urban policy and are designed to use Structural Funds for urban projects. These plans have criteria-based urban development areas – deprived neighbourhoods, areas in need of housing development and high-growth potential areas.

Czech cities are faced with a number of other specific problems. The roots of these problems are often interrelated and are also connected with lifestyle changes. Many cities are struggling with an incomplete economic structure, a weakening demographic and social situation (ageing population, rising single-person households) as well as insufficient technical, transport and environmental infrastructure and civic amenities relying on inappropriate technology.

The following problems are due to several underlying trends that have emerged from the Czech Republic's transformation, particularly in cities: deindustrialization and job cuts in the manufacturing and tertiary sectors especially in central urban areas, new construction of high-value resi-

dential areas in central urban districts, extensive suburbanisation of residential and activity areas. Drivers of Czech cities' reorganisation – resulting in socio-spatial segregation – were and remain the deregulation and privatization of the housing market as well as extensive investment in urban areas at the expense of other areas being neglected.

In addition to the European structural funds, local authorities are also supported by various national programmes focusing on housing, public space, environment, transport and human resources. This approach can help achieve sustainable urban development in Czech cities.

## References

- EUKN (2011): Cohesion Policy in Urban Practice. An Ambitious Urban Agenda? The Hague.
- Ministerstvo pro místní rozvoj (2007): National Strategic Reference Framework of the Czech Republic 2007 – 2013. Prag.
- MMR – Ministry for Regional Development of the Czech Republic (2010): Principles of Urban Policy [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.mmr.cz/CMSPages/GetFile.aspx?guid=84cacc85-1d6a-4162-b4c7-ec92dd3310ab> (Accessed: 4/2012).
- MMR – Ministry for Regional Development of the Czech Republic (2007): Guidelines of the Ministry for Regional Development for essential Principles in preparation, evaluation and approval of an Integrated Urban Development Plan (pursuant to Resolution No. 883 of the government of the Czech Republic, dated 13 August 2007). Prag.
- Sýkora, Ludek (2004a): Cities in the Czech Republic. In: Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Affairs (Ed.): Cities in the New EU Countries. Position, Problems, Policies. Amstelveen: 17 – 22.
- Large sections of this text were written by the Czech Ministry of Regional Development.

## Hungary

In Hungary, the main actors of urban policy are the cities and towns themselves, as set by the Law on Local Governments (2007). Each of the 3,200 municipalities in Hungary has its own local government (of which more than 300 are towns). This law administers local governments' competences and duties. Financial capacities are ensured by their tax revenues and state directives carrying out certain tasks. Urban development is also the central government's task, having regulatory and coordinative functions on this issue. The integrated dimension of urban policy is defined by the law on spatial development and physical planning (Act XXI of 1996). This law aims to balance spatial development and harmonize regional and national development as well as territorial planning.

The *National Spatial Development Concept (NSDC)* (Parliamentary Decree 97/2005) is a key legal document to set goals regarding certain towns' function within the territorial network. It addresses the issue of polycentricity in relation to Budapest and another seven towns which have been appointed as regional poles. Out of the seven mid-term territorial objectives defined in the concept, the one specifically linked to urban issues is the development of a highly competitive Budapest metropolitan area which seeks to take advantage of its international economic and cultural role. The revision of the national spatial policy is currently taking place in 2012 and is expected to include the topics of urban network, urban-rural relations as well as functional relations between towns and their hinterlands.

Other regulations also affect urban development. The most important of these concerns the built environment. The law on shaping and protecting the built environment (Act LXXVIII, 1997) deals with the fundamental requirements, instruments, rights and commitments related to the built environment. Furthermore, it addresses the scope of duties and competences. The major change of the Hungarian urban policy practice due to the LEIPZIG CHARTER is also disclosed in this Act. Started at the end of 2007 as a simple requirement for applications to EU Structural Funds, modifying the Act on the Built Environment in 2009 made it compulsory for all urban settlements in Hungary to develop an *Integrated Urban Development Strategy (IUDS)*. The *IUDS* has to follow a strict thematic structure formulated by the government: a settlement plan has to contain the overview of the whole city's situation, to define all the potential areas for development and to describe the implementation tools as well as institutional framework of the planned actions. A special part of an *IUDS* is the so called anti-segregation plan (status assessment and anti-segregation programme, with a particular emphasis on the Roma population). This plan tries to assess the segregational impacts of the development conceived and to develop a complex system of tools in order to reduce segregation levels rather than increasing it in other urban areas as a result of the intervention. According to estimates, approximately two-third of Hungarian towns have already prepared their *IUDS* (which needs to be revised periodically).

Several urban renewal programmes have been implemented in the past decades. In Budapest, for example, a fund available citywide since 1994 has co-financed urban renewal actions and projects in the capital's 23 districts. Another example has been the special programme financed by a specific central fund to refurbish pre-fabricated high-rise housing estates. However, thanks to the EU Structural Funds, urban development funding became much more stable.

The urban dimension and urban development play a key role in the implementation of the *New Hungary Development*

*Plan (National Strategic Reference Framework)*, co-financed by EU Structural Funds. Between 2007 and 2013, urban areas have the opportunity to use support within regional operational programmes. This can contribute to the implementation of their integrated urban development strategies, including function-enhancement urban rehabilitation or social urban regeneration. Physical renewal of private housing in deprived areas and partnership(s) with social actors can also be included. Towns applying for Structural Funds for their urban renewal actions need to have an *Integrated Urban Development Strategy* which sets objective criteria on eligibility for integrated urban renewal. An integrated approach contributes to the demonstration of a territorially-based planning approach, the combination of various policy approaches and connect the aims of inhabitants, local governments, business and NGO actors.

Besides an integrated approach, other issues mentioned in the LEIPZIG CHARTER also gained importance in Hungary such as sustainability, land management, spatial planning and energy efficiency of buildings. The Hungarian Presidency of the European Council in 2011 worked in particular on the sustainability aspects of European urban development. It explored different management tools to address climate change mitigation and adaptation at urban level, analysed European demographic and migration challenges from an urban point of view as well as tried to strengthen the urban dimension of territorial cohesion in the context of the EU Territorial Agenda's revision process.

## References

- EUKN (2010): National Urban Policy of Hungary [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.eukn.org/Hungary/hu\\_en/E\\_library/Urban\\_Policy/National\\_Urban\\_Policy\\_of\\_Hungary](http://www.eukn.org/Hungary/hu_en/E_library/Urban_Policy/National_Urban_Policy_of_Hungary) (Accessed: 4/2012).
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Large sections of this text were written by the Hungarian Ministry of Interior.

## Iceland

Over 90% of the 320,000 inhabitants in this scarcely populated country live in urban areas. More than a third are to be found in the capital, Reykjavik whereas the entire metropolitan area is home to two thirds of Iceland's total population. The city's bulk has fewer than 10,000 inhabitants. The high urbanisation rate is due to a prolonged rural-

urban migration which has shaped the country in the 20th century (cf. Precedo 2009).

Against this background, urban policy in Iceland has to address not only issues in the capital (region), but also the challenges facing small towns. The Parliament of Iceland



thus adopted a national strategic plan to strengthen the economic development in the more rural parts of the country through a series of programmes and initiatives (cf. Jørgensen/Ærø 2008: 34). There is no specific national urban development policy in Iceland and, accordingly, no ministry assigned to the issue.

At local level, urban development policies focus on the control of sub-/urbanisation in Reykjavík's growing metropolitan area. Its territory is divided between different communities and there is therefore no competent regional authority. The rapid and largely uncoordinated urban growth has led to such problems as excessive urban sprawl and lack of coordination concerning large construction projects (e.g. localisation of shopping centres). In 2002, the eight municipalities of the Capital Region agreed to a joint development plan for the capital area with a planning horizon to 2024. This plan mainly addresses the concerted organisation of public transport and waste management. Furthermore, it also includes suggestions on land use, urban development, landscape planning, environmental issues as well as evaluating social and economic impacts of developments in the capital region (cf. Svæðisskipulag höfuðborgarsvæðisins; Jørgensen/Ærø 2008: 34; Reynarsson 2001: 6).

Early 2000, Reykjavík initiated the *Future City* urban development programme. The programme's objective was to develop a future vision for the city's next decade and a half through a dialogue between the municipality and the inhabitants. For this purpose, several events were organised such as conferences, debates, discussions with experts and study groups. These dialogues resulted in the implementa-

tion early 2003 of the *Masterplan Reykjavík 2001 – 2014* (*Aðalskipulag Reykjavíkur 2001 – 2014*) which mainly included statements on land use and transport development. Recently, a crucial urban development project has been the development of the capital's old port area with a particular focus on the cultural sector (including the construction of a new concert hall on the waterfront) (cf. Aðalskipulag Reykjavíkur 2001 – 2024; Reynarsson 2001: 2; Bomsdorf 2008).

## References

- Bomsdorf, Clemens (2008): Neuer Glanz für Hafenstädte. In: art. Das Kunstmagazin. 16. Mai 2008 [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.art-magazin.de/architektur/6444.html> (Accessed: 5/2012).
- Jørgensen, Gertrud, and Thorkild Ærø (2008): Urban Policy in the Nordic Countries – National Foci and Strategies for Implementation. European Planning Studies. Vol. 16, No. 1, January 2008: 23–41 [Internet]. N.p. URL: [www.eukn.org/dsresource?objectid=147967](http://www.eukn.org/dsresource?objectid=147967) (Accessed: 5/2012).
- Precedo, Pedro (2009): Social Connection and Urban Fabric in Reykjavík at the Dawn of the Global Economic Downturn. BA Thesis [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://skemman.is/stream/get/1946/2753/9074/1/Lokaritgerd.pdf> (Accessed: 5/2012).
- Reykjavíkurborg – Skipulags- og byggingarsvið (a): Aðalskipulag Reykjavíkur 2001 – 2024 [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.reykjavik.is/desktopdefault.aspx/tabid-3818/6385\\_view-2732](http://www.reykjavik.is/desktopdefault.aspx/tabid-3818/6385_view-2732) (Accessed: 5/2012).
- Reykjavíkurborg – Skipulags- og byggingarsvið (b): Svæðisskipulag höfuðborgarsvæðisins [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.reykjavik.is/desktopdefault.aspx/tabid-3818/6385\\_view-2733](http://www.reykjavik.is/desktopdefault.aspx/tabid-3818/6385_view-2733) (Accessed: 5/2012).
- Reynarsson, Bjarni (2001): Reykjavík – the Future City. Paper presented at the conference: Area-based initiatives in contemporary urban policy. Danish building and Urban Research and European Urban Research Association. Copenhagen 17.–19. May 2001 [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.sbi.dk/euraworkshops/papers/workshop1/reynarsson.htm> (Accessed: 5/2012).

## Latvia

Latvia's general development strategy is to strengthen growth and competitiveness in all areas of the country and increase cities' economic attractiveness based on the available resources and development possibilities. Against this background, integrated urban development issues have become increasingly important for the implementation of the LEIPZIG CHARTER in Latvia as well as regarding its key elements as important basic principles. The regional policy guidelines focus in particular on an area-based approach, cross-sectoral and cross-level collaboration, governance approaches and the involvement of the broadest possible spectrum of local stakeholders in the context of urban development processes (cf. Nicis/EUKN 2008: 15 f.).

Although Latvia has so far not yet established a national programme explicitly addressing integrated urban development, the *Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia up to 2030 (SDSL)* and the *Latvian National Development Plan 2007–2013 (NDP)* are two essential strategic development and planning documents pursuing a geographically and socio-economically balanced development of the country. They also include the first approaches to an integrated urban development. The *SDSL* thus covers action areas such as cultural development, training and employment, promotion of entrepreneurial independence, health care, education and schools, increase of energy efficiency, sustainable land development, improvement of (public) transport infrastructures and in general a wider participation and networking of local stakeholders, institutions and

organizations. It also determines a spatial development perspective for Latvia, including its most important development centres, that forms a basis for a polycentric state development in order to provide inhabitants with equal life and work conditions regardless of their place of residence. The most important approaches to be implemented in terms of spatial development include: enhancement of the potential and competitiveness of development centres, creating attractive urban environment for both inhabitants and investors, cooperation and interaction of urban and rural areas in providing workplaces and services, facilitating entrepreneurial activities and creation of improved living conditions in the countryside, strengthening development centres' functional networks as well as agreeing on efficient use of resources on the basis of complementarity and cooperation principles. (cf. Saeima of the Republic of Latvia 2010).

The *NDP* determines that a polycentric development of the urban network provides the necessary preconditions for an evenly balanced development in Latvia. The cities and towns have thus become a driving force for the country's development, as well as its regions'. As such, the *SDSL* is intended to be set in a long-term perspective whereas the *NDP* builds medium-term planning goals. The creation of both development and planning documents was conducted with wide participation of representatives from regional and local governments as well as of entrepreneurs, NGO's, citizens and other interested parties. (cf. MVIV 2010: 387 ff.; Nicis/EUKN 2008: 60).

With an aim of fostering polycentric development and under the competence of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development (*VARAM*) in charge of organising the European Regional Development Fund at national level, one of the priorities implemented is "polycentric development". For this purpose, three approaches are being pursued: growth of national and regional development centres, sustainable development of Riga and growth of associations of municipalities (*Novadi*). Under this priority, 35 municipalities can implement integrated projects which are essential for their development. An integrated local development strategy is a precondition to being eligible for support, reflecting a clear vision on territorial development as well as identifying challenges, growth resources and complex development solutions.

Furthermore, methodological guidelines for the elaboration of integrated development strategies at regional and local level following the LEIPZIG CHARTER principles were also compiled at national level. This was supported by OECD LEED experts and took into account the participa-

tion of stakeholders such as planners, regional and local representatives, etc. The purpose of these guidelines is to provide practical recommendations for development planners and politicians in effective territorial development planning. Additionally, methodological support was provided on the ground (cf. RAPLM 2008). The implementation of an integrated urban development policy in Latvia is almost exclusively located at local level and addresses for the most part building and urban regeneration (redevelopment, improvement of transport and public infrastructures, improving residential environments; cf. MVIV 2010: 400 f.).

Among the challenges facing the implementation of integrated approaches in Latvia at national, regional and local level is the development of essential technical skills and structures for a stronger cross-sectoral and cross-level cooperation. Overall, it seems also important to strengthen public trust concerning the administration's actions (cf. Nicis/EUKN 2008: 51).

## References

- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Nicis/EUKN (2008): European survey: Levers of public action for the development of sustainable cities. Appendix 1: Answers to the first part of the questionnaire. November 6th, 2008 (French Presidency). N.p.
- RAPLM – Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government of the Republic of Latvia (2008): Guidelines for elaboration of the integrated development strategy of local government. Riga.
- Saeima of the Republic of Latvia (2010): Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia until 2030. Riga.
- Large sections of this text were written by the Latvian Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development (*VARAM*).

## Lithuania

Like other Central and South Eastern European countries, Lithuania underwent an extensive privatisation of its municipal housing stock in the 1990s. The consequences of this process was a massive disinvestment and dereliction of the building fabric, which has become the central challenge for urban development in this country. Moreover, a restricted housing market significantly limits accession opportunities for lower-income households (cf. MVIV 2010: 409).

In response to this situation, the *Lithuanian Housing Strategy 2004 – 2020* was adopted at national level to set relevant targets for an integrated urban development. This encompasses the creation of social housing and conventional residential opportunities for vulnerable population groups (low-income earners, unemployed, young families) as well as promoting social cohesion and mixing. Additionally, local governments are encouraged to actively support the participation of institutional stakeholders, NGOs and residents in the development and implementation of urban development strategies and plans by providing local funds for this purpose. The *Programme of Refurbishment of Multi-family Buildings* was issued in 2004 to help implement the *Lithuanian Housing Strategy* and promote energy efficiency in the housing stock (cf. MVIV 2010: 408 ff.; Government of the Republic of Lithuania 2004: 6 ff., 12).

Besides these national programmes focused on building and urban renewal, integrated urban development approaches are being experimented at local level in Lithuanian cities. The capital, Vilnius, has many years' experience in the area-based development of deprived neighbourhoods. This is the case in city-wide integrative approaches such as the *Vilnius City Strategic Plan 2002 – 2011* and the *Comprehensive Plan of the Territory of Vilnius City Municipality (Vilniaus miesto savivaldybės teritorijos bendrasis planas iki 2015 metų)*. Since 1998, the *Vilnius Old Town Renewal Agency (OTRA)* has implemented the area-based *Vilnius Old Town Regeneration Strategy (VOTRS; cf. inter alia Raugaliene 2008; VSAA n.d.)*.

This original municipal organisation now has an NGO status and is considered to be an interface between stakeholders, residents and local governments. The strategic management of *OTRA* and the implementation of the annual project plans (*VOTRP*) is assumed by a superior group. This *OTRA Supervision Council (OTRA SC)* consists of 16 representatives from national ministries, local governments and private and public organizations (cf. Rutkauskas et al 2003: 15 ff., Kulikauskas 2006: 8). Besides an emphasis on

constructional and urban renewal approaches such as redevelopment, neighbourhood improvement and enhancement of public infrastructure, *OTRA* has also established public mobilisation and participation in the deprived neighbourhoods of Užupis and Paupys in the historic centre of Vilnius (cf. MVIV 2010: 419; Rutkauskas et al. 2003: 15 f., 21 f.; Kulikauskas 2006: 13 f.),. Other Lithuanian cities such as Kaunas, Klaipėda, Panevėžys and Šiauliai have also established comprehensive strategic urban development plans taking into account elements of an integrated approach.

### References

- Government of the Republic of Lithuania (2004):  
The Lithuanian Housing Strategy. Resolution No. 60, January 21 2004. Vilnius.
- Kulikauskas, Paulius (2006):  
Case Study of Vilnius Old Town Revitalisation – Draft [Internet]. Vilnius. URL: [http://www.vsaa.lt/Case\\_study\\_PK.doc](http://www.vsaa.lt/Case_study_PK.doc) (Accessed: 5/2012).
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010):  
Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union.  
Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Raugaliene, Jurate (2008): The Revitalization of Vilnius Old Town, 1995 – 2005. In: GUD – Global Urban Development Magazine. N.p.
- Rutkauskas, Gediminas, et al. (2003):  
Vilnius Old Town: Uzupis – Paupys Area Case study.  
Advanced Draft for WP2/WP3. ENTRUST Vilnius case 2002 – 2003.
- VSAA – Vilniaus senamiesčio atnaujinimo agentūra (n.d.):  
Vilniaus senamiesčio atnaujinimo agentūra/Vilnius Old Town Renewal Agency [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.vsaa.lt> (Accessed: 5/2012).

## Malta

An essential element of strategic management in Malta is the 1992 *Structure Plan for the Maltese Islands* which spans over a twenty year period. This spatial structure plan is part of a cross-sectoral approach coordinating land use at a national level, taking into account social, economic and environmental issues. It is the foundation of local detailed plans (cf. MEPA 1990; Cassar 2004: 77).

For instance, a conservation-oriented urban and development plan for the Grand Harbour Area was created in 2002 (*Grand Harbour Local Area Plan*), tackling the economic and social renewal and revitalization of communities around the harbour. It is in this context that the first attempts were made to achieve an integrated cross-sectoral urban development strategy, including partnerships between the private and public sector (cf. MEPA 2002; ENTRUST 2004: 28 ff.; MVIV 2010: 456).

One of the main general background conditions of the *Grand Harbour Area Local Plan* is the development of deprived areas with sub-standard housing, poor transport accessibility, socio-economically weaker households and ongoing population loss coupled with a growing proportion of older residents in the central areas of sub-municipalities of the Valletta agglomeration, especially in historical districts. This is occurring despite low unemployment figures and a good economic situation throughout Malta. Impacts of World War II are still clearly visible in the building fabric, mainly in the form of derelict land. In areas around Valletta, Floriana and Cottonera there are also many cases of rebuilt urban areas interspersed within deprived neighbourhoods (cf. Cassar 2004: 73 ff.; Borg 2006).

In order as to link urban renewal with transport planning, the Ministry for Urban Development and Roads (MD) established in 2005–2007 the *Transit Orientated Development Strategy and Policy*. This strategy essentially consists of concentrating different uses (such as shopping, working, leisure) close to more attractive public transport hubs. The Project Development and Coordination Unit (PDCU) was established in December 2006 to implement this strategy (Nicis/EUKN 2008).

Based on the *Grand Harbour Local Plan Area* and the *Transit Orientated Development Strategy and Policy*, integrated action plans for several districts around the port have been created since 2007. Their goal is to develop the areas in the context of economic, social and cultural challenges. Developments include not only urban, architectural and transport infrastructure but are also based on social integration

(especially of the unemployed), subsidiarity and promotion of public-private partnerships. Another key issue of these action plans is climate change mitigation (Nicis/EUKN 2008).

Coordinated by the PDCU in collaboration with various government authorities and agencies as well as relevant local councils, an initial action plan was developed for the Cottonera area with the three historic towns of Birgu (Vittoriosa), Bormla (Cospicua) and L'Isla (Senglea) on the edge of the Grand Harbour (*Cottonera Action Plan – Social Inclusion through better mobility and accessibility 2008–2018*). The integrated and holistic plan seeks to improve mobility and accessibility, as well as living conditions for residents of the Cottonera area. At the same time, a likey gentrification is to be counteracted. The preparation of the plan was accompanied by a broad participatory process with a series of public events (Ministry for the Environment and Spatial Planning, Spatial Planning Directorate, Republic of Slovenia 2008).

A similar integrated approach should also be taken in the renewal of a deprived neighbourhood of Valetta (Il Biccerija). For this area, the goals are to foster economic development and attracting new residents, as well as a renewal of historical monuments. The implementation should take place within a framework of public-private partnerships (MVIV 2010: 463 ff.).

In summary, renewal projects in Maltese deprived neighbourhoods since the adoption of the LEIPZIG CHARTER have increasingly taken an integrated approach. In addition to structural and urban renovation of the building stock, these approaches also take into account improvement of public transport systems and social inclusion. Furthermore, these increasingly include bottom-up approaches involving local politics and other key on-site stakeholders. Key factors for a successful integrated urban renewal are considered to be (MVIV 2010: 465):

- holistic approach,
- participation of key stakeholders,
- identification of the key issues,
- Articulation of objectives and measures with the participation of all relevant stakeholders.

## References

- Borg, Malcolm (2006): Alternative Transit Systems in the Harbour Area. In: Buhmann, Beck Koh, Hasse (Eds.) (2006): Landscape Architecture. Conceptual Proposals for Valletta and Floriana. Bernburg.
- Cassar, Godwin (2004): Cities on Malta. In: Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Affairs (Ed.) (2004): Cities in the New EU Countries. Position, Problems, Policies. Amstelveen: 73 – 78.
- ENTRUST (Ed.) (2004): Regenerating neighbourhoods in partnership – learning from emergent practices.
- MEPA – Malta Environment & Planning Authority (2002): Grand Harbour Local Plan. Valletta.
- MEPA – Malta Environment & Planning Authority (1990): Structure Plan for the Maltese Islands. Valletta.
- Ministry for the Environment and Spatial Planning, Spatial Planning Directorate, Republic of Slovenia (Ed.) (2008): Coordination between Territorial and Urban Development. Final Report on Action 1.1. of the First Action Programme for the Implementation of the Territorial Agenda of the EU. Ljubljana.
- MUDR – Ministry for Urban Development and Roads (2004): A Public Transport Strategy for the Maltese Islands. TOD Policy Paper. Valletta.
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Nicis/EUKN (2008): European survey: Levers of public action for the development of sustainable cities. Appendix 1: Answers to the first part of the questionnaire. November 6th, 2008 (French Presidency) [Internet]. The Hague. URL: <http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/corporate/doc/AppelOffre/Europeen%20survey%20EN.pdf> (Accessed: 3/2012).

## Montenegro

Since Montenegro withdrew from the former Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1992, it has experienced an uneven territorial development. Between urban and rural areas, but mainly between the less developed northern half of the country and the much more developed Centre and South, there remain strong differences in the population distribution as well as with regards to social and economic situations. Background causes include the loss of importance of formerly important industrial centres and the effects of armed conflict in former Yugoslavia in the 1990s.

Against this background, the main challenges facing urban development in Montenegro today are social problems such as unemployment (especially amongst young people but also within disadvantaged groups such as refugees and Romani people), poverty, precarious and illegal employment as well as crime. In many areas, building/urban deficiencies, lack of social infrastructure, shortage of housing as well as green and public spaces, or environmental problems can be observed (cf. Müller/Lješković 2008: 105 ff.; MTEP 2007: 24 ff.; Golubovic 2006: 1). Overall, uncontrolled and illegal construction outside of designated areas are the result in many places of a poor implementation of town planning instruments. This is particularly the case in coastal regions and around the capital, Podgorica. Furthermore, increasing socio-spatial polarisation trends can be observed in urban areas.

Although Montenegro has not yet established a specific programme explicitly addressing integrated urban development, certain approaches in the context of the key *National strategy of sustainable development of Montenegro*

(*NSSD*) play an important role. Adopted in 2007 at national level, the *NSSD* stresses the importance of governance, integrated approaches as well as cooperation and dialogue with participation of different stakeholders. It is divided into three thematic pillars with corresponding fields of action: economic development (including diversifying the economic structure of the country, employment, supporting local economic initiatives), the environment and natural resources (including promoting environmental protection, reducing energy consumption and increasing energy efficiency) and social development (including promotion of education and training, health promotion, a general improvement in quality of life and safety in urban neighbourhoods, taking disadvantaged groups of residents into account and reduction of illegal construction; cf. MTEP 2007: 12 ff., 24 ff., 58 f.).

The *NSSD* also includes an *Action Plan* in which priorities for action within the individual fields are detailed. It also includes information about specific timelines and persons responsible for the implementation as well as the identification of indicators for an annual evaluation. This monitoring will serve to review and adjust the National strategy of sustainable development of Montenegro every five years (cf. MTEP 2007: 17, 65 ff.). The implementation of the *NSSD* is conducted by the *National Council for Sustainable Development (NCSD)*. Established in 2002, the *NCSD* consults the Prime Minister, representatives of all ministries, the three largest cities in the country, business associations and large companies, research institutions and NGOs (cf. NSOR). This network of national stakeholders is supported by the *Office for Sustainable Development (OSD)*, a cross-departmental

office of the Prime Minister established in 2005 also in charge of monitoring the implementation of the *NSSD* (cf. NSOR; MTEP 2007: 65 f.).

The major challenges which the *NSSD* faces are the development of a coherent spatial planning system at national, regional and local levels as well as improving implementation controls and public participation processes. To ensure this, (continuing) education and training institutions must be established, especially addressing the need for local authorities to develop relevant skills (cf. Government of Montenegro 2009: 56 ff.; MTEP 2007: 45).

## Norway

In Norway, local authorities are responsible for urban development and renewal – no national programme has yet been launched in these areas (MVIV 2010: 470 ff.). At the local level, the development of deprived neighbourhoods is particularly important, as is the case of the *Grorud Valley Action Project (Groruddalssatsingen)* in Oslo. Over one fifth of the capital's population lives in the four districts concerned: Alna, Bjerke, Grorud and Stovner in the Grorud valley area. The challenges they are confronted to include in some cases very large qualitative disparities between residential areas leading to severe deficiencies in the building stock in some neighbourhoods, the economic decline of some neighbourhood centres with negative consequences to local life, heavy traffic congestion due to the presence of three motorways, a railway line and two underground lines which follow the valley and constitute physical barriers between urban areas, as well as the – related – stress caused by noise and air pollution. On top of these issues, these neighbourhoods also face social and socio-structural problems in certain areas (low levels of education, unemployment, high turnover, social segregation with ethnic and cultural aspects), followed by a negative image (cf. Oslo Kommune 2012).

Against this background, the 2007–2016 *Groruddalssatsingen* action programme is being implemented to improve the local environmental and living conditions in the Grorud Valley, thus strengthening the residents' identification to their neighbourhood. The Norwegian government and the city of Oslo have agreed to cooperate on this

## References

- Golubovic Matic, Darinka (2006): Influence of Socio-Economic factors in the development of the Bars Urban Region. Paper presented at the 42nd ISoCaRP Congress 2006, Istanbul.
- Government of Montenegro – Office for Sustainable Development (2009): The Second Annual Report on the Implementation of the National Strategy of Sustainable Development of Montenegro for the period April 2008 – September 2009. Podgorica.
- MTEP – Government of the Republic of Montenegro/Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Protection (2007): National strategy of sustainable development of Montenegro. Podgorica.
- Müller, Yvonne, and Sanja Lješkovčić (2008): Illegal construction in Montenegro. In: Technical Chronicles. Journal of the Technical Chamber of Greece (TCG). No 1-2/2008. Athen: 105 – 110.
- NSOR – National Council for Sustainable Development (NSOR) [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.eeac-net.org/bodies/montenegro/mo\\_nsor.htm](http://www.eeac-net.org/bodies/montenegro/mo_nsor.htm) (Accessed: 5/2012).

project. Each contributes approximately 50 million Norwegian Kroner yearly (approximately 6.7 million euros) to the project and both share the responsibility of implementing the initiative. At the local level, a cooperation committee was established with 35 stakeholders representing among others the local residents, organizations, public agencies, housing associations, local entrepreneurs, local authorities and the city of Oslo. At the political level, the Ministry for the Environment organises once a year a meeting of political actors (*Politisk Møte*) where different ministries, the Oslo City Council and representatives of the areas involved decide on the priorities and resources for the following year. A coordination committee guarantees the proper interaction between the different sectoral areas of action as well as communication and exchange between all actors and levels involved (Oslo Kommune 2012). The cooperation between local authorities and ministries is organised by the on-site bureau *Plankontoret for Groruddalen*, created early 2001 by the City of Oslo (Department for Urban Development). A particular attention is also given to the activation and involvement of local residents beyond these formal bodies (cf. City of Oslo 2004 and Oslo Kommune 2012).

*Groruddalssatsingen* covers four main action areas/programmes in environmentally friendly transport development (Programme 1), green development, sports and culture (Programme 2), housing and urban development (Programme 3), as well as early childhood development, schooling and education, health and social interaction (Programme 4). Within each field, individual projects and

measures are implemented, based to a great extent on annual, participatory action plans. The lead responsibility for each programme is shared between one of the ministries (departments for environment, transport, local and regional development or for children, equality and social inclusion) and one of the municipal departments (transport and environment, urban development or social issues). Until 2012, the spatial priorities were focused in the Furuset (Alna), Romsås (Grorud) and Haugenstua (Stovner) neighbourhoods. In 2012 another four areas were included: Lindeberg (Alna), Linderud (Bjerke), Ammerud (Grorud) and Fossum (Stovner).

Today, more than 200 projects have been completed (cf. Oslo Kommune 2012). In Norway a close cooperation between national, local and territorial levels is emphasized as essential to successful integrated development strategies (MVIV 2010: 480).

## Poland

In Poland, more than 60% of the population now lives in cities where the fast urbanization process has sometimes left large development gaps between urban and rural areas. Against this background, urban development policy in Poland faces the challenge of stabilizing the social and spatial cohesion in metropolitan regions. Other challenges include managing demographic change, overcoming socio-spatial fragmentation within cities, raising the economic competitiveness of Polish cities, improving the inadequate transport infrastructures as well as providing (affordable) housing (cf. MRR n.d., OECD 2011: 98, 104).

Urban development and renewal in Poland are mainly municipal affairs. No national or regional urban development and renewal programmes have yet been issued. The 68 Polish cities have an extensive local autonomy but, in order as to apply for funding, must establish local development strategies and identify areas where renewal measures have to be implemented. However, for financial reasons, urban renewal measures cover mostly only very small parts of urban areas or in some cases take into account only individual buildings (MVIV 2010: 490; EUKN see also 2011).

Against this background, ERDF funds count as the most important resources for urban development in the 16 Regional Operational Programmes in Poland. The Ministry of Regional Development laid an overarching framework for their use as well as for designing strategies and programmes of various departments at national level in the

## References

- City of Oslo. Agency for Planning and Building Services (2004): The Grorud Valley Action Project.
- Falleth, Eva Irene, and Gro Sandkjær Hansen (2011): Participation in planning – a study of urban development in Norway. In: *European Journal of Spatial Development*, No. 42.
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June, 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Nystad, Jens Fredrik (Ed.) (2004): Building and Urban Development in Norway – a selection of current issues. The Norwegian State Housing Bank. N.p.
- Oslo Kommune, Plankontoret for Groruddalen (2012): Groruddalssatsingen [Internet]. URL: [http://www.prosjekt-groruddalen.oslo.kommune.no/om\\_groruddalssatsingen/](http://www.prosjekt-groruddalen.oslo.kommune.no/om_groruddalssatsingen/) (Accessed: 08/2012).

*National Development Strategy 2007–2015 (Strategia Rozwoju Kraju)*. It is based on six guidelines (MRR 2006: 25): increasing economic competitiveness and innovation, improving technical and social infrastructures, (qualitative) employment growth, strengthening social cohesion, improving safety, rural development, regional development and improving territorial cohesion. The strategy document suggests measures or areas of activity for all the six points, some of which are particularly relevant for a (potentially) integrated urban development: strengthening small and medium enterprises (SME) development and expansion of transport infrastructures, improvement of housing supply, environmental protection, safety, access to education, health care, nursing and other social services and creation of employment opportunities (MRR 2006: 26 ff.). There is a particular emphasis on the need for a comprehensive public participation (ibid.: 47 ff.) and the importance of inter-ministerial cooperation and the collaboration of national, regional and local levels is also stressed in the strategy at various points (ibid.: 73 ff.).

In parallel to EU funding, local governments can also apply for social housing funds. Furthermore, a government fund promoting energy performance of buildings is also available (cf. MVIV 2010: 483 ff.).

*The National Strategy of Regional Development 2010–2020: Regions, Cities, Rural Areas* coordinates national and local development strategies as part of an integrated regional

policy and decentralizes planning powers to the regional level. The overriding objectives are to improve the economic, social and territorial cohesion, combined among others with the strengthening of urban functions and the support of regeneration processes (of socio-economically disadvantaged areas) in urban areas. Overall, the importance of network-based decision-making, coordination between different fields of action and actors, common standards for all regions as well as appropriate management structures will be emphasised (cf. EUKN 2011: 77; NSRD 2011: 7 ff.; OECD 2011: 99).

The latest strategic approach is the *National Spatial Development Perspective 2030 (Konsepję Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju 2030)* which brings together spatial planning and socio-economic development at all levels of government. A networking-oriented, participatory and integrated development approach is therefore emphasised, whereby cities and city networks (to be established) play a special role. Overriding areas of activity include economic and employment development, construction or improvement of social and transport infrastructures and environmental protection (cf. EUKN 2011: 77; MRR n.d.; OECD 2011: 102).

Overall, the principle of integrated urban development – in the spirit of the LEIPZIG CHARTER – is recognised as important. However, urban development at local level still focuses mainly on “classic” spatial planning. Strategies that include economic and social considerations in addition to urban aspects are often difficult to implement because of

their complexity and the limited financial resources available (MVIV 2010: 502). One of many good examples of successful integrated urban (district) development is located in the city of Ruda Śląska. There, in a deprived area of the city, measures for building regeneration have been carried through with the establishment of a neighbourhood centre, offers in the fields of sport, education and culture, an intensification of citizen involvement and a local neighbourhood management (BMVBS 2010: 31 ff.)

## References

- BMVBS – Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (Ed.) (2010): *Stadtumbau in mittel- und osteuropäischen Städten. Ergänzung der europäischen Vergleichsstudie zum Stadtumbau West. Reihe Werkstatt:Praxis, Heft 72.*
- EUKN – European Urban Knowledge Network (2011): *Urban Development in Europe. A Survey of National Approaches to Urban Policy in 15 Member States.* The Hague.
- MRR – Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego (n.d.): *Konsepję Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju 2030.* Warszawa.
- MRR – Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego (2006): *Strategia Rozwoju Kraju 2007–2015.* Warszawa.
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): *Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed.* N.p.
- NSRD – Ministry of Regional Development (2011): *National Strategy of Regional Development – synthesis.* Warsaw.
- OECD – Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (2011): *Poland. OECD Urban policy Reviews.* Paris.

## Portugal

Several integrated urban development programmes have been implemented in Portugal. These are respectively under the responsibility of the *Direcção-Geral do Ordenamento do Território e Desenvolvimento Urbano (DGOTDU)* at national level, and of the regional governments of Azores and Madeira for these autonomous regions. The *Instituto da Habitação e da Reabilitação Urbana (IHRU)* is in charge of implementing the housing and urban regeneration policy for the state. The *Política de Cidades POLIS XXI (2007–2013)* is a national policy, regionally managed and implemented by the local authorities. As main framework, it addresses issues such as innovation and competitiveness, integrated urban planning and urban governance, environmental protection and quality of life as well as social cohesion. Measures and projects mainly focus on building partnerships for integrated urban regeneration as well as urban

networks for competitiveness and innovation, innovative urban development and consolidating the national urban system structure. Single programmes are financed by combined government funds and EU funding, as well as by private resources in the case of public-private partnerships or through the involvement of private funds (Campos 2008; EUKN 2010), whereby the main LEIPZIG CHARTER principles are taken into account. The *JESSICA* Initiative, present in Portugal since 2009, is another instrument contributing to the implementation of the *Política de Cidades POLIS XXI (2007–2013)* which adds private sector investment to local initiatives already co-financed by EU structural funds (Regional Operational Programmes). *JESSICA* supports sustainable projects in urban regeneration, energy efficiency, renewable energies as well as local and business entrepreneurship.



In a more intensive form, the *Iniciativa Bairros Críticos (IBC – Critical Urban Areas Initiative 2006 – 2013)* is an experimental implementation of this programme based on the LEIPZIG CHARTER principles in the three deprived neighbourhoods of Lisbon-Cova da Moura, Vale da Amoreira and Porto-Lagarteiro (cf. MVIV 2010: 522; IHRU ICB). The problems in these areas include poor residential environment quality, partially illegal housing, low education and qualification levels of local residents, income poverty, high dependence on government transfer payments, discrimination as well as negative local image (cf. IHRU ICB).

More mobile population groups are usually drawn towards urban peripheries where the housing offer is of better quality and more diverse. This development has intensified socio-economic discriminations and building/urban dereliction, particularly in inner city areas (cf. Benach/Walliser 2011: 229). Simultaneously, these neighbourhoods – which are characterized by an ageing population and/or a disproportionate number of young people – display strong potentials. These include the availability of affordable housing, cultural diversity, strong social networks and good neighbourly relations, occasionally a very active non-profit sector and in some places well functioning (informal and semi-informal) local economies (cf. IHRU ICB).

The *Iniciativa Bairros Críticos* focuses on experimenting new forms of interdepartmental cooperation at national and local level, as well as cooperation of political and administrative levels with local residents. Thus, at national level, eight ministries are involved in the programme's implementation whereas local organizations, NGOs, residents' associations and private companies are engaged at local authorities' level. The *Instituto da Habitação e da Reabilitação Urbana* supervises each of the three districts' steering committees, which consist of one local government representative, representatives of two or three ministries as well as a representative of a residents' association and/or citizens' initiative per area. Furthermore, a project team is in charge of implementing the respective measures and projects in each area. It is also held accountable to the steering committee (MVIV 2010: 521 ff.).

Measures within building and urban range include rehabilitation and modernization (including accessibility), increasing buildings' energy efficiency, the expansion and improvement of infrastructures, as well as enhancing the residential environment, including the creation of public green and leisure spaces. In terms of social integration, different neighbourhoods focus on different issues. These vary from an orientation focused on improving the social, educational and health infrastructures to promoting the

local economy by including consulting and training services or by supporting start-ups (MVIV 2010: 523 f.).

## References

- Benach, Nuria, and Andrés Waliser (2011): Introduction to the special issue: urban problems and issues in contemporary Spanish and Portuguese cities. In: *Urban Research & Practice*, Vol. 4, No. 3, November 2011: 227 – 231.
- Campos, Vitor (2008): Política de Cidades POLIS XXI. Direção-Geral do Ordenamento do Território e Desenvolvimento Urbano [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.dgotdu.pt/pc/> (Accessed: 3/2012).
- Domingues, Álvaro, Nuno Portas and Teresa Sá Marques (2004): Portugal: urban policies or policies with an urban incidence? In: Euricur – European Institute for Comparative Urban Research, Erasmus University Rotterdam (Eds.) (2004): *National Urban Policies in the European Union*. Eds.: Leo van den Berg, Erik Braun, Jan van der Meer. Rotterdam: 82 – 84.
- EUKN – European Urban knowledge Network (2010): Urban Policy in Portugal [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.eukn.org/Portugal/pt\\_en/EUKN/Urban\\_Policy\\_in\\_Portugal](http://www.eukn.org/Portugal/pt_en/EUKN/Urban_Policy_in_Portugal) (Accessed: 3/2012).
- IHRU ICB – Instituto da Habitação e da Reabilitação Urbana: Portal da Habitação – Iniciativa Bairros Críticos [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.portaldahabitacao.pt/pt/ibc/> (Accessed: 2/2012).
- MVIV – Gobierno de España – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): *Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union*. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.

## Romania (with case study Timișoara)

A key condition to understanding urban development in Romania is the incomplete transformation process which started in 1989. Cities still feature building and urban neglect, a lack of investment and economic stagnation, neighbourhoods in dire need of renewal and development with regards to the housing stock, infrastructure, public space and local economy. Significant suburbanisation trends and a stagnation of inner city areas are signs of spatial implications of a socio-economic polarisation. Like many other transition countries, Romania's housing stock was also privatised, leaving new owners without necessary resources for its preservation. An unclear land and building ownership structure as well as a weak public sector against private investors' interests are further challenges for urban development (cf. MVIV 2010: 554, 557 f.; Gabi 2008: 48 f.; gtz 2008: 20 f.; Timișoara/gtz 2007)<sup>1)</sup>.

Discussion at state level on a national urban policy is essentially still in its early stages. However, despite the economic crisis, there is a growing concern on strengthening the development of (central) urban areas instead of residential and commercial developments in suburban areas. A compulsory (regulatory) framework for integrated urban development is thus currently being developed for this purpose in Romania. Furthermore, applications to national and European funds are legally regulated, prescribing municipalities to develop integrated approaches (cf. MVIV 2010: 554 ff.). Passed in 2008, this law identifies seven Romanian cities of great regional economic importance as (metropolitan) growth poles: Brașov, Craiova, Iași, Cluj-Napoca, Constanța, Ploiești and Timișoara. A further thirteen cities were identified as „Urban Development Poles”. The *Priority axis 1 “Support to sustainable development of urban growth poles”* funded by the EU Structural Funds 2007–2013 “*Regional Operational Programme*” (ROP) for a sustainable economic and employment development allows these cities to upgrade their technical and social infrastructure, to renovate their social housing stock as well as to improve socio-economic conditions in urban areas. Integrated development plans (*PIDU – Plan Integral de Dezvoltare Urbanistică*) established by local authorities with the participation of citizens and other local actors are required to qualify to these funds (cf. Wermke 2011; Guvernul României 2008; Guvernul României 2007: 122 ff.).

1) Parts of the article that do not refer to other sources are based on in-situ interviews carried out with local administrative and neighbourhood stakeholders.

Overall, integrated urban development in Romania is mainly a local concern, as shown by the example of Timișoara.

### Implementation of integrated urban (district) development in Romania: the example of Timișoara

The city of Timișoara is located in the most western area of Romania and its 310,000 inhabitants include more than 30 different ethnic groups. On account of the settlement of various foreign companies after 1989, unemployment in the city is today under 2 % and the average household income is around 400 euros/month. Timișoara has the largest asset of protected historic buildings in Romania, which, however, present many problems. Old buildings were expropriated by the State at the time of the Socialist Republic and apartments divided into smaller units on the basis of a legal regulation, thus limiting maximum floor space per person, and then were made available at low rents. In the 1990s, the massive housing privatisation fragmented ownership structures and the local authority had difficulties promoting urban renewal, which is why many buildings remain today in poor conditions. To address this situation, the community – especially individual home owners – must be involved as much as possible in municipal plans.

Until a few years ago, Romanian cities filled their duties on the basis of local land use plans. According to Romanian law, these were to be renewed every ten years. However, more strategic planning approaches have recently been promoted by State authorities. With its integrated *Masterplan Planul Urbanistic General (PUG) Timișoara* (second development phase 2012) based on the LEIPZIG CHARTER, the city of Timișoara developed a local strategy that goes beyond a mere land-use planning and features an urban development plan (cf. Primăria Municipiului Timișoara 2012: 13). This master plan included, among other things, an integrated approach to the three old building areas of Cetate, Josefîn and Fabric (Timișoara/gtz 2007), developed in 2007 with the support of the former *Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ – German Agency for Technical Cooperation)*. At the time, the regeneration measures in these three historic districts were some of the most important and visible projects in terms of integrated urban renewal in Timișoara. The plan also served as a basis for a comprehensive participation process, open to stakeholders other than property owners.

The master plan established city-wide the following planning guideline principles: “access and mobility”, “innovative and entrepreneurial economy”, “attractive environment” and “community partnership”. These were to be implemented by developing a competitive urban economic structure (e.g. establishment of commercial, industrial and research parks, promotion of small and medium-sized enterprises, developing education infrastructure, improvement of accessibility and mobility, development of “hard”, communication and utility infrastructures) and generally increasing the attractiveness of Timișoara (e.g. building renovation, development of public space, construction of social infrastructure, energy efficiency improvement, development of the housing stock, preserving the architectural heritage, development of image and identity). Furthermore, an improved governance would be achieved notably through technical staff training, applying integrated urban development principles and strengthening participation processes (cf. *Primăria Municipiului Timișoara 2012*).

All administrative departments have been involved in developing the plan, bringing their different issues for the first time together in one office (Department for Urban Planning). The *PUG Timișoara* serves as a flexible planning framework and as basic principle for a more inclusive government activity as well as for increased citizen participation, which has become mandatory in Romania since January 2012. The plan is not supported financially, which is why resource-related questions remain largely open. However, some of the projects discussed should be taken into account in the annual budget plans. In addition, the master plan serves as the basis for obtaining EU funds.

With its integrated and participatory approach, the master plan is a new instrument for the administration and the citizens. These actors therefore first had to get used to its implementation, in particular with regards to participatory processes. Citizen’s expectations are now relatively high, however, these issues tend to be more specific and related to individual experiences rather than developing a strategic planning approach. This gap between “theory” and “practice” is to be bridged in the future by tangible applications of the *PUG* (action plans) in which the administration’s and local issues are brought closer together and realistic implementation options are presented.

In terms of organisation, this partnership between administration and neighbourhoods has been institutionalized with the establishment of neighbourhood councils. These voluntary, politically independent civic organizations seek to improve quality of life in their neighbourhoods. In



Timișoara, 19 district councils aim to trigger a dialogue between citizens and the administration, to foster residents’ participation and thus promote (local) social cohesion. Neighbourhood councils generally have 15 to 30 members

and are assigned for three year mandates. They do not have their own budget but receive financial grants from the town for the implementation of neighbourhood festivals, the publication of district newspapers or their own websites, etc. The chairmen of neighbourhood councils are elected by local residents. They are in touch with the local administration and in particular with their contact person from the department in charge of communication who takes part in the neighbourhood councils' meetings (cf. Primăria Municipiului Timișoara n.d.).

The Fabric neighbourhood – an old building district with many historic buildings and with a local population of approximately 35,000, a traditionally multiethnic population structure (Roma, Hungarians, Serbs, German, etc.) as well as a high proportion of socio-economically disadvantaged households – also has its own neighbourhood council. It holds themed public meetings every three months to reach out to the local population. Issues addressed in these meetings include the condition of buildings, streets, public spaces and infrastructure as well as social and neighbourhood conflicts and safety issues. The neighbourhood council gathers improvement suggestions together and forwards them in the form of written submissions to the relevant local government departments. Proposals can also be addressed at regular inter-neighbourhood council meetings in the presence of the mayor and heads of departments, in which municipal plans are debated and planning priorities are set. The Fabric neighbourhood council then uses cultural events to present both itself and the work it has achieved. Cooperation with schools in the neighbourhood raises interests concerning local urban development and the need for participation. Previous successful achievements thus include the regeneration of a central square in the area, the redevelopment of three parks, the rehabilitation of roads and their lighting, an improved traffic management, publishing a neighbourhood newspaper, setting and operating its own website as well as smaller activities such as neighbourhood festivals.

## Slovenia

At national level, the framework for urban development is essentially defined by the Slovenian *Spatial Planning Act* which was revised in 2007 to include, among other, goals in terms of sustainable development and quality of the living environment as well as certain elements of the LEIPZIG CHARTER. One of the law's main concern is, in view of an efficient land use, to promote an integrated urban renewal, prioritising the use of brownfield sites or other underdevel-

oped sites with existing infrastructure in urban areas before the development of new settlements. Integrated urban development is thus understood as a combination of social, economic, environmental and spatial aspects of urban planning (Nicis/EUKN 2008: 31; Pogačnik 2010).

It appears overall in Timișoara that successful neighbourhood developments are achieved through communication and cooperation between all stakeholders and levels, as well as through the backing by the city leaders. Several interviewees suggested for future development the need to improve the administrative staff's and other stakeholders' (e.g. technical staff) essential know-how and called for a greater professionalization of neighbourhood councils in order as to move towards neighbourhood management (stimulation and coordination of mobilisation and participation).

## References

- Gabi, Stefan (2008): Stadtentwicklung in Rumänien. Ein Erfahrungsbericht. In: PlanerIn Heft 3, Juni 2008: 48 – 50.
- gtz – Deutsche Gesellschaft für technische Zusammenarbeit (Ed.) (2008): Lebendige Altstädte – urbane Kulturen. Integrierte Altstadtentwicklung. Eschborn.
- Guvernul României (2008): HG Nr. 998/2008, HG 1149/2008, HG 1513/2008.
- Guvernul României (2007): Programul Operational Regional 2007 – 2013. Bukarest.
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Primăria Municipiului Timișoara (2012): Planul Urbanistic General Timișoara 2012. Etapa 2 – Concept General de Dezvoltare Urbana (Matsrplan), Ianuarie 2012. Timișoara.
- Primăria Municipiului Timișoara (n.d.): Consiliile consultative de cartier. Timișoara.
- Timișoara/gtz – Stadt Timișoara/Deutsche Gesellschaft für technische Zusammenarbeit (Ed.) (2007): Integriertes Maßnahmekonzept zur behutsamen Erneuerung und wirtschaftlichen Belegung der Altbauquartiere von Timișoara. Timișoara.
- Wermke, Holger (2011): Entwicklungsstrategie für Kronstadt [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.partnerregion-centru-rumaenien.eu/zusammenarbeit/wirtschaft/142-entwicklungsstrategie-fuer-kronstadt.html> (Accessed: 5/2012).

Besides, Slovenia already has a *Spatial Development Strategy* established in 2004. It also deals with urban develop-

ment, aiming to improve the quality of life and the social environment in cities and districts by focusing among other on renewing residential areas, rehabilitating and stabilising deprived neighbourhoods as well as reusing derelict and conversion land. In addition to promoting an urban renewal developing social and cultural infrastructure with green and public spaces, this strategy supports proximity to the workplace and good accessibility. Deprived neighbourhoods, which are restricted by issues of use and development, should be identified and spatially delimited (MOP 2004; Pogačnik 2010). In Slovenia, socio-spatial discriminations are primarily concentrated in districts of the country's eight major cities. Deprived areas are mostly situated in housing estates as well as former workers' neighbourhoods in city centres (cf. Sendi et al 2004: 43 ff., MOP 2004: 15; Ploštajner et al. 2004: 59; Andrews 2004: 134 f.).

A national programme supporting urban (development) policy in Slovenia has so far not yet been issued. However, integrated urban renewal has been a priority in Slovenia's operational "Regional Development" programme when applying for European Structural Funds. Furthermore, there are a number of sectoral and departmental approaches, strategies and programmes at state level that consider integrated urban development to be important.

Due to the absence of a regional government level, the implementation of various policies is split between the state and local authorities (Nicis/EUKN 2008: 75 f.). Programmes and strategies addressing specific urban problems take into account the interests of all stakeholders concerned and involved (including owners, investors, planners, municipalities, NGOs, residents), and are developed at local level (cf. MOP 2004: 33 ff.; Andrews 2004: 128 f.; Sendi et al. 2004: 47 f.).

The *Coastal Area Management Programme (CAMP)* is an example of an integrated approach to regional and inter-urban development. This programme, which was implemented over the period 2004 – 2007, included all three coastal towns of Slovenia (Koper, Izola, Piran). The aim was notably to design the coastal strip as a public space and to connect the cities. For this purpose, the three local authorities amended their urban development plans at the same time. Further sectors of priority included improving the sustainability of tourism and transport, reducing environmental pollution, protecting cultural heritage, preserving the biodiversity and strengthening competitiveness and quality of life in the region. A great importance was given to stakeholders' and the general public's participation in the planning process (Nicis/EUKN 2008: 61 f.; UNEP/ MAP-PAP/RAC 2008).

The "Ljubljana 2025" Vision is another example of a local integrated urban development approach. Social, environmental and economic elements were integrated to the preparation of this vision for the future development of Ljubljana. Specifically, these include improving the urban quality of life, rehabilitating and restoring the historic Old Town, expanding green areas city-wide as well as creating new jobs in more recent residential areas and improving the infrastructure to reduce congestion problems. Various ministries, local authorities, NGOs and citizens were involved in developing this vision (Janez n.d., Nicis/EUKN 2008: 62 f.).

## References

- Andrews, Kaliopa Dimitrovska (2004): Nachhaltige Raumentwicklung in Slowenien. Zwischen globalen Trends und lokalen Stadtentwicklungsproblemen. In: Uwe Altröck, Simon Güntner, Sandra Huning and Deike Peters (Eds.), *Zwischen Anpassung und Neuerung. Raumplanung und Stadtentwicklung in den Staaten der EU-Osterweiterung*. Planungsrundschau Nr. 11. Cottbus: 125 – 139.
- Koželj, Janez (n.d.): Vision of Ljubljana in 2025; a proposed spatial vision for the long-term development of the city [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.ljubljana.si/en/municipality/vision-ljubljana> (Accessed: 5/2012).
- MOP – Ministrstvo za okolje in proctor/Ministry of the Environment, Spatial Planning and Energy Slovenia (2004): SDSS – Spatial development Strategy of Slovenia (Official Gazette of the RS no. 76/04) [Internet]. Ljubljana. URL: [http://www.arhiv.mop.gov.si/fileadmin/mop.gov.si/pageuploads/publikacije/drugo/en/sprs\\_eng.pdf](http://www.arhiv.mop.gov.si/fileadmin/mop.gov.si/pageuploads/publikacije/drugo/en/sprs_eng.pdf) (Accessed: 5/2012).
- Nicis/EUKN (2008): European survey: Levers of public action for the development of sustainable cities. Appendix 1: Answers to the first part of the questionnaire. November 6th, 2008 (French Presidency) [Internet]. The Hague. URL: <http://urbact.eu/fileadmin/corporate/doc/AppelOffre/European%20survey%20EN.pdf> (Accessed: 3/2012).
- Ploštajner, Zlata, Barbara Černič Mali and Richard Sendi (2004): *Large Housing Estates in Slovenia. Policies and practices*. RESTATE report 3g. Utrecht.
- Pogačnik, Andrej (2010): Polycentric urban system in Slovenia. Vortrag bei der Tagung "Functional flows of innovation and development perspectives in MED regions" am 7. Oktober 2010 in Ljubljana [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.inflowence.eu/Data/Sites/1/presentations/s1\\_pogacnik\\_polycentricityinslo\\_oct2010.pdf](http://www.inflowence.eu/Data/Sites/1/presentations/s1_pogacnik_polycentricityinslo_oct2010.pdf) (Accessed: 5/2012).
- Sendi, Richard, Kaliopa Dimitrovska Andrews and Barbara Černič Mali (2004): *Cities in Slovenia*. In: Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Affairs (Ed.): *Cities in the New EU Countries. Position, Problems, Policies*. Amstelveen: 43 – 48.
- Spatial Planning Act (ZPNact), Official Gazette of the RS, no. 33/2007. Validity: since 28/04/2007 [Internet]. Ljubljana. URL: [http://www.arhiv.mop.gov.si/fileadmin/mop.gov.si/pageuploads/zakonodaja/prostor/nactrtovanje/prostorsko\\_nactrtovanje\\_en.pdf](http://www.arhiv.mop.gov.si/fileadmin/mop.gov.si/pageuploads/zakonodaja/prostor/nactrtovanje/prostorsko_nactrtovanje_en.pdf) (Accessed: 5/2012).
- UNEP/MAP-PAP/RAC (2008): *MAP Coastal Area Management Programme (CAMP) Slovenia: Final Integrated Report*. MAP Technical Series No. 171. UNEP/MAP [Internet]. Athens. URL: <http://195.97.36.231/acrobatfiles/MTSacrobatfiles/mts171.pdf> (Accessed: 5/2012).

## Spain

The Spanish Constitution establishes that housing and urban policies are the competence of the country's 17 autonomous regions. However, these remain under the umbrella of state legislation – such as the national *land act* – and have their own corresponding legislative bases. Within this framework, cities also act as a third public planning authority.

Housing and urban policy investment programmes are implemented at all three government levels and focus mainly on social housing for disadvantaged segments of the population as well as on urban renewal (historical centres). The *Ministerio de Fomento* is in charge of these policies at national level. In 1992, with the participation of the regions and cities, the *Plan Estatal de Vivienda* (national housing plan) was launched with a 4-year running period. In the meantime, it has been further developed into the *Plan Estatal de Vivienda y Rehabilitación* (National Housing and Urban Renewal Plan) for the 2009–2012 period, taking into account the LEIPZIG CHARTER criteria. The “*Iniciativa Urbana*” established by the *Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad* as an integrated approach for the implementation of ERDF funding is also of crucial importance at national level.

Urban development and renewal policies in Spain must currently pay attention mostly to the challenges imposed by the real estate and financial crisis. Spain having a much stronger home ownership culture rather than that of rental – social housing is also about providing affordable property –, the consequences of the real estate and financial crisis have been particularly severe. From 1997 to 2007, the number of newly built houses and apartments rose as rapidly as property prices, driven mainly by favourable bank loans with long repayment periods. As interest rates started rising, demand declined, banks awarded in light of the international banking crisis less interesting loan conditions and many households were unable to pay their debts. As a result, over 680,000 new houses are now for sale. The economic crisis, unemployment and personal insolvency make for a closed circuit.

An other critical element of recent urban development in Spain is the rapidly growing number of immigrants. Their share of the total population rose from 3.3% in 2001 to 12.1% in 2009 (cf. Leal 2011). As immigrants usually have very little material resources, they have to rely on affordable housing. This is typically found dispersed throughout various residential neighbourhoods, and is particularly concentrated in towns centres with derelict old housing

buildings as well as new (social) housing estates of the 1950s–1970s. This is particularly the case in the metropolitan areas of Madrid and Barcelona. In these areas, immigrants come across elderly people stricken by poverty and other socio-economically less well-off population groups that cannot afford accommodation in an increasingly privatized housing market. In parallel, more socially mobile households have migrated to suburban areas (EUKN 2010; Martínez et. al. 2001: 27; Valdivia/Almirall 2011: 1 f.).

Old buildings and public housing neighbourhoods affected by immigration have social, socio-economic, architectural and urban development consequences which can also be found in other West European cities (restoration and modernization delays, unemployment as a result of the economic crisis, etc). However, Spanish cities have the particularity of seeing emerging informal trends in the housing market (illegal sublets), leading notably to overcrowding. In certain neighbourhoods, parallel gentrification trends can be observed, leading to socio-economically disadvantaged and better-off population groups living in the same district without developing any significant contact. Nevertheless, functioning social networks and/or active civic associations exist in some of these areas and can be considered as important potentials (Valdivia/Almirall 2011: 4 ff.). Overall, it can be said that deprived neighbourhoods have not developed in excluded areas, despite immigration to Spanish cities reaching 5 million.

To address these challenges – in particular the growing demand for affordable housing –, the following overall objectives have been pursued under the *Plan Estatal de Vivienda y Rehabilitación* (cf. MVIV 2008: 51909 ff. and 2010: 615):

- Ensuring free access to a wide range of accommodation taking into account the different needs and physical abilities of various population groups,
- Encouraging the redevelopment activities in historic city centres and deprived neighbourhoods while taking into account aspects of energy efficiency and accessibility,
- Developing the social housing offer in the renovated building stock and building new social housing,
- Establishing on-site redevelopment agencies and counselling offices,
- Assuring that a minimum of 40% of the total housing stock is for rent,
- Ensuring that rents do not represent more than a third of household incomes,

- Taking into account social, educational and cultural issues as well as energy efficiency.

Two significant regional examples in the context of integrated urban (district) development are the Catalan programme for the development of neighbourhoods, urban areas and historic town centres requiring “special attention” (Act 2/2004), and the Balearic Islands’ programme for the renewal and development of deprived neighbourhoods (cf. MVIV 2010: 594). The integrated Catalan approach focuses on neighbourhood renewal in terms of building and urban development, provision of social infrastructure, creation and development of open spaces, energy efficiency and resource sustainability, gender issues in public spaces and the link between social and local economic development (cf. *ibid.*: 604). The development of the La Mina district in Adrià de Besòs in the metropolitan area of Barcelona is an example of urban planning and social action integration, closely relying on the cooperation of involved government administrations as well as an integrated development plan. In the Balearic Islands, key measures include supporting deprived groups (especially young people), fostering (local) economic structures through the promotion of small businesses for example, education and training programmes, placing job seekers into the labour market and improving public transportation networks (*ibid.*: 611).

Basic requirements to a successful integrated urban (district) development include vertical coordination between different government levels, cross-sectoral cooperation of different municipal departments as well as horizontal networking of all relevant actors on the local implementation level (local inhabitants and other). Overall, the inclusion of measures and projects specifically addressing the development of deprived neighbourhoods in citywide strategies is also important (MVIV 2010: 625).

Against this background and with regards to the LEIPZIG CHARTER, two legislative initiatives are currently being pursued in Spain to strengthen integrated urban development (in line with the 2010 *Toledo Declaration*). An updated version of the *Plan Estatal de Vivienda y Rehabilitación 2013–2017* is also currently being prepared. In view of the overarching Spanish *State Land Act*, it may be observed that this law does not explicitly make reference to the LEIPZIG CHARTER (although both were adopted in 2007). However, it does take into account in many respects the same basic principles of sustainable urban development.

## References

- EUKN – European Urban knowledge Network (2011): *La Mina Neighbourhood: Combining Urban Planning with Social Action*. In: EUKN: Cohesion Policy in Urban Practice. An Ambitious Urban Agenda? The Hague: 70–73.
- EUKN – European Urban knowledge Network (2010): *Urban Policies in Spain* [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.eukn.org/Spain/en/EUKN\\_Spain/Urban\\_Policies\\_in\\_Spain](http://www.eukn.org/Spain/en/EUKN_Spain/Urban_Policies_in_Spain) (Accessed: 3/2012).
- Leal, Jesus (2011): *Increasing social mixing and socioeconomic inequalities: the influence of liberal housing policies in Madrid*. Enhr Conference 2011 – 5–8 July, Toulouse.
- Martinez, Andrés Walliser; María Bruquetas Callejo and Francisco Javier Moreno Fuentes (2001): *National and city contexts, urban development programmes and neighborhood selection. The Spanish background report*. A working paper for UGIS, Urban development programmes, urban governance, social inclusion and sustainability. Madrid.
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): *Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union*. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2008): *20751 Real decreto 2066/2008, de 12 de diciembre, por el que se regula el Plan Estatal de Vivienda y Rehabilitación 2009–2012*. BOE núm. 309, Miércoles 24 diciembre 2008.
- Valdivia, Blanca Gutiérrez, and Pilar García Almirall (2011): *Housing and immigrant population in Barcelona*. Enhr Conference 2011 – 5–8 July, Toulouse.
- Parts of this text were written by Eduardo de Santiago (Ministerio de Fomento).

## C Countries with predominantly local approaches to integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods)

### Croatia

To understand urban (district) development in Croatia, it is crucial to keep in mind the key background conditions that are the consequences of the 1991–1995 war and the ongoing transformation process since the early 1990s.

A particular area of focus in Croatia is the lack of available housing in cities. The socialist era was marked above all by a disinvestment in the (old) building stock as well as in new housing developments and the war left 14% of the housing stock damaged or destroyed. Since the early 1990s, the low-rent housing stock has undergone an intense process of privatisation – 82% of all accommodations are now privately owned. This has had the effect of fragmenting the ownership structure and create of lack of private capital for modernisation and renovation. Furthermore, many cities are confronted to problems of illegal settlements, inadequate social and technical infrastructure, concentration of social problems (unemployment, poverty, lack of labour market skills, risk of exclusion), (local) economic decline and lack of municipal resources. City regions also feature trends of significantly uncontrolled development. Particularly in the case of the housing market for lower income population groups there was a backlog for a long time (MVIV 2010: 93 ff.; see also Cavrić/Toplek/Šiljeg 2008: 2; Sunega/Bezovan 2007: 8).

Government funds under the *Physical Planning Strategy and Programme of the physical plans* have and will be granted to cultural and historical heritage restoration, repair or reconstruction of destroyed and damaged buildings taking into account the aspect of accessibility, living environment improvement, development of public space (free and open spaces) and the improvement of technical infrastructure as well as partly of social housing estates (MVIV 2010: 93, 100). At national level, urban renewal is approached through the

lens of building and urban planning. The implementation responsibility lies in general with the regions and in particular with the municipalities. The fragmented ownership structures however often prevent reaching consensus on development goals, policies and projects of urban and neighbourhood renewal (ibid.: 94).

In the area of urban renewal, public participation in decision-taking beyond the form of public hearings have so far been rather slight, but discussion forums and participation networks are scheduled (MVIV 2010: 99, 101 ff.). The pooling of different actors' interests and the strengthening of transparent participation structures will be seen as key conditions to a successful integrated urban (district) development (ibid.: 106; Karzen 2003).

#### References

- Cavrić, Branko, Silvija Toplek and Ante Šiljeg (2008): Measuring sustainable urban development in selected coastal cities: an indicator and GIS based approach for city of Zadar and Pula [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.ioiusa.net/articles/view/141598/?topic=24394> (Accessed: 3/2012).
- Karzen, Mirna (2003): Sustainable Towns of Croatia. Program for the Development of Urban Public Spaces in Croatia. Final Policy Paper [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.policy.hu/karzen/Research\\_Proposal/research\\_proposal.html](http://www.policy.hu/karzen/Research_Proposal/research_proposal.html) (Accessed: 3/2012).
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Sunega, Petr, and Gojko Bezovan (2007): Regional differences in housing availability and affordability in the Czech Republic and in Croatia. Sustainable Urban Areas. International Conference 25–28 June 2007, Rotterdam. Workshop: East European Housing & Urban Policy.

### Estonia

In Estonia, an independent urban policy and approaches for an integrated urban development only play a secondary role at national level. This is supported by the fact that no financial support programme has been established in this area so far. Furthermore, the LEIPZIG CHARTER only has a

minor importance for the Estonian urban policy. Urban development and renewal are determined by private (market) actors, whilst the public sector only retains a framing role through spatial planning (cf. MVIV 2010: 191 ff.; MMR 2009: 19 ff.; Pehk 2008: 38 ff.).



First steps to an integrated urban development are nevertheless being experimented as part of the national implementation of EU Structural Funds. Since 2008, measures and projects for the design and improvement of public/green/open spaces, creation of sustainable urban transports and the improvement of social infrastructure (especially child care) have been supported in five major Estonian cities under the *Development of Urban Areas* programme. The European Regional Development Fund *Strengthening the competitiveness of regions* programme has financed, amongst other projects, the upgrading and rehabilitation for economic purposes of derelict military and industrial sites (cf. MVIV 2010: 192, Minister for Regional Affairs, 2007).

Urban development in Estonia is mainly the responsibility of municipalities. Main topics of concern typically include the upgrading of inner cities and public space, urban regeneration of neighbourhoods and the housing stock (rehabilitation, renovation, neighbourhood improvement, increasing building energy efficiency) as well as sustainable urban transport (cf. MVIV 2010: 190 ff.). Crucial basic principles are integrated development plans, which Estonian municipalities are legally compelled to establish. The plans generally include strategic mission statements and implementation recommendations with a time perspective of at least three years. The overall emphasis of the development goals is the socio-economic development of each community, but also pays attention to participation and co-production of the urban community in creating a liveable urban environment (cf. MVIV 2010: 200; City Development Services of the Tartu City Government 2006; City of Tallinn).

## Greece

The foundation for urban development in Greece is the 2508/97 Law (GG 124 A) for the sustainable development of cities and villages which essentially provides the legal basis of Greek urban planning. Its overall objectives are environmental protection and containment of urban sprawl trends, housing area development, development of deprived neighbourhoods including social and technical infrastructure, eco-friendly renovation of central areas as well as protection of archaeological or historically and culturally valuable sites. Means to achieve these objectives are developed in regional spatial plans and municipal land use plans. Preliminary inquiries are also carried out, determining regeneration or programme areas. The importance of public participation and other relevant local actors in

Despite all the guidelines and development plans, integrated urban development has overall so far played a rather minimal role at local level and urban development projects tend to be rather sectoral than cross-sectoral. This is for example the case concerning mandatory participation of residents and local stakeholders in urban development which is not given sufficient consideration (cf. Pehk 2008: 44 ff.).

## References

- City Development Service of the Tartu City Government (2006): The Development Strategy Tartu 2030. Tartu. URL: <http://www.visittartu.com/vvfiles/5/5339e688b5812a522ee6b251ce42412.pdf> (Accessed: 5/2012).
- City of Tallinn: Tallinn Innovation Strategy 2009–2013 [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.tallinn.ee/est/Tallinn-Innovation-Strategy-2009-2013> (Accessed: 5/2012).
- Minister for Regional Affairs (2007): Conditions for the Measure “Strengthening of the Competitiveness of Regions”. Regulation No. 7 of the Minister for Regional Affairs of 22 October 2007 [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.siseministeerium.ee/public/PKT\\_korrektne\\_eng.pdf](http://www.siseministeerium.ee/public/PKT_korrektne_eng.pdf) (Accessed: 5/2012).
- MMR – Ministry for Regional Development of the Czech Republic (2009): „Assessment Report” on the Implementation of the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities (Czech Presidency) [Internet]. Prague. URL: <http://www.eukn.org/dsresource?objectId=166461> (Accessed: 4/2012).
- MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Pehk, Teele (2008): Who makes the city? Mapping the urban planning system in Tartu, Estonia. Master Thesis. University of Tampere [Internet]. Tampere. URL: <http://tutkielmat.uta.fi/pdf/gradu03429.pdf> (Accessed: 5/2012).

planning and design of actions and projects is equally explicitly pointed out (Law 2508/97).

The Greek Ministry of the Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works is responsible for the implementation and monitoring of urban renewal programmes. The development of the areas of Patras, Heraklion, Larissa, Volos, Kavala and Ioannina are determined by the Ministry and the local district, whereas in large urban areas, the Ministry and the local council cooperate directly together. The approaches to sustainable urban development is financed through public investment programmes as well as annual grants from the Ministry of the Environment, Physical Planning and Public Works as well as by a state agency re-

sponsible for the implementation of the programme. Municipal participation, as well as funds from regional authorities and occasionally resources from third parties, are attributed to specific measures and projects (Law 2508/97).

Comprehensive strategies for a more integrated urban development were implemented for the first time in six Greek urban areas as part of the EU *URBAN* Community Initiative (1994–1999). These, as well as the *URBAN II* (2001–2006) experiences, now contribute to national projects for integrated development of deprived urban units which can also be found in rural areas of Greece (cf. EUKN). Deprived areas were barely taken into account for a long time in Greece, partly as they were less apparent than in similar areas of other European countries. Socio-economic inequalities between different population groups do exist in Greece – particularly as a result of the deindustrialization process started in the 1990s and the current economic crisis –, but comparatively less so than in other European countries in terms of spatial concentration (cf. EUKN). Nevertheless, more attention will be drawn on the development of disadvantaged neighbourhoods to address more seriously in the future the integrated approach to socio-spatial issues (cf. MVIV 2010: 282).

Approaches to integrated development of (urban) districts are being implemented especially in Athens in relation to the renovation of the historic city centre (Plaka) and the protection of historical and cultural heritage (cf. MVIV

2010: 290 ff.). Overall, the Greek experiences show that successful integrated urban (district) development depends primarily on the following factors (cf. MVIV 2010. 293 f.):

- explicit coordination of the integration of different fields of action in terms of social, economic, cultural, environmental and urban issues,
- coordination of the different steering and implementation levels,
- establishment of on-site offices,
- extensive participation of all relevant stakeholders (residents and other local actors) in the planning and implementation of policies and projects,
- monitoring and evaluation.

## References

EUKN – European Urban Knowledge Network: National Urban Policy in Greece [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.eukn.org/E\\_library/Urban\\_Policy/National\\_Urban\\_Policy\\_of\\_Greece](http://www.eukn.org/E_library/Urban_Policy/National_Urban_Policy_of_Greece) (Accessed: 5/2012).

Economou, Dimitris, George Petrakos and Yannis Psycharis (2004): National Urban Policy in Greece. In: Euricur – European Institute for Comparative Urban Research, Erasmus University Rotterdam (Ed.): National Urban Policies in the European Union. Eds.: Leo van den Berg, Erik Braun, Jan van der Meer. Rotterdam: 76–77.

Gesetz 2508/97. N.p. N.D.

MVIV – Gobierno de Espana – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.

## Luxembourg

So far, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has not yet applied an integrated programme for urban (district) development at national level. Nonetheless, it seeks to take into account integrative approaches suggested in the LEIPZIG CHARTER as well as recommendations developed in the European context for this policy area. For this purpose, the *Cellule nationale d'Information pour la Politique Urbaine – CIPU* (National Information Centre for Urban Policy) has been established. It is jointly supported by the University of Luxembourg, three ministries (*Ministère de l'Economie et du Commerce extérieur, Ministère du Logement, Département de l'Aménagement du territoire du Ministère du Développement durable et des Infrastructures*) and three local authorities (Luxembourg, Esch-sur-Alzette, Nordstad municipal cluster). Its aim is to create a national platform for the exchange of experiences in urban development, to contribute to the design of future urban policies in Luxembourg and act as an interface between European, national and local levels.

The *CIPU* addresses stakeholders of urban development in ministries and local authorities, in the private sector as well as in research environments. It mainly covers networking and knowledge transfer activities in the context of events. A database on urban development, information on funding programmes and assistance in applying for funding are also part of the *CIPU*'s main tasks (Becker 2010: 43 ff.).

The current directing framework for spatial planning in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg is the *Programme Directeur*. Approved in 2003, it is organised around three fields of action: “transport and communication”, “environment and natural resources” and “urban and rural development.” The latter advocates for a highly integrated “establishment of towns and villages that meets social needs, provides a high quality of life and promotes a social integration policy” (MI 2005a: 12). An implementation strategy for the *Programme Directeur* is given in the Integrative traffic and land

development concept for Luxembourg (*Integratives Verkehrs- und Landesentwicklungskonzept für Luxemburg – IVL*, MI 2005b), which also serves as a coordinating framework for the *Plan Directeur Sectoriel*. The *Programme Directeur* is thus itemized in four thematic priorities: “Traffic,” “Public space and landscape,” “Commercial and Industrial Zones” and “Housing” (cf. ML/MIAT 2009: 7). The “Housing” section promotes, amongst other things, “mixed social and urban structures to counter the displacement of residential neighbourhoods out of the city centres” (ML/MIAT: 60). Under the *Pacte Logement*, a legally binding cooperation of state and local levels has been established in order as to counter the pressure on the housing market in Luxembourg. Local authorities are not only granted state funds for activities and projects reducing housing costs and improving social intermix, but it will also be granted to them by the *Pacte Logement* in set urban renewal areas (*zones à restructurer*) which provides them with a pre-emptive right to acquire real estate in order as to better regulate the housing market (cf. ML 2008).

To enable a coherent and integrated development of urban centres, four target areas (*convention areas*) have been defined at regional level. Based on a contract between the government and the local authorities, it sets economic, environmental and social goals in terms of a sustainable and integrated approach (cf. DAT).

Finally, integrated urban development approaches can be found at local level in the city of Luxembourg. Initiated in 2005 under the medium-term *Integrative urban development concept Luxembourg 2020* and the 24 suburban frame-

works based on local participation, it provided the initial ideas for integrative approaches to renewing deprived neighbourhoods. Furthermore, it is important to keep in mind that socio-spatial discrimination in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg is almost exclusively focused in the four major cities – particularly in high-density (old) areas in the centre of the capital – simply because of the geographical situation of the country (cf. Ville de Luxembourg 2005: 14 ff.).

## References

- Becker, Tom (2010): Europäisierung der Städtepolitik? Das Beispiel „CIPU“ in Luxemburg. In: *Europa Regional* 18 (2010) 1: 38 – 47.
- DAT – Département de l'aménagement du territoire: Développement régional au niveau d'importantes agglomérations urbaines [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.dat.public.lu/developpement\\_regional\\_poles\\_urbains/developpement\\_regional\\_importantes\\_agglo\\_urbaines/index.html](http://www.dat.public.lu/developpement_regional_poles_urbains/developpement_regional_importantes_agglo_urbaines/index.html) (Accessed: 2/2012).
- MI – Ministerium für Inneres und Raumplanung, Direktion Raumplanung (Ed.) (2005a): Eine nachhaltige Raumentwicklung für Luxemburg. Die wesentlichen Leitideen aus dem Programm Directeur. Luxemburg.
- MI – Ministerium für Inneres und Raumplanung, Direktion Raumplanung (Ed.) (2005b): IVL – Ein Integratives Verkehrs- und Landesentwicklungskonzept für Luxemburg. Luxemburg.
- ML – Ministère des Classes Moyennes, du Tourisme et du Logement (Ed.) (2008): Le Pacte Logement en bref. Luxemburg.
- ML/MIAT – Ministère des Classes Moyennes, du Tourisme et du Logement, Ministère de l'Intérieur et de l'Aménagement du Territoire (Eds.) (2009): Plan Directeur Sectoriel „Logement“. Draft. Luxemburg.
- Ville de Luxembourg (Ed.) (2005): Integratives Stadtentwicklungskonzept Luxembourg 2020. Ed.: Bureau d'Etudes en Urbanisme & Aménagement du Territoire ZILM. Luxemburg.

## Macedonia

In Macedonia, there are strong social differences between urban and rural areas which have led to an ongoing rural-urban migration. War refugees from neighbouring countries also settled in the cities throughout the 1990s (cf. United Nations 2004: 2). These immigration waves have created concentrations of disadvantaged population groups in some of the cities' areas, in particular those already affected by unemployment and poverty. Other challenges faced by urban development in Macedonia include the massive privatisation of the former public housing stock which began in the 1990s. This phenomenon – also prevalent in other transition countries – led to a general disinvestment of the building fabric in the districts concerned due to the new owners' lack of resources. Finally, cities are also confronted to problems of uncontrolled and illegal development due

to poor planning and guiding instruments (cf. MVIV 2010: 548, Frank/Minervini/Pavlovska 2007: 8 ff.; United Nations 2004: 1).

Against this background, the Macedonian state has established key national development objectives such as strengthening the economy of the country's least developed areas, reducing poverty, improving the housing supply and fostering urban development also in social terms (cf. United Nations 2004: 4). The foundations for achieving these goals are the following government initiatives: *Annual Programme for urban planning created and funded by the Government of Republic of Macedonia*, *Annual Programme for construction and maintenance of housing owned by the Republic of Macedonia* and *Annual programme for equitable*

*regional development*. They mainly focus on the constructional and architectural issue but, at least indirectly, also address education, employment, economic development, preservation of cultural heritage and social inclusion in general (cf. MVIV 2010: 539).

Since the country's independence in 1991, urban development processes have essentially been dominated by private developers and businesses, and have tended therefore to be heavily market-oriented. The main issue at the time was the sole development of structural and physical buildings and infrastructure (cf. MVIV 2010: 535; World Bank 2006: 47 f.). Since the 2002 *Law on Self-Government*, urban development in Macedonia is today mainly the responsibility of local authorities. It enabled a gradual decentralisation of public functions by the government to the local level, and was later supported by complementary legislation such as the *Law on Spatial and Urban Planning* and the *Law on Environment*. Besides the general responsibilities of a public administration, local authorities are now also in charge of controlling investments in education and culture, social affairs, health, economic development, environment, planning and urban development. The law guarantees the local authorities' autonomy and ensures state funding of municipal budgets from public tax revenue (cf. Frank/Minervini/Pavlovska 2007: 6 ff.). In most cases, these funds tend however to be insufficient for the implementation of planning tasks or for the preparation of compulsory *General Urban Plans (GUP)*. These *GUPs* establish the spatial development of cities and local authorities for a period of ten years. Integrated urban development considerations can only be addressed in a few cases not only for financial reasons, but also as most local governments remain fairly young and

therefore lack sufficient experience. This is also the reason for participation processes in the context of urban development to have only recently emerged (cf. Hristova 2009: 292; World Bank: 2006: 47 ff.).

Overall, the coordination of administrative levels and units as well as the inclusion of local stakeholders in urban development procedures remain important goals in Macedonia. These aims are rooted in the recent legal framework endorsing local authorities' autonomy (cf. MVIV 2010: 549; Frank/Minervini/Pavlovska 2007: 8).

## References

- Frank, Edward, Corrado Minervini and Danica Pavlovska (2007): *Municipal Administrative Reform and Land Development Issues in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYRoM)*. Papers in Land Management No. 5. Cambridge.
- Hristova, Aneta (2009): *Eine Hauptstadt im Umbruch: Die postsocialistische Stadtentwicklung von Skopje*. In: Uwe Altröck, Ronald Kunze, Elke Pahl-Weber, Ursula von Petz and Dirk Schubert (Eds.): *Jahrbuch Stadterneuerung 2009*. Schwerpunkt „Megacities und Stadterneuerung“. Berlin: 281 – 292.
- Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning, Government of the Republic of Macedonia (2004): *Spatial Plan of the Republic of Macedonia*. Skopje.
- MVIV – Gobierno de España – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): *Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union*. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- United Nations (2004): *Human settlement country profile Republic of Macedonia* [Internet]. N.p. URL <http://www.un.org/esa/agenda21/natlinfo/countr/macedonia/HSettlMacedonia04f.pdf> (Accessed: 5/2012).
- World Bank (2006): *Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*. Issues in Urban and Municipal Development. A Policy Note. N.p.

## Serbia

The general conditions for urban development in Serbia include the after-effects of the military conflicts in former Yugoslavia and the related incomplete transformation process since 1990. For cities, this included in particular physical destruction and substantial migration of war refugees. Furthermore, international sanctions against Serbia following the war have slowed the transformation from a planned to a market economy. Structural economic change did not occur until the beginning of the new millennium: in comparison with other Eastern European countries, Serbia now faces the challenge of extreme deindustrialization with serious effects on the labour market. There is widespread unemployment and an overall low wage level compared to relatively high costs of living, resulting in poverty and low

standard of living of the population (Vujošević 2010: 22 ff.; Djordjević/Dabović 2009: 144).

A spatial implication of these economic and social developments is the emergence of deprived urban neighbourhoods which are characterized, amongst other things, by constructional and urban deficiencies, disinvestment, inadequate technical, traffic and social infrastructure, shortcomings in the living environment and green and public spaces as well as environmental problems. Furthermore, a growing lack of urban housing is a result of massive immigration (since the 1970s, continuing rural exodus and war-induced immigration of refugees). For a long period, it was impossible to acquire private plots of land in the city

centres. Land prices in inner-city locations today have soared (due to speculation). As a result, poorer segments of the population have either fled of their own accord to suburban areas (acquiring real estate) or have been pushed there as living in the inner city has become too expensive. In general, city centres and suburban areas are (still) confronted to uncontrolled and illegal development because of a hesitant application of planning and steering instruments in several places (Vujošević 2010: 22; gtz 2010; Lazarevic/Djukic 2006: 3, 7, 11).

Serbia's national level addressed these challenges with the *Planning and Building Act* adopted in 2009 and the legally binding *Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010 – 2014 – 2025* launched in 2010 as a framework for urban development. It focuses on regulation of land use rights and private property, issues of regulation and control of land use as well as the introduction of hierarchical planning instruments at local level and participation in planning processes (GTZ 2012o: 4; Djordjević/Dabović 2009: 148). The goals of the *Spatial Plan* include a balanced, sustainable economic and social development of Serbian regions as well as the preservation of natural resources and (architectural) cultural heritage. Stressed in the LEIPZIG CHARTER, the integrated, cross-sectoral consideration of spatial development aspects and the involvement of a wide circle of stakeholders – political, administrative, civil society, economic – in planning at the national and local level is of particular importance. The plan's implementation will be regularly reviewed on the basis of an indicator system (cf. Republic of Serbia 2010).

As part of the decentralization of Serbia's administrative structure since 2000, urban planning is primarily today under the responsibility of the municipal level. The first approaches to integrated urban (district) development will be tested in the cities of Kragujevac and Uzice with the support of the German Agency for International Cooperation (Deutsche Gesellschaft für internationale Zusammenarbeit

– GIZ). In these municipalities, integrated development plans for central urban neighbourhoods will be developed with explicit reference to the LEIPZIG CHARTER. Their objectives include the strengthening of inner development (increase building density, conversion, land development) as well as improving technical and social infrastructure and the upgrading of public spaces. Furthermore, the scope of these projects seeks to strengthen the inter-departmental collaboration at the administrative level and to anchor a variety of participatory approaches in local communities. Overall, the municipalities must be supported in developing expertise and in the introduction of technical and legal instruments – for example, land use and land policy control (gtz 2010: 19). Belgrade, the capital, has also established a strategic urban development plan with the *City of Belgrade Development Strategy*. It includes integrative elements and in addition to constructional, infrastructural and economic issues, also addresses social and health activity areas, as well as management and organization (City of Belgrade/PALGO Center 2008).

## References

- City of Belgrade/PALGO Center (Eds.) (2008): *City of Belgrade Development Strategy – Goals, Concept and Strategic Priorities*. Draft. Beograd.
- Djordjević, Dejan, and Tijana Dabović (2009): *System of Spatial Planning in Serbia: a Critical Overview*. In: *Razgledi* 31: 143–157.
- gtz – Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (2010): *Unapređenje upravljanja zemljištem na nivou lokalnih samouprava u Srbiji/ Strengthening of local land management in Serbia*. Beograd.
- Lazarevic, Eva Vanista and Aleksandra Djukic (2006): *NGO Association for Urban Regeneration Belgrade, Serbia*. Paper presented at The Corporate Responsibility Research Conference 2006 Dublin. Begrade.
- Republic of Serbia – Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning, Republic Agency for Spatial Planning (2010): *Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010 – 2014 – 2025 – Abridged Version*. Begrade.
- Vujošević, Miodrag (2010): *Collapse of strategic thinking, research and governance in Serbia and possible role of the Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia (2010) in its renewal*. In: *SPATIUM International Review* No. 23, October 2010: 22–29.

## Slovakia

One of the biggest challenges of urban development in Slovakia is still related to the completion of the economic transformation process. This is characterised by a strong deindustrialization and tertiarisation of the economy, followed notably by (long term) unemployment, leading to a general polarization of income levels and lifestyles. Spatially, this is mainly reflected in the urban realm which has seen develop (high-value) neighbourhoods in contrast to

deprived neighbourhoods in old buildings' inner-city districts and large housing estates. The latter in particular are usually characterised by low building standards (in energy efficiency for example), a need for renovation, an inadequate living environment (e.g. lack of green spaces) and a lack of transport links to the rest of the city (Bucek 2004: 39 f.). A general problem has been the considerable privatisation of housing since 1989 – today, more than 96% of the

housing stock is privately owned. The majority of former tenants do not often have the necessary funds for preservation (MVIV 2010: 571 ff.).

There is yet no sign in Slovakia of either an (coherent) urban development or urban renewal policy in order to address these challenges at national level. However, various sectoral policies tackle urban issues, including social and economic development. Urban renewal issues are also taken into account in regional and urban planning, based on regional development promotion legislation (Act no. 539/2008) (MVIV 2010: 571 ff.). Until recently, housing and land management, environmental remediation and protection of the urban environment, heritage conservation, improvement of social infrastructure with regards to content and in technical aspects (education, health, culture), and the strengthening of economic competitiveness were issues undertaken by the *Action plan for Sustainable development 2005 – 2010 (Akčný plán trvalo udržateľného rozvoja; Úrad vlády SR 2012)*. Furthermore, the state supports renovation and modernization measures through low-interest loans from its *Housing Development Fund* as well as tax abatements from the Ministry of Construction and Regional Development (MVIV 2010: 571 ff.). Since the 1990s, the state has been allocating living space for Romani populations,

particularly in isolated locations. This however has not eased an already difficult socio-spatial integration (Hurrle 2004: 89).

A more inclusive approach is to be expected from the national urban development strategy which is currently being prepared (MVIV 2010: 571 ff.).

## References

- Bucek, Ján (2004): Cities in Slovakia.  
In: Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Affairs (Ed.) (2004): Cities in the New EU Countries. Position, Problems, Policies. Amstelveen: 37–42.
- Hurrle, Jakob (2004): Die Dritte Welt in der Ersten Welt. Entwicklungs- und Erneuerungsstrategien für ländliche Roma-Ghettos in der Slowakei.  
In: Uwe Altröck, Simon Güntner, Sandra Huning and Deike Peters (Eds.): Zwischen Anpassung und Neuerfindung. Raumplanung und Stadtentwicklung in den Staaten der EU-Osterweiterung. Planungsgrundschau Nr. 11. Cottbus: 89–107.
- MVIV – Gobierno de España – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union.  
Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Úrad vlády SR (2012): Urban renewal and landscape regeneration [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://www.tur.vlada.gov.sk/1108/6-urban-renewal-and-landscape-regeneration.php> (Accessed: 4/2012).

## Turkey

Among the factors determining urban development in Turkey, it is important to note the relatively strong economic growth including globalisation trends, a similarly strong population growth and an economic development related to the extensive rural-urban migrations, leading to a rapid expansion of cities. Not only in Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir, but also in medium and large cities of Anatolia, an increasing pressure on land and housing market has emerged combined to socio-spatial segregations. According to the government, the exposure to illegal settlements (*Gecekondu*) in central urban areas is the main urban and sociopolitical challenge (MVIV 2010: 677 ff.; Uluşan/Dülgeroğlu 2011: 1).

Illegal occupation of public or private land in Turkey goes back to the 1950s. At the time, the (scarce) public resources were mainly invested in the large-scale construction of (urban) industrial areas rather than in urban development and housing. As a result, Turkish cities developed primarily by private construction initiatives from immigrants who found work in the cities and where public planning and regulation remained largely absent. Istanbul, for example,

thus had a belt of illegal residential areas around its town centre, which, like other *Gecekondu*s, were gradually legalized and therefore expanded. To this day, approximately half of the Turkish housing stock has been created this way, and partly suffers from severe urban and sanitary shortcomings: poor building structures, maintenance deficiencies, insufficient energy efficiency, lack of seismic safety, large building density, shortcoming of green and open spaces, inadequate light exposure and ventilation, etc. Furthermore, there are also social problems such as low educational level, unemployment, poverty, etc. (Inceoglu/Yürekli 2011: 2; MVIV 2010: 677 ff.; Uluşan/Dülgeroğlu 2011: 3 ff.).

Against this background, and as a result of an increasing pressure on poor urban areas led notably by a demand for central housing for the middle class and a growing tourism industry, the Turkish government has set up an (urban) “Emergency Action Plan”. In cooperation with local authorities, it is expected to limit the emergence of additional *Gecekondu*s, develop existing deprived areas and provide low-income population groups with (suburban) social

housing (Inceoglu/Yürekli 2011: 4 ff.; MVIV 2010: 677 ff.; Mutman/Turgut 2011: 4 ff.; Uluşan/Dülgeroğlu 2011: 5 ff.).

The state agency for Housing Development (*TOKI – Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı*) is in charge of implementing appropriate strategies – lasting generally two to two and a half years – which include preliminary studies, plans, re-settlement measures, demolition and new construction. It works in close collaboration with the municipalities, which are mainly in charge of providing upgraded residential areas with (social) infrastructures (MVIV 2010: 678 ff.). The regeneration process in *Gecekondu*s and in deprived city-centre neighbourhoods affected by building dereliction and social segregation often consist of extensive renovation of architectural ensembles where only the (historical) facades remain. Former homeowners and tenants have a pre-emptive right upon completion of the construction works. However, due to increased property prices in most districts after completion of the projects, there is a serious risk of gentrification with subsequent displacement effects (Inceoglu/Yürekli 2011: 4 ff.). Notably in Istanbul, where several *Gecekondu*s and disadvantaged areas have been regenerated, the experience of implementing renovation measures has proved to be particularly successful and accepted by the local population when integrated to a holistic development approach and conducted with a participatory approach (cf. Mutman/Turgut 2011: 9 ff.)

Beyond the “Emergency Action Plan” focusing on *Gecekondu*s, there has so far been no other programme for urban development or renewal launched by the government in Turkey. Nonetheless, this plan can be considered as part of an overall integrated strategy for housing, also taking into account economic, infrastructural, social and health issues (MVIV 2010: 679 ff.).

## References

- Inceoğlu, Arda, and Ipek Yürekli (2011): Urban transformation in Istanbul: potentials for a better city. Enhr Conference 2011 – 5–8 July, Toulouse.
- Mutman, Demet, and Hulya Turgut (2011): A Social and Spatial Restructuring in Inner-City Residential Areas: The Case of Istanbul. Enhr Conference 2011 – 5–8 July, Toulouse.
- MVIV – Gobierno de España – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- Uluşan, Haluk, and Yurdanur Dülgeroğlu (2011): Reading the urban „mixitie“ through residential environments in a mega city: case Istanbul. Enhr Conference 2011 – 5–8 July, Toulouse.

Prior to a summary key findings for groups A, B and C in chapter 7, a contrasting view of strategies for integrated urban (district) development in countries outside Europe will be presented.

6 Contrasts:  
integrated urban (district)  
development in Brazil, China,  
India and the USA



Situations in Brazil, China, India and the USA – not only because of the size and population of these countries, but also in terms of state-building, political systems, economic and social environments, etc. – cannot be compared with those of European countries. Nonetheless, it is still worth taking a

look overseas to have a better understanding of how problems develop and how possible solutions could be found in the European urban context. Examining these foreign perspectives should present the European situation in a different light and inspire new solutions.

## Brazil

Since the mid-20th century, and in particular between the late 1960s and the mid-1970s, Brazil has experienced a strong economic growth. A consequence of this was the rapid transformation from a rural state (rural population in 1950 was still of 74%) to one of the most urbanized countries in the world. Seeking employment, the rural population especially moved to the larger urban areas. Today, almost 85% of Brazil's population lives in cities. Despite a significant decrease of rural emigration in recent years, urbanization levels should keep rising to exceed 90% by 2045, by when Brazil's urban population is expected to reach over 200 million. At the same time, cities are the motors of the country's economy as they represent approximately 90% of Brazil's GDP (UN 2012; cf. Bueno/Sedeh 2010; Osorio 2007: 4).

This development has been followed by several gaps. Brazil is characterised today by considerable social inequality, mainly due to income disparity between regions and between social groups. The gap between rich and poor has become very distinct. In particular, cities show significant social and spatial disparities: wealthier neighbourhoods in central and suburban areas show increasing trends of urban space privatization (to the point of the appearance of gated communities) face illegal and informal settlements (*favelas* and *vilas*). The latter neighbourhoods are highly affected by unemployment and poverty, inadequate sanitary conditions, environmental problems and crime. They typically lack access to social infrastructure (education, health) and mobility opportunities, affecting employment potential (cf. Imparato/Rust 2003). Furthermore, many of the settlements were established in topographically problematic and dangerous sites, therefore at risk of flood and landslide when exposed to heavy rain (Bueno/Sedeh 2010; cf. del Rio 2009: 27 ff.; Osorio 2007).

The first attempts to address these changes were taken at national level after the end of the military rule in 1985 and the return to democracy with the adoption of a new constitution in 1988 (*Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil*) and its profound changes to the state structure. Amongst other things, it regulated the autonomy of cities



in political, fiscal and economic terms (a novelty in Latin America then) and emphasized the need for a more inclusive social and urban development. The basic principle for urban development is the master plan which, according to the Constitution, every community over 20,000 inhabitants has to establish (del Rio 2009: 24 ff.; Osorio 2007: 6).

In 2001, another important legal foundation for urban development in Brazilian cities was introduced with the City Statute (*Estatuto da Cidade*). Keeping the “right to the city” guideline in mind – by which a social and sustainable

urban development grants all residents access to urban resources –, the City Statute established rules and instruments to control as well as develop participatory approaches for urban development. Its key instrument is the possibility to designate illegal and informal settlements as *Special Areas of Social Interest (AEIS)* in the context of municipal master plans. This allows for an official recognition of the existence of these residential areas, thus allowing the establishment of social infrastructure in the affected districts. In general, the City Statute addresses the principles of integrated urban development, including area-based focus and participation of all relevant actors (joint residents' and administration steering committees, establishment of participatory budgeting, etc.; cf. Bueno/Sedeh 2010; del Rio 2009: 30 ff.; cf. also Cities Alliance/Ministry of Cities Brazil 2010, Osorio 2007: 6 f.).

Overall, the focus on sustainable urban development includes upgrading public spaces (e.g. Rio de Janeiro, Curitiba), renovating historic central areas (e.g. Salvador, Bélem), converting brownfield sites (e.g. Porto Alegre), but mostly upgrading favelas (cf. del Rio/Siembieda 2009: 125 ff.). A number of Brazilian cities applied integrated area-based and community programmes for the improvement of illegal settlements – in certain cases, since the early 1980s. Some of these are found in Belo Horizonte (*PROFAVELA*), Recife (*PREZEIS*), Rio de Janeiro (*Favela-Bairro*) and São Paulo (*multirão programmes, Guarapiranga programme*; cf. Imparato/Ruster 2003: 76 ff.; Duarte/Magalhães 2009; Baker 2006).

Concerning the improvement of slums, certain criteria must generally be met (including appropriate topographical situation, legalized status in the master plan and legalized rights of the residents). Legalising settlements allows each city to arrange tax collections, to set up minimum building safety standards, to ensure infrastructure development as well as provision and disposal (electricity, drinking water, sewer system, waste disposal) and to implement social facilities (including education and health care). Local population participation plays an essential role in the development and implementation of these measures (cf. Bueno/Sedeh 2010; Duarte/Magalhães 2009; Baker 2006). To operate more precisely its development operations in the large number of illegal settlements, municipalities such as São Paulo have established monitoring systems, networking-oriented management and organizational structures at local level (including cross-departmental steering committees, establishment of a publicly elected supervisory body) as well as a mediation authority bringing together local authority and residents (cf. amongst other The Cities Alliance 2009).

The challenges of urban development which Brazil will face in the coming years include the difficult process of property legalization, controlling consequential land price increase and speculation (especially when building new homes for displaced favela-dwellers) as well as preventing new illegal settlements in view of the ongoing urbanisation process (cf. Bueno/Sedeh 2010; Baker 2006: 19).

## References

- Baker, Judy L. (2006): Integrated Urban Upgrading for the poor: The Experience of Ribeira Azul, Salvador, Bahia. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3861, March 2006. Washington, D.C.
- Bueno, Fernando Serpone, and Veridiana Sedeh (2010): No Excuses Slum Upgrading [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://citiscopescope.org/2010/no-excuses-slum-upgrading> (Accessed: 6/2012).
- Cities Alliance/Ministry of Cities Brazil (2010): The City Statute: A commentary. São Paulo.
- del Rio, Vincente (2009): Introduction: Historical Background. In: Vincente del Rio and William Siembieda (Eds.): Contemporary Urbanism in Brazil – Beyond Brasilia. Gainesville: 1–36.
- del Rio, Vincente, and William Siembieda (Eds.) (2009): Contemporary Urbanism in Brazil – Beyond Brasilia. Gainesville.
- Duarte, Christiane Rose, and Fernanda Magalhães (2009): Upgrading Squatter Settlements into City Neighborhoods. The Favela-Bairro Program in Rio de Janeiro. In: Vincente del Rio and William Siembieda (Eds.): Contemporary Urbanism in Brazil – Beyond Brasilia. Gainesville: 266–290.
- Imparato, Ivo, and Jeff Ruster (2003): Slum Upgrading and Participation. Lessons from Latin America. World Bank – Directions in Development. Washington, D.C.
- Osorio, Leticia Marques (2007): Positive policies and legal responses to enhance security of tenure in Brazil. Case study prepared for Enhancing Urban Safety and Security: Global Report on Human Settlements 2007 (UN-Habitat).
- The Cities Alliance (Ed.) (2009): Social Housing in São Paulo: Challenges and New Management Tools. Washington, D.C.
- United Nations – Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2012): World Urbanization Prospects, the 2011 Revision.

## China

Function, structure and population of Chinese cities have experienced a radical change in the past 30 years. Until the 1980s, the Chinese state controlled the development of cities as (production) centres for its planned economy. Land prices played no role and large industrial plants were therefore also located in inner cities. Cities only had scarce exclusive resources for housing and infrastructure development while housing was provided by government companies or by municipal offices in charge. Rents were extremely low as each resident was entitled to benefits (Zhou/Logan 2008: 143). Overall, the central Chinese government focused on limiting growth in urban areas and increasing the number of small and medium-sized cities (White/Wu/Chen 2008: 118).

The growing openness of China to international economic relations since the 1980s (i.e. replacing a planned economy by a market one) has been related to an enormous rural-urban migration: between 1980 and 2000, almost 270 million Chinese seeking work and attractive earning opportunities moved from the countryside to the cities. In 1980, the urban population was of approximately 190 million. In 2005, it was of more than 560 million. It is estimated that the level of urbanization of the Chinese population in 2020 will exceed 60% (Yusuf/Nabeshima 2008: 1, 8; cf. also Fan 2008: 80).

The state control of urban development has declined with economic transformation. Since 1988, cities can levy taxes independently with the government largely withdrawing in return from local development funding. It is now local governments' responsibility to fund urban public policies and their implementation. This includes not only the development of infrastructure and public safety, but also employment policy, public services and social protection of vulnerable groups. Against this background however, local governments are pushed to achieve short-term income (e.g. in the real estate sector), thus securing their financial resources, rather than developing long-term strategic and integrated planning also addressing social security issues. Tax and social policies can vary considerably between cities and competition between districts to attract private companies has increased, since revenues from land sales and rental are their main source of income (Saich 2008: 181 ff.; Zhou/Logan 2008: 150).

China's intense urban development has led to many challenges. Whereas there is hardly any lack of housing in the cities, it is not the case everywhere concerning water supply, sewage, waste management and public transport. Due



to their location in drier regions and to strong demographic growth, two out of three Chinese cities are threatened by water scarcity. Growing motorized individual transport has

resulted in high levels of air pollution and urban sprawl to suburban areas. Particularly when taking into account climate change, increasing energy consumption in the cities is very problematic (Wang 2009: 3 ff.; Yusuf/Nabeshima, 2008: 8 ff.).

Economic development in inner cities is characterized by a massive decline of the manufacturing sector combined to a strong tertiary sector and a rapid growth of business services. The housing market is also (spatially) differentiated: privatized to some extent, a market-based real estate industry and land market have emerged with correlated pricing mechanisms. These developments are followed by a relatively strong urban sprawl. This is a new feature for the country and has a distinct socio-spatial pattern. China's suburbs have high-income commuting households areas (some as gated communities) in the immediate vicinity of working-class districts and poor urban areas drawing rural populations. Even the manufacturing sector (and its employees) has – partly as a result of deliberate resettlements – relocated from central areas to new suburban commercial and residential areas, resulting in a massive expansion of the road and motorway network. Employment growth in suburban areas has in parts exceeded that of central urban areas (Zhou/Logan 2008: 140 ff.).

Disparities between urban and rural areas have overall increased, but this is also to be observed both between and within cities, which can show considerable socio-spatial variations. The wage gap notably between urban and rural areas has widened, but there are also some significant income differences between various provinces and cities. Particularly in cities like Shanghai where economic growth is above average, social inequalities are increasing. Combined to the development of diverse (urban) lifestyles, new (unequal) income and consumption patterns have emerged, leading to differentiated demands including housing, education and transport infrastructure (White/Wu/Chen 2008: 115 ff.; Zhou/Logan 2008: 142 ff.).

An important starting point to observing socio-spatial processes in China is its Hukou system. Established in the late 1950s by law as a means to implement residential site allotment and control, it has since been modified several times. With this system, every Chinese citizen was allocated a residence in the “agricultural” or “non-agricultural” (urban) areas. On this basis, rural-urban migrations were limited to a minimum. With the economic transformation and due to the correlated increased demand for labour in the cities, the Hukou system has however been gradually reformed since the mid-1980s. The government thus introduced in 1985 temporary urban residence permits for rural migrants,

combined with an increasingly market-driven food and housing supply. In the mid-1990s, this led metropolitan areas such as Shanghai to introduce “blue stamp” Hukou, on the basis of which skilled migrants with a capital were allowed to settle in the city. In 2003, the Chinese State Council eventually issued a directive granting (in principle) rural migrants the right to work in cities. The implementation of this directive remains however a municipal issue. Beijing, Shanghai and Guangzhou in particular keep a strong hold over the Hukou system to regulate and limit influx of rural population (Fan 2008: 66 ff.; White/Wu/Chen 2008: 121 ff.; Yusuf/Nabeshima 2008: 5).

In parallel, urban labour markets (in particular concerning construction, trade and services) offer employment opportunities for the “floating population” of migrants with rural Hukou. They are marginalized not because of unemployment but rather because they have no legal residence status for the cities. They are at greater risk of being poor, are structurally disadvantaged by a limited access to social services and security systems (health, education, unemployment benefits, pension) and are often discriminated (Fan 2008: 70 ff.; Yusuf/Nabeshima 2008: 7 f.; Zhou/Logan 2008: 157).

State and local politics are more focused on urban planning and infrastructure development than on social issues. Although development or reform approaches have been engaged, some serious catching up is still to be made in these areas. The government has made efforts to reduce urban poverty in cooperation with neighbourhood organizations through participatory strategies as well as introduced monitoring and evaluation measures. Furthermore, an effort to communicate on government reforms was made, such as concerning transfer payments to poor communities. The access of migrants without urban Hukou to social services remains extremely challenging, as it turns out that most cities are overwhelmed by the duty of providing the same quality of public services as that prior to decentralization (Saich 2008: 181 ff.; Taylor 2008: 98; Yusuf/Nabeshima 2008: 14, 24 ff.).

## References

Fan, C. Cindy (2008): Migration, Hukou, and the City. In: Shahid Yusuf and Tony Saich (2008): *China Urbanizes. Consequences, Strategies, and Policies*. The World Bank. Washington, D.C.: 65–89.

Friedmann, John (2005): *China's Urban Transition*. Minneapolis.

Logan, John R. (Ed.) (2008): *Urban China in Transition*. Malden, Oxford, Carlton.

Saich, Tony (2008): *The Changing Role of Urban Government*. In: Shahid Yusuf and Tony Saich (2008): *China Urbanizes. Consequences, Strategies, and Policies*. The World Bank. Washington, D.C.: 181–206.

Taylor, John G. (2008): *Poverty and Vulnerability*. In: Shahid Yusuf and Tony Saich (2008): *China Urbanizes. Consequences, Strategies, and Policies*. The World Bank. Washington, D.C.: 91–104.

Wang, Rui (2009): *Sustainable Urban Development in China. A Literature Review on Issues, Policies, Practices, and Effects*. UCLA, Los Angeles.

White, Michael J., Fulong Wu and Yiur Por (Vincent) Chen (2008): *Urbanization, Institutional Change, and Sociospatial Inequality in China, 1990–2001*. In: John R. Logan (Ed.) (2008): *Urban China in Transition*. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: 115–139.

Yusuf, Shahid, and Kaoru Nabeshima (2008): *Optimizing Urban Development*. In: Shahid Yusuf and Tony Saich (2008): *China Urbanizes. Consequences, Strategies, and Policies*. The World Bank. Washington, D.C.: 1–40.

Yusuf, Shahid, and Tony Saich (2008): *China Urbanizes. Consequences, Strategies, and Policies*. The World Bank. Washington, D.C.

Zhou, Yixing, and John R. Logan (2008): *Growth on the Edge: The New Chinese Metropolis*. In: John R. Logan (Ed.) (2008): *Urban China in Transition*. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: 140–160.

## India

India is one of the least urbanized countries in the world (less than a third of its population lives in cities), but in absolute population figures is the second largest urban network after China. The urban population is expected to increase to 37% by 2025 and 50% by 2050 (UN 2012).

Until the early 1990s, India's economy was in many sectors highly regulated and heavily based on the socialist planned economy model (nationalization of major industries, five-year plans). Deregulation and an increasing market liberalisation resulted in the last two decades' economic boom in both the industrial and tertiary sectors, with two thirds of India's gross national product created today in cities. This is combined with a significant increase in migration to Indian cities from poorer, less developed parts of the country as well as from Nepal and Bangladesh.

As neither jobs nor homes are available in sufficient numbers, much of the immigrant population however lives in precarious conditions in illegal/informal settlements or slums. In certain cities, this affects more than half of all inhabitants. The most serious problems in these settlements, together with the concentration of disadvantaged population groups, are in particular the often totally inadequate constructional condition of the most basic accommodations, extremely poor hygienic conditions (inadequate drinking water supply and drainage, water and soil pollution, disease risk), lack of infrastructural services, significant psychosocial problems such as alcoholism, crime and prostitution as well as low education and training levels. Due to their limited mobility and difficult access to education, the inhabitants of these settlements are furthermore



disadvantaged (cf. Schubert 2009; Mahadevia/Joshi 2009: 4).

Not only in informal settlements, but also in general, India's cities are characterised by high population densities, lack of housing, significant environmental issues (induced by motorized traffic) as well as deficient technical, social and transport infrastructures. As for Brazilian cities, there are great social and spatial disparities. Slums are a distinctive sign of these developments. An other would be the increasingly expanding satellite towns in suburban areas, New Towns and Integrated Townships, which are often clearly delimited and evolve as self-sufficient neighbourhoods. These middle and higher income neighbourhoods are often given preferential treatment in the implementation of development projects, thus deepening socio-spatial disparities in access to municipal public services, infrastructure and facilities. An elite-oriented social structure, a lack of competence within the local government and an increasing level of corruption support these developments (Schubert 2009: 104; Chattopadhyay 2008: 5 ff.).

In order to address urban issues and increase urban areas' competitiveness and attractiveness for investors in view of the projected future growth, India has introduced a national support programme for urban development for the 2005–2012 period. The *Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM)* supports 63 cities with high investment needs in technical and traffic infrastructure. It seeks to achieve a sustainable infrastructure development as well as increase efficiency of municipal public services (sanitation, irrigation and drainage, provision and disposal, roads, urban transport, etc.), urban renewal of historic areas (reducing traffic congestion, removing of detrimental commercial and industrial uses, etc.), take into account architecture and built heritage, develop a better overall control over planning, foster public participation in development processes and raise local government's commitment to the citizens' interests. Furthermore, the *JNNURM* also takes into account the situation of the urban poor: integrated slum development, insuring housing provision and improving building infrastructures, access to education and health care as well as social security are further objectives of this programme. Its implementation is also associated to a number of reform initiatives for the development of modern administration structures, procedures and competences in municipalities. The *JNNURM* should thus help develop a transparent and modern financial management in the cities, create city-wide coherent planning systems, promote governance approaches as well as reform the local tax system and the economic viability of local institutions (Government of India 2004).

Relevant local authorities (*Urban Local Bodies – ULB*) are responsible for the implementation of national policies. Since the mid-1990s, these *ULBs* have taken over many national duties previously organised by the state as part of decentralization efforts. They have become responsible for the basic provision of public infrastructure and services, for upgrading slums and for city planning and urban development (Vaidya 2009: 13; Tiwari n.d.). To implement the *JNNURM*, each city must establish a *City Development Plan (CDP)* with guidelines, approaches and financing concepts on the basis of which explicit measures and projects will be identified (*DPR – Detailed Project Report*). In addition to public subsidies, private funds through public-private partnerships (PPP) are expected to support the completion of individual projects. Use of government funds is thus insofar bound to the compulsory implementation of administrative reforms (Government of India 2004: 6; Vaidya 2009: 25 ff.; cf. also Mahadevia/Joshi 2009: 8 ff.).

Overall, the *JNNURM* programme is a new approach to urban development in India. How successful this policy will be in its implementation and reform efforts remains however uncertain. Recent examples show that focusing on infrastructure development has triggered urban land speculation (due to a concomitant enhancement of urban spaces) and led in many places to the displacement of vulnerable population groups. The development of land price and a lack of land policies constitute for example an obstacle to the establishment of social (non-commercial) infrastructure (schools, parks). In these conditions, achieving a socially fair urban development is hardly possible for local authorities. Furthermore, in spite of decentralisation efforts, several administrative difficulties remain as many state laws are not adapted to the new responsibilities of national and local levels, which in practice often leads to conflicts between the two (cf. Mahadevia/Joshi 2009: 3; Vaidya 2009: 13 ff.; Mahadevia 2001: 246 ff.).

## References

- Chattopadhyay, Basudha (2008): Sustainable Urban Development in India. Some Issues. New Delhi.
- Government of India – Ministry of Urban Development (2011): Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission. Annual Update 2010 – 11. New Delhi.
- Government of India – Ministry of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation/Ministry of Urban Development (2004): Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission. Overview. New Delhi.
- Mahadevia, Darshini (2002): Sustainable Urban Development in India: An Inclusive Perspective. In: Development in Practice, Volume 11, Numbers 2 & 3, May 2001: 242 – 259.
- Mahadevia, Darshini, and Rutul Joshi (2009): Subversive Urban Development in India: Implications on Planning Education. Ahmedabad.
- Schubert, Dirk (2009): Der größte Slum Asiens: Dharavi (Mumbai) – Von Fehlschlägen der “Sanierung” zum Modellprojekt? In: Uwe Altröck, Ronald Kunze, Elke Pahl-Weber, Ursula von Petz and Dirk Schubert (Eds.): Jahrbuch Stadterneuerung 2009. Berlin: 99 – 114.
- Tiwari, D.P. (n.d.): Challenges in Urban Planning for local bodies in India [Internet]. Bhopal. URL: <http://www.gisdevelopment.net/application/urban/overview/urban00037.htm> (Accessed: 6/2012)
- United Nations – Population Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2012): World Urbanization Prospects, the 2011 Revision.
- Vaidya, Chetan (2009): Urban issues, reforms and way forward in India. Working Paper No. 4/2009-DEA. New Delhi.

## USA

American urban development is usually paired to white middle-class suburbanization and discriminated central urban neighbourhoods based on ethnic-racial criteria with a particularly strong segregation of the African-American minority. At its very centre, the Central Business District (CBD) is left without residential purpose. City and suburban areas are hereby considered as functional units in which the urban centre organises its hinterland. Societal and socio-spatial dynamics are mainly based on the integration of immigrants with a displacement effect on long-time residents, as well as the gradual blending of newcomers into mainstream society which, in turn, reinforces socio-spatial differentiation by ethnic and socio-economic segregation processes (cf. Dear 2005: 34 f.; Falke 2008: 183 ff.).

The recent history of American metropolitan areas after the end of the Second World War is mainly related to the decline of old industrial Fordist city centres, the growth of suburban areas as well as the emergence of new post-Fordist urban landscapes characteristic of the (South-) Western United States. As a result of the economic restructuring ongoing since the 1970s (deindustrialization, tertiarisation, etc), former industrial cities in the north (*rustbelt*) such as Detroit or Pittsburgh, but also relatively prosperous cities with a former large share of industrial mass production such as Los Angeles, now face a labour market and income polarization – mostly along ethnic-racial lines – affecting unemployment and poverty in large parts of their inner city populations. Consequences of this include the development of highly deprived neighbourhoods in parallel to an accelerated suburbanization of (white) middle class households (cf. Dear 2005: 33 ff.; Falke 2008: 183 f.).

Today, more than 60% of the urban population lives in suburban areas, with its promise of ethno-racial and socio-economic homogeneity, security and absence of serious integration problems in schools (Falke 2008: 184 f.; Thieme/Laux 2005: 40 ff.). In many places, suburbia has developed from being a downtown “satellite” to a separate urban centre with its own labour market and infrastructure offer (as can be observed for example in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area / Orange County in many places). The suburban area thus increasingly determines the development of downtown areas (Dear 2005: 30). A specific challenge in the suburbs is the demographic ageing, in particular of baby boomers (Falke 2008: 185). Typical suburban dwellers have been for a long time predominantly white middle-class, yet a recent trend for has seen increasing settlement of Asian and Hispanic households (Thieme/Laux 2005: 43).

In many central urban areas, socio-spatial settlement patterns vary against the background of sustained inflow of immigrants especially from Asian and Latin American countries and the consequent increase of ethnic minorities. In certain areas, this is even more the case than previously. In most cities today, the white population has been (clearly) outnumbered. There is a progressive socio-spatial fragmentation of the city as a whole (mainly in ethno-racial but also economic terms) and an equally strong homogenization of its subspaces, with a growing number of private estates (*CID – Common Interest Developments*). Gated communities with their exclusionary nature of surveillance is an example of these processes at the “top” of the socio-economic scale (cf. Dear 2005: 30 ff.; Falke 2008: 186; Thieme/Laux 2005: 41 ff.).



On the other hand, providing deprived social groups and households in central urban areas with social services and care, especially affordable housing, is a great challenge. This issue is addressed by the urban development policy supported by the federal government and operated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The HUD has set itself the task of contributing to the sustainable and inclusive development of communities as well as providing qualitative, affordable housing to all population groups. For this purpose, the government has allocated funds to the different areas of community development (*Community Development Block Grants*) and developed various support opportunities and programmes to

- foster home ownership and affordable housing opportunities for low income households,
- provide housing and institutional support to homeless individuals,
- encourage the development of special economic zones (Empowerment Zones) in deprived neighbourhoods,
- support ethnic groups' organizations and institutions and promote community development in general,
- promote capacity building of local organizations for neighbourhood and housing development with the goal of an integrated development of urban areas in partnership with deprived inhabitants.

Concerning the latter point, integrated strategies of urban (district) development have been implemented in the U.S. as in the case of neighbourhood renewal programmes in Harlem and the South Bronx, New York. From the 1950s to the 1980s, both areas were characterised by the emigration of high-income households with a simultaneous influx of poorer population groups from different ethnic backgrounds. Disinvestment in the housing stock has led to serious urban afflictions. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, a comprehensive response was given to this situation with laws, tax breaks and government subsidies focusing on home ownership and rehabilitation of the existing housing stock. The new development approaches were (initially) designed as integrated and were based on a strong level of participation including private investors, project executing organisations and intermediate developers as well as *Community Development Corporations (CDC)*. The latter are local resident organizations started in the 1960s which took into their own hands the development of their neighbourhood to counter the lack of municipal planning initiatives. They have thus gained extensive experience in project management and fundraising. Amongst other programmes, housing (construction) projects for different income groups and measures to promote the local (ethnic) economy have been successfully implemented (Matuschewski 2005: 14 ff.).





## References

- Dear, Michael (2005): Die Los Angeles School of Urbanism. In: *Geographische Rundschau* 57, Heft 1: 30 – 36.
- Falke, Andreas (2008): Föderalismus und Kommunalpolitik. In: Peter Lösche (Ed.) (2008): *Länderbericht USA*. Bonn: 160 – 195.
- HUD – U.S. Department for Housing and Urban Development [Internet]. N.p. URL: <http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD> (Accessed: 6/2012).
- Lösche, Peter (Ed.) (2008): *Länderbericht USA*. Bonn.
- Matuschewski, Anke (2005): Revitalisierung innerstädtischer Slums und Ghettos in New York City? In: *Geographische Rundschau* 57, Heft 1: 14 – 21.
- Parnreiter, Christof (2008): Von Mauern und Löchern: Zuwanderung in die USA. In: *Geographische Rundschau* 60, Heft 10: 40 – 50.
- Thieme, Günter, and Hans Dieter Laux (2005): Jenseits von „Black and White“. Suburbanisierung ethnischer Minderheiten in den USA. In: *Geographische Rundschau* 57 (2005) Heft 10: 40 – 50.

Observing conditions, challenges and strategies of urban (district) development in Brazil, China, India and the United States reveals differences and similarities that are at least analog to certain of those in European countries.

In Brazil, China and India, it is clear that urban economic growth is essentially concerned with the issue of less skilled workers' immigration, leading to growing social inequality and strong socio-spatial segregation in the cities with the emergence of large deprived neighbourhoods. In the USA, a country with a tradition of immigration, such fragmentations are primarily based on ethnic-racial criteria and are to a large extent also reflected in the suburban areas. Overall, the countries studied face a far greater risk of social exclusion and development of deprived urban areas than European cities.

The strategies for dealing with deprived neighbourhoods in Brazil, China, India and the USA are similar insofar as such areas are for the first time – albeit to varying degrees – accepted as parts of the cities and urban society. Accordingly, they are more or less taken into account in government programmes and in various planning and development concerns of the respective cities. Integrated, area-based participatory approaches pursuing both architectural and social goals prove to be the most appropriate strategies for the development of deprived neighbourhoods, although the occurrence of such approaches in the countries studied is very different.

Overall, in all four countries, (integrated) urban (district) development supported by the government proves to be both strategically and financially important, in particular for creating a stable environment for local development.

# 7 The state of urban (district) development in Europe: summary and conclusion

The comparison of integrated urban (district) development approaches in the Member States of the European Union, its candidate countries and in Norway and Switzerland reveals some general trends, despite differences between countries – even when compared to the results of the 2007 study (BMVBS 2007):

- Integrated, area-based strategies of urban (district) development in Western Europe continue to play a large role and are gaining importance in Central and Eastern Europe.
- In the European context, there are differences between countries
  - which have implemented comprehensive programmes for integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods) at national level (Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom),
  - those which have implemented national or regional programmes for integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods) or in which have developed guidelines at national level (Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain)
  - and those which have mainly implemented local approaches to integrated urban development (of deprived neighbourhoods) (Estonia, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Slovakia, Turkey).
- The boundaries of this categorisation are fluid as integrated urban (district) development is currently gaining importance in many of the countries studied. Compared to the situation in 2007, several countries have now enshrined the notion of integration at national level and local authorities tend to implement integrated development strategies more frequently. This is partly due to the requirements imposed by the EU subvention policy.
- For countries of the first group especially, the national level plays the role of an important impulse generator, in particular for the integrated development of deprived neighbourhoods (in the urban context). This driving function will not only be filled by formulating a framework, but also by providing subsidies, which, in the face of the current economic crisis and the related financial rigour, are declining in many places (such as in Denmark, Germany, Great Britain).
- A number of EU Member States and candidate countries, especially the majority of the central and eastern European countries, remain essentially focused on building and urban measures in the context of urban development. Reasons for this include the effects of the extensive privatization of former public housing stocks (private disinvestment, fragmented ownership) and a constant need for investment in terms of infrastructure renewal.
- In addition to built urban aspects, most Western European countries consider social and local economic issues, environmental concerns, integration of ethnic minorities and (further) education of deprived population groups as part of integrated urban (district) development strategies.
- Overall, the main goals and topics of national approaches to integrated urban (district) development include:
  - the development of deprived neighbourhoods,
  - social cohesion and integration,
  - housing (new, renewal, upgrading),
  - taking into consideration architectural and archaeological heritage,
  - infrastructure development,
  - sustainable urban transport, mobility, public transport,
  - local economy, training and employment, economic competitiveness and labour market policy,
  - fighting climate change, energetic renewal, increasing energy efficiency,
  - environmental protection and development.
- Especially in Central and Eastern European countries, applying to EU subsidies has to a large extent raised awareness regarding integrated urban (district) development (Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Romania, Slovenia).
- Strategies designed to be inclusive usually give priority to the development of deprived neighbourhoods.
- A more explicit area-based approach, which is one of the important elements to an urban (district) development emphasized by the LEIPZIG CHARTER, is in many countries the basis for such strategies (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom).

- Local integrated development plans/concepts are in many countries a (formal) basis or fundamental instrument for sustainable urban (district) development policy (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland).
  - The bundling of different resources at national, regional and/or local level plays an important role especially for countries with complex integrated approaches (France, Germany, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom).
  - This is often followed by a contract between the national and/or regional and/or local levels (Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden).
  - A majority of the countries studied have created separate management and organizational structures in relation to integrated urban (district) development projects (Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Finland, France, Latvia, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Romania, United Kingdom, Sweden, Switzerland). These include inter-departmental committees at national, regional, local and neighbourhood level as well as a network between them, thus seeking to improve the administrative course of action.
  - At local level, the creation of local partnerships between municipalities, residents, economic and above all housing associations, social institutions and organizations has been emphasised (Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom). The implication of the private sector, foundations and other third parties can furthermore capture additional resources.
  - Empowerment, mobilization and participation of local communities and other relevant actors (increasingly) play an important role in the integrated urban (district) development. In 2007, Western European countries were mostly concerned. Today, this has spread throughout Europe (Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom).
  - Only relatively few of the countries studied explicitly stated the importance of sustainment approaches (such as Denmark and Germany) and monitoring (Germany, France, Iceland, Montenegro, the Netherlands, Sweden).
- According to various sources (mainly MVIV 2010) and interviewees from municipal administrations and district level, (isolated) prerequisites are or were decisive for the success of integrated urban (district) development. These can be briefly summed up:
- close co-operation between national, municipal and neighbourhood levels,
  - integrating spatial policies and projects into urban strategies,
  - strongly taking into account community work (unrelated to specific projects),
  - a comprehensive and transparent inclusion of all relevant actors, institutions and organizations (residents and local stakeholders, entrepreneurs, economic, educational and social services) in adopting objectives as well as the planning and implementation of policies and projects,
  - coordinating different fields of action from the social, economic, cultural, infrastructural, environmental and urban topics by developing a interdepartmental cooperation for a holistic approach,
  - institutionalization of structured cooperation or network structures (e.g. via contracts),
  - financing through a single fund which would equally support structural as well as social and economic policies and projects
  - monitoring and evaluation,
  - strengthening the professional skills of civil servants as well as of other actors involved in the integrated urban (district) development,
  - intensification of the general (international) experience exchange.

Overall, the results found in this paper's description of national policies show three trends:

- 1 Approaches to integrated urban (district) development have increasingly become a guiding principle in all EU Member States, its candidate countries and in Norway and Switzerland – either as part of national programmes and/or of local strategies for a holistic development of urban areas.
- 2 It turns out that the “LEIPZIG CHARTER on Sustainable European Cities” has had a significant impact, either by explicit reference (for example in Bulgaria, Cyprus, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Romania, Spain) or by some of its elements, at local implementation level.

- 3 It can be noted that despite the economic crisis, subsequent budgetary constraints and overall financial restrictions at national, regional and local level, approaches to integrated urban (district) development and related programmes in many EU Member States have significantly gained importance.

Overall, the challenge in Europe will consist of finding more integrated courses of action in many topics of urban (district) development despite increasingly limited financial resources – notably through closer partnerships between national and local levels as well as the political, administrative, economic and citizen spheres.

## References

BBSR – Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung im Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung (Ed.) (2010): *Transnationale Perspektiven für Klimaschutz und Klimaanpassung. Wie Kommunen und Regionen INTERREG IV B nutzen können*. Berlin (Eds.: Daniel Zwicker-Schwarm, Andrea Wagner, Cornelia Rösler, Anja Neubauer).

BBSR online – Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung im Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung: *Reference Framework for Sustainable Cities (RFSC)* [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.bbsr.bund.de/nn\\_22410/BBSR/DE/Stadtentwicklung/StadtentwicklungEuropa/EuropaeischeStadtpolitik/Netzwerke/rfsc/01\\_start.html](http://www.bbsr.bund.de/nn_22410/BBSR/DE/Stadtentwicklung/StadtentwicklungEuropa/EuropaeischeStadtpolitik/Netzwerke/rfsc/01_start.html) (Accessed: 2/2012).

BMVBS – Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung (Ed.) (2007): *Integrated Urban Development – a Prerequisite for Urban Sustainability in Europe*. Berlin (Eds.: Thomas Franke, Wolf-Christian Strauss, Bettina Reimann, Klaus J. Beckmann).

BZK – Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations (2005): *Ministerial Meeting Urban Policy „Cities Empower Europe“*. Conclusions Dutch Presidency 2004, 13.01.2005.

Difu – Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik (2007): *Sustainable Urban Transport and deprived urban areas – Good Practice Examples in Europe*. Berlin.

Difu – Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik im Auftrag des Bundesministeriums für Verkehr, Bau- und Wohnungswesen (Ed.) (2003): *Strategien für die Soziale Stadt. Erfahrungen und Perspektiven – Umsetzung des Bundesländer-Programms „Stadtteile mit besonderem Entwicklungsbedarf – die soziale Stadt“*. Bericht der Programmbegleitung. Berlin.

Dohnke, Jan, Antje Seidel-Schulze and Hartmut Häußermann (2012): *Segregation, Konzentration, Polarisierung – sozialräumliche Entwicklung in deutschen Städten 2007–2009*. Difu-Impulse 4/2012. Berlin

EC – Council of the European Union (2006): *Renewed EU Sustainable Development Strategy*. Brussels. 15/16 June 2006.

EC – Council of the European Union (2005a): *Declaration on the Guiding Principles for Sustainable Development*. Presidency Conclusions, Annex 1. Brussels. 16/17 June 2005.

EC – Council of the European Union (2005b): *European Council of 22 and 23 March 2005 in Brussels – Presidency Conclusions*, March 2005.

EU Commission – Commission of the European Communities (2010): *Communication from the Commission. Europe 2020. A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth*. Brussels.

EU Commission – Commission of the European Communities (2008): *Fostering the urban dimension. Analysis of the Operational programmes co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (2007–2013)*. Brussels.

EU Commission – Commission of the European Communities (2006a): *Communication from the Commission to the Council and Parliament. Cohesion Policy and cities: the urban contribution to growth and jobs in the regions*. Brussels.

EU Commission – Commission of the European Communities (2006b): *Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on Thematic strategy on the Urban Environment*. Brussels.

EU Commission – Commission of the European Communities (2006c): *Regulation (EC) No 1080/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 on the European Regional Development Fund and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1783/1999*. Official Journal of the EC L 210/1 of 5 July 2006. Brussels: 1–11.

EU Commission – Commission of the European Communities (2005): *Communication from the Commission. Cohesion policy in Support of Growth and Jobs – Community Strategic Guidelines, 2007–2013*. Brussels.

EU Commission – Commission of the European Communities (2000): *The Lisbon European Council – An Agenda of Economic and Social Renewal for Europe. Contribution of the European Commission to the Special European Council in Lisbon, 23–24th March 2000*. Brussels.

EU Commission – Commission of the European Communities (1999): *Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Sustainable Urban Development in the European Union: A Framework for Action*. Brussels.

- EUKN – European Urban Knowledge Network (2006): Strategies for upgrading the physical environment in deprived urban areas – Examples of good practice in Europe. The Hague.
- Final Appendix to the final statement by the ministers in charge of urban development for implementing the Leipzig Charter. Marseille, 25th November 2008.
- First Action Programme for the Implementation of the Territorial Agenda of the European Union. Agreed on the 23rd November 2007, at Ponta Delgada, Azores.
- Franke, Thomas, Rolf-Peter Löhr and Robert Sander (2000): Soziale Stadt – Stadterneuerungspolitik als Stadtpolitikenerneuerung. In: Archiv für Kommunalwissenschaften, 39. Jahrgang 2000, II. Halbjahresband, Berlin: 243 – 268.
- Franke, Thomas, and Wolf-Christian Strauss (2005): Management gebietsbezogener integrativer Stadtteilentwicklung. Ansätze in Kopenhagen und Wien im Vergleich zur Programmumsetzung „Soziale Stadt“ in deutschen Städten. Difu-Materialien 8/2005. Berlin.
- Griesel, Maart, and Frans van de Waart (Eds.) (2011): Multilevel Urban Governance or the Art of Working Together. Methods, Instruments and Practices. The Hague.
- Häußermann, Hartmut (2000): Die Krise der „sozialen Stadt“. In: Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, B10-11/2000: 13 – 21.
- Instituto Universitario de Urbanística de la Universidad de Valladolid (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in Europe. Summary Document. June 2010, Valladolid.
- Lille Priorities. Conclusions of the French Presidency of the European Union at the end of the informal meeting of Ministers responsible for urban affairs at the Conference „Europe, spatial and urban development“. Lille, 2.11.2000.
- MS – Marseille Statement. Final Statement by the ministers in charge of urban development. Marseille, 25.11.2008.
- MIF – Ministry of the Interior Finland (2006): Senior Officials' Meeting on Urban Policy. Lappeenranta 2006. Conclusions by the Presidency.
- Ministerio de Vivienda, Dirección General de Urbanismo y Política de Suelo (2006): Wohnungsbaupolitik als Instrument für Stadterneuerung. Bericht Spaniens für das 17. Treffen der Wohnungsbauminister der Europäischen Union. Barcelona, 16. und 17. Oktober 2006. Madrid.
- MMR – Ministry for Regional Development of the Czech Republic (2009): „Assessment Report“ on the Implementation of the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities (Czech Presidency) [Internet]. Prague. URL: <http://www.eukn.org/dsresource?objectid=166461> (Accessed: 4/2012).
- MOP – Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning (2008a): Coordination between Territorial and Urban Development. Final Report on Action 1.1 of the First Action Programme for the Implementation of the Territorial Agenda of the EU. Ljubljana.
- MOP – Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning (2008b): Slovenian Presidency Report on activities in the field of territorial cohesion and urban development. Ljubljana.
- MVIV – Gobierno de España – Ministerio de Vivienda (2010): Integrated Urban Regeneration in the European Union. Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban development, June 2010. Attached Documents. Document I: List of countries surveyed. N.p.
- ODPM – Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2005a): Conclusions of Bristol Ministerial Informal Meeting on Sustainable Communities in Europe. UK Presidency, Bristol.
- ODPM – Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2005b): European Evidence Review: Ministerial Informal Meeting on Sustainable Communities. Source document UK Presidency.
- Stiftung SPI (2007): Proactive education and training policies for children and young people in deprived urban areas – good practice examples in Europe. Berlin.
- Swianiewicz, Paweł, Rob Atkinson and Ana Baucz (2011): Background Report on the urban dimension of the Cohesion Policy post 2013. Report prepared at the request of the Polish EU Presidency. Warsaw.
- TD – Toledo Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban Development Declaration. Toledo, 22 June 2010.
- TRD – Toledo Reference Document on Integrated Urban Regeneration and its strategic potential for a smarter, more sustainable and socially inclusive urban development in Europe. Toledo, 2010.
- URBACT (2007): Stärkung der lokalen Ökonomie und der lokalen Arbeitsmarktpolitik in benachteiligten Stadtquartieren – gute Praxisbeispiele in Europa. Saint-Denis La Plaine.
- Van Dijken, Koos, Mart Grisel and Wim Hafkamp (2008): Levers of public action for the development of sustainable cities. The Hague. November 10th, 2008.
- Working Paper of Urban Development. Trio Presidency of Spain-Belgium-Hungary (January 2010–June 2011) [Internet]. N.p. URL: [http://www.rfsustainablecities.eu/IMG/pdf/TRIO\\_PRESIDENCY\\_EN\\_cleo723b3.pdf](http://www.rfsustainablecities.eu/IMG/pdf/TRIO_PRESIDENCY_EN_cleo723b3.pdf) (Accessed: 2/2012).



Bundesinstitut  
für Bau-, Stadt- und  
Raumforschung

im Bundesamt für Bauwesen  
und Raumordnung



## Imprint

### Publisher

Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development  
Invalidenstraße 44  
10115 Berlin

### Editors

German Institute of Urban Affairs (Difu)  
Zimmerstraße 13–15  
10969 Berlin  
Thomas Franke, Christa Böhme, Wolf-Christian Strauss, Klaus J. Beckmann

Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development  
within the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning  
Deichmanns Aue 31–37  
53179 Bonn  
André Müller in collaboration with Thomas Marshall

### Lectorsip

German Institute of Urban Affairs (Difu)  
Patrick Diekelmann

### Translation

Thomas Marshall

### Edition

October 2012

### Printing

AZ Druck und Datentechnik GmbH, Berlin

### Picture credits

Wolfgang Aichinger: page 73  
BMVBS / Frank Ossenbrink: page 7  
Günther Burghardt: page 77 (bottom)  
Thomas Franke: cover (top right), page 75  
Manuela Hocke: page 77 (top)  
Olaf Schnur: page 80 (bottom)  
Wolf-Christian Strauss: Cover (top left, bottom), pp. 29, 36, 59, 80 (top)

### Design and Layout

Oswald und Martin Werbeagentur, Berlin

### Reprinting and copying

All rights reserved

This publication can be downloaded from  
<http://www.nationale-stadtentwicklungspolitik.de>.

The contents of this study reflect the view of the authors.

ISBN 978-3-88118-512-7

The German National Library lists this publication  
in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>

