



NATIONALE  
STADT  
ENTWICKLUNGS  
POLITIK



Bundesinstitut  
für Bau-, Stadt- und  
Raumforschung

im Bundesamt für Bauwesen  
und Raumordnung



## Ten years after the Leipzig Charter



The enduring relevance of  
integrated urban development  
in Europe



## **Ten years after the Leipzig Charter**

The enduring relevance of integrated urban development in Europe

## **Imprint**

### **Published by**

Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR)  
within the Federal Office for Building and Regional Planning (BBR), Bonn  
Deichmanns Aue 31–37  
53179 Bonn

### **Scientific support**

Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR)  
Department I 2 – Urban Development  
Dr. Marion Klemme  
marion.klemme@bbr.bund.de

Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB)  
Department SW I 1 – General Issues of Urban Development Policy, BBSR  
Tilman Buchholz

### **Research contractor**

European Urban Knowledge Network (EUKN), The Hague  
Direction: Mart Grisel, Dr. Sjoerdje van Heerden  
Edited by: Dr. Sjoerdje van Heerden, Lea Scheurer

### **Edited by**

Kate Elliott

### **Status**

May 2017

### **Typesetting and layout**

Sander Pinkse Boekproductie, Amsterdam

### **Production**

Warden Press/Wardy Poelstra, Amsterdam

### **Printed by**

Printforce, Alphen a/d Rijn

### **Orders from**

silvia.wicharz@bbr.bund.de  
Stichwort: Ten years after the Leipzig Charter

### **Picture credits**

Cover: Mart Grisel  
Bundesregierung/Sandra Steins: p. 3; mapchart.net: p. 23, 29, 34; Stuart Acker Holt: p. 24, 30; Gijs Wilbers:  
p. 35; Mario Roberto Durán Ortiz: p. 68; Pexels/@little boy: p. 70; commons.wikimedia.org/Palava City: p. 71;  
commons.wikimedia.org/Andres de Wet: p. 73; Mart Grisel: p. 74, 80

### **Reprint and copying**

All rights reserved  
Reprint allowed with detailed reference only.  
Please send us two sample copies.

The contents of this report reflect the views of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the publisher.

## Message from the Minister

Ten years ago, the EU Member States agreed on the Leipzig Charter, a basic document on integrated urban development. Since then, the challenges for our cities and societies have grown further. Everywhere in Europe we are facing challenges, such as climate change, digitalisation, globalisation, the integration of immigrants and the strengthening of social cohesion.

In order to cope with these tasks, not only consistent and coordinated solutions across all governmental levels are necessary. Participation of all groups in the city is also needed. With this claim, the Leipzig Charter specifically focused on socially and economically disadvantaged neighbourhoods already in 2007.

The present report “Ten years after the Leipzig Charter” investigates in what way urban policy has been designed in an integrated and holistic fashion in various European and some extra-European countries in recent years. Anticipating the German Presidency of the Council of the EU in 2020, the study also serves to reflect upon the future of integrated urban development in Europe.

This report’s findings show that, by now, integrated and participative urban development policy according to the Leipzig Charter prevail all over Europe and at local and regional levels in particular. This report fuels the debate around the Urban Agenda for the EU, established with the Pact of Amsterdam in May 2016. Building upon the legacy of the Leipzig Charter will be of key importance with regard to European structural policy after 2020.



Photo: Federal Government/Sandra Steins

This study shall provide enriching insights to all readers and shall contribute to the efforts to maintain European cities as thriving, inclusive and habitable places.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Barbara Hendricks". The script is fluid and cursive.

Dr. Barbara Hendricks  
Federal Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety



## Table of contents

Introduction .....	6
1 The Leipzig Charter .....	7
2 An integrated approach to a sustainable urban future .....	9
3 Ten years after the Leipzig Charter – European policy developments .....	11
4 Modern-day urban challenges .....	13
5 Methodological approach .....	16
6 Integrated urban development in the national practice .....	18
7 Integrated urban (district) development in Brazil, China, India, South Afrika and the USA .....	67
8 Discussion and conclusion .....	77
References .....	82

## Introduction

In 2007, the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities brought a great deal of political attention to integrated approaches to urban development. In 2012, the study “5 Years after the LEIPZIG CHARTER – Integrated Urban Development as a Prerequisite for a Sustainable City” concluded that integrated, area based strategies of urban development continue to play a prominent role in Western Europe while gaining importance in Central and Eastern Europe. In 2017, marking the tenth anniversary of the Leipzig Charter, it is time to analyse and re-assess the state of integrated urban development in Europe.

The present study, which was carried out by the European Urban Knowledge Network (EUKN) and commissioned by the German Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR), examines the extent to which the principles of the Leipzig Charter have been applied during the period from 2012 to 2016. To this end, thirty-five countries from the European continent have been studied. In addition, analyses of national urban policies in five countries outside Europe – Brazil, China, India, South Africa and the United States of America – put the ideas of the Leipzig Charter into a wider geographical context. Also, three case studies were conducted, illustrating the practical implementation of an integrated approach to urban development in the cities of Brno (Czech Republic), Brussels (Belgium) and Vantaa (Finland).

The overarching objective of the study is to take stock of the importance of integrated urban development policies and concomitant governance arrangements, coordination mechanisms and financing instruments in view of current, modern-day urban challenges and the most recent European political developments. A tailor-made expert survey served as the main tool for data collection. This survey was distributed among public servants working in the national ministries and departments responsible for urban policy. Additional analyses were performed based on desk research.

The content of the report is structured as follows: the first chapter discusses the key aspects of the Leipzig Charter, which have not lost their relevance. Chapter 2 further elaborates on the integrated approach establishing the core theme of the Leipzig Charter. The third chapter lists the outcomes of EU Presidencies related to integrated and sustainable urban development, culminating in the Urban Agenda for the EU in 2016. Following a discussion of pressing urban challenges in chapter 4, chapter 5 describes the methodological approach of the study. Subsequently, chapter 6 analyses the state of integrated urban development across European countries, further illustrated by three case studies. What follows is a contextualisation of the European approaches by describing urban development policy challenges and solutions in Brazil, China, India, South Africa and the United States of America in chapter 7. Finally, the concluding chapter 8 summarises the main findings of the report at a glance.



# 1 The Leipzig Charter

*"Living in cities is becoming increasingly popular. This is a positive development, and one that we have to boost. Families are returning from the urban fringe and rural hinterland to the inner cities. Urbanity is becoming a hallmark of quality. ... Europe's cities are currently experiencing a renaissance, and policy-makers have to shape this renaissance. It will usher in a new phase of urban development."*

Wolfgang Tiefensee, German EU Council President, 2007

On 24 and 25 May 2007, the EU Ministers responsible for urban development gathered in Leipzig for the Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban Development and Territorial Cohesion. The outcome of this meeting was the signing of the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities. In this political document, all Member States commit to adopt and strengthen an integrated approach to urban development, marking a new era in EU urban policy. The Charter presents two key principles for policy-makers to advance the sustainable development of cities: 1) to make greater use of integrated urban development policy approaches, and 2) to give special attention to deprived neighbourhoods within the context of the city as a whole.

Integrated urban development policy entails that the spatial, sectoral and temporal aspects of key areas in urban policy are harmonised. The Leipzig Charter acknowledges that every level of government bears a specific responsibility for the future of our cities and regions. To deal effectively with such parallel responsibilities, the coordination between different sectorial policies should be improved, while keeping in mind temporal and spatial aspects of urban development policies. Since there is no stand-alone policy to foster sustainable European cities with competitive businesses and high quality living conditions for people, the coordination of different policies at different levels of government is essential (BBSR 2012; BMVBS/BBR 2007; Eltges 2009).

The Leipzig Charter further states that urban development policies and the search for innovative solutions have a better chance of success if they have commitment from the government bodies at the highest level. High-level government involvement in the development of urban policy can empower cities to deliver national, regional and local ambitions. In order to allow for a stable financial basis for cities' tasks, Member States also need to have the opportunity to use resources from the European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds for the implementation of substantial national, regional and/or local programmes.\* Furthermore, integrated urban development should draw on a wide range

of expert knowledge for support. A systematic and structured exchange of experience across geographical and sectoral boundaries can help develop the necessary skills to implement integrated urban development policies on all levels, and especially locally (idem).

The Leipzig Charter specifically emphasises the ability of the integrated approach to congregate and unite different interests of the parties involved. Building a consensus among administrative levels, the citizenry and businesses is a step further towards a successful policy. The coordination should also be applied to funding schemes. At a time of budgetary constraints and fiscal belt-tightening in Europe, the possibility of public-private partnerships gains importance, although these partnerships include specific challenges. Moreover, innovative public participation schemes allow citizens to influence future policies and thus play an active role in shaping their immediate living environment (idem).

The special attention brought to deprived neighbourhoods can be approached from two different perspectives. There are both ethical and practical reasons for concentrating efforts in most disadvantaged areas. The assumption of the European city as a value-driven cohabitation model marks the origin of the wish to make European cities fairer and more equitable places to live. Hence, all residents must have access to the same set of services and opportunities, such as a safe and healthy environment and good education opportunities. At the same time, concentrating efforts on the parts of a city with the greatest problems is seen as the most effective way to improve the quality of life for all in the city. Considerable differences in terms of economic and social opportunities, levels of economic development and the social status of residents in individual city areas can destabilise the social fabric of the city. A policy of social integration, which contributes to reducing inequalities and prevents social exclusion, can help to maintain the security and cohesion within cities. The Leipzig Charter emphasises that only a city that is socially stable as a whole can unleash its full potential for growth.

\* The main funding schemes within the ESI Funds in this regard are the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), whose currently valid Regulation<sup>1</sup> Article 7 assigns a minimum share of five per cent to urban development; the European Social Fund (ESF), and the Cohesion Fund. Specific instruments for urban area investments are the ERDF-fed Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas (JESSICA) scheme for the establishment of revolving funds operated in the 2007-2013 programming period and the Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI) introduced in the 2014-2020 period. ITI allows for a combination of structural funds in defined areas.

Furthermore, the Charter specifically names education as the key to equal opportunities, stating that education opportunities should be tailored to the needs of children and young adults (*idem*).

In sum, the Leipzig Charter promotes a holistic and integrated development policy to foster sustainable communities where, according to the definition given in the Bristol Accord, “people want to live and work, [which] are safe, inclusive, well planned, built and run, and offer equality of opportunity and good services for all” (UK Presidency 2005: 6).

## 2 An integrated approach to a sustainable urban future

All EU Member States, European institutions, candidate countries and relevant stakeholders signed the Leipzig Charter. The political agreement on core topics of the Charter and their encompassing acknowledgement create an important starting point for further activities of sustainable and integrated urban development in Europe. However, the Leipzig Charter goes beyond mere political commitments. It also recommends concrete steps and instruments for reaching its goals. To establish sustainable communities and a sustainable European urban network, it puts forward a holistic approach to urban and regional policies based on implementation-oriented planning tools (Eltges 2009). In the following section three key instruments of the Leipzig Charter are discussed. In order to illustrate the challenges, a sketch is provided of a contemporary urban challenge for each of the key instruments.

### A spatial perspective and area based interventions

An area-based approach, or spatial perspective, is used to frame urban problems spatially, as well as to capture their characteristics. When relying on a spatial perspective, economic, environmental and social aspects should be analysed as a whole, rather than separately, as their complex and intertwined relationships should be considered. Thus, to improve one geographical area efficiently its whole cause-and-effect web has to be taken into consideration (EUROCITIES 2004: 8). Moreover, a spatial perspective and an area/place-based approach can help to overcome sectoral policies.

Urban poverty, social exclusion, high unemployment, health inequalities, growing migration flows and their associated consequences are some of the main focal points of urban development policy. Evidently, a spatial perspective or area/place-based approach plays a critical role in dealing with these challenges, given their spatial concentration. Multiple studies indicate that in more developed Member States deprivation is less and mainly concentrated in cities, while, in less developed EU countries deprivation is higher and mainly concentrated in rural areas, smaller towns and suburbs (EUKN 2014; URBACT 2015). Thus, a more detailed geographical breakdown of the prevailing situation and its main determinants can benefit policies addressing deprivation. Area/place-based interventions do not focus on individuals, but on a specific geographical unit. Usually they combine so-called hard measures, such as demolition and regener-

ation of housing, with soft measures such as social capital building and labour market integration (EUKN 2014; URBACT 2015). An area/place-based approach is particularly appropriate for managing the transformation of neighbourhoods with regenerative capacity, instead of focusing exclusively on building and developing new neighbourhoods from scratch (Rio Fernandes 2011). As urban poverty is usually concentrated in specific neighbourhoods and regions, it is only through an area/place-based approach that the issue can be tackled most efficiently.

### Multi-level governance

While sustainable development issues are rooted in rising global concerns, urban planning typically takes place at subordinate levels of government. Therefore, the pursuit of feasible sustainable development schemes has to be carried out through dialogue, multi-disciplinary collaborations and partnerships between a wide range of actors from various fields and regulatory levels (EU, national, regional, local). The aim of such an integrated approach is to best serve the combined interests of all parties involved. By relocating authority upwards, downwards and sideways, there is room for an optimal pooling of resources, both financially and in terms of interdisciplinary expertise (EUROCITIES 2004). For instance, local budgets can be combined with national or EU funding programmes, or with additional resources from non-governmental actors, such as foundations or private companies. Strengthening cooperation and dispersing authority between all relevant actors can play a significant role in the success of a certain policy. Typically, multi-level governance supplies wider support and greater legitimacy. Moreover, the coordinated involvement of different actors of government has become indispensable, given the decentralisation processes many European countries currently experience, while the call for an urban dimension in European and national policies becomes stronger (EUKN 2011b).

The threat of climate change is one of the most significant challenges of our time, and serves to illustrate the need for multi-level governance. The battle against it involves an enormous range of actors across several governmental levels, from local to global. Given the global nature of the problem the focus is mainly placed on international negotiations in Copenhagen, Cancún or Paris. However, on a day-to-day basis, the most substantial decisions

that address carbon dioxide emission and that stimulate sustainable development are made by local, regional and national authorities, industries and other relevant institutional actors (McEwen/Swenden/Bolleyer 2010). It is clear that national governments will be unable to meet their international commitments in addressing climate change when they lack a more explicit engagement from sub-national actors. For example, land-use planning and waste management are usually in the hands of local governments and they play a crucial role in dealing with energy consumption and concerns relating to transport issues (Betsill/Bulkeley 2006). Therefore, it is crucial to include all levels of government and to set up a network between administration and neighbourhood entities to tackle climate problems efficiently, while collaborating closely with EU and international level actors in terms of technical support and administration.

### **Bottom-up approach and empowerment**

Many urban planning approaches are mainly top-down, whereby planners and authorities, depending on the context and task, involve the local communities in the implementation phase. However, this approach is often subjected to criticism, as it carries with it the danger of planning in disregard of the needs of local actors on the ground (Dias/Curwell/Bichard 2014). A well-planned bottom-up approach with effective participation of the stakeholders and the local population concerned allows decision-makers to have a stronger base of understanding of a specific area. The active participation of local communities in planning the neighbour-

hood not only improves the area physically. Participation processes can also be used as a tool for empowerment, especially in deprived areas that are occupied by the most vulnerable groups of a city's population (such as low-income families and inhabitants with immigrant backgrounds). A participatory process allows them to assume ownership of the urban development process, by having an opportunity to engage in policy formulation and implementation (El-Asmar/Ebohon/Taki 2012). The strengthening of civil engagement requires the structural involvement of various actors at political and administrative levels, as well as at community levels, including associations, interest groups, local initiatives, and especially self-organisations of the poor and other minorities (EUKN 2014).

Recently, much attention has been paid to the distribution of migrants and refugees among European countries and the national policies and lower level programmes that aim to advance their integration. Notwithstanding this focus on (inter-)governmental measures, it can be argued that the current migration movements and their effects have a specific significant local magnitude, especially in terms of social cohesion. Social cohesion incorporates various dimensions, including civic culture and common values, solidarity, the minimisation of wealth discrepancies, social capital and social networks (Kearns/Forrest 2000). Bottom-up processes that include a considerable level of citizen participation and dialogue between different stakeholders may foster social cohesion. These processes build trust and recognition among local inhabitants, including new arrivals, such as migrants and refugees. Thus, they contribute to the reduction of urban poverty and social inequalities.

### 3 Ten years after the Leipzig Charter – European policy developments

Since 2007, documents of EU Council Presidencies and various implementation instruments have further developed the Leipzig Charter. The study “5 Years after the LEIPZIG CHARTER – Integrated Urban Development as a Prerequisite for a Sustainable City” (BBSR 2012) provides an overview of this development up to the Toledo Declaration adopted by the Spanish EU Presidency in the first half of 2010. The Toledo Declaration again stresses the importance of integrated approaches to urban development and reformulates the key elements of the Leipzig Charter by emphasising the need for: a holistic approach, horizontal networking within and vertical networking between all levels involved, strategic planning at a city-wide level by means of an integrated urban development concept, linking the integrated approach to an area-based/spatial perspective, and linking the integrated approach to the aim of inclusion (idem).

Pointing to these elements, the Toledo Declaration (2010) indicates how the Leipzig Charter fits well with the three priorities from the Europe 2020 strategy, launched in 2010, those being: smart, sustainable and inclusive growth (idem). To achieve this tripartite goal, the Europe 2020 strategy relies on five headline targets in the areas of employment, innovation, education, poverty reduction and climate/energy (EC 2010).

The Presidency troika of Spain, Belgium and Hungary, active from 2010 to the first half of 2011, linked the Europe 2020 strategy to a revised version of the Territorial Agenda (TA 2020) which had originally been decided on under German EU Presidency. On 19 May 2011, the ministers responsible for spatial planning and territorial development adopted the TA 2020 in Gödöllő, Hungary. The aim of the Territorial Agenda is to build an inclusive, smart and sustainable Europe of diverse regions. It promotes place-based policy-making, which includes working in an integrated manner and multi-level dialogue, instead of single-sector and top-down approaches. The TA 2020 states that the Europe 2020 objectives can be achieved only if the territorial dimension of the strategy is considered, and specifically declares that the objectives and concerns identified in the Leipzig Charter, Marseille Declaration (2008) and Toledo Declaration should be taken into account in territorial policy-making at all levels.

In October 2011, the European Commission’s Directorate General for Regional and Urban Policy (DG REGIO) published the “Cities of Tomorrow” report, offering an outline for a shared vision of the European city of tomorrow (EC 2011). The report emphasises the importance of an integrated approach in order to achieve sustainable urban development. It further stresses the need for governance whereby government structures are adequately equipped to respond to challenges in a multi-scalar governance system. The “Cities of Tomorrow” report served as a starting point for both the European Commission and the Member States to work towards an Urban Agenda for the EU (EUKN 2015).

In July 2014, the European Commission together with the Dutch incoming Presidency launched a public consultation on the Urban Agenda for the EU. The results indicated that the EU should support cities in addressing urban challenges, while in turn cities can contribute to achieving the priorities of the EU. Also, it was found that the Urban Agenda for the EU should not be a legislative document, but rather “a framework to improve and coordinate existing initiatives, collect and monitor data on impact, and address bottlenecks” (idem: 12).

On 10 June 2015, the Informal Meeting of Ministers responsible for territorial cohesion and urban matters was held in Riga. At this meeting, prepared under the Latvian EU Presidency, all participants agreed on the “Riga Declaration – Towards an EU Urban Agenda”. It marked the first time that EU ministers responsible had committed to the development of an Urban Agenda for the EU, in partnership with cities, the European Commission and other stakeholders (Latvian Presidency 2015).

In October 2015, the twelve priority themes of the Urban Agenda for the EU were formally presented under the Presidency of Luxembourg. These themes followed from surveys and workshops held with urban areas, non-governmental organisations, Member States, particularly the Dutch incoming Presidency, and the European Commission. The priority themes are: the inclusion of migrants and refugees, air quality, urban poverty, housing, circular economy, jobs and skills in the local economy, climate adaptation, energy transition, the sustainable use of land and nature-based solutions, urban mobility, digital transition and innovative and responsible public procurement (for a further elaboration, please see the next chapter).

On 30 May 2016, a major milestone was reached by means of the Pact of Amsterdam, agreed upon at the Informal Meeting of EU Ministers Responsible for Urban Matters, upon the invitation of the Dutch Presidency. The Pact of Amsterdam contains the operational framework of the Urban Agenda for the EU and further elaborates on its goals. The work on the priority themes discussed above focuses on the areas of better regulation, better funding and better knowledge exchange.

Next to the twelve priority themes, the Pact names eleven cross-cutting issues. These are:

- Effective urban governance, including citizens' participation and new models of governance;
- Governance across administrative boundaries and inter-municipal cooperation: urban-rural, urban-urban and cross-border cooperation; link with territorial development and the Territorial Agenda 2020 (well-balanced territorial development);
- Sound and strategic urban planning (link with regional planning, including research and innovation smart specialisation strategies (RIS3), and balanced territorial development), with a place-based and people-based approach;
- Integrated and participatory approach;
- Innovative approaches, including Smart Cities;
- Impact on societal change, including behavioural change, promoting, among other things, equal access to information, gender equality and women's empowerment;
- Challenges and opportunities of small- and medium-sized cities and polycentric development;
- Urban regeneration, including social, economic, environmental, spatial and cultural aspects, also linked to brownfield redevelopment with the objective of limiting greenfield consumption;
- Adaptation to demographic change and in- and out migration;

- Provision of adequate public services of general interest (within the meaning of Article 14 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) in conjunction with Protocol Number 26);
- A final cross-cutting issue puts the emphasis on the international dimension of an Urban Agenda for the EU and the link with the New Urban Agenda (Habitat III) of the United Nations (UN), the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs, 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development) and the Paris Agreement on climate change of December 2015. In that respect, the Urban Agenda for the EU can be seen as an important element of the New Urban Agenda. This conforms to the EU objective to be a stronger global actor and the need to increase consistency between its internal and external policy.

The Pact of Amsterdam specifically refers back to the Leipzig Charter stating that "[a] balanced, sustainable and integrated approach towards urban challenges should, in line with the Leipzig Charter on sustainable European Cities, focus on all major aspects of urban development ... in order to ensure sound urban governance and policy" (The Netherlands Presidency 2016: 4). Similarly, the Opinion of the Committee of Regions entitled "Concrete steps for implementing the EU Urban Agenda" (CoR 2016) states that the Leipzig Charter already stressed the importance of integrated approaches in cities in 2007, while naming multi-level governance as the key to solving complex problems. In that respect, the Leipzig Charter proves its enduring legacy by having sowed the seeds for the development of an Urban Agenda for the EU, reinforcing and stimulating cooperation and exchange between urban authorities on a local, regional, national, supranational and even global level.



## 4 Modern-day urban challenges

Following the trend towards urbanisation, policy-makers and planners from around the world have acknowledged the importance of cities. In the EU, 72 per cent of the population lives in urban areas. Most of the city dwellers live in medium-sized cities (250,000 to 500,000 inhabitants). Compared to other continents, Europe has a small share of both small and large cities. Currently, the population in European cities is still growing, leading to population loss in some other areas. Capital cities have been growing the fastest due to inward migration. In several cities, more than 20 per cent of the population was born abroad. Furthermore, an ageing population, and poor fertility are affecting the entire European continent. Across Europe, urban areas are the primary producers of knowledge and innovation. Cities represent indisputable engines of economic growth, whereby the service sector is the most important source of employment. However, most cities experience an employment paradox, whereby cities manifest a high concentration of jobs, while at the same time the employment rates among urban dwellers are lower than the country's average (EC/UN-Habitat 2016).

Evidently, the current state of European cities brings with it its challenges. At the moment, these are fittingly captured by the twelve priority themes of the Urban Agenda for the EU, which the Pact of Amsterdam, published in May 2016, introduces and describes. Below, each priority theme is discussed separately, indicating why integrated action at the EU level and multi-level cooperation are needed, and addressing its main objectives. While these themes specifically address major European urban issues, they overlap substantially with global urban challenges. The list and the (arbitrary) order of priority themes are taken from the Pact of Amsterdam (The Netherlands Presidency 2016).

### 1. Inclusion of migrants and refugees

Migration is currently a major challenge for the EU. The growing numbers of migrants and refugees have increased the need for a common strategy. Cities, as important actors in achieving the reception of refugees and services for newcomers, should be more closely involved in the development of policies. Addressing this current situation – new refugee groups, new destinations, higher numbers – requires coordination and concerted action at the EU level. It further requires knowledge exchange between all urban actors across the EU with regards to the reception, housing and integration of refugees, as well as (flexible) use of EU funds. The objectives are to manage the integration of

incoming migrants and refugees, and to provide a framework for their inclusion.

### 2. Air quality

Air pollution has been one of Europe's main concerns in many cities since the late 1970s. Cities experience the negative environmental and human health impact of urban mobility and transport. The greater involvement of local actors in identifying possible bottlenecks in valid (European) law is thus needed. The objective is to achieve systems and policies to ensure good air quality for human health. This demands that legislative and technical aspects will be linked to a wide range of polluting sources such as motorised traffic, industries and agricultural activities.

### 3. Urban poverty

Its multi-dimensional nature and its spatial concentration make fighting urban poverty a complex issue that requires a multi-sectoral approach, multi-level coordination and a place-based perspective. Strengthening EU-level coordination with regard to European Structural Investment Funds tools and instruments, mutual learning and knowledge exchange can enable urban stakeholders to develop and implement tailor-made approaches. Urban poverty refers then to issues related to the structural concentration of poverty in deprived neighbourhoods. Solutions that need to be designed and applied using an integrated approach are: place-based solutions (regeneration of deprived neighbourhoods) and people-based solutions (socio-economic integration of people living in deprived neighbourhoods).

### 4. Housing

Many of the cities' challenges relate to housing, e.g. the fight against urban poverty, and the promotion of energy efficiency. Affordable housing and physical renewal in deprived areas are essential for the EU social inclusion objectives. The final objective is to create affordable housing of good quality, particularly for those most in need.

### 5. Circular economy

The transition to a circular economy requires a systemic, multi-level governance approach which takes into account the myriad of inter-linkages within and between sectors, along value chains and between actors. Local initiatives can benefit from appropriate support from higher – national and European – governmental levels. A framework to support this is provided by the Circular Economy Package (2015) presented by the European Com-

mission, which includes revised legislative proposals and a new action plan. The success of this action plan will depend on the cooperation between all levels of government. Its objective is to increase the re-use, repair, refurbishment and recycling of existing materials and products to promote job opportunities, focusing on waste management, the sharing economy and resource efficiency.

#### **6. Jobs and skills in the local economy**

Increasing Europe's competitiveness and stimulating investment for the purpose of job creation are a top priority for both Member States and the Juncker Commission. There is a need to strengthen multi-level cooperation to promote job growth in cities and to further the Europe 2020 targets with regard to employment and education. Improving the accessibility of EU funds and the exchange of knowledge and experience can help to reduce mismatches on the labour market. More specifically, the focus is on attracting and keeping enterprises, creating new enterprises, producing and consuming locally, supporting new ways of working and ensuring that skills meet needs.

#### **7. Climate adaptation**

Climate adaptation is one of the key targets of the Europe 2020 strategy. This target can only be reached if cities and other key stakeholders are fully involved. EU regulations have an important impact on local policies, and better coordination is needed to ensure tailor-made solutions. Climate adaptation requires effective partnerships to reduce vulnerability and promote optimal benefits for urban communities. Cross-border cooperation and the exchange of knowledge and experiences are needed to boost innovative approaches in urban climate resilience. The objectives are to anticipate the adverse effects of climate change and to take appropriate action in order to prevent or minimise the damage it can cause to cities.

#### **8. Energy transition**

A timely implementation of energy transition initiatives requires multiple approaches in parallel, and the involvement of different governance levels. An improved and structured exchange of experience can lead to new approaches in these fields, for instance with regard to integrated neighbourhood strategies in energy efficiency and the refurbishment of buildings. There is a need for mapping synergies and for knowledge exchange between existing EU programmes, and for developing cross-sectoral financial instruments and concrete actions. The objectives are to achieve a long-term structural change in energy systems by making a shift to renewable energy and energy efficiency.

#### **9. Sustainable use of land and nature-based solutions**

Stronger integration of projects and practices promoting urban green infrastructure across Europe can help to make European cities more sustainable, more habitable, healthier and more attractive. Sustainable land-use includes addressing urban sprawl, urban regeneration, the development of brown fields, and adaptation to demographic change. Many EU-funded programmes are already in place, but policies can become more effective when synergies and potential areas for collaboration are identified and used for setting up concrete actions. The objective is to ensure that the processes of growth and shrinkage in cities are mindful of the environment.

#### **10. Urban mobility**

The development and successful implementation of strategies to further the use of sustainable (and soft) mobility and intelligent city logistic systems is a major task for cities and city regions today. Improving connectivity within cities (e.g. to connect deprived areas) and regionally (surrounding areas) is important for the accessibility of services, and to spur economic development. There are already many EU initiatives and funding possibilities in this area, but more extensive coordination could help to maximise the results of these initiatives and to improve mutual learning. The objectives are to achieve sustainable and efficient urban mobility, focusing on public transport, reduction of motorised private transport and the promotion of so-called soft mobility (walking, cycling), accessibility (design of the public space for the disabled, elderly, young children, etc.), and efficient transport with good internal (local) and external (regional) connectivity.

#### **11. Digital transition**

The digital single market priority of the European Commission and the related digital agenda cuts across many sectoral policies and impacts on urban development. There is a range of different strands of EU activities, funding and policies associated with so-called smart cities. These could be better coordinated to enhance their effectiveness, simplify processes, remove duplication, reveal gaps and shortcomings of existing initiatives, improve data sharing and increase the engagement of cities. In the end, this will greatly improve the overall quality of public services and business activities. There is also a need to improve open innovation and data.

#### **12. Innovative and responsible public procurement**

Strategic use of public procurement may help cities to address social and environmental objectives.



Therefore, cities are in need of knowledge about innovative approaches, guidelines and technical support. There are additional challenges for small- and medium-sized cities; for them public procurement may be too complex, and they are in need of support and guidance on standardisation.

Specific to the Urban Agenda for the EU is the development of a range of European Partnerships. Each Partnership focuses on one of twelve priority themes. Within these Partnerships, Member States, the European Commission and other European institutions, Urban Areas, NGOs, associations work together to ensure the strengthening of the urban dimension in EU policies, while taking into account the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality. In principle, the Partnerships are established for three years, and each theme should be implemented through an Action Plan which includes concrete

actions at EU, national and local levels. This Action Plan should be a rolling agenda document that can be updated when needed.

It must be noted that the predominantly thematic and sectoral design to the Partnerships also entails the risk of insufficient regard being paid to interdependencies of the topics and integrated approaches in accordance with the Leipzig Charter. The complex nature of the modern-day urban challenges presented above calls for integrated approaches sensitive to trade-offs between individual challenges and which try to reconcile these. Such conflicting goals might emerge in several topics, e.g. between the poles of economic growth and resource efficiency, or between housing needs and the fight against urban sprawl and the maintenance of green spaces.

## 5 Methodological approach

Before the country analyses are presented, a short insight into the study's methodological approach follows. The main research question guiding this study is: To what extent have the principles of the Leipzig Charter been applied in all EU Member States, its candidate countries, and Norway and Switzerland in the past five years (2012-2016)? To generate the relevant data an expert survey was designed whereby the Leipzig Charter itself, as well as the evaluation study on five years Leipzig Charter (BBSR 2012), served as inspiration for the questions. The survey contained several sets of mostly open questions, distinguishing four main theoretic sections.

The first section served to identify to what extent a country's urban policy has been organised and carried out in an integrated way over the past five years. This set of questions specifically focused on the current governance structure, the responsible authorities, the hierarchical structure and the involvement of other key urban actors. The second section asked how integrated urban development has been coordinated over the past five years, focusing on the development and implementation of urban and territorial policies, and the respective cooperation of different levels of government. In this regard, the roles of specific coordinating bodies or institutions were also considered, as well as coordination with EU programmes or networks and other key stakeholders on the local level, civil society and non-governmental organisations. The third section looked into the financial aspect of urban development policy, and more specifically into how the authority over EU funding allocation and spending was distributed and/or delegated between levels of administration. The final section examined the degree to which an integrated approach to deprived urban neighbourhoods exists and how it materialised.

Early in 2016 a pilot round for the survey tested its clarity and quality. From May 2016 onwards, the final survey was distributed among public servants working in the national ministries and departments responsible for urban development policy in the respective countries. Most of the respondents filled out the survey, providing valuable input for their countries' analyses. In the rare cases of unreturned surveys, analyses needed to be based on desk research rather than on expert input. Also, in some cases, additional information was gathered via desk research complementing survey input. In this respect, it is important to note that all analyses that include additional references do not exclusive-

ly represent the input received from the national experts, but also come from other sources. Furthermore, whenever possible experts received a preliminary draft of the respective country analysis for factual scrutiny. Analyses based on desk research were also sent to specialists for validation. An important general remark is that the country analyses represent a governmental perspective due to the institutional affiliation of the experts surveyed.

The survey design and all communication around the questionnaire were carried out in English, and all survey answers were provided in English. Also, the country analyses were drafted in English and translated into German and French for the final report.

Based on the structure of the survey, each country analysis covers the most important findings from each section. Generally, the thematic sections are discussed in a consistent order: analyses entail a focus on the country's urban policy, on policy coordination, on financing and on the approach towards deprived neighbourhoods. However, when needed for matters of clarity, topics were combined. Also, whenever deemed relevant and explicitly provided in the survey, additional information such as the geographic context was added to the analyses.

To collect input for the case study selection, respondents could list up to three practical illustrations of an integrated urban development project in the survey. Fewer than half of the countries responded to this request. Based on this information and several criteria, case studies were selected. Most importantly, case studies had to be recent, preferably mirroring the period under analysis for this report. This requirement severely reduced the practical examples to choose from. Second, while relying on the limited availability of practical examples, the geographical spread of the case studies (within Europe) was taken into account, as well as variation in the development phase of the project and variation in the objectives. In this respect, the focus was not strictly on the regeneration of socio-economically deprived urban areas. The aim of the case studies was to illustrate the broader range of implementation of integrated urban development policy.

Lastly, the state of play of urban policy in five countries that are not located on the European continent has been analysed to add a global context to the main research question. These countries are Brazil, China, India, South Africa and the United States

of America. These country analyses also largely follow the same structure of analysis as the European countries, but all of them are based on desk research carried out in English since no survey was sent out. Yet again, drafts have been complemented by national experts, who are mentioned at the end of the analyses.

## 6 Integrated urban development in the national practice

This chapter depicts the findings concerning integrated urban development in the 28 EU Member States, its candidate countries, and Norway and Switzerland. The presentation is made in alphabetical order; an explicit categorisation is dispensed with due to the heterogeneity of country contexts and approaches. The guiding questions for the analysis, elucidated in detail in the methodological chapter, follows four thematic main aspects:

- Governance structures in urban development policy;
- Institutional coordination mechanisms including European networks;
- Architecture and competence allocation concerning the financing of urban development;
- Approach to deprived neighbourhoods.

The answers to these questions, given by national experts in the competent authorities in written form, were aggregated to form a continuous text covering the four aspects in the best possible way. The questioning of governance structures, coordination mechanisms, financing opportunities and arrangements, and the approach to deprived neighbourhoods are supposed to allow a summarised yet comprehensive portrayal of the multi-dimensionality of an integrated approach to urban (district) development policy in a given national context.

Three case studies illustrate the practical implementation of an integrated approach to sustainable

urban development in this study. The first concerns the regeneration of a socio-economically deprived inner-city neighbourhood in Brno, Czech Republic (project duration 2009-2015). The second case study deals with the Canal Plan in Brussels, Belgium. This project started in 2011, and encompasses the renovation of buildings, improvement of public spaces, and upgrading of infrastructure and facilities along the canal area. The third case study presents the Aviapolis development plan in Vantaa, Finland. The plan was approved in 2014, and includes the development of a multifunctional urban area around Vantaa airport, aiming to connect two city neighbourhoods that have so far been largely separated by the airport's brownfield sites. For each case study, it was asked to what extent the approach was integrated and how. The descriptive analyses show that all projects entailed vertical and horizontal cooperation within and between administrations and cooperation with private actors, although to a varying degree. In addition, most projects acknowledge the relevance of cross-sectoral integration, bridging different urban challenges (e.g. housing, urban poverty, the sustainable use of land, unemployment, climate adaptation, circular economy and mobility). However, one lesson learned from these particular case studies is that the involvement of citizens and the civil society throughout all phases of the project still leaves room for improvement. This observation is to a lesser extent true in the case of Brno.

### Albania

Albanian urban development policy is mainly organised along national and local structures. Regional authorities, called *Qarks*, have thus far not played an important role in territorial development, but structural reforms are anticipated. The Territorial Administrative Reform of 2015 reduced the number of municipalities from 284 to 61. Pressing issues such as the development of informal settlements, simultaneously occurring shrinkage and urban sprawl, and the general lack of urban development policies during the transition from communism to a market economy induced the national government to create a dedicated Ministry of Urban Development in 2013. This ministry is responsible for the development and implementation of policies around urban planning, land management, housing, the legalisation and integration of informal settlements, and urban waste management. In 2013, a Solid Waste Sector was created within the ministry to work towards a Master Plan providing

regional solutions to waste management and land rehabilitation.

Executive agencies attached to this ministry, such as the National Territorial Planning Agency, the Agency for Territorial Development, the National Housing Agency, and the Agency of Legalisation, Urbanisation and Integration of Illegal Buildings and Areas, fulfil urban- and planning-related tasks. The National Territorial Council, a ministers' committee chaired by the Prime Minister and vice-chaired by the Minister for Urban Development, approves spatial planning documents for all levels. The coordination between national and local authorities is the responsibility of the National Territorial Planning Agency. Each municipality approves a General Local Plan, integrating the guidelines stemming from national and regional plans into a 10-year planning document.

In 2016, the first General National Territorial Plan and two Integrated Cross-Sectoral Plans for the Coastline and for the Tirane-Durres Economic Zone were approved. These strategic plans aim to create a legal framework for sustainable urban, economic, social and environmental development, and to foster strategic domestic and foreign investment. The General National Territorial Plan comes as a legal obligation on Albania's way to EU integration and represents the first large-scale initiative for the regulation of the territory, including cross-sectoral planning.

In 2016, the first Housing Strategy was approved, addressing housing needs and homelessness, with a focus on vulnerable and disadvantaged groups. Besides improving the legal framework, this strategy provides for the establishment of a reliable data system on the situation of homeless families. The National Housing Agency represents a liaison body between the Ministry of Urban Development and local authorities with a mandate to provide affordable housing. State initiatives fostering public-private activities aimed to create social housing have not succeeded in the past.

The Ombudsman, who inter alia deals with housing and human rights, issues recommendations. In the NGO sector, there are associations advocating for specific minority groups' rights with regard to affordable and appropriate housing. These interest groups can provide feedback via consultation procedures that accompany legislative proposals.

The Ministry of Urban Development remodelled the Regional Development Fund in 2013. This fund is a financial mechanism open to all municipalities submitting projects in the fields of infrastructure, digitalisation, education, urbanisation and urban revitalisation. The Master Plan on Integrated Waste Management is financed by the German KfW Development Bank. EU instruments such as the In-

strument for Pre-Accession Assistance, Technical Assistance and Information Exchange mission experts and twinning projects are extensively used. Generally, authorities pay close attention to spatial development priorities defined by international organisations such as the EU, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the United Nations (UN) and the Council of Europe.

The Ministry of Social Welfare and Youth and the municipalities define the indicators of deprived urban areas. Deprived neighbourhoods are often places where members of the Roma and Egyptian minorities live. To improve living conditions, in 2014 a fund for the reconstruction of houses for these communities was set up. Furthermore, the National Action Plan for Roma and Egyptian Integration in the Republic of Albania 2016-2020 was adopted, supported by the UN Development Programme's Support to Social Inclusion of Roma and Egyptian Communities (SSIREC) project. Unlike Roma, the so-called Egyptians do not have any official minority status, as they have not preserved their own language, but both groups are considered to be marginalised and socially excluded (Ministry of Social Welfare and Youth 2015: 12). The exact origins of the Egyptian community are contested, with different hypotheses stating that their roots are indeed in Ancient Egypt, in Spain or in North West India (CESS 2012: 16).

Based on the recognition of a need to take into account spatial, sectoral and temporal aspects in urban development policy, three pilot projects on informal settlements with a value of 3.1 million U.S. dollars have been carried out by the national authorities in cooperation with local government, giving around 25,000 people better access to road infrastructure, sanitation and general public services. Other projects have been realised in partnership with international organisations and their financial institutions.

#### Additional references

CESS – Center for Economic and Social Studies, 2012: A Needs Assessment Study on Roma and Egyptian Communities in Albania. Available at: <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/albania/docs/Roma%20Needs%20Assessment.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Ministry of Social Welfare and Youth, 2015: National Action Plan for Integration of Roma and Egyptians in Albania. 2016-2020. Available at: <http://www.al.undp.org/content/dam/albania/docs/misc/Plani%20i%20Veprimi%20ENG.PDF?download>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

## Austria

In Austria, there is no national urban development policy in place. There are, however, discussions about the need for better coordination of main urban challenges, embedded in the overall context of spatial development. The political debate focuses on the preservation of green and free spaces,

sustainable mobility, sustainable development of settlements and on social cohesion in the context of governance in city regions.

The Federal Chancellery plays a coordinating role regarding questions on urban and regional devel-

opment. Federal, regional and local authorities deal with urban issues in accordance with their constitutional responsibilities and competences. The Austrian Association of Cities and Towns and the Austrian Association of Municipalities represent the interests of urban areas.

The Austrian Conference on Spatial Planning (Österreichische Raumordnungskonferenz, ÖROK) constitutes a national coordination forum for spatial development. All federal ministries, regional governments, associations of cities and municipalities, and the social and economic stakeholders (Chambers of Labour, and Economic Chambers) take part in this conference. The ÖROK decides on the Austrian Spatial Development Concept (Österreichisches Raumentwicklungskonzept, ÖREK), which serves as a strategic framework for long-term spatial development. The most recent ÖREK (2011) also addresses the need to install an Austrian agglomerations policy. In this respect, it aims to create more efficient governance structures for functional city regions. The Agenda City Regions in Austria (*Agenda Stadtregionen in Österreich*), adopted by the ÖROK in 2015, illustrates this effort. This agenda is to be followed by an implementation roadmap (*Strategieplan*).

The ÖROK and its working groups and sub-committees play a key role in multi-level cooperation for urban development, including the coordination of EU programmes and networks. Furthermore, in line with the idea of an Austrian agglomerations policy, a Working Partnership City Region (*Kooperationsplattform Stadtregion*) came into being in 2012. This Partnership includes various stakeholders such as the Federal Chancellery, Austrian states, cities, planners and regional management authorities, and is coordinated by the Austrian Association of Cities and Towns. Together with researchers from the Technical University of Vienna and a consulting firm, the Partnership has been the main contributor to the 2015 Agenda City Regions.

More generally, the different regional planning and building codices reflect an understanding of the importance of integrated approaches to urban development. However, the involvement of local communities and civil society stakeholders in specific urban development projects does not follow a general approach, but happens on a case-by-case basis and also differs from region to region.

In Austria, there is no national budget for urban development policies. EU structural funds co-finance urban actions in Austria to some extent, depending on the provisions set out in the operational programmes, and depending on the activity level of individual municipalities or regions. In the 2007-

2013 programming period, there were nine regional European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) programmes, including one for Vienna. For the 2014-2020 period, programmes have been merged into one programme for the entire country. Based on the provisions on sustainable urban development according to Article 7 of the ERDF Regulation, the city of Vienna and several cities in Upper Austria are specifically addressed in the programme. Here, EU funding flows into the implementation of the Smart City Vienna Framework Strategy (*Smart City Wien Rahmenstrategie*), into measures targeting deprived areas in Vienna, and into urban renewal programmes effective in city regions, amongst others. In addition, the 2014-2020 programme allows for the Community-led Local Development (CLLD) instrument to strengthen city-hinterland cooperation, using Tyrol as a pilot region.

The regional level of government (*Länder*) is in practical charge of EU fund administration. With regard to the use of ERDF resources within Vienna, the city selects relevant projects based on an assessment catalogue. In order to receive ERDF support for projects within the priority axis on sustainable urban development according to Article 7 of the ERDF Regulation, beneficiaries in Upper Austria need to appoint a so-called city regional forum (*Stadtregionales Forum*). The region of Styria has committed a budget within its ERDF programme share for activities related to the Art. 7 approach, without formally referring to that article. Applications for CLLD in Tyrol need specifically to include local and regional actors.

Apart from the bigger regional capitals, measures focusing on deprived areas constitute rather a secondary practice in Austrian policy-making. A federal urban renewal law that dates from 1974 defines indicators for the identification of deprived areas. These indicators include the standard of housing, hygiene aspects, and environmental influences. The regional level is responsible for the implementation of this law, however, the law has not been applied in recent years. The city of Vienna has established its own catalogue of indicators to define its disadvantaged areas within the ERDF operational programme.



## Belgium

Decision-making powers in Belgium are divided between the federal level, the three Linguistic Communities (Flemish, French, and German), and the three Regions (Flanders, Brussels-Capital and Wallonia). All levels have their own legislation, parliament and government, and enjoy large autonomy in many policy areas. The sixth state reform of 2011 (ongoing) has further strengthened the role of the Regions. As a result, urban policy mainly falls within the Regions' responsibility. However, a federal State Secretary in charge of Big Cities Policy (*Politique des grandes villes/Grootstedenbeleid*) has remained. Its focus lies on social integration and poverty reduction. The responsible ministry is the Federal Public Service for Social Integration, Poverty Reduction and Urban Policy (*POD Maatschappelijke Integratie/SPP Intégration Sociale*).

The three Regions are territorial entities and exercise authority over their economy, employment, housing, public works, energy, transport, environment, urban renewal and planning, poverty reduction, welfare, public health, education, and international affairs regarding their territory. The Regions have developed their own urban policies with specific support programmes.

In Flanders, urban policy forms part of a cross-cutting approach that includes a number of ministries. Within the Agency for Internal Management (*Binnenlands Bestuur*), a dedicated department (*Stedenbeleid Vlaanderen*) works on urban policy. There are specialised institutes such as *Ruimte Vlaanderen* and the Flemish Association of Spatial Planning (*Vlaamse Vereniging voor Ruimte en Planning*), and knowledge institutes like the Flemish Cities Knowledge Centre (*Kenniscentrum Vlaamse Steden*) and the Flemish Cities and Municipalities Association (*Vereniging van Vlaamse Steden en Gemeenten*). Following regional guidelines, implementation of urban policy largely rests with local communities.

In Wallonia, there is a Minister specifically responsible for urban policy. The current Minister is also in charge of local authorities, housing, energy and sport facilities. The Department for Territorial Development and Urbanism (*Département de l'Aménagement du Territoire et de l'Urbanisme*) is the main administrative coordinating body and deals with urban renewal, urban regeneration and deprived neighbourhoods. The Association of Walloon Cities and Municipalities (*Union des Villes et Communes de Wallonie*) is an important actor which co-shapes urban development policy. In 2016, the Parliament of Wallonia adopted a new

Territorial Development Code (*Code du Développement Territorial*), aiming to reduce urban sprawl and promote regional economic development (enforced from June 2017).

City Contracts (2000-2014) formed the principal federal programme in support of a multi-level approach to urban development, with an annual budget of 53 to 70 million euros. Seventeen Belgian cities, where underprivileged neighbourhoods had been identified, agreed upon these contracts. The main objectives of the City Contract were to strengthen social cohesion, reduce the ecological footprint and increase cities' attractiveness. Since 2014, no new City Contracts or equivalents have been developed at the federal level.

Flanders' 2014-2019 coalition programme integrated sectoral subsidies in the Municipal Funds (*Stedenfonds*), giving cities and municipalities more financial autonomy. Flemish urban policy provides a number of subsidy schemes, such as structural funding through the Municipal Fund and the funding of neighbourhood stewards for newcomers to the community. The Flemish Government allocates project grants of approx. three million euros per project to cities for innovative urban renewal projects to create new dynamics in urban districts or neighbourhoods. Projects must be realised in co-operation with one or more private partners. Urban renewal projects are set up in consultation with local residents and civil society. Selected cities not only get financial benefits, but also guidance and recommendations from urban experts from various disciplines (architecture, planning, economy, housing, social inclusion, health care, urbanism, etc.), guaranteeing a multidisciplinary approach. In addition, the Flemish Government set up a Smart Flanders programme to support open and agile smart cities and to establish pilot projects regarding urban challenges. Flemish urban policy also supports contact points for the integration of Roma citizens and anti-radicalisation programmes aimed at young people attracted to Islamism. Concerning European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) support, urban areas are a focus point for achieving greenhouse gas emissions reduction in the housing and transport sectors. In the 2014-2020 period, 20 million euros will go to specific sustainability programmes in Antwerp and Ghent. The city of Antwerp has been awarded a five million euro grant via the Urban Innovative Actions scheme for a co-housing integration project. Recently, a cross-sectoral urban working group has started working on a more aligned approach to European funding.

The main financing instrument of regional development in Wallonia is the *Plan Marshall 4.0*, a large-scale investment programme adopted in 2015. The plan channels investments to the following axes: human capital development, business innovation, territorial development, circular economy and digital innovation. Urban policy is also supported by means of EU funds, in particular by the ERDF. Two of the six main axes of the 2014-2020 operational programme are devoted to urban public areas, focusing on urban environment and urban public spaces and integrated urban development. Specific Walloon tools for urban policy are urban renewal and urban regeneration operations, both of which rely on partnerships between the Region and given municipalities. Urban regeneration (*Revitalisation urbaine*) operations are based on an integrated cross-sector approach relying on public authorities. In urban renewal (*Rénovation urbaine*) operations, the private sector is also financially involved, and the focus is more on the built environment. The rate of regional financial support depends on the type of action and area (notably Preferred Initiatives Areas). The Region also supports the reconversion and rehabilitation of abandoned areas in urban as well as in other contexts, notably old industrial sites.

In 2016, the federal government presented its Third Federal Plan to Fight Poverty (*Derde Federaal Plan Armoedebestrijding/Troisième Plan fédéral de lutte contre la pauvreté*) 2016-2019. This plan is based on strategic objectives like combatting child poverty, increasing access to employment, fighting homelessness and poor housing, and creating access to health services. There are several fora and institutional arrangements that address the habitability of deprived urban neighbourhoods. Also, Belgium coordinates (together with France) the Partnership on Urban Poverty within the framework of the Urban Agenda for the EU. Other federal policies aimed at cities and towns are related to urban safety and security. Cities can receive a federal allowance to establish a local safety and prevention policy, for which they must develop a Strategic Safety and Prevention Plan. The implementation of the strategic plan results from a diagnosis of local safety through which the strengths and weaknesses with regard to safety and prevention can be analysed at the local level. A more recent policy measure of

combatting small forms of criminality and subversive behaviour are so-called Municipal Administrative Sanctions. Cities and municipal councils can impose an administrative fine for actions such as the illegal dumping of waste, illegal graffiti or harassment in streets and squares, which might lead to a sense of insecurity among local residents. The legislator has also provided the option of a mediation procedure between perpetrator and victim. Mediation is obligatory for young people under 16. 30 mediators have been made available to 30 cities throughout the country by the Federal Public Service for Social Integration, Poverty Reduction and Urban Policy.

In Flanders, there is no specific policy aimed at deprived urban neighbourhoods, but many projects have been set up in deprived urban areas. A City Monitor (*Stadsmonitor*) maps cities' habitability and comprises more than 200 indicators.

The Walloon approach to deprived neighbourhoods is based on a long-standing categorisation of Preferred Initiatives Areas (*Zones d'initiatives privilégiées*). The objective is to support these areas, identified on people-based and area-based criteria, by channelling dedicated funding to them. In 2015, the Walloon government launched a call for projects yielding New Neighbourhoods (*Quartiers Nouveaux*) to be developed by municipalities and the housing sector. Ten projects that aim to provide better housing will be implemented (CREAT-UCL 2016).

The Brussels Capital Region has since 1994 been working with Sustainable Neighbourhood Contracts (*Contrats de Quartiers Durables*), aimed at housing rehabilitation or housing creation, public space redevelopment, or social and participative initiatives. These four-to-six-year contracts are implemented by varying sets of local actors, like municipalities, Public Centres for Social Welfare or NGOs (Ville de Bruxelles n.d.). In late 2016, the Brussels Parliament adopted a new regulation on urban revitalisation. It offers a global regulatory framework for three main programmes, namely the Sustainable Neighbourhood Contracts, the Contracts for Urban Renewal and the Brussels part of the former federal City Contracts.

#### Additional references

CREAT-UCL – Centre de recherches et d'études pour l'action territoriale de l'Université catholique de Louvain, 2016: Quartiers Nouveaux. Available at: <https://www.ciu2016quartiersnouveaux.be/index.html#WINNER>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Ville de Bruxelles, n.d.: Contrats de quartier Durables. Available at: <https://www.bruxelles.be/contrats-de-quartier>. [accessed 10/05/2017].



## Case study: Brussels

At the heart of Brussels lies the Brussels Canal, initially composed of the Willebroek Canal and the Charleroi Canal. The Willebroek Canal, leading north, was dug between 1551 and 1561 to connect Brussels to Antwerp in 30 kilometres. The canal was used to ship goods such as tapestries, lace and draperies. The Charleroi Canal, leading south, was built between 1830 and 1870 and connected the city to Charleroi and the Hainaut mining area. This new waterway enabled Brussels to bring in coal on a massive scale, reinforcing the city's industrial, demographic and urban boom. In the early 20th century, more extensive and deeper port facilities were built to make Brussels a seaport. The opening of the seaport spurred development once again, and new industries (chemicals, petrochemicals, constructions materials, cement works etc.) grew up to the north and south of the axis of the canal.

However, like many other cities, Brussels experienced a downturn in its population from the 1970s onwards. Also, the city was particularly hard hit by deindustrialisation. Along the canal many brown-field sites emerged while building stock deteriorated. In parallel, lower-income population groups arrived in the area.

Especially since the establishment of the Brussels-Capital Region in 1989, authorities have started to invest in renovating buildings, improving public spaces, and upgrading infrastructure and facilities along the canal area.

One tool to advance and foster this development is the Canal Plan, initiated in 2011. Based on interdisciplinary planning the Canal Plan aims to boost economic activity, to create housing that suits all household profiles, to improve public spaces and to promote functional diversity. The Brussels-Capital Region launched an international competition to develop a plan for the whole area.

The Canal Plan's methodology consists of three main elements: innovation, flexibility and sustainability. Part of the innovative element is the governance structure. The Canal Plan is a project of the Brussels-Capital Region, implemented under the supervision of the Minister-President. Its implementation relies on a core team that includes: the chief architect, a research by design team, the Brussels Planning Agency *perspective.brussels* that is in charge of planning, elaboration and monitoring the regulatory framework, a canal plan team at the Region's Urban Planning Directorate in charge of assessing all applications and permits, and a team of project leaders at the Urban Develop-

ment Corporation (*Société d'Aménagement Urbain*) responsible for the operational implementation of the Canal Plan. In addition, all municipalities and regional services concerned are involved in the definition of all projects. Residents and civil society are also included in the dialogue by means of community participation events.

The innovative aspect of the governance structure especially lies in a dedicated transversal team dispersed in different Regional administrations. By applying such transversal governance, it is ensured that expert input is given via specific institutions in each project phase, from planning, to delivering permits, to the operational phase. Another innovative aspect is the way the whole 2,509 hectares of the canal area are included in the project. In this respect, the concentration of actions and resources is limited to a zone of 313 hectares that mainly concern publicly owned land (municipalities, region, port authority, public companies, etc.). Through these public impulses, a positive spillover effect for private estate investors to join the Canal Plan process is generated.

The flexibility of the approach is expressed by a guiding principle evolving from project to project.



Source: mapchart.net



Photo: Stuart Acker Holt – Brussels canal

Another aspect is the co-construction of projects between public and private actors. This cooperation ensures the feasibility of the projects, while at the same time regional and local authorities ensure the enforcement of the main general planning and landscape principles.

The sustainable future of the area is safeguarded by the inter-linkages with relevant social, economic and environmental challenges. This includes the construction of public housing and economic de-

velopment measures like business incubators. Furthermore, financial aid for the depollution of sites, green building, and renewable energy production are part of the general plan. Also, social development in the form of social, cultural and community infrastructures is taken into account. Thus, the Canal plan is embedded in an integrated urban development policy embracing all aspects needed for the sustainable development of the canal area. The Regional Government aims to have implemented the Canal Plan's ambitions by 2025.

## Bulgaria

In Bulgaria, the Council of Ministers determines the guidelines, policy principles and financial framework for spatial planning at the national level. The Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works leads spatial planning policy implementation and coordinates the activities of central and local executive authorities and local administration. It further provides methodological guidance, and supervises all spatial planning activities.

Municipal councils and mayors determine the local policy for their respective territories. No other regional authorities are involved in this process. Following the national guidelines, urban authorities develop and implement urban development strategies. However, it is a novelty for local urban authorities to focus on sustainable and integrated development in accordance with Article 7 of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) Regulation. The lack of experience in managing such integrated urban development strategies and the

lack of sufficient public resources represent the biggest challenges for all authorities involved.

The National Spatial Development Concept for the period 2013-2025 is financed under the 2007-2013 regional development operational programme for Bulgaria and defines the main priorities for territorial development. It names 39 big and medium-sized cities that have the potential to implement activities for sustainable urban development in accordance with Article 7 of the ERDF Regulation. Based on the National Spatial Development Concept and the Bulgarian Regional Development Act, these 39 cities have developed Integrated Plans for Urban Regeneration and Development. These plans are the basis for the implementation of sustainable urban development activities.

During the preparation and implementation of the Integrated Plans for Urban Regeneration and Development, urban authorities organise public hear-

ings, surveys, focus groups and interviews. In doing so they follow the instructions of the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works. Local communities, non-governmental organisations and businesses play an active role in the discussion of local development priorities, but the development of strategies for urban development is often outsourced to external experts. Nonetheless, all official documents (laws, regulations, national strategies, methodological guidance, application guidelines, etc.) are published for public consultation; thus, various stakeholders have the opportunity to provide suggestions or comments.

National urban and territorial policies are thoroughly coordinated and thematically linked with EU programmes, networks and policies. The EU structural funds' operational programmes set out the general financing of urban development projects, and are thus crucial to their realisation and implementation. The 2007-2013 programming period introduced the concept of sustainable and integrated urban development in Bulgaria, and the 2014-2020 programming period initiated more sophisticated mechanisms for implementation. During 2007-2013, Bulgarian local authorities used the existing urban master plans and municipal development plans as a basis for the implementation of integrated urban development measures. In the 2014-2020 programming period, they are implementing specific Integrated Plans for Urban Regeneration and Development, which correspond to the requirements of Article 7 of the ERDF Regulation. The ERDF operational programmes also finance the Integrated Plans for Urban Regeneration and Development, coordinated by the managing authority in the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Works. Bulgaria also uses the Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas (JESSICA) instrument and set up two such urban development funds in the 2007-2013 period, financing 35 projects.

## Croatia

The Croatian Law on Local and Regional Self-Government regulates the organisation and competences of counties, municipalities and cities. According to that law, municipalities and cities conduct activities within the scope of their self-government competences, such as settlement development, and spatial development and urban planning. The Ministry of Construction and Physical Planning, the Ministry of Regional Development and EU Funds, and the Ministry of Public Administration are responsible for urban development policy on a national level. The Croatian Institute for Spatial Devel-

The Integrated Plans for Urban Regeneration and Development set out urban regeneration intervention zones that correspond to the notion of deprived neighbourhoods. These zones are differentiated along their basic functions, similar characteristics and conditions of the physical environment, social and ethnic population structure, and structure of the main funds. There are three types of zones: zones with predominantly social functions, zones with potential for economic development, and zones of public functions with high importance. Each type of zone has specific characteristics and criteria. Zones with predominantly social functions are urban areas with predominantly residential functions, zones with potential for economic development are urban areas with the predominant purpose of industrial and other business activities, and zones of public functions with high importance refer to city centres, central pedestrian zones or other areas with a concentration of important public functions. Concerning the definition of zones, a number of criteria apply. For instance, social zones have to meet a combination of criteria such as poor technical infrastructure, high levels of poverty, social exclusion, long-term unemployment, crime, the predominance of ethnic minorities, poor housing conditions, etc.

Following the relevant EU structural fund regulations, each particular zone is approached in an integrated fashion. The characteristics of the area and the effects on the urban population in terms of quality of life, ecological and aesthetic quality of the living environment, the city's attractiveness, and economic growth potentials are taken into account. The integrated plans represent a combination of temporally and spatially related project ideas, actions and investment needs that apply in certain urban intervention zones in cities. They have been elaborated by working groups, organised by urban authorities, which included representatives of different stakeholders, businesses, public authorities, non-governmental organisations, etc.

opment (CISD; *Hrvatski zavod za prostorni razvoj*) and 21 Regional Spatial Development Institutes are the main bodies tasked with setting up national and regional spatial plans. A new Spatial Development Strategy, developed by the CISD, is expected to be adopted in the first half of 2017. This strategy sets out the basic principles and priorities of spatial development, and strategic directions along with the implementation framework.

In 2014, three spatial development planning laws were adopted: the Physical Planning Act, the Con-

struction Act and the Building Inspection Act. Their main aim is to improve the planning regime. The Regional Development Act, also adopted in 2014, provides a clear definition of urban areas (urban conurbations, larger and smaller urban areas). It introduced the obligation to adopt strategies for the development of urban areas as a base for planning projects. The goal was to create a foundation for better planning and better preparation of development projects, and to allow for making better use of EU funds intended for urban development.

Unlike vertical interinstitutional cooperation between different levels of government, horizontal connections and overlapping responsibilities concerning urban development policies are not fully established in Croatia. In contrast to environmental impact assessments, territorial impact assessments are still lacking. Nevertheless, improvements have been made in the areas of strategic planning, programming, and implementation. A deliberate focus is put on implementing urban development projects in the largest urban areas with most capacity for project implementation.

Even though the reform of local and regional self-government and of regional development is currently high on the agenda, the process of decentralisation has never been devised in a comprehensive and integrated manner. Nevertheless, stakeholders are involved in the development of national-level policies by participating in working groups and public consultations. Public administration bodies for different sectors provide input into the Spatial Development Plans. Public communal discussions open the process to the public. The business sector has a strong influence on urban development policy due to its close connection with local authorities, which is visible in local-level public-private partnerships for public infrastructure projects. NGOs and professional organisations shape the debates via capacity building and agenda setting. All in all, cooperation with civil society and non-governmental actors still offers room for improvement, as stakeholders are not structurally involved at an early level of drafting policy. The new Spatial Development Strategy aims to include the key stakeholders at the earliest possible stage. It also encourages a cross-sectoral approach and better cooperation among stakeholders at all levels.

## Cyprus

The 1972 Town and County Planning Law establishes a three-tier hierarchy of development plans in Cyprus: the Island Plan for the entire country, Local Plans for urban agglomerations and areas of exceptional importance, and Area Schemes

The Regional Development Act is harmonised with the determinants of the 2014-2020 EU cohesion policy. Having been an EU Member State since 2013, Croatia has experienced some difficulties with bottlenecks concerning administrative capacities, the preparation of mature projects for financing in the transport (railways) sector, and public procurement. The biggest urban development projects are to be co-financed by EU grants through Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI). The ITI is focused on the agglomerations of Zagreb, Rijeka, Split and Osijek, and on the cities of Zadar, Slavonski Brod and Pula. These urban areas applied for a public call for proposals for implementation of the ITI. They are preparing projects and activities to achieve the following goals:

- Cities as drivers of future development;
- Clean and resilient cities, especially in light of climate change;
- Inclusive cities and urban poverty solutions.

The European Regional Development Fund, the Cohesion Fund and the European Social Fund provide a total financial support of approx. 345.4 million euros for this purpose. Interventions may combine infrastructure projects and different so-called soft activities.

One of the largest urban challenges is illegal construction. By statutory law, areas of illegal construction are designated for urban remediation. The most endangered areas lie at the fringe of the largest urban centres, in the entire coastal area and on the islands. These areas can be considered the functional equivalents of deprived neighbourhoods.

The Roma's quality of life and housing are particularly unsatisfactory, especially in the Roma settlements. Therefore, Croatia has adopted the National Roma Programme, the Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015 Action Plan and the National Roma Inclusion Strategy 2013-2020. The last aims to help the members of the Roma minority to improve their living conditions and to promote their inclusion in the social life and decision-making processes in the local and extended community. The strategy also focuses on changing the attitude of the majority population by promoting principles of non-discrimination and desegregation.

at local level. Since 1992, a Policy Statement for the Countryside has filled the void for areas having neither a Local Plan nor an Area Scheme. The appropriate implementation of the Island Plan has been obstructed by the forced division of the is-



land, and its re-scoping – a longer-term political process including a complex reorganisation of existing national-level responsibilities – is under consideration. In recent years, the spatial planning legislation has seen some changes, especially with regard to responsibilities for the preparation of spatial plans and changes in the review process. This has strengthened public participation and the legal framework of consultation with a variety of stakeholders. Planning authorities at the national, district and municipal levels oversee the implementation on the basis of the development plans' provisions.

The integration of national sectoral policies (e.g. housing, transport, tourism, environment etc.) into spatial planning and urban policy is achieved through extensive consultations with competent ministries and agencies. In addition, the Planning Board (*Πολυενοτικό Συμβούλιο*) processes all urban agglomeration development plans and integrates the spatial dimension of key policy areas into urban policy guidance documents. The Planning Board is an independent organisation with decision-making powers in large areas of urban development and spatial planning policy. It is composed of representatives from professional, business, academic and civil society communities, national ministries, and associations like the Union of Cyprus Municipalities, the Cyprus Union of Communities and the Cyprus Scientific and Technical Chamber. The Planning Board also conducts open calls for public consultation and structured public hearings.

Local authorities experience serious challenges stemming from the limited capacities of the local government system, aggravated by the repercussions of the financial crisis. Still, they have developed various forms of inter-municipal cooperation to address common challenges, as well as informal arrangements for metropolitan inter-municipal cooperation (e.g. within the Nicosia urban agglomeration) and spatial forms of multi-level governance (e.g. for regional Water Boards). Due to the shortcomings of the current local government system a broad reform and new legislative framework for the operation of local government is under way. Through this reform, regional level clusters are provided for to acquire competences in development control (the process of permitting development under conditions specified in the planning system), water and sanitation, and waste management. Local clusters would manage green areas, public space and refuse collection, among others. Overall, the reform aims to update and streamline the local government system's coordination, monitoring and regulatory framework.

Local associations and organised interest groups, as well as local business chambers and trade as-

sociations, can participate in the planning process through statutory procedures and informal public participation inquiries. The larger municipalities run occasional project-specific calls for consultation. The Department of Town Planning and Housing has recently conducted several experimental Structured Democratic Dialogue processes as a tool for bottom-up participatory planning. The results will be evaluated regarding their usefulness as a consensus building tool to promote local participation at the neighbourhood level.

The Directorate-General for European Programmes, Coordination and Development is responsible for coordination with EU cohesion policy. According to the operational programmes of the current programming period, sustainable urban development objectives are to be achieved through parallel interventions in priority areas such as climate change and environmental protection, employment and labour mobility, social inclusion and combating poverty, and sustainable urban mobility. In line with this, a series of Integrated Sustainable Urban Development (ISUD) strategies identify the basic development needs and potentials of each area of intervention, particularly concerning deprived urban neighbourhoods. These strategies have been co-developed by the four main municipalities (Nicosia, Limassol, Larnaca and Paphos) on the basis of specifications set at national level by the Department of Town Planning and Housing. They include guidelines for an integrated approach to urban development and the establishment of thematic priorities and selection criteria, with 135 indicators relating to demographic trends, economic situation, environmental sustainability, mobility, cultural and social infrastructure, etc.

The management of European Structural and Investment Funds is carried out in partnership with national and/or regional authorities through a system of shared management. The managing authorities have assigned to so-called intermediate bodies functions, such as the selection, monitoring and verification of projects. For urban development, the Ministry of the Interior was designated as the intermediate body responsible for the monitoring and verification of projects, whilst the four local authorities that prepared ISUD strategies are responsible for the selection of projects in their territory. For the 2014-2020 programming period, the funds allocated to urban development account for 18.5 per cent of Cyprus' European Regional Development Fundbudget, but project implementation has been severely delayed due to the repercussions of the economic and financial crisis, affecting governmental and private spending and access to finance.

## Czech Republic

The Ministry of Regional Development of the Czech Republic is the main entity in charge of the development and coordination of urban policy. In 2010, the ministry formulated six Principles of Urban Policy (*Zásady urbánní politiky*), being: the regional nature of urban policy, polycentric development of the settlement structure, a strategic and integrated approach to urban development, promotion of the development of towns as development poles in a territory, care for the urban environment, and the deepening of cooperation, creation of partnerships and exchange of experience in sustainable urban development. The governmental approval of an updated version of this document is scheduled for spring 2017.

In addition, the Ministry of Regional Development drafts the Spatial Development Policy (*Politika územního rozvoje*) in line with the Czech Building Act. This strategic document covers country-wide spatial planning objectives and delimits different area types. It further determines the conditions for envisaged Development Plans. The Spatial Development Policy specifically implements the key objectives of the Leipzig Charter in the field of land-use planning. Another document administered by the Ministry of Regional Development is the Architecture and Building Culture Policy (*Politika architektury a stavební kultury*), approved in 2015. This policy aims to improve the quality of the built environment by setting out long-term visions and corresponding measures. Some of these measures, such as educational issues and settlement structure arrangements, are handled or implemented by regional authorities. The Leipzig Charter serves as an important source for the Architecture and Building Culture Policy and is explicitly mentioned in it.

In addition, the Regional Development Strategy of the Czech Republic 2014-2020 (*Strategie regionálního rozvoje ČR 2014-2020*) constitutes the basic instrument of the regional policy. It is intended to secure coherence of the national regional policy with the EU's regional policy and with other sectoral policies having an impact on the territorial development. It provides the framework for regionally targeted development programmes financed from national sources or co-financed by EU funds. In regional policy, multi-level cooperation between central and local authorities is promoted. Urban policy is related to regional policy and thus follows the same logic. Regional and local authorities are bound by the Spatial Development Policy in defining development principles, procurement rules and land-use and regulatory plans. Together the secretariats of the National and Regional Standing

Conferences update the Principles of Urban Policy. Prior to the adoption of the Architecture and Building Culture Policy, regional authorities provide their feedback on the draft.

At the local level, there are separate structures and strategies for urban development. The Union of Towns and Municipalities of the Czech Republic (*Svaz měst a obcí České republiky*) is a non-governmental political body that represents local urban interests. It provides a platform for urban development-related activities by cities and towns, with a specific focus on the establishment of Integrated Urban Development Plans.

EU programmes create an important framework for policy documents such as the Principles of Urban Policy. In addition, outputs from EU-related networks (e.g. EUKN, EUROCITIES, and URBACT) are used. The Ministry of Regional Development has a coordinating role and is in direct contact with the abovementioned networks.

Czech municipalities are among the beneficiaries of EU structural funds. The operational programmes in the 2014-2020 period address a variety of urban challenges. Until June 2016, approximately 15.3 billion euros went to cities and towns within the 2007-2013 programming period. The Czech Republic has quite extensively taken up the Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI) tool, using it alongside the Integrated Development Plans of Areas (Binek et al. 2015). The Integrated Development Plans that some municipalities employ are partly financed by EU funds as well. Coordination of the Integrated Development Plans, ITI and Community-led Local Development (CLLD) lies with the National Standing Conference (*Národní stálá konference*), whose tasks are set out in the Czech Republic's Partnership Agreement with the European Commission. The National Network of Local Action Groups (*Národní síť Místních akčních skupin*) represents local rural interests and is the umbrella institution for the CLLD tool.

The Czech concept of a Socially Excluded Locality (*sociálně vyloučená lokalita, SVL*) serves to identify deprived areas. Socially Excluded Localities are mapped by looking at indicators such as labour market exclusion, social contact opportunities, the extent to which public services are available, and the degree of political participation. The government's Department for Social Inclusion applies a so-called Coordinated Approach to Socially Excluded Localities (*koordinovaný přístup k sociálně vyloučeným lokalitám, KPSVL*) to municipalities where deprived neighbourhoods have been iden-

tified. This approach is based on local strategic planning, cooperation and coordination of social inclusion policies. The Czech Republic has no specific national urban policy funding instrument. Still,

some national funding goes to municipalities with Socially Excluded Localities, even though no fixed budget for these areas exists.

#### Additional references

Bínek, Jan; Opravil, Zdeněk; Chmelař, Roman; Svobodová, Hana, 2016: Cooperation and mutual relationships of cities and their hinterlands with regard to the operation of EU integrated development instruments. *Quaestiones Geographicae*, 35(2), p. 59–69.

### Case study: Brno

Like many of its European counterparts, the city of Brno includes neighbourhoods with many socio-economic problems. A neighbourhood that has been particularly known for its severe deprivation is the so-called Brno Bronx, part of the Zábřehovské neighbourhood. For years, this neighbourhood has been struggling with high long-term unemployment, low educational levels, and relatively neglected municipal housing and public spaces. The largely residential area stretches for almost 21 hectares, and is situated in the Brno-Centre city district and its bordering Brno-North city district. Brno itself is the second largest city of the Czech Republic and home to almost 400,000 residents.

To fight the social and economic deprivation of the area, the local government proposed an integrated city development plan. The aim of the plan was to concentrate financial means for territorially defined areas of the neighbourhood, and to address the most serious problems in a comprehensive way. Systematic support for regeneration should help to reduce the social risks that had been related to the residential area for so many years. In 2008, a steering group was set up to start preparations. In 2009, the plan was officially approved, having obtained funding from the EU Integrated Operational Programme, a subsidy from the national Ministry of Regional Development, and funding from the Brno municipal budget.

The integrated city development plan comprised three main elements, being: the regeneration of apartment houses, the revitalisation of public spaces and several so-called soft projects in the field of social integration. Residents participated via the community work of the NGOs included in the project. A local magazine informed them about the plans. A more direct form of participation was a survey among school pupils, who could provide input concerning the design of the Hvězdíčka parc. To begin with, a number of residential buildings in the area were selected for reconstruction. In total 157 buildings were settled on, including 129 residential buildings and 28 commercial properties. Out of the total of 157 houses, 89 are on the territory of the

Brno-Centre city district and 68 in the Brno-North city district. As for their ownership, 57 houses are the property of the City of Brno and 100 houses are privately owned. Courtyard-balcony rental houses with bourgeois street facades that were constructed during the 18th and 19th centuries form a significant part of the defined area. A number of these buildings are protected monuments, but most of the housing stock in the area was not maintained after the end of the Second World War and was severely dilapidated. The renewal of the buildings took place between 2010 and 2015 and encompassed not only technical reconstruction (replacement of windows, thermal insulation and repairs) but also aesthetic (facade renewal). Attention was also paid to the interior; each newly built or reconstructed social flat was equipped with a standard bathroom and kitchen.



Source: mapchart.net



Photo: Stuart Acker Holt – Brno

Furthermore, the integrated plan included the revitalisation of public spaces. For this purpose, a new green space was mapped out, located in the courtyard of several residential building blocks. Based on consultation with the public, expert input and tenders, a final design was decided upon. A central paved area forms the heart of the park, functioning as a square for interaction between visitors. The rest of the park is divided into four areas, each with its own function (e.g. basketball, volleyball, closed playgrounds, lawns, benches, and areas for relaxation). The park also includes a low entry barrier youth centre offering leisure activities.

Lastly, several pilot projects interconnected the housing renewal and public space revitalisation with social programmes predominantly focusing on the integration of Roma communities endan-

gered by social exclusion. In this respect, various NGOs were actively involved in the plan. These social programmes mainly concerned family support, educational services, employment services, as well as social and legal counselling.

As scheduled, the plan was concluded in 2015. Thus, the project is now perhaps in its most difficult phase: that of creating sustainability. In this respect, several follow-up projects (especially soft ones) are still being worked on, aiming to preserve and further stimulate the improved living environment. For the time being, the current transformation should mark a gradual return to the stature of the site in pre-war times, when the residential area was a quiet, pleasant and popular place to live in Brno.

## Denmark

The Danish Planning Act of 1992, last amended in 2016, sets the framework for spatial planning by assigning planning responsibility to the Minister for Business, the five Regional Councils, and the 98 municipalities. Since 2015, the Danish Business Authority has been responsible for spatial planning. The Minister for Business presents a National Planning Report for municipalities and regions at the beginning of every new term of office, entailing long-term planning considerations. The last Danish government published an urban policy strategy in 2015. The plan, called “Sustainable Cities – a social and green sustainable urban policy”

(*Bæredygtige byer – en social og grøn bæredygtig bypolitik*), defined seven so-called sustainable tracks with cross-disciplinary potential regarding professional competences and sectors. The seven sustainable tracks show how urban development and spatial planning can contribute to sustainable development.

While the state sets overall planning guidelines, municipalities translate these into Municipal Plans (*Kommuneplan*) and more implementation-oriented Local Development Plans. The Regional Councils develop Regional Growth and Development Plans



that set out goals concerning infrastructure, business development, education, employment, urban development, nature and environment, and culture. The Copenhagen metropolitan area is subject to a dedicated strategy called the Finger Plan 2013, referring to the hand-like shape of the Greater Copenhagen area. The Finger Plan is regulated through the Danish Planning Act.

The Urban Renewal Act was first adopted in 2004 and last amended in 2016 under the auspices of the Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing. It seeks to serve as a tool for the Danish municipalities to make a targeted effort in urban and housing policy. It stimulates development in the poorest urban areas, with a specific focus on derelict parts of the housing stock. To address these objectives, municipalities can make use of four types of decisions at the local government level: building renewal, condemnation, recreational areas and neighbourhood renewal. This differentiation targets the state funds to different types of challenges, e.g. run-down urban spaces, outdated housing standards or hazardous buildings.

Within the Ministry of Transport, Building and Housing, the self-governing Centre for Social Housing Development (*Center for Boligsocial Udvikling*) strengthens the social housing initiatives in disadvantaged areas by gathering knowledge and measuring the impact of current initiatives. On this basis, the Centre for Social Housing Development advises decision-makers and practitioners about effective intervention. In addition, the Ministry manages a digital database for urban renewal (*Byfornyelses Databasen*), which is a platform for knowledge sharing, including all state-funded neighbourhood renewal programmes and pilot projects.

There is a long tradition of informal exchange between the different levels of government, while the coordination between these levels mostly happens via formalised channels. The Municipal Plans as well as any newly established or revised legislative act are subject to mandatory public hearings. Also, municipalities that initiate an urban development programme under the Urban Renewal Act need to involve citizens. In terms of regional development, the Business Development Act regulates regional growth fora, which bring together representatives

of the business community, knowledge and educational institutions, the labour market parties, and local and regional authorities to exchange their first-hand knowledge of regional conditions for growth.

Denmark receives a rather small amount of structural funds compared to other EU countries, and only five per cent of these funds is used for urban development issues.

In recent years, the Danish government has launched area-based measures to fight urban deprivation. These measures revolve around physical interventions, the social mixing of tenants, labour market integration and fighting crime. The Danish definition of deprived neighbourhoods is related to the Social Housing Act, which regulates the approximately 600,000 social housing units. In order to ensure social housing for vulnerable groups, local authorities command 25 per cent of all vacant social housing dwellings. Some of those units are troubled by social problems and a bad public reputation.

In Denmark a deprived neighbourhood is defined as a social housing area with more than 1,000 inhabitants where three of the five following criteria are fulfilled: more than 40 per cent of the inhabitants are unemployed, more than 2.7 per cent have been convicted of a crime, more than 50 per cent are of non-Western origin, more than 50 per cent of the adult residents have no further education beyond elementary level, and the average income is less than 55 per cent of the average income of the region. The ministry responsible for housing publishes a list of challenged neighbourhoods annually. By December 2015, 25 neighbourhoods had been identified as deprived.

The policies that aim to alleviate deprivation in social housing units are organised in various ways. There are national grant programmes that primarily support social work (e.g. crime prevention). The self-governing National Construction Fund runs a social programme from 2015 to 2018 worth 1.9 billion Danish kroner (approx. 255 million euros). The Social Housing Act regulates the National Construction Fund's infrastructure programme, offering 640 million Danish kroner (approx. 86 million euros) for four years to improve infrastructure in disadvantaged areas.

## Estonia

The Estonian Ministry of Finance and the Minister for Public Administration are responsible for the design, coordination and monitoring of regional development policy, including urban area development. The Ministry of Finance is also responsible

for spatial planning and territorial administration, which includes the financial management principles for local authorities. Other ministries deal with urban topics on a sectoral basis. For instance, the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Communica-

tions looks after the digital society, urban mobility, housing and smart city projects. The Association of Estonian Cities (*Eesti Linnade Liit*) represents municipalities in budget negotiations, connects them internationally, and helps to establish cooperation structures between local governments.

In 2014, a new national Regional Development Strategy (2014-2020) was adopted which set up a framework for regional policy. The strategy includes an implementation plan, inter alia for the efficient use of the EU structural funds in regional development. The specific policy goals of this strategy focused on urban areas' development are:

- Improving the living environment of the five largest urban areas to foster their internationally competitive development – by promoting sustainable urban development with regard to mobility systems, public spaces, child care, the development of under-used urban districts, as well as by integrating foreign specialists into the society and labour market;
- Fostering the development of other county centres as drivers for their wider hinterlands – mainly by providing jobs and services, by investing in public infrastructure, and by developing the public space;
- Facilitating transport links, cooperation and joint planning within functional urban areas.

The National Spatial Plan Estonia 2030+ (*Eesti 2030+*) of 2012 aims to improve the quality of the environment in cities and sparsely populated areas. It sets out objectives related to settlement development, transport and mobility, and energy infrastructure, while maintaining green networks.

As the municipal level is the only sub-national government tier in Estonia, exchange between local and central government on urban development is crucial. For instance, in recent years the Network of Urban Development Specialists has developed into an informal collaboration platform. Assembled on this platform are representatives from the Ministry of Finance, the Association of Estonian Cities, and from the city administrations of the 20 largest Estonian cities. The network consults and functions as an exchange for good practices between Estonian cities and beyond. Most cooperation between governmental and non-governmental institutions in Estonia happens via informal channels.

A monitoring committee keeps track of the implementation of the Regional Development Strategy and supervises the territorial impact assessments for European Structural and Investment Funds-supported measures. The committee comprises ministries and local authorities' representatives. Prior to the adoption of the strategy, a wide range of non-governmental actors (non-governmental organisations (NGOs), business associations and researchers) provided their input. An important non-governmental actor is the Urban Lab (*Linnalabor*), an NGO promoting community-based initiatives for urban development and citizens' participation in urban planning and development.

The Ministry of Finance designs and coordinates the policy framework and grant schemes for urban development, but actors such as the Association of Estonian Cities, county governments, other ministries and Enterprise Estonia (*Ettevõtluse Arendamise Sihtasutus*), are also invited to provide input. The last is the primary intermediate body in charge of the implementation of the grant schemes for regional and urban development.

EU structural funds, especially the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), form a big share of the total national regional policy allocations. The operational programme for the 2014-2020 programming period contains a specific priority axis on sustainable urban development (in line with Article 7 of the ERDF Regulation). Within this axis, ERDF-fed schemes provide nearly 100 million euros for the sustainable development of five larger urban areas of Estonia. The schemes target city-hinterland cooperation. Joint investment plans are prepared prior to the funding application. The general implementation structure comprises the Ministry of Finance as managing authority, Enterprise Estonia as implementing authority, and municipalities as implementers and project selection entities.

There is no specific policy instrument in place for deprived neighbourhoods in Estonia. However, one of the investment priorities within the priority axis on sustainable urban development in the ERDF operational programme specifically targets the development of two larger urban areas of the Ida-Viru County (EC 2017a).

#### Additional references

EC – European Commission, 2017a: Operational Programme for Cohesion Policy Funds 2014-2020. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/en/atlas/programmes/2014-2020/estonia/2014ee16m3op001](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/atlas/programmes/2014-2020/estonia/2014ee16m3op001). [accessed 21/04/2017].

## Finland

Due to the relatively small size of most Finnish cities, urban and regional policies are closely intertwined. Concerning regional development, Finland is undergoing major reform efforts. For the first time in its history, a directly elected regional level government will be created. This governmental level will take over responsibility for health and social care from the municipalities. Also, it will have responsibility for regional development and land-use planning. These two tasks were formerly carried out by Regional Councils, which will be abolished in the course of the reform (Ministry of Social Affairs and Health 2016). Due to these developments, the future role of cities and city regions as actors in urban policies is still somewhat unclear at this point. The key challenges defined by the current government relate to structural change, energy transition, digital transition, the inclusion of migrants and circular economy. At national level, the responsibility for urban development is shared between the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment and the Ministry of the Environment.

Since 2007, there has been in place a specific Metropolitan Policy for the Helsinki urban region. This policy is mainly coordinated by the Ministry of the Environment. Apart from that, cities and city regions have signed Growth Agreements with the Finnish state, running from 2016 to 2018 (Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment 2016). For Helsinki, Tampere, Turku and Oulu, additional agreements on land-use, housing and transport exist (Ministry of the Environment 2016). The Six City Strategy (*6Aika*) is a partnership between the six largest Finnish cities aiming to create “shared projects, platforms, co-creation models, standards and open data” (6Aika 2016) that allow the entire city community to participate in urban development. Regional development priorities are agreed on by the national government and implemented by different administrative sectors and the – soon to be abolished – Regional Councils.

The Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment is the leading national-level entity for urban policy together with the Ministry of the Environment. The Urban Policy Committee, established in 2007, is the central coordinating and advisory body for urban policy. It comprises representatives of ministries, cities and the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities. Its tasks include the coordination of actors on urban policy and the drafting of the national urban policy.

The Growth Agreements facilitate direct channels of exchange between city and state levels on ur-

ban development. The Six City Strategy is special insofar as the six largest cities manage it autonomously. Within the Helsinki Metropolitan Policy, national ministries, cities, other local authorities in the metropolitan region and key stakeholders (e.g. knowledge institutions, business representatives and regional chambers of commerce) work together to contribute to the development of the Helsinki metropolitan region in an integrated fashion.

The Advisory Council on Regional Renewal is chaired by the minister for regional development and acts as a high-level cooperation body for regional development strategies. It brings together representatives of national ministries, the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities, the Regional Councils, the Centres for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment, regional state administrative agencies and large cities.

The Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment administers the programme-based European Structural and Investment funding of urban development in Finland, whereas the implementation of urban policy resides with the Regional Councils, the Centres for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment, and cities. The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the European Social Fund play a role in financing urban activities. The two 2007-2013 ERDF operational programmes for Western and Southern Finland have directed a share of four to five per cent directly to urban programmes. The Six City Strategy is related to the EU-funded Integrated Territorial Investment instrument and is embedded in Finland's structural fund programme implementation following Article 7 of the ERDF Regulation. The EU funding allocation is generally prepared in a partnership process, while projects are implemented by mostly regional implementing bodies and overseen by the managing authority, in this case the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment.

In the past, there have been two urban renewal programmes that focused on suburban areas, the Suburban Redevelopment Programme (2009-2011) and the Neighbourhood Redevelopment Programme (2013-2015). Both targeted the most deprived neighbourhoods in the 14 biggest cities in Finland. These programmes also provided guidelines for defining deprived neighbourhoods, using indicators such as income level, education, unemployment, demography and distribution of the housing stock. The programmes followed an integrated approach and were financed by the Ministry of the Environment. At the moment, there are no programmes in place that specifically target deprived neighbourhoods.

#### Additional references

6Aika, 2016: Open and Smart Services. Available at: <http://6aika.fi/in-english>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment, 2016: Growth agreements. Available at: <http://tem.fi/en/growth-agreements>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, 2016: Health, Social Services and Regional Government Reform. Available at: <http://alueuudistus.fi/en/frontpage>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Ministry of the Environment, 2016: Land use and building. Available at: <http://tem.fi/en/growth-agreements> [accessed 21/04/2017].

### Case study: Vantaa

Less than half an hour's drive from Helsinki centre lies Finland's main airport Helsinki-Vantaa, officially located in the territory of the city of Vantaa. Together with Helsinki, Espoo and Kauniainen, Vantaa forms the core of the Finnish capital region. It has around 215,000 residents and borders Helsinki to the south. Vantaa is currently home to an ambitious development plan called the Aviapolis. This plan corresponds to the Aerotropolis phenomenon, describing a diverse city that develops around an airport and uses the aviation hub as its financial engine. It departs from the idea that in the future urban centres will develop around busy airports the same way as current centres have developed around busy railways.

In 2014, the Aviapolis frame plan was approved by the Vantaa city planning committee. It is to be implemented in an area that stretches almost 3.5 km<sup>2</sup>, divided into several smaller areas, each with its own function. Most of the area is owned by the municipality of Vantaa, the airport operator Finavia and the State of Finland. However, in total over 100 different actors share ownership. The plan has six main objectives: to transform the existing residential area into a pedestrian friendly urban neighbourhood, to build an ecologically and sustainable city, to use smart and sustainable transport options, to enable the settlement of 60,000 jobs in the area, and to provide housing for 20,000 residents. Development will take place over the next decades, but in 2020 the first urban quarters should be completed, and constructions began in 2015.

At present, about 500 people live in the planning area, mostly in flats that were built in the 1970s and 2010s. These residents have limited options when it comes to retail, and purchase their groceries south of the planning area in Finland's largest shopping centre. In the future, more retail options should be available within closer proximity. The pedestrian and bicycling networks in the area are currently also insufficiently developed, so the plan specifically aims for the creation of more walkable and bikeable urban neighbourhoods. The primary tool to achieve this is to change the scale principles; large urban blocks will be transformed into smaller paths and parks. The street network will be complemented by an urban green structure, consisting of block parks, green inner courts and a few large parks.

Approximately one fifth of the planning area is marked as mixed urban neighbourhoods which include different functions such as workplaces, services and other activities, as well as living. These areas in particular are planned in the central part of the region, where aircraft and road traffic noise pollution is relatively low. Jobs are intentionally placed within the areas of mixed urban functions, while at the same time the entire (surrounding) area should serve as an easily accessible workplace. In this respect, nearby areas have the opportunity to develop distinctive business zones that can take advantage of the close proximity of the airport. The already existing Ring Rail Line will connect the



Source: mapchart.net





Photo: Gijs Wilbers – Vantaa

Aviapolis to the larger metropolitan area. Through this line more than 150,000 people will be able to reach the Aviapolis within half an hour.

The planning site further includes 43 heritage sites inventoried by the Vantaa City Museum, of which the most prominent will be preserved. For some of these buildings, such as several warehouses close to the airport, new functions will have to be found as old industries move out. Also, due to the industrial history, land has been contaminated in a few places. Parts of these sites have already been cleaned up, but it is most likely that additional purification will be investigated in further stages of development.

To create and maintain a shared vision among the many stakeholders of the Aviapolis (different levels of government, private land owners, future and current residents, businesses, environmental organisations etc.) cooperation is essential. For this reason, the project has implemented an integrated approach, whereby the municipality is supported by the national government, cross-sectoral partnerships have been established, and multiple stakeholders (especially private and public actors) work together. At the same time, the input of (future) local residents is incorporated by means of focus groups, whereby special attention is given to the wishes and needs of the youth community.

## France

The General Commission for Territorial Equality (*Commissariat général à l'égalité des territoires, CGET*) advises and supports the government in the design and implementation of the French City Policy, the *Politique de la ville*. The CGET is a national body, attached to the Prime Minister. It was created in 2014 as a result of the merging of three national bodies: the Interministerial Delegation in Charge of Spatial Planning, the General Secretary of the Interministerial Committee in Charge of City Policy and the National Agency for Social Cohesion and Equal Opportunity. The CGET oversees the National Agency for Urban Renovation (*Agence nationale pour la rénovation urbaine, ANRU*), which finances the urban renewal dimension of the City Policy.

The Directorate-General of Planning, Housing and Nature in the Ministry of Housing and Sustainable Homes is in charge of the design, implementation

and evaluation of public policies on housing, urban planning and sustainable cities. The Unit for Sustainable Urban Planning supports the implementation of laws in the field of housing and urban planning originating from the *Grenelle de l'Environnement*, a round-table civil society exchange forum on sustainable development held in 2007. In continuation of these laws, the Sustainable City Plan (*Plan Ville Durable*) from 2008 defines sustainable urban policies with regard to climate change, biodiversity, environment and resource protection, social cohesion, solidarity between territories and generations, and responsible modes of production and consumption.

The application of the *Loi NOTRe (Nouvelle organisation territoriale de la République)*, an all-encompassing territorial reform package, impacted on urban development policies and governance

arrangements in various ways. For instance, the number of regions was reduced from 26 to 18. In addition, a law for the modernisation of public territorial action and affirmation of metropolises was adopted in 2014. It re-established the general clause of competence for regional and departmental councils and created new competences of metropolises with more than 400,000 inhabitants, *inter alia* to encourage economic development.

The CGET monitors the City Policy through the Interministerial Committee of Cities (*Comité interministériel des villes, CIV*) and, since 2015, has done so through the Interministerial Committee for Equality and Citizenship (*Comité interministériel à l'égalité et à la citoyenneté, CIEC*). Both the CIV and the CIEC decide on measures relating to urban, social and economic development for priority areas.

Following the 2014 update of the City Policy, agglomerations have developed City Contracts (*Contrats de ville*) with public and civil society partners. The City Contracts run from 2015 to 2020 and are based on integrated strategies mostly aiming at deprived neighbourhoods and their inhabitants. They are organised around three pillars: the development of economic activities and employment, social cohesion, and living conditions and urban renewal. Urban authorities retain the operational leadership of the City Contracts. Citizen Councils monitor and evaluate the City Contract, and act as a forum for information exchange and tabling proposals.

The state dedicates around 400 million euros per year to the City Policy (in 2017 the following priorities were decided on: education success with 77 million euros; adult intermediaries and vectors of social link in priority neighbourhoods with 67.2 million euros; support to associations in favour of social cohesion in deprived neighbourhoods with 200 million euros; a tax exemption for retail shops with up to 50 employees and a turnover of up to ten million euros). The ANRU, via its New National Programme for Urban Renewal (*Nouveau programme national de renouvellement urbain*), dedicates five billion euros to urban renewal policies to transform the living environment of deprived neighbourhoods. To support innovative urban projects related to energy and ecological challenges, Regional Work Committees implement the Cities of Tomorrow Investment Plan, a call for projects within the Programme of Investments for the Future (*ramme d'investissements d'avenir*) worth 668 million euros for

2010-2017 and effective in 31 cities, the *EcoCities*. These committees comprise regional state services, agencies, local authorities' representatives and the national financing authority *Caisse des Dépôts*.

The European dimension of City Contracts emerges from the application of Article 7 of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) Regulation. The deployed integrated approach entails a multi-sectoral, strategic, territorial and multi-level coordination approach. Concerning the usability of European Structural and Investment (ESI) Funds for urban development, there is room for improvement in the complementarity of the place-based (ERDF) and people-based (European Social Fund, ESF) logic of funds. Topics like urban poverty, which require combined efforts, in particular could be targeted more effectively with better integrated funding possibilities. Since 2014, regional authorities have been responsible for managing the ESI Funds. The CGET coordinates the implementation of the funds and the monitoring of the Partnership Agreement.

The City Policy is the national policy targeted at the most deprived neighbourhoods and supporting urban, social and economic development strategies through City Contracts. Deprived urban areas, called priority districts (*quartiers prioritaires de la politique de la ville*), are of central importance for French urban development policy and form the priority areas of interventions. According to the most recent definition, priority neighbourhoods are areas with a minimum population size of 1,000 where low-income population forms the majority. On average, the priority areas have more than 10,000 inhabitants, a share of around 20 per cent of people with a non-EU migration background, and a median annual income of around 9,000 euros. The integrated approach targeted at deprived neighbourhoods is fixed as a priority in the Partnership Agreement between the European Commission and France, specifying that at least ten per cent of the national allocation from ERDF and ESF need to support integrated urban strategies.

The Businesses and Sensitive Areas Charter (*Charte Entreprises et Quartiers*) of 2013 aims at reinforcing the presence of businesses in deprived neighbourhoods. Enterprises receive a flat-rate state contribution of 5,000 euros per recruitment, and they may benefit from tax exemptions when establishing themselves in the mentioned priority areas.

## Germany

In Germany, diverse forms of integrated urban development can be found both in the context of different programmes by the federal government, the federal states and municipalities, as well as in the independent strategies of many cities and municipalities.

In 2007, the National Urban Development Policy (*Nationale Stadtentwicklungspolitik*) was set up by the former Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development (nowadays Federal Ministry for Environment, Nature Protection, Construction and Nuclear Safety, *Bundesministerium für Umwelt, Naturschutz, Bau und Reaktorsicherheit, BMUB*), the Conference of Construction Ministers (*Bauministerkonferenz*), the German Town and Community Association (*Deutscher Städte- und Gemeindebund*) and the German Association of Cities (*Deutscher Städtetag*). In line with the concerns of the Leipzig Charter, it wants to unite all actors and interested parties, focusing on cities. It serves the vertical and horizontal coordination within urban development, sees itself as a communication platform, takes up model actions and solutions, and concentrates on a broad exchange of experience. To this end, pilot projects have been and are being carried out in civil society, social and innovative cities, climate protection, building culture and regionalisation (around 140 projects in approx. 90 municipalities). Numerous different formats such as think tanks or competitions support the dialogue with a wide range of urban development actors. For example, a university day of the National Urban Development Policy is organised to take advantage of the capacities of the broad education and research landscape in Germany to support urban development. It offers the opportunity of information exchange on current research questions on urban development to representatives of the federal government, the federal states and the municipalities as well as to scientists and researchers. The central nation-wide exchange platform with regard to contemporary questions of urban development policy is the National Congress on National Urban Development Policy which takes place annually.

An important instrument for the concrete implementation of the Leipzig Charter in Germany is the urban development funding (*Städtebauförderung*) by the federal government and the federal states. Within the framework of a contract to be concluded with the states on an annual basis, the federal government provides grants for investment purposes in various urban funding programmes, supplemented by funds of the federal states and the

municipalities. In total, the federal government will provide 790 million euros in 2017, complemented by resources from states and municipalities, with a total budget of more than 2.2 billion euros. For comparison: five years ago, urban development funding amounted to around 1.4 billion euros. This underlines the increase in its (political) significance in recent years.

The Social City (*Soziale Stadt*) programme, launched in 1999, plays an important role within urban development. It aims to improve the living conditions and social cohesion in disadvantaged neighbourhoods by means of an integrated approach. This is pursued through innovative forms of management focusing on networks and space, the activation and participation of the population and other local actors in the conception and implementation of the programme, as well as the bundling of financing options from different sources (EU, federal and state programmes, municipal regular funding, funding of third parties like foundations). Integrated development concepts form the basis for the implementation of the programme, developed jointly by municipalities and local stakeholders. To date, the programme has been implemented in more than 720 areas in over 420 cities and municipalities. These are neighbourhoods that have deficits in terms of social structure, job offers, education level, social infrastructure, local supply as well as construction quality, housing, housing environment, and environment in general. Basically, these are suburban or inner-city (often late nineteenth-century) neighbourhoods or large-scale residential areas from the post-war period.

The federal government developed the integrated approach of the Social City programme, which was already the force behind the Leipzig Charter, into a leading programme for cross-departmental cooperation. For this purpose, among others, sectoral programmes with a more target group-oriented focus as well as those with an integrative socio-spatial focus should be aligned more closely.

This approach is given additional attention by the challenge of how to integrate a large number of refugees who have arrived since 2015. To this end, in 2017, the federal government launched the new Social Integration in the Neighbourhood Investment Pact (*Investitionspakt Soziale Integration im Quartier*), for which 200 million euros will be made available every year from 2017 to 2020. The aim is to maintain and expand social facilities, such as schools, libraries and kindergartens or local neighbourhood centres, and to qualify them as places of

integration within the neighbourhood, open to all population groups.

The Social City is supported by partner programmes of the BMUB and other ministries. These include the programmes Education, Business, Work in the Neighbourhood (*Bildung, Wirtschaft, Arbeit im Quartier, BIWAQ*) of the BMUB and Supporting Youth in the Neighbourhood (*Jugend stärken im Quartier, JUSTIQ*) of the Federal Ministry for Family, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, both sponsored by the European Social Fund.

Finally, funds raised according to Article 7 of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) Regulation are used in disadvantaged neighbourhoods in particular. During the past funding period, Germany exceeded the obligation to spend at least five per cent of ERDF fundings at the national level for integrated measures for sustainable urban development. This figure of around eight per cent

is planned to be further increased to up to 14 per cent in the 2014-2020 funding period, which again underlines the particular importance of the integrated approach in German urban development. In Germany, the states are responsible for the drafting and the implementation of the structural funds' operational programmes.

Although many municipalities whose autonomy is legally enshrined in the German Basic Law have established independent models and programmes for integrated urban development, it is clear that the above-mentioned funding schemes are nevertheless a strong driver for the dissemination of integrated approaches at the municipal level in Germany.

Note: This analysis has been drafted by the German Institute for Urban Affairs (Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik) (Thomas Franke and Wolf-Christian Strauss) in collaboration with the BMUB.

## Greece

In recent years, the socio-economic crisis has influenced urban policies in Greece. Cities have fewer financial and human resources to formulate and implement urban policies. Hence, municipalities' priorities have changed to dealing with (urban) poverty and social exclusion. In recent years, cities have also become more involved in measures to stimulate the local labour market. Nonetheless, the general structure of responsibilities has remained formally unchanged. In addition to these contemporary challenges, the absence of a clearly formulated urban policy in Greece has been found to induce delays in the design, public deliberation and implementation of policy.

The Law on Spatial Planning – Sustainable Development and other regulations (No. 4447/2016) determines the current rules and conditions for national, regional and urban planning in Greece. A specific law, the New Regulatory Plan for Attica – Athens and Other Provisions (No. 4277/2014), sets out the basis for the development of the metropolitan region of Attica, comprising Athens. The Ministry of Environment and Energy is responsible for preparing and enforcing regulatory requirements regarding spatial planning and environmental protection. Within this ministry, the Directorate of Metropolitan, Urban and Suburban Areas sets the guidelines for urban planning and oversees the implementation of the New Regulatory Plan for Attica. The ministry also drafts the National Spatial and Development Strategy (*Χωροταξικός Σχεδιασμός – Βιώσιμη Ανάπτυξη*), taking into account priorities issued by other ministries. The strategy contains the

medium- and long-term targets of spatial national development and the appropriate measures, e.g. concerning sustainable urban development or the structure and designation of the urban network. It forms the basis for all spatial plans and the investment plans of the government and local authorities. A revision takes place every five years on the basis of a certified need. It, takes into account the development strategy and priorities of each programming period of the structural funds, the fiscal targets, the national public investment programme, and international, European and national policies on protection and development.

Regional authorities formulate Regional Development and Spatial Plans, taking into account the National Spatial and Development Strategy. They are approved by the Ministry of Environment and Energy and revised every five years. There is one such plan for each of the twelve regions excluding the Region of Attica, whose plan is formulated by the Ministry of Environment and Energy and is approved by Parliament. Cities, via municipal councils, formulate their own Local Spatial Plans, to be approved by the Ministry of Environment and Energy. In addition, they design and implement five-year urban development plans after consultation with civil society groups, which are approved by the Ministry of the Interior. Plans of the municipalities face the threat of insufficient implementation due to the lack of financial but also human resources, while insufficient decentralisation creates added bureaucracy and time-consuming processes.



Triggered by the crisis repercussions, NGOs and citizens' groups have become more actively involved in urban development policies, mostly focusing on environmental, heritage and urban neighbourhood protection. NGOs and voluntary groups cooperate with municipalities to implement interventions that deal with urban poverty and social inclusion. Lately, these interventions have also focused on the reception of migrants and refugees. The Church has shown itself to be a very active actor in implementing interventions regarding poverty.

Urban and territorial policies are mostly implemented through the EU structural funds and the respective operational programmes. Thus, the key aspects of these policies are discussed and approved by the National Monitoring Committee of the Partnership Agreement between Greece and the European Commission. As the entity responsible for the Partnership Agreement, the Ministry of Economy and Development plays an active role in designing urban development interventions and issuing guidelines for the implementation of integrat-

ed urban development programmes. As national schemes address deprived people rather than deprived neighbourhoods, e.g. via a guaranteed minimum income scheme, specific area-based funding mostly comes from EU sources. Urban authorities have been invited to submit integrated plans as a basis for the deployment of the Integrated Territorial Investment instrument by many of the regional managing authorities. Those integrated plans are based on the five-year development and spatial plans of the cities. The Community-led Local Development tool is also to be implemented in urban areas, but the process has been delayed due to a lack of human resources and regulatory obligation in setting up Local Action Groups. General bottlenecks around the implementation of the urban development plans include overly complex bureaucratic procedures, the lack of technical assistance to cities, a lack of funding for the preparation and maturation of projects, and insufficient capacities at the local level.

## Hungary

In Hungary, urban development policy is part of regional development policy. However, its legal frameworks are integrated into the built environment regulation system that is dealt with by the Prime Minister's Office. While no national urban policy exists, a number of national policy strategies impact on urban development or address it explicitly. They can also be coordinated directly by the Prime Minister and the Government through urban development programmes.

The National Development 2030 – National Development and Territorial Development Concept (*Nemzeti Fejlesztés 2030: Országos Fejlesztési és Területfejlesztési Konceptió*) (Ministry of National Development 2014) outlines the long-term vision of the country's spatial development based on sectoral and territorial objectives. The concept clearly sets out the need for more multi-centred and balanced territorial development aimed at reducing regional disparities. Furthermore, the preparation of a National Settlement Policy considering international urban agendas began in 2016. Further important national strategic documents relating to urban development are environment and transport policy-related strategies such as the National Framework Strategy on Sustainable Development (of 2013), the National Climate Change Strategy (under revision), the National Environment Protection Programme 2015-2020 (of 2015), the National Water Strategy 2030 (under construction) and the National Transport Strategy (of 2014).

The National Development and Territorial Development Concept suggests more effective multi-level territorial governance, while generally upholding a highly-centralised state structure. The Budapest metropolitan region assumes a special role as a macro-regional centre. In general, local self-government units are found at the county, district and city or town levels. With the 2011 amendments to the Local Government Act and to the Spatial Development and Land-Use Planning Act, county governments took over competences for public service provision, spatial planning and territorial, rural and urban development, while existing territorial development councils at national, county and sub-regional levels were abolished. The amendments came along with a distinct limitation of municipalities' duties and responsibilities (Varró/Faragó 2016: 52). The Government Decree 314/2012 describes planning processes and provides content for urban development concepts and integrated settlement planning strategies. Operational programmes and national projects help cities and towns to create their own concepts and strategies. Today, all major cities and many towns have those documents, which are the basis of urban development.

On national level, the existing fora for coordination regarding urban policy are the Prime Minister's Office, the Ministry of National Development and the Ministry of National Economy. At the regional level, the county governments coordinate the level of settlement. At the local level, the processes for

stakeholder involvement have to be implemented in accordance with a local partnership plan.

Around 2010, Hungary experienced severe economic difficulties stemming from the country's unsustainable private and public debt levels, giving rise to labour market, pension and tax reforms (Government of Hungary 2015). The New Széchenyi Plan (Új Széchenyi Terv) from 2011 represented the government's answer to the difficulties. The largest national urban development investment programme is the Modern Cities Programme (*Modern városok program*). Next to these national financing schemes, regional and urban development is fostered by EU structural funds. In the 2014-2020 programming period, large sums of co-financing go to large-scale infrastructure projects. With regard to integrated approaches in urban areas and deprived neighbourhoods, Hungary is only beginning to implement such projects. The 2007-2013 period supported "the first truly integrated socially sensitive regeneration project in Hungary" (EC 2016: 3). This project sought to improve housing and living conditions of people in the Magdolna neighbour-

hood in Budapest by both upgrading housing infrastructure and implementing soft measures targeting local residents. It was funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) with more than 6.4 million euros (EC 2013). The 2014-2020 regional operational programme on territorial and settlement development, including ERDF and European Social Fund, covers the themes of development of the local economic environment (industrial parks, local economy, sustainable tourism, mobility), enterprise-friendly urban development (green cities and brownfields, infrastructure for environmental protection), urban areas for a low-carbon economy (urban transport development, energy efficiency), local community services and public participation (health care, social infrastructure, deprived urban areas) and human resource development and co-operation. It allocates around one billion euros to integrated sustainable urban development (EC 2017). Hungary furthermore has a National Social Inclusion Strategy (Emberi Erőforrások Minisztériuma 2014), addressing the issues of extreme poverty, child poverty, living conditions of the Roma, and territorial inequality and segregation.

#### References

- EC – European Commission, 2013: Neighbourhood renovation boosts community spirit in Magdolna. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/en/projects/hungary/neighbourhood-renovation-boosts-community-spirit-in-magdolna](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/projects/hungary/neighbourhood-renovation-boosts-community-spirit-in-magdolna). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- EC – European Commission, 2016: European Structural and Investment Funds – Hungary. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/policy/what/investment-policy/esif-country-factsheet/esi\\_funds\\_country\\_factsheet\\_hu\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/what/investment-policy/esif-country-factsheet/esi_funds_country_factsheet_hu_en.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- EC – European Commission, 2017b: Territorial and settlement development OP. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/en/atlas/programmes/2014-2020/hungary/2014hu16m2op001](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/atlas/programmes/2014-2020/hungary/2014hu16m2op001). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Emberi Erőforrások Minisztériuma, 2014: Magyar Nemzeti Társadalmi Felzárkózási Stratégia II. Tartósan Rászoruló – Szegény Család-ban Élő Gyermekek – Romák. Available at: [http://www.kormany.hu/download/1/9c/20000/Magyar%20NTFS%20II%20\\_2%20mell%20\\_NTFS%20II.pdf](http://www.kormany.hu/download/1/9c/20000/Magyar%20NTFS%20II%20_2%20mell%20_NTFS%20II.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Government of Hungary, 2015: Convergence Programme of Hungary 2015-2018. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/csr2015/cp2015\\_hungary\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/csr2015/cp2015_hungary_en.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Ministry of National Development: National Development 2030, 2014: National Development and Territorial Development Concept. Available at: [regionalispolitika.kormany.hu/download/b/c9/e0000/OFTK\\_vegleges\\_EN.pdf](http://regionalispolitika.kormany.hu/download/b/c9/e0000/OFTK_vegleges_EN.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Varró, Krisztina; Faragó, László, 2015: The Politics of Spatial Policy and Governance in Post-1990 Hungary: The Interplay Between European and National Discourses of Space. *European Planning Studies*, 24(1), p. 39–60.

## Ireland

Central government develops urban policy in Ireland and supervises its implementation. Urban policy is delivered through a system of 31 local authorities, 3 Regional Assemblies and 95 municipal districts. The Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government provides the legal framework and general policy guidance. Regional Assemblies coordinate, promote and support strategic planning. Lastly, implementation of urban policies lies with local planning authorities.

In recent years, Ireland has conducted an extensive programme of reform in local government, as laid out initially in a policy document called "Putting People First – An Action Programme for Effective Local Government". The Local Government Reform Act of 2014 provided legislative underpinning for these reforms, and replaced the existing eight regional authorities and two Regional Assemblies with three new Regional Assemblies. It also provided for the establishment of municipal districts and the dissolution of town councils. The three new Regional Assemblies consist of representatives of

local authorities within the region. They draw up regional spatial and economic strategies, replacing the current regional planning guidelines.

The central government, elected in 2016, published a number of policy documents that illustrate its high priority for urban renewal. A working group, chaired by the Minister for Housing and Urban Renewal, is examining proposals and new measures for such a new urban policy. It is due to report in the second quarter of 2017.

The National Spatial Strategy of 2002 is currently being replaced by a National Planning Framework (NPF) called "Ireland 2040 – Our Plan". The NPF will set a new planning and development context for Ireland and all its regions until 2040, representing a strategic, high-level framework for the coordination of a range of national, regional and local authority policies and activities, planning, and investment. It will provide policy guidance on:

- Providing for future trends and growth in relation to employment and housing;
- Enabling all Ireland's regions to play their full part in overall national development;
- Equipping the regions with the right mix of physical and social infrastructure working within available resources in a prioritised manner;
- Making development more sustainable and greener, particularly in response to climate change;
- Strengthening the opportunities for an all-island approach to development.

Ireland's central government communicates policy through information circulars to local authorities, and through seminars and meetings. The Regional Assemblies oversee consistency in planning matters between national, regional, and local plans. The local government reform offers local authorities more involvement in the economic development of their communities.

Representatives of enterprises and economic development agencies are involved in drafting new regional spatial and economic strategies. In addition, the regional reform programme provides for citizen engagement, public participation networks and Local Community Development Committees. A series of workshops was held in June 2016 as part of the consultation for the NPF.

There is no national budget reserved for urban development. Most of the Housing, Planning, and Local Government Department's expenditure is allocated to social housing. In addition, the Department's Regeneration Programme targets the most disadvantaged urban communities, defined by the most extreme social exclusion and unemployment,

through a holistic programme of physical, social and economic regeneration. A commonly used resource for defining deprived neighbourhoods is the Pobal HP Deprivation Index. Pobal, a non-profit-making company, was established by the Irish government as an intermediary to support social and economic development. The index captures the relative affluence or disadvantage of geographical areas using data from various censuses. The deprivation score is assigned using a sophisticated model which accounts for three underlying dimensions of social disadvantage: demographic decline, social class deprivation, and labour market deprivation.

The responsible body for European Structural and Investment Funds, and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) in particular, is the Department of Public Expenditure and Reform. Ireland has launched a Designated Urban Centres Grant scheme for 25 local authority capital projects to avail of the five per cent ERDF resources reserved for sustainable urban development. European Social Fund (ESF) resources are managed by the Department of Education and Skills.

The Social Inclusion and Community Activation Programme (SICAP) is the government's primary social inclusion programme with a significant impact on urban areas. It is funded by the central government, the ESF, and a special allocation under the Irish Youth Employment Initiative. The aim is to reduce poverty and promote social inclusion through local, regional and national collaboration. SICAP is overseen by Local Community Development Committees which manage a coordinated development approach in their areas. SICAP's target groups are: children and families in disadvantaged areas, single parents, new communities (including refugees and asylum seekers), people living in disadvantaged communities, people with disabilities, Roma, unemployed, low-income workers and households, Travellers (pejoratively referred to as gypsies), young unemployed people from disadvantaged areas and NEETs (young people who are not in employment, education or training). Programme implementers have a target for the number of assisted people who must come from disadvantaged areas as defined by the Pobal HP Deprivation Index.

## Italy

In Italy, urban development policy is a shared competence between the state government and regional, provincial and municipal governments, with the state government defining the strategic priorities. Different national ministries, e.g. the Ministry of Infrastructures and Transports, deal with urban development-related policy by sectoral responsibility. Policies relevant for several municipalities within one province may be handled by the provincial level or, in the case of a regional dimension, by the regions. In general, municipalities take care of local development policies, in line with the autonomy allowed for by the Italian Constitution. However, the particularities of Italy's geography and politics, with more than 8,000 municipalities, complicate urban policy and more specifically actions for the recovery of deprived urban neighbourhoods.

Based on the Urgent Measures for the Country's Growth Law of 2012, the state government adopted an urban development policy called the National Plan for the Cities (*Piano Nazionale per le Città*). In 2014, the Ministry of Infrastructures and Transport signed agreements with each of the 28 cities that received financial support. The policy's goal is to improve urban areas, with particular regard to deprived and degraded areas. The National Control Room (*Cabina nazionale di regia*) selected 28 projects for national funding out of construction projects proposed by city councils. The volume of funding differs from city to city, from four million to 24 million euros. The agreements have no fixed duration, but the Ministry supplies the national funding according to the state of play. The National Plan for the Cities funds infrastructure, new buildings, the restoration of buildings and all measures related to urban regeneration.

A number of institutionalised multi-level cooperation fora exist. Exchange between the state government and the governments of Trento and Bolzano normally take place within the State-Regions and autonomous Provinces Conference (*Conferenza Stato-Regioni e Provincie autonome*). The state and the municipal governments cooperate via the State-Cities and local Authorities Conference

(*Conferenza Stato-Città ed Autonomie locali*). The arena for linking all government levels is the Unified Conference (*Conferenza Unificata*). Beyond these fora, the national government can enter into specific cooperation agreements with individual regions or local authorities. There is no formalised public stakeholder consultation on national urban and territorial policies, but local communities, such as inhabitants' associations, local interest groups or the private sector participate in projects according to local laws.

The EU funding allocation is distributed between the state government and the regional governments. The main difficulty in making full use of the opportunities provided by funds like the European Regional Development Fund stems from the absence of eligible projects for funding submitted by cities.

Italy has developed some indicators to define deprived neighbourhoods, processed by the National Statistics Institute. They are related to the population density, to the presence and accessibility of services, to the presence of infrastructure, to employment, and to the level of youth unemployment. In order to make any type of European, national or regional funding available for policy on deprived urban neighbourhoods, Italy makes use of integrated approaches. The different authorities (national, regional and local) get involved in implementing the National Plan for the Cities after the signing of the city-specific agreements, in which the total amount of funding, the costs of each intervention, a timetable, and the role of and funding share from each authority are defined. Local authorities decide on the scope of resource allocation to such neighbourhoods or parts of their urban territory. The National Plan for the Cities will be fulfilled when all tasks included in the agreements are reached. The 28 projects funded from 2014 to early 2017 dealt with the regeneration of deprived neighbourhoods (e.g. the west side of the city of Lecce, the Mestre and Marghera areas of Venice and the Pietralata neighbourhood in Rome). In the meantime, another programme called Deprived Peripheries (*Periferie degradate*) was developed, but it is still in its start-up phase.

## Latvia

There is no separate urban policy in Latvia, but this policy field does play a significant part in the national regional policy. The Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development is the main authority responsible for regional, including urban, policy development, implementation coor-

dination, monitoring and evaluation. The State Regional Development Agency, a national regulatory authority operating under the supervision of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development, manages the regional development programmes of national, European and other funds.

Five Planning Regions are responsible for territorial development planning at regional level and the implementation of available support measures. Their role has been reinforced during the past five years. They received responsibility for entrepreneurship promotion, which went hand in hand with the establishment of five Regional Business Centres. Local municipalities take care of local development planning and implementation. Associations representing the local level are involved in regional, including urban, policy development, implementation and monitoring. The same goes for organisations like the Employers' Confederation of Latvia and the Latvian Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

In 2013, the revised Regional Policy Guidelines were adopted at national level, defining the operational framework for regional policy and introducing a new approach towards sustainable regional development planning and implementation. It introduced a more active role for Planning Regions and municipalities in the promotion of regional development, wider use of integrated and place-based approaches in the provision of public investment, better coordination of regional and sectoral policies, and wider involvement of stakeholders. Documents like the Leipzig Charter and the EU Territorial Agenda have inspired the development of the national regional policy framework. Latvia is also active in the Urban Agenda for the EU process and takes part in three Urban Agenda Partnerships, namely on housing (with the city of Riga and the Ministry of Economy), urban poverty (with the city of Daugavpils), and jobs and skills in the local economy (with the city of Jelgava as one of the coordinators). The long-term development concept is represented in the Sustainable Development Strategy of Latvia 2030 (2010), which, in turn, shapes the medium-term development planning document, the National Development Plan of Latvia for 2014-2020 (2012).

Despite ongoing needs for more efficient vertical and horizontal cooperation in order to reach a truly integrated policy approach, there are several policy coordination instruments in place. The Development Planning System Law (2008) sets the hierarchical planning structure by defining planning document types, their hierarchy and mutual relations, and by determining the organisation, coordination and management of the planning system. The Regional Development Law (2002) defines the institutional competences, coordination mechanisms, regional policy targets, financial resources for regional policy and the funds assignment procedure. The five Planning Regions coordinate support instruments and the collaboration between the local and the national levels.

Since 2011, the Cross-Sectoral Coordination Centre has operated under the Cabinet of Ministers. It creates the most important long- and medium-term development planning documents and provides sectoral conformity with the hierarchically highest planning documents. The Network of Development Centres, comprising the 30 largest cities, is the main backbone of Latvia's polycentric settlement structure. Knowledge exchange is promoted further via methodological guidance for the elaboration of regional and local development programmes and for the promotion of horizontal and vertical coordination and cooperation, capacity-building seminars, and networking events open to all stakeholders.

Local authorities are the main beneficiaries of national territorial support measures. Integrated local development programmes are preconditions to attracting financial support. Nevertheless, EU funding represents the main source of funding for the implementation of regional policy. The Urban Development Centres have attracted significant EU funding in the 2007-2013 and 2014-2020 periods. In the current 2014-2020 programming cycle, the nine largest cities in Latvia apply the Integrated Territorial Investment instrument.

The Regional Development Coordination Council coordinates EU-financed territorial investments at project level. The Council includes representatives from ministries, Planning Regions, local governments, and employers' and employees' organisations. Local Action Groups established by local communities, NGOs, entrepreneurs and local inhabitants foster the development of rural regions and small towns, applying the EU's *LEADER (Liaison Entre Actions de Développement de l'Économie Rurale)* approach.

The Land Management Law (2014) defines deprived areas in several ways: as areas with damaged or defective land surface, as abandoned construction and mining areas, or as abandoned or under-used areas of former economic and military activities having a negative impact on the surrounding areas, environment and the local population. Similarly, deprived areas are clarified in the implementation rules of the pertinent EU funds' measures. There is no specific national budget in place for deprived urban areas. Integrated approaches however form the basis for the attraction of investments at the regional or local level, which may include deprived neighbourhood development. There are several EU-funded measures available for local municipalities, transforming deprived areas into spaces attractive for entrepreneurs and based on an integrated approach.



## Lithuania

In Lithuania, urban development policy is a shared responsibility of national and local authorities. The broad directions with regard to spatial structures and the functioning of the urban network are established in the Comprehensive Plan of the Territory of the Republic of Lithuania (*Lietuvos Respublikos teritorijos bendrasis planas*), adopted in 2002. This plan is obligatory for national governmental institutions taking decisions on territorial use, management and protection. Furthermore, it provides planning conditions for special thematic (e.g. for transport, electricity, landscape) plans on national or local levels, and is the obligatory reference document for long-term programmes and sectoral development strategies. The Comprehensive Plan also informs economic development strategies and other strategic plans.

The Ministry of the Environment is the main state-level authority concerning urban development policy design, and it coordinates its implementation in pursuance of sustainable development, the provision of housing, and environment protection. Lithuania comprises 10 statistical regions and 60 municipalities. In 2010, an administrative reform abolished the regional level administration. Local self-government through municipalities is stipulated by the Constitution, which provides for independent state and municipal budgets and the right for municipalities to establish local levies. Municipal authorities are responsible for territorial planning and the development of their territory. They implement national urban development policy and related laws within their jurisdiction.

The most recent version of the Law on Territorial Planning stems from 2014. It is designed to improve the requirements and conditions for territorial planning, especially at the local level, and to accelerate implementation. The law stipulates that a programme for implementation shall follow the approval of the Comprehensive Plan. The National Environmental Protection Strategy of 2015 (*Nacionalinė aplinkos apsaugos strategija*) defines priority areas of environmental protection policy and long-term objectives, also concerning the urban environment. The key directions for their implementation are:

- Promotion of sustainable planning of cities and peri-urban territories;
- Promotion of development and implementation of sustainable urban transport development plans;
- Development and use of research, innovation and solutions on urban issues.

As regards coordination between levels of government, the Ministry of the Environment is the main responsible authority. The different administrative units coordinate their activities based on their assigned competences.

The Architects' Association of Lithuania promotes the high quality of the built environment, raises public awareness of urban development issues, and supports cooperation between different actors such as the state, cities, professionals and civil society. Other professional organisations like the Lithuanian Association of Civil Engineers and the Lithuanian Real Estate Development Association participate in the planning and implementation of various programmes and strategies related to their respective fields in cooperation with governmental bodies, research institutions and non-governmental organisations. Legal and natural persons have the right to participate in the territorial planning process and to access planning documents. Since 2014, territorial planning documents have been accessible to the wider public via the Digital Supervisory Information System Processing Territorial Planning Documents (*Teritorijų Planavimo Dokumentų Rengimo ir teritorijų planavimo proceso valstybinės priežiūros Informacinė Sistema, TPDRIS*). Issues of Lithuanian regional and urban policy are also publicly discussed in the Lithuanian Urban Forum, an annual event held since 2007.

The 2007-2013 European Regional Development Fund and Cohesion Fund programme for Lithuania covered, among other things, local and urban development. Also, Lithuania participates in the Interreg, ESPON and URBACT programmes. In the current programming period, Regional Development Councils are responsible for project selection and approval. They consist of mayors, delegated members of municipal councils and a representative appointed by the government. Their involvement ensures municipal partnership in implementing joint actions. At the regional level, integrated investments foster job creation, territorial regeneration and the attractiveness of the living and investment environment. Integrated Territorial Development Programmes define measures for the targeted areas. The Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas (JESSICA) instrument contributed to investments in the renovation of multistorey houses from 2007 to 2015 in all 60 Lithuanian municipalities.

The Lithuanian approach to deprived neighbourhoods is connected to the EU structural funds programming periods. So-called Target Territories (TT)



are selected by the national government together with representatives from other government levels for regeneration activities. Among those TT, areas displaying high unemployment and a large share of welfare recipients are called problematic territories (*probleminé teritorija*). The guiding principle of programmes is to prevent area deprivation and reduce socio-economic disparities. Measures for TT encompass investments in urban

infrastructure development, social housing and the renovation of public spaces. In the 2014-2020 period, measures target 23 TT in five major cities. In order to access support for TT, investments need to be concentrated within a specific territory, they need to solve the essential problem of the locality, and they need to be integrated with other territorial investments.

## Luxembourg

As no integrated programme has been applied at the national level up to the present, Luxembourg predominantly has local approaches to integrated urban development. The current governance structure on urban policy is based on the concept of multilevel governance in a unitary state. While, at national level, the Department of Spatial Planning and Development within the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructure defines and implements urban policy, there is considerable consultation with the local level – either directly with municipalities and so-called convention areas, or indirectly via the Association of Luxembourgish Cities and Municipalities (*Syndicat des Villes et Communes Luxembourgeoises*). Other authorities that are involved at the national level are the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Housing, the Ministry of the Economy, the Department of Transport within the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructure, and the Department of Public Buildings and the Highways Agency.

The key instrument of national spatial planning, the National Programme of Spatial Development (*Programme Directeur d'Aménagement du Territoire, PDAT*), was adopted in 2003. PDAT is a policy framework that aims to coordinate sectoral programmes in order to achieve spatial planning objectives. It specifies 13 objectives that belong to three overall intervention areas: urban and rural development; transport and telecommunications; and environment and natural resources. Currently, four sectoral master plans with relevance for the local level are being developed. These sectoral plans create a link with other instruments and programmes, such as the Housing Pact.

The governance structure on urban policy consists of formal and informal elements that are defined by the Law of Spatial Planning of 2013 and by the PDAT. The Law of Spatial Planning introduced a series of tools and mechanisms and redefined certain roles of the Department of Spatial Planning and Development. Furthermore, the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructures has initiated several integrated urban planning processes, similar

to the ones proposed by the Leipzig Charter. Convention areas, based on Conventions for Territorial Development between the state and municipalities (*conventions de coopération territoriale Etat-communes*), were introduced in the early 2000s in order to address social, economic and environmental issues faced by urban areas. They bring together technical and political representatives of the national ministry, the cities and their adjacent municipalities.

There are several coordination mechanisms in place. The High Council of Spatial Planning and Development (*Conseil Supérieur de l'Aménagement du Territoire*) has a consultative function and brings together the national authorities with various stakeholders. There are also regular consultation sessions between the convention areas and the relevant authorities at the national level.

The National Information Cell for Urban Policy (*Cellule Nationale d'Information pour la Politique Urbaine, CIPU*), led by the Department of Spatial Planning and Development, is a tool that ensures the efficient development and implementation of national urban and territorial policies, coordinated with regional and local authorities. CIPU acts as a platform for exchanging experiences in urban development to influence the future design of urban policies. The first convention establishing CIPU was signed in 2007 by three of the country's main cities and the Departments of Spatial Planning and Development, the Department of Transport within the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Infrastructure, as well as the ministries of Housing, the Economy and the Interior. A second convention restructuring CIPU was signed in 2016.

For legislative initiatives and major projects, the Department of Spatial Planning and Development consults important stakeholders, such as non-governmental organisations, the private sector, associations and interest groups on a case-by-case basis.

As to the financial aspect, Luxembourg does not have a national fund that is specifically dedicated to

urban development or urban policy in general. The Ministry of the Interior is the supervisory authority for the cities and municipalities. Municipalities receive a block grant out of the Municipal Fund of Financial Allocation per trimester that takes into account a set of criteria to determine the final allocation per municipality.

Concerning EU funding, urban development was not a main priority for the 2007-2013 Luxembourgish European Regional Development Fund programme, which focused on the promotion of economic activities and research and innovation. For the 2014-2020 period, however, one of the stated investment priorities is a low carbon economy with

a focus on urban areas and sustainable multimodal urban transport.

Luxembourg has not yet incorporated any particular national policy or programme focused on developing deprived urban neighbourhoods. At local level, however, the city of Luxembourg presents a series of integrated urban development approaches as part of the medium-term Integrative Urban Development Concept Luxembourg 2020 and the 24 suburban frameworks. These are based on local participation within seven main functional assets: housing, economy, traffic, green spaces, leisure and tourism as well as Luxembourg as an international, national, and regional centre (EUKN 2011a).

#### Additional references

EUKN – European Urban Knowledge Network, 2011a: Urban Development in Europe: A Survey of National Approaches to Urban Policy in 15 EU Member States. Available at: <http://www.eukn.eu/fileadmin/Lib/files/EUKN/2012/EUKN%20key%20publication%20urban%20development%20in%20Europe.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

## Macedonia

Macedonia, as one of the former Yugoslav republics with EU candidate state status, is in a process of economic and political transition. The complicated political situation, finding its expression in civic protests in 2015 and 2016, followed by months of a provisional government, is impeding this process. The developments in national urban policy need to be assessed within the larger context of state decentralisation and empowerment of the local level of government. Macedonia does not have a dedicated national urban development policy, but has created institutions fostering an incremental decentralisation process.

This process has been going on for almost two decades. It started with Macedonia's signing of European Charter of Local Self-Government in 1997 and gained momentum with the first Public Administration Reform Strategy in 1999 and its follow-up strategies, the latest covering the 2010-2015 period (Sejdini 2016). Among others, the agreements with the EU in the wake of the accession negotiations following Macedonia's candidate status obtained in 2005 have promoted competence allocation to the local level (idem). Institutionally, the process has been reflected in the establishment of a dedicated Ministry of Local Self-Government in 1999, and a Law on Local Self-Government in 2002. The degree of decentralisation has increased in pace since 2005, with the putting into effect of a more comprehensive legal framework. Competences were transferred from central to local government, such as urban planning, environment protection, local economic development, culture, social protection, education, and health care, backed up

by a stronger financial base for municipalities (Sejdini 2016). In the realm of urban planning, municipalities inter alia adopt urban plans and issue building permits (Ministry of Local Self-Government 2014).

Currently, the Ministry of Local Self-Government is the main body responsible for urban policy and planning at the national level. The 84 Macedonian municipalities enjoy equal status despite considerable variation in size and capacities. The Association of the Units of the Local Self-Government, which is also a member of the European umbrella organisation, the Council of European Municipalities and Regions, has been representing municipalities since 1972. Inter-municipal cooperation has been fostered by means of a specific law, enacted in 2009. The cooperation is facilitated and implemented via institutions such as joint working bodies and committees, joint administrative bodies or joint public enterprises (Ministry of Local Self-Government 2016). Financial support is provided by the central government to areas of outstanding importance and based on administrative and financial capacities and the expected benefits of cooperation (idem). Given the lack of resources of some, mostly smaller, municipalities, inter-municipal cooperation is considered of specific importance to ensure service delivery and critical resources for core tasks such as strategic planning. The Inclusive Development Networks established in the Vardar, North-eastern and Pelagonija planning regions are one of the results of this process (idem).

Some of the biggest urban challenges in Macedonia are connected to the persistently high levels of poverty and unemployment (World Bank et al. 2014). Related to this are the unsatisfactory housing conditions, emerging from a predominantly privately-owned housing stock which is unaffordable for large parts of the population and often in poor condition (Bouzarovski/Salukvadze/Gentileits 2011). The National Strategy for Reduction of Poverty and Social Exclusion for the period 2010-2020 covers 14 areas, from employment to education, housing and gender equality, and has identified measures for reaching the objectives.

International organisations play an important role in the general socio-economic development process, with the biggest share of funding coming from the EU's Pre-Accession Assistance (World Bank et al. 2014). Macedonia also takes part in the Regional Cooperation Council's South East Europe 2020 Strategy from 2013, which aims to couple the growth strategy of the EU, Europe 2020, with that of South-Eastern Europe (Regional Cooperation Council 2013). The strategy addresses urban areas and topics with regard to sustainable transport and concerning the application of the subsidiarity principle.

## References

- Bouzarovski, Stephan; Salukvadze, Joseph; Gentileits, Michael, 2011: A Socially Resilient Urban Transition? The Contested Landscapes of Apartment Building Extensions in Two Post-communist Cities. *Urban Studies*, 48(13), p. 2689–2714.
- Ministry of Local Self-Government, 2014: Citizens & the Municipality. Available at: <http://mls.gov.mk/en/publications/local-self-government/210-citizens-and-the-municipality>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Ministry of Local Self-Government, 2016: Inter-Municipal Cooperation in the Republic of Macedonia. From Norms to Practice. Available at: <http://mls.gov.mk/en/publications/local-self-government/774-inter-municipal-cooperation-in-the-republic-of-macedonia-from-norms-to-practice>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Regional Cooperation Council, 2013: South East Europe 2020 strategy. Available at: <http://www.rcc.int/pubs/20/south-east-europe-2020-strategy>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Sejdini, Mirjana K., 2016: An Overview of the Reformed Local Government in Macedonia. *Macrothink Institute Business and Economic Research*, 6(1), p. 440–463.
- World Bank – International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; IFC – International Finance Corporation; MIGA – Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, 2014: Country Partnership Strategy for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for the Period of FY2015 – FY2018. Available at: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/870671468053680320/pdf/895560CPS0P147020Box-385310B000U0090.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

## Malta

Currently, Malta is experiencing complex urban challenges relating to housing, transport, employment and vulnerabilities specific to its peripheral location. The archipelago's small size, high population density and its high degree of urbanisation further add to these challenges.

Urban development policy in Malta is mainly the responsibility of the Planning Authority, which is the national planning entity within the Office of the Prime Minister. Legally, the planning system is guided by the Development Planning Act of 2016. This Act replaced the Environment and Development Planning Act of 2010 which had previously merged the environment and planning portfolios into the Malta Environment and Planning Authority. The 2016 Act separated them again, yielding the Planning Authority and the Environment Resources Authority.

The highest level spatial planning document for the Islands is the Strategic Plan for Environment and Development (SPED), adopted in 2015, which es-

tablishes the regulatory governance structure for urban development policy. It serves as a national urban planning strategy for the development of urban and rural areas, the coastal zone and the marine area. It also regulates sustainable land and sea resource management. The plan intends to guide urban development in an integrated fashion, also by setting out the division of roles between all relevant entities concerning policy implementation.

The SPED requires horizontal and vertical consultations between the main government bodies responsible for urban matters, housing, transport and communications, industrial and commercial affairs, health, environment, and agriculture and fisheries. These consultations are held within the framework of the Development Planning Act, which places the decision-making process under a hierarchical structure with the minister responsible for planning and the Parliament's Standing Committee on the Environment and Development Planning at the highest level. The Standing Committee scrutinises all urban and territorial plans and policies,

and coordinates both policy development and implementation.

Simultaneously, the Planning Authority's Executive Council coordinates the consultation with other governmental bodies, such as the 68 Local Councils for Malta and Gozo. These Local Councils represent local residents, and are consulted on development proposals concerning them directly. The Executive Council also involves other stakeholders like non-governmental organisations (NGOs), special interest groups, entrepreneurs and developers, and the general public. The Chamber of Architects and Civil Engineers, and the Malta Chamber of Planners are statutory consultees. Other professional associations like Malta Enterprise, the Malta Developers Association and NGOs such as the National Trust of Malta (*Din l-Art Helwa*) and the Malta Heritage Trust (*Fondazzjoni Wirt Artna*) have a more specialised role in consultations. The Planning Authority's principal medium for information dissemination and participation is its website.

The Inter-Ministerial Coordination Committee (IMCC) provides a framework for coordination between the European Structural and Investment Funds and other EU and national funding instruments. The IMCC includes representatives from managing authorities, intermediate bodies, national contact points for European Territorial Cooperation programmes, authorities responsible for the migration and asylum programmes, and others. Its purpose is to maximise resources whilst reducing the risk of overlap and duplication.

One priority axis of Malta's 2014-2020 European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and Cohesion Fund operational programme aims to create an integrated approach to urban development addressing specific needs of communities in identified urban areas. The thematic objectives in this axis cover the conservation and development of natural and cul-

tural heritage, and support for physical, economic and social regeneration of deprived communities in urban and rural areas. The Ministry for European Affairs is to develop an implementation strategy for these actions. During the 2007-2013 period, 7.6 million euros from the ERDF and the Cohesion Fund went to an integrated regeneration project targeting the mobility, social and housing challenges of the Cottonera area which included the three cities Birgu, Senglea and Cospicua.

The European Social Fund programme for the 2014-2020 period addresses the specific needs of geographical areas most affected by poverty, and of people at highest risk of discrimination or social exclusion. The Food and/or Basic Material Assistance operational programme 2014-2020 funded by the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived provides the most deprived households with periodic food distribution. In this regard, the ERDF operational programme identifies the harbour area of Malta as the urban area where integrated actions for sustainable development are most needed. This area exhibits the highest proportion of people at risk of poverty, unemployment, truancy, crime and vandalism.

The interdepartmental National Strategic Policy for Poverty Reduction & for Social Inclusion Malta 2014-2024 addresses the multi-dimensional aspects of poverty and social exclusion, and provides an integrated approach to achieving national social priorities. This policy also had repercussions for the 2014 budget, which bolstered the resources for several ministries to finance measures concerning social exclusion, pension reform, and health and long-term care. In the logic of the policy, deprived neighbourhoods are specific urban areas where the percentage of people in poverty is higher than in the rest of the country. In support of the social inclusion policy, one of the SPED's thematic objectives addresses the spatial dimensions of deprivation.

## Montenegro

The urban policy governance structure in Montenegro includes the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism at the national level, and secretariats for urbanism within the 23 municipalities. A regional administrative level does not exist. The Directorates for Spatial Planning and for Construction within the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism perform tasks under the responsibility of the Law on Spatial Development and Construction. The Directorate for Spatial Planning is responsible for the development, monitoring and implementation of all national planning documents, but also for approving local planning documents.

The national Parliament decides on the Spatial Plan of Montenegro (last version from 2008) and on Spatial Plans for Special Purposes like national parks or coastal zones, while the Government adopts more technical land-use plans. The local parliaments decide on local planning documents, with the prior approval of the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism. National-level documents are considered to be of a higher order. The inter-sectoral hierarchy demands compliance between spatial development and other policies.

In planning procedures, communication between all stakeholders (ministries, municipalities, institutions, interested public) generally follows formal written procedures with strict deadlines, and this applies also to public consultations. Experts in the field of spatial planning, geology, engineering and architecture contributed to the drafting of the Spatial Plan of Montenegro, the country's central urban development policy document. This document sets out the key factors defining land-use and organisation (natural conditions, population, settlements, economic development, social and technical infrastructure, environmental and cultural heritage). It further suggests spatial development concepts that address all these challenges, together with guidelines for implementation. The Annual Reports of Spatial Development, prepared by the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism and adopted by the Government, analyse the implementation process on an annual basis. Some key EU documents addressing socio-economic, environmental and territorial development, like the Leipzig Charter, have been of particular importance for the development of the Spatial Plan of Montenegro.

Two national strategies, namely the National Strategy for Sustainable Development (NSSD) until 2030 (adopted in 2016, building on an earlier strategy of 2007) and the National Strategy for Integrated Coastal Zone Management (adopted in 2015), have an enduring impact on spatial planning. The NSSD defines the strategic goals and measures for long-term sustainable development and for the transposition of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. The Coastal Zone Management Strategy, aligned with the Coastal Area Spatial Plan, establishes land-use guidelines directing construction to the least vulnerable areas. It also suggests key implementation criteria and a coordination mechanism to improve the convergence of sectoral management with coastal zone development. The main institution in charge of NSSD evaluation and review is the Division for Sustainable Development and Integrated Coastal Zone Management within the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism.

The National Council for Sustainable Development, established in 2002, serves as a cross-sectoral advisory body. It is chaired by the President of Mon-

tenegro and composed of different societal stakeholders. After a number of reforms introducing a broadening of its mandate and working methods, the revised Council (renamed the National Council for Sustainable Development, Climate Change and Integrated Coastal Zone Management) has been focusing more on resource efficiency, climate change and integrated coastal zone management. It deliberates on the NSSD implementation reports and gives recommendations before government adoption.

The transition process to a market economy has been going hand-in-hand with the expansion of urban areas and of informal settlements in particular. Such informal structures have become a synonym for deprived neighbourhoods in Montenegro. A regularisation strategy dating from 2010 points to around 100,000 illegally constructed buildings, the bulk of which are concentrated in Podgorica and along the Adriatic coast. Many of these settlements have limited or no access to basic infrastructures and public services like water, sewage, roads, solid waste management, or electricity. The magnitude of this problem has prompted the search for a national solution. In 2016, a Law on the Regularisation of Informal Structures was adopted, inspired by a United Nations Development Programme pilot project in 2012. It proposes a two-step process for regularisation, dealing with ownership issues and subsequently with improving the quality of life in informal settlements by investing in infrastructure (using annual fees for the use of temporary informal buildings, residential land charges for informal structures, and legalisation fees) and by retrofitting existing buildings.

The main contemporary governance challenge is to further improve the legal framework and to introduce consistent fiscal and financial measures for legalisation and enforcement. In addition, the adoption of participatory planning approaches, feasibility studies, fiscal and environmental impact assessments, results-monitoring and evaluation, and a focus on capacity building programmes for officials are considered important elements for stabilising the governance architecture in terms of urban development.

## The Netherlands

The Netherlands has a long tradition of applying integrated approaches to urban development. In the past, the main national policy approach was composed of the Metropolitan Policy (*Grotestedenbeleid*, 1994-2009) and the 40 Strong Communities Plan (*Actieplan Krachtwijken*, 2007-2011). There is

a growing consciousness of the need to address increasingly complicated urban challenges via integrated and flexible approaches. Experience with national urban policy in the Netherlands in the last twenty years has shown that one of the main challenges in the cooperation between national and



local authorities is coming to a mutual understanding concerning the definition and handling of the challenges in cities.

Since 2014, a new national Urban Agenda (*Agenda Stad*) has been in place which aims to foster innovation, quality of life, and economic growth in Dutch urban regions. The national government and the EU provide legal instruments, funding and governance structures, while specific thematic *City Deals* facilitate innovative solutions at city level. City Deals are partnerships between cities and national ministries, also including business and civil society actors, citizens and knowledge institutions. In these City Deals cities, ministries and other relevant stakeholders work together on strategic experiments and living labs, which, can be upscaled and lead to a change in the institutional context. The Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations is the responsible organisational entity for the Urban Agenda and coordinates these City Deals.

The Ministry of Environment and Infrastructure is responsible for the national infrastructural and spatial development vision (*structuurvisie*) and the multi-annual programme for infrastructure, spatial development and transport, which impacts urban areas as well. There is also a national policy dealing with population decline in both rural and urban regions, coordinated by the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations and carried out in cooperation with local provincial authorities.

The City Deals aim to bring together different sectors at different levels of government in order to address specific local-level challenges. However, local authorities are the most important partners in the City Deals, including various stakeholders and depending on the nature and theme of the City Deal. Local authorities play a less direct role in the national infrastructural and spatial development vision and in the multi-annual programme for infrastructure, spatial development and transport. Predominantly regional authorities (provinces and metropolitan authorities) are involved in these two more territorially-oriented policies, while private actors and civil society are also consulted.

A national programme focusing on Rotterdam South was set up in 2011 to tackle this specific area's issues around housing quality, employment and education, and safety via an integrated approach. Local authorities, civil society actors, employers, the educational sector and knowledge institutions, and housing companies have shared responsibilities and the national government is the facilitator where necessary.

The EU offers a number of programmes and networks that are used in Dutch national urban policy. For instance, the participating actors of the City Deals can be engaged in the URBACT network where applicable. Also, through the City Deals, the national urban agenda addresses a majority of the key themes mentioned in the Urban Agenda for the EU. Where necessary, links between City Deals and the thematic Partnerships of the Urban Agenda for the EU are actively sought.

There is no special share of the national budget earmarked for urban development or deprived areas, but several sectoral funds are used to that end. Recently, decentralisation of responsibilities and budgets in the social domain has impacted on the way urban policy is financed and organised. Municipalities have been given more responsibilities in terms of policy implementation, while some national programmes have ended. Hence, there is no longer a specified extra national budget for urban renewal. The relationship between cities and national ministries has become less hierarchical due to decentralisation, and development and implementation of policies have grown closer together. The Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations coordinates the decentralisation programmes of the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport, the Ministry of Security and Justice and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.

The Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas (JESSICA) initiative, establishing revolving funds for investment in urban development, financed 30 projects during the 2007-2013 programming period by means of 3 funds. Follow-up funds are planned for the 2014-2020 period. The City Deals can make use of EU structural funds (including the Urban Innovative Actions) to finance projects. Furthermore, the Rotterdam South national programme employs the Integrated Territorial Investment instrument.

The Ministry of Economic Affairs coordinates the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) programmes, and the Ministry of Social Affairs is responsible for the European Social Fund programme. Four regional management authorities oversee the implementation process of the regional ERDF operational programmes. The monitoring committees consist of representatives of the competent urban, municipal and other authorities, economic and social partners, and, where appropriate, civil society representatives like environmental partners, non-governmental organisations and authorities dealing with social inclusion, gender equality, and non-discrimination.

The definition of a deprived neighbourhood is left to the respective cities. A national monitoring tool called *leefbarometer* measures the quality of life down to the district level based on a set of 100 indicators. Since the termination of the 40 Strong Communities Plan, there has no longer been any specif-

ic national policy on deprived neighbourhoods in the Netherlands. An exception is the programme focusing on Rotterdam South, which is the only national programme dealing with deprived neighbourhoods in the Netherlands.

## Norway

There is great awareness of the challenges relating to rapid and wide-spread urbanisation in Norway, which are especially relevant for the largest urban areas. Norwegian urban development policy is based on these challenges – rapid population growth, shortage of housing in the fastest-growing cities, pressure on land-use, traffic congestion and pollution, and the effects of climate change – and on their impact on urban areas. This policy contributes to the implementation of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal number eleven called “Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable”.

Embedded in a relatively decentralised state structure, all three-government levels – national, regional and local – execute urban development policy. The Planning and Building Act (2008) is the main tool for the implementation of urban development policy. Due to a holistic approach to urban policy, all ministries are responsible for it, but the executive authority lies with the Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation. This Ministry is responsible, in addition to the Planning and Building Act, for the Local Government Act, housing policy, and local administration.

At the national level, all ministries cooperate in the making of the government’s National Expectations on Regional and Local Planning (last version from 2015). Every four years, these expectations review national policies in general, and transport, infrastructure and urban development in particular. All ministries also cooperated in preparing the National Guidelines on Housing, Land-Use and Transport Planning (of 2014). These guidelines demand sustainable planning of dwellings, land-use and transport on all three government levels. In addition, the government provides white papers, also on planning issues, as well as resolution of conflicts.

At the regional level, County Councils take care of regional policy and respective strategies. They address key issues like urban sprawl and public transport. At the local level, the Municipal Councils carry out local urban development policy. Municipalities establish their own master plans and land-use plans, and are in charge of social and physical infrastructure. Private investors and construction

companies play an important role in urban development and the implementation of urban policy. All private land-use plans must be politically approved by the municipal authorities before they can be implemented. Generally, planning processes are based on wide participation, with a focus on the local population. According to the Planning and Building Act, any actor that establishes a land-use plan must ensure active participation.

There are two national city-focused programmes. The Planning for the Biggest Cities Programme (2013-2017) aims to make smarter use of the Planning and Building Act in the cities of Oslo, Bergen, Stavanger and Trondheim. Second, the Development Programme for City Regions (2013-2018) is intended to foster inter-municipal cooperation for positive demographic and business development. In addition, the government makes annual economic transfers to municipalities according to the age structure of their populations to contribute to their expenses relating to kindergartens, schools, health care and general care for the elderly. The government also provides annual so-called large city grants to the four largest cities. A transfer relating to rapid urbanisation is the so-called growth grant. From 2015, the government made the grants available to more municipalities by reducing the threshold from 1.7 to 1.6 per cent in population growth over the past three years. For 2017, the total transfer for large city grants and the growth grant amount to almost 900 million Norwegian kroner (approx. 127 million euros). In addition to this, the National State Housing Bank (*Husbanken*) provides financial assistance to local authorities for urban renewal activities.

Deprived neighbourhoods are not considered a major issue, as the renovation of existing deprived areas took place already in the 1990s. However, some areas in the larger cities are in need of integrated urban development actions addressing socio-economic challenges, such as low income, high unemployment, low health scores, school dropouts, and social segregation with ethnic and cultural aspects. Generally, local authorities take responsibility for integrated urban development actions, but for some areas there is an established cooperation between the national government

and municipalities. One of these integrated urban development programmes, the Grorud Valley Programme (*Groruddalssatsingen*), has been running in the capital Oslo since 2007. Four ministries and several of their directorates have been engaged, as well as several municipal sectors (such as for health, social, education, home services, kindergartens and maintenance). The programme has institutionalised fora for vertical and horizontal cooperation. A municipal office coordinates the programme

within the municipality of Oslo, and the Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation coordinates on the national level and between the state and the municipality. The evaluation found better health conditions, lower school dropout rates, better living conditions, and higher degrees of residents' identification with their neighbourhood in the four districts involved. Based on this success, the programme will continue for another ten years starting in 2017.

## Poland

Poland's national-level policy is increasingly focused on actions aimed at cities in all their variety. In 2015, Poland created a National Urban Policy 2023 (NUP; *Krajowa Polityka Miejska*). This policy sets out the government's urban policy-related activities within the context of the 2017 national Strategy for Responsible Development (*Strategia na Rzecz Odpowiedzialnego Rozwoju*), the National Strategy of Regional Development 2010-2020: regions, cities, rural areas (*Krajowa Strategia Rozwoju Regionalnego 2010-2020: region, miasta, obszary wiejskie*), and the National Spatial Development Concept 2030 (*Koncepcja Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju 2030*). The NUP is addressed directly to national ministries and other government institutions, and indirectly to regions, cities, citizens, non-governmental organisations and experts. It aims to strengthen urban areas' capacities for sustainable development, job creation and the provision of a high quality of life. Five objectives – the efficient, compact and sustainable, coherent, competitive, and the strong city – lead the policy. These objectives link with a variety of areas such as spatial management, public participation, urban mobility, energy efficiency, revitalisation, investment policy, economic development, climate adaptation, demography and urban governance.

The Ministry of Economic Development is mainly responsible for the national-level urban policy, and the minister competent for regional development mainly coordinates the NUP. Regional and local authorities play an important role in its implementation. Improving cooperation between local government units is one of the main aims of the NUP, including city-to-city cooperation and cities' integration within functional urban areas. On the regional level, the delivery of the NUP objectives hinges upon the voivodship governments which are responsible for regional development strategies and concomitant land-use plans.

The NUP explicitly mentions the Leipzig Charter as part of a framework establishing Poland's new approach to urban policy. One aspect of the inte-

grated approach to regional policy is the involvement of various levels of government, social partners and businesses. Besides informal channels, several institutionalised fora exist in Poland for the coordination of urban and regional policies. These include the National Territorial Forum (*Krajowe Forum Terytorialne*), the Joint Commission of Government and Local Government (*Komisja Wspólna Rządu i Samorządu Terytorialnego*), the Convention of Marshals (*Konwent Marszałków*), and bodies such as the Union of Polish Metropolises (*Unia Metropolii Polskich*) and the Association of Polish Cities (*Związek Miast Polskich*). The National Territorial Forum is composed of representatives of the government, local authorities and socio-economic partners. It analyses key processes affecting regional policy, assesses its implementation and gives recommendations. Territorial contracts are agreements between central and regional government defining development priorities. They form one of the most-used coordination instruments with regard to the implementation of major projects. The 16 contracts (one per region) are managed by central and regional authorities, but local authorities and beneficiaries take part in the implementation process. The preparations of the NUP coincided with the dynamic development of so-called urban movements (*ruchy miejskie*). Since 2011, these civil society groups have been promoting their ideas and visions on public space and urban living in Poland.

EU structural funds have contributed largely to Poland's territorial and urban development. In the 2007-2013 programming period, the Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas (JESSICA) initiative was implemented in five regions. Also, some 170 agreements with Urban Development Funds regarding municipal projects were signed in that period. In the current funding period, support for sustainable urban development implementing the European Regional Development Fund Regulation's Article 7 is provided entirely through Integrated Territorial Investment, with a total allocation of 3.8 billion euros, additionally supported under the national operational

programmes with around two billion euros. The European Structural and Investment Funds operational programmes also co-finance urban revitalisation activities within a framework provided by the Ministry for Economic Development. These guidelines emphasise the need for comprehensive preparation of revitalisation programmes (connecting social, economic, infrastructural and environmental dimensions) and coordinated actions aimed at degraded areas. Around 40 million euros have been allocated by the national government to support municipalities in programming revitalisation activities.

The Act on Revitalisation, adopted in 2015, is the first law devoted entirely to the regeneration of degraded areas – not entirely, but also in cities. It puts forward integrated solutions to organise regeneration processes, taking into account social, economic, spatial, and technical aspects in

delimited regeneration areas. The Revitalisation Act lists phenomena like unemployment, poverty, crime, educational problems, low social capital, poor local economic conditions, poor environmental quality, insufficient provision of technical and social infrastructure, and deficient public spaces as examples of challenges in deprived neighbourhoods. Local authorities are responsible for the selection of deprivation indicators and for the delimitation of intervention areas. The main delivery tool is the Revitalisation Programme, a multi-annual programme prepared by municipalities that sets out regeneration activities in the social, economic, spatial, functional, technical and environmental spheres. What persists is the need for comparable frameworks at the regional and national levels, consisting of regulations, financial support instruments and information and education mechanisms to consolidate revitalisation as part of the broader vision of the city.

## Portugal

Most coordination of long-term local and sectoral policies takes place at the regional level through five Regional Coordination and Development Commissions (*Comissões de Coordenação e Desenvolvimento Regional, CCDR*) and the two autonomous regions Madeira and Açores. The CCDR are national bodies that act as regional planning authorities. Municipal governments steer urban development at the local level on the basis of the respective Municipal Master Plan (*Plano Director Municipal, PDM*). All municipalities are required to have a PDM, which defines the land-use regime and provides the regulatory framework for public- and private-led development in the municipality's administrative area. The Minister of the Environment oversees national and regional spatial planning and urban policy agencies.

The PDM have been the corner stone of Portuguese spatial planning for many years, due to their land-use regulatory role, reinforced by absent or at least incomplete national and regional strategic development planning, and insufficient detailed urban planning. The reformed Spatial Planning and Urban Development Framework Policy Act of 2014 has further asserted this role, since it has determined the integration of all binding land-use regulations into the PDM.

In 2008, a new administrative layer consisting of two Metropolitan Areas and 21 Intermunicipal Communities came into being. A new legal framework was approved in 2013, including the decentralisation of some activities from central government to these institutions. A territorial administrative reform to be

implemented throughout 2016/2017 will introduce the indirect election of the CCDR executive bodies. It will also bring with it the decentralisation of key areas, such as transport, sea ports, health care, education, and civil protection to municipalities.

Some national urban development policies operate on a more ad hoc basis, mainly POLIS XXI (2007-2014), Sustainable Cities 2020 (*Cidades Sustentáveis 2020*, since 2015), and sectoral programmes. POLIS XXI was the national urban development policy, promoted by the Secretary of State for Territorial Planning and Cities. Today, Sustainable Cities 2020 serves as a national strategic framework for sustainable urban development. The framework includes principles for urban authorities and a roadmap for urban development opportunities supported by the EU structural funds.

During the past decade, urban development policy has operated under a continuous process of decentralisation. These reforms tried to result in a clearer division of roles between policy development and implementation. Nevertheless, coordination between different levels of government lacks an effective conflict management structure, and overlapping institutional arrangements may interfere with each other. The government-led territorial administration reform process, taking place throughout 2016 and 2017, aims to tackle some of these issues.

The National Land Commission (*Comissão Nacional do Território, CNT*) which was created in 2015 develops, coordinates, and implements national territorial policies. It brings together representatives of

national agencies, the Association of Portuguese Municipalities, the five CCDR and a non-governmental organisation (NGO). As regards horizontal territorial governance, the five CCDR are the main bodies responsible for intersectoral coordination.

Urban policy design, monitoring and assessment are strongly influenced by a small community of private consultants and academics. In addition, professional and scientific organisations and NGOs shape processes via monitoring or consulting committees, working groups or public inquiries. The real estate and construction industry and services have been central urban actors in the past four decades. A growing community of professional public, private and third-sector actors is directly involved in programme implementation.

Many Portuguese towns and cities have participated in partnerships for urban regeneration, Community-led Local Development (CLLD) projects or URBACT action plans. All in all, around nine per cent of the European Regional Development Fund's (ERDF) validated expenditure in the 2007-2013 programming period financed urban development projects. Also in the current period, the ERDF supports instruments for urban development in Portugal like urban partnerships, CLLD, Integrated Territorial Investment and Integrated Actions for Sustainable Urban Development (IASUD). All of them require

an integrated approach. Many of these instruments target one of the twelve Urban Agenda for the EU priority themes. In fact, EU structural funds are the main financing tools for deprived urban areas in Portugal by financing the Integrated Action Plans for Deprived Communities (*Planos de Ação Integrada para Comunidades Desfavorecidas*). The CCDR oversee the regional operational Programmes in their function as managing authorities.

Portugal has employed several different approaches to deprived neighbourhoods in recent years. The Critical Neighbourhoods (*Bairros Críticos*) term was the core concept in the *Iniciativa Bairros Críticos (IBC) 2005-2013*, and was used in the Urban Regeneration Partnerships 2007-2013 under POLIS XXI. The city of Lisbon has used the Priority Intervention Neighbourhoods and Areas (*Bairros e zonas de intervenção prioritária, BIP/ZIP*) concept since 2012. Both the IBC and the BIP/ZIP programmes share with the Leipzig Charter a focus on deprived urban areas and integrated approaches. For example, the neighbourhoods identified by the BIP/ZIP programme are mapped in the PDM for eligibility regarding municipal funding for bottom-up solutions. Parish councils and non-profit-making organisations can apply for funding and are evaluated on: public participation, sustainability, innovation, and pertinence and complementarity with regard to the identified problems.

## Romania

Romania has three established territorial administrative levels: the national, the county and the local level. All levels assume different roles and competences for urban development. The national level ensures the national legislative, policy and financial framework; the county level (via the County Council) sets up guidelines for spatial planning and urban development relating to county priorities; and the local level implements the respective policies, adapting them to the local specificities.

The Ministry of Regional Development, Public Administration and European Funds carries out tasks related to urban development at national level. The Law on Spatial and Urban Planning prescribes that the ministry develops the General Urban Planning Regulation. The national policy for urban development is implemented through these two documents. The Law on Spatial and Urban Planning has undergone some changes lately (last amendment in 2016) in order to be adapted to socio-economic needs, challenges and trends. The changes promote the implementation of urban regeneration projects and aim to make urban development more integrated and more participative. The government decision

for approval of General Urban Planning Regulation is in this period in process of modification.

The coordination of administrative levels is ensured by the national, zonal, county and local planning tools, established by the Law on Spatial and Urban Planning. These include: the Territorial Development Strategy of Romania and the National Spatial Plan (national level); Regional Zonal Spatial Plans and the Zonal Spatial Plans for inter-county, inter-municipal and peri-urban areas (zonal level); County Spatial Plans (county level); and General Urban Plans, Zonal Urban Plans, and Detailed Urban Plans (local level). Vertical and horizontal coordination between levels of government and public consultations takes place via obligatory consultations in the planning documents' approval processes.

The private housing sector has an important role in the implementation of housing policies since it owns 97 per cent of Romanian dwellings. A national priority is combating urban poverty. In this regard, measures within housing policy are considered to be extremely important, and aim to increase the accessibility of the housing market to disadvantaged



groups. Actors such as the National Agency for Housing (*Agentia Nationala de Locuinte*), the National Investment Company (*Compania Nationala de Investitii*), the Romanian Association of Municipalities (*Asociatia Municipiilor din Romania*) and the Association of Cities (*Asociatia Oraselor din Romania*) play a role by co-implementing urban investments and representing local entities.

The Ministry of Regional Development, Public Administration and European Funds coordinates national and European funding for urban development. The regional operational programme represents the main framework and implementation tool for urban development. The implementation of the programme lies with eight Regional Development Agencies. The Ministry of Regional Development, Public Administration and European Funds and the Regional Development Council (consisting of representatives of County Councils) jointly coordinate these agencies. The Regional Development Agencies support local authorities in developing and implementing the Integrated Urban Development Plans (IUDP).

Setting up the IUDP is obligatory under the European Regional Development Fund operational programmes. For the bigger cities, the IUDP are developed at the metropolitan level. The focus themes for the 2014-2020 period are metropolitan areas, energy efficiency, economic development and support of the private sector, urban regeneration in neighbourhoods with social programmes, and urban mobility. More than three billion euros are assigned to urban development and around 100 million euros for the priority axis on the regeneration of deprived urban areas in the current programme.

The Ministry of Regional Development, Public Administration and European Funds also targets support to towns smaller than 50,000 inhabitants in line with the provisions of the Riga Declaration. The objective is to strengthen their capacity to develop and implement integrated urban policy and to ensure conditions for sustainable spatial development. In order to achieve this goal, a project funded in recent years called Platform for Integrated and Sustainable Urban Development (*Platformă pentru dezvoltare urbană durabilă și integrată*) addressed three integrated components, namely: urban planning and development tools, training of local administration staff in cities of below 50,000 inhabitants, and pilot projects of integrated urban development policies in five pilot cities. The project has a budget of around one million euros and yielded i. a. the elaboration of integrated urban development policies in the cities of Brad, Caracal, Murfatlar, Rosiorii de Vede and Gherla. In preparation for the 2014-2020 financing period, several projects with technical support from the World Bank were implemented, aiming at increasing administrative capacity at the national level. They were related to the economic development of Romanian cities, combating informal housing, and prioritising investments.

Regarding the accessibility of neighbourhoods, in order to improve the urban structure and to avoid urban segregation, Romanian cities can develop urban mobility plans in line with the legal provisions and implement them via European funds. Two axes of the regional operational programme provide a budget of around two billion euros for this. These urban mobility plans are supposed to improve public transport and to facilitate the use of non-polluting forms of transport.

## Serbia

In Serbia, urban development policy is primarily the responsibility of local governments, while the national level provides a general framework. Nevertheless, the local level generally has very limited capacities despite delegated competences in some areas (EC 2014). As regionalisation has not yet been implemented, the regional level of government is asymmetric and incomplete. The existing statistical regions have been modelled on the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (*Nomenclature des Unités territoriales statistiques, NUTS*) classification.

In addition, urban development in Serbia is taking place against the backdrop of socio-economic and demographic challenges relating to the transition process after the disintegration of the Socialist Fed-

eral Republic of Yugoslavia and the isolation following the Yugoslav Wars in the 1990s. On top of negative natural population growth, high unemployment and large regional disparities, the repercussions of the recent financial and economic crisis have aggravated the situation. Especially challenging are the generally unsustainable public finances (EC 2014; World Bank Group 2015).

The Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure is the national-level responsible body for spatial planning and urban development, and the key legal basis is the Law on Planning and Construction of 2009, which was substantially amended in 2014. A distinct document on national urban policy is planned to be developed in cooperation with the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale*

*Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)* in 2017. Until then, the Spatial Plan for the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020 will remain the sole national framework on the matter and decision-makers will focus on the harmonisation of spatial and urban planning documents.

The current planning regime includes one national spatial plan, 9 regional spatial plans, 164 local spatial plans, and spatial plans for special purpose areas. The national spatial plan and the regional spatial plans are followed by five-year implementation programmes specifying priority projects, indicators and territorial information systems. Secretariats for Urban Planning at the levels of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina and the city of Belgrade are in charge of urban development for their constituencies. Local governments establish bodies for themselves depending on their status, size, needs and available human and financial resources. During the preparation of the national spatial plan, the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina and Belgrade were included through standard planning procedures such as data collection and public participation. In the absence of other regional governments, the state cooperates with regional development agencies, districts and local governments covered by the regional spatial plans.

EU programmes in which Serbia as a candidate country is eligible to participate are taken into account when preparing the strategic planning documents. These plans can serve as the basis for submitting EU-funded projects, but EU projects can also contribute to the realisation of different planning solutions. The programmes of most interest to Serbia are the Interreg VB Danube Transnational Programme, the Adriatic-Ionian Transnational Programme, as well as Interreg-IPA Cross-border Co-operation (CBC) Programmes. The EU Pre-Accession Assistance scheme (*Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance, IPA II*) represents a comprehensive regime promoting Serbia's development. The Serbian European Integration Office is in charge of the programming of the IPA II funding, while decentralised (financial) management is the

competence of the Department for Contracting and Financing of EU-funded Programmes in the Ministry of Finance, or can be entrusted to an international organisation. Regional and local authorities as well as non-governmental organisations are eligible for funding. The Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure provides co-financing for the development of urban plans and cooperates with donors, international organisations, state authorities and local governments in the preparation and implementation of projects and strategies taking effect in urban areas. One example is the elaboration of Integrated Urban Development Strategies for 13 cities and municipalities within the GIZ-financed "Strengthening of Local Land Management in Serbia" project.

Deprived neighbourhoods in Serbia are referred to as informal settlements or substandard settlements, the latter not meeting the most basic hygienic standards and often being inhabited by the Roma population. The Law on the Legalisation of Buildings of 2015 provides a tentative framework for regularisation. There is no specific policy or programme targeting deprived neighbourhoods. However, EU funds in particular require integrated approaches as prerogatives to access funds that aim at improving administrative and other capacities of Serbian institutions on its way towards EU integration. Such EU-funded projects have included strategies and measures promoting the improvement of living conditions in substandard settlements, e.g. within the "We are here together – European support for the inclusion of Roma" project (2013-2015; worth 4.8 million euros). The project, implementing the National Strategy for Social Housing from 2009, initiated regulatory urban plans for substandard Roma settlements, and supported the construction of urban infrastructure and social housing. Furthermore, it established a geographic information system for monitoring. A total of 9.5 million euros from the IPA II scheme in 2017 and 2018 is planned to be allocated to upgrading substandard Roma settlements.

#### Additional references

- EC – European Commission, 2014: Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA II): Indicative Strategy Paper for Serbia (2014-2020). Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key\\_documents/2014/20140919-csp-serbia.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2014/20140919-csp-serbia.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- World Bank Group, 2015: Republic of Serbia. Public Finance Review 2015: Toward a Sustainable and Efficient Fiscal Policy. Available at: <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/pubdocs/publicdoc/2015/11/776271446462342355/PFR-eng-web-final.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

## Slovenia

In Slovenia, urban development policy is an integral part of spatial development policy, which is predominantly implemented at the national and local

levels. The state prepares laws, policies and instruments providing the spatial development objectives and frameworks for planning at the regional and

local level. The Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning is responsible for organisational aspects of spatial planning. It is currently developing a new Spatial Development Strategy (*Strategija Prostorskega Razvoja Slovenije, SPRS*). Until completion of the new version, the 2004 version serves as the main spatial development document.

The National Housing Programme Resolution 2015-2025 (*Resolucija o nacionalnem stanovanjskem programu 2015-2025*) establishes an active housing policy committed to development goals in spatial and social planning, and housing market regulation. The policy defines four targets as prerequisites for an effective housing policy: a balanced supply of adequate housing, easier access to housing, quality and functional housing, and greater housing mobility of the population.

Slovenia's administrative structure does not include an institutionalised regional level, although the current legal framework allows for intermunicipal planning. Twelve regional agencies act as public bodies in the preparation of Regional Development Programmes, which are adopted by Regional Development Councils. Each of these councils consists of municipal representatives, economic actors, and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). The Regional Spatial Plan (as provided by the Spatial Planning Act adopted in 2007) is an implementation-oriented document covering mainly intermunicipal issues. Municipal Councils of the participating municipalities adopt Regional Spatial Plans. In practice, regional spatial planning has not been applied widely thus far. However, in 2014, regional development and spatial planning were integrated at regional level for the first time through the provision of spatial planning guidelines for all twelve regional development programmes.

Municipalities undertake spatial planning on their territories. Their principal task is to provide rational, mixed and sustainable land-use. In decision-making procedures, municipalities are responsible for involving all relevant parties. Their planning must not be contrary to national planning documents and Regional Spatial Plans. National bodies provide input during the drafting and adoption process of municipal strategies. The exact nature of the consultation in planning processes depends on the policy to be adopted. Generally, the creation of synergies between development and implementation is not yet fully effective. While municipalities draft and adopt their spatial planning documents, implementation often lies with private companies and investors who decisively shape urban development via construction and investment activities.

Coordination between different levels of government is currently carried out only in the context of the preparation of specific spatial planning documents on the state (National Spatial Plans) and local levels (Municipal Spatial Plans). An Agreement for the Development of the Regions pledges coordination between the national and regional/intermunicipal level. Coordination via the regional agencies and Regional Development Councils has not yet yielded the hoped-for success. An important NGO network for intermunicipal cooperation is *Mreža za prostor*.

The development of national urban and territorial policies is coordinated with EU programmes and networks, whereby state actors closely follow urban-related developments on the EU agenda. Urban development policy in Slovenia is heavily influenced by the EU structural fund objectives. During the 2014-2020 period, sustainable urban development will be implemented in eleven cities through the Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI) mechanism. ITI will combine investment priorities for urban renewal, sustainable mobility and energy efficiency. Since an integrated territorial development strategy is a prerequisite to access to EU funding, Sustainable Urban Strategies have been set up at city level which incorporate economic, environmental, demographic and societal challenges. Since 2014, the Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning has supported municipalities' preparation processes through a territorial dialogue.

The Housing Fund of the Republic of Slovenia is the central national institution for the funding and implementation of the National Housing Programme, and for the encouragement of housing construction, renovation and maintenance. Municipalities can establish their own housing funds.

The Spatial Planning Act defines brownfield sites as areas with significantly reduced levels of economic, social, cultural and ecological conditions where revitalisation measures are deemed necessary. In addition, the Spatial Development Strategy defines so-called degraded areas and degraded urban areas. An integrated approach of comprehensive renewal aims to revitalise such deprived areas. A set of spatial planning measures should improve the functional, technical, economic, social, cultural, and ecological conditions in these areas. Furthermore, these activities are also intended to improve the area's functionality, housing and spatial design. One of the most important challenges to comprehensive renewal is the lack of regional-level instruments and decision-makers. In 2016, the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Ljubljana developed a new methodology for revealing

deprived urban areas, using a set of measures for physical, functional, environmental and social degradation. As there is no national budget especially targeting deprived neighbourhoods, the earmarked

resources provided by EU structural funds are of major importance for making a significant change in this field.

## Slovakia

Local- and regional-level administration in the Slovak Republic works via a dual structure, comprised of a decentralised state administration, and autonomous regional and local self-governments. The administrative structure currently consists of 8 self-governing regions and 2,928 municipalities. The Act on Municipalities (of 1990, last amended in 2016) states that municipalities of any size have the same competences such as transport, public areas, nature and environmental protection, territorial planning, housing and culture. This vast tableau of tasks can be challenging to small towns with fewer capacities. Next to these competences, municipalities issue generally binding regulations that apply to their jurisdiction, manage funds, and ensure the functional operation of the territorial entity.

National-level ministries provide the legislative framework and fiscal policy affecting urban development possibilities. The Ministry of Transport and Construction is responsible for urban development policy, as laid down in the Act on the Organisation of Government Activity and on the Organisation of Central State Administration (of 2001, last amended in 2016). Spatial planning becomes effective via binding spatial plans at national, regional and local levels. These plans are complemented by regional and municipal socio-economic development programmes.

A dedicated urban development policy for the Slovak Republic is currently being prepared and will be approved by the government before the end of 2017. This policy aims to bridge different sectoral policies and promotes an integrated approach to urban development by combining people-based and physical interventions. It further aims to foster strategic decision-making based on correct data and permanent monitoring and assessment of interventions. Lastly, it is intended to contribute to the development of wider urban areas. The principles of this new policy have been discussed with stakeholders within a specialised working group, established in 2014, composed of regional and local authorities, ministries, researchers, entrepreneurs, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and the civil society. The common strategic goal is to foster productive cities providing a good quality of life.

The vertical tiers of government cooperate in regional and socio-economic planning in pursuance

of cohesion, sustainable development and job creation, as laid down in the Regional Development Support Act of 2008, last amended in 2014. Regional governments and municipalities are responsible for the elaboration and implementation of development plans. According to the latest amendments, development plans must be prepared in partnerships between public administration, business and the civic sector. In addition, several municipalities may draft joint socio-economic development plans. Nevertheless, integrated local and regional development programming is still nascent.

A newly introduced Development Fee (Act on Local Development Fee as amended in 2017) aims to help municipalities to finance new physical and social infrastructure. It applies to buildings permitted as of 1 November 2016, and can be established by a generally binding regulation of the municipality, which can make use of the fee for its budget. However, these extra costs create a financial and administrative burden increasing the overall costs for construction companies and for end-users. Municipalities can introduce or change the fee rate at the beginning of a calendar year.

The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development is responsible for the regional operational programmes and for the allocation of resources in accordance with Article 7 of the European Regional Development Fund Regulation. Cities need to develop integrated strategies within their wider urban areas covering safe and ecological transport, public services and regional quality of life, among other things. The Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas (JESSICA) instrument has been implemented within an existing financial institution, the State Housing Development Fund. This fund was used to improve the energy efficiency of the housing stock in cities. In the 2014-2020 period, this investment will continue via a similar financial instrument.

At the municipal or neighbourhood level, no sufficient statistical data exist to analyse specific area-related problems and their interrelatedness. However, there is a dedicated budget for so-called lagging or least-developed districts. The Law on Support to the Least-Developed Districts of 2016 allows the concentration of measures and funding in districts with a defined above-average region-

al unemployment rate. Currently 12 out of the 79 Slovakian districts are eligible. The law stipulates support to local initiatives and joint actions of towns and villages in the district, combined with measures at the county and central levels. Financial support is provided in accordance with district-specific Action Plans prepared by Regional Councils including local government, businesses, NGOs, schools and other relevant stakeholders. These councils select priorities, projects and measures. The Action Plans devote specific attention to marginalised Roma

communities. They are implemented for the period 2016-2020 and are funded from the national budget, European Structural and Investment Funds, budgets of local municipalities and from private sources. The main objective of all projects and measures adopted at either local, regional or national level is to reduce unemployment in lagging regions and to stimulate economic growth by supporting transport infrastructure, accessibility of the peripheral regions, labour mobility, education and training, and local entrepreneurs.

## Spain

All three levels of Spanish government – national, regional, and local – are involved in the design and implementation of urban policies and spatial planning. The Autonomous Communities (*Comunidades Autónomas*) are, inter alia, responsible for housing and spatial planning policies. In most regions, regional spatial plans are binding on municipal governments. The municipalities or town councils (*Ayuntamientos*) assume competences in planning matters by defining, implementing and managing Urban Master Plans, making municipalities the main actors in land-use planning.

The central state administration develops policies and sectoral plans in the fields of housing, transport, communications, energy and environment. However, according to a decision of the Constitutional Court, the central government has no authority to prepare a general national spatial plan. The Ministry of Public Works is responsible for housing, urban, infrastructure and transport policies and investment plans in these sectors at national level. Within this Ministry, the General Directorate of Architecture, Housing and Land sets up basic legislation in land and private property and technical regulations for buildings. It also defines the Housing and Rehabilitation National Investment Plan and manages the funding assigned in it to the Autonomous Communities for its territorial implementation.

Lately, there has been a profound shift in national urban policy. Since the start of the crisis involving the financial and construction sectors in 2008, the focus has moved from new urban developments to the regeneration of existing urban fabric. The result was a comprehensive plan of housing and urban issues, related to the National Reform Programme, an extensive legislative and investment framework effective from 2013 onwards. This comprehensive set of legislative and investment measures aims to reactivate the construction sector, to create jobs and to improve energy savings and efficiency in the building sector. The previous Land Act of 2008

and the new Urban Rehabilitation, Regeneration and Renewal Act approved in 2013 were merged into one text in 2015, and now constitute the main legislative framework for urban development at national level. In addition, the National Investment Housing Plan 2013-2016 aims to facilitate access to rental housing for people with scarce economic resources.

As regards inter-institutional cooperation, consultation procedures often involve compulsory public participation (e.g. for Urban Master Plans). For legislation addressing current issues, ad hoc working groups are formed that often include representatives of the National Federation of Cities and Provinces (*Federación Española de Municipios y Provincias*), the Autonomous Communities and various sectoral stakeholders. The new Urban Rehabilitation, Regeneration and Renewal Act gave a more active role (for example in management and implementation) to public-private partnerships in urban regeneration, trying to foster private investment.

The Urban Initiatives Network (*Red de Iniciativas Urbanas, RIU*) is one of the sectoral networks in the National Strategic Reference Framework/Partnership Agreement between the European Commission and Spain. The RIU secretariat is co-managed by the Ministry of Public Works and the Ministry of Finance and Public Administration.

The National Housing and Rehabilitation Investment Plan, which provides funding for physical interventions in urban regeneration, is funded by the Ministry of Public Works. The Ministry of Finance and Public Administration, through the General Directorate of Community Funds, is the government body responsible for assessing and coordinating the application of EU structural funds (European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and Cohesion Fund in particular).

Within the 2007-2013 programming period, ERDF resources amounting to 1.1 billion euros were chan-



nelled to various types of municipalities and to the Autonomous Communities. In the 2014-2020 period, the earmarked ERDF funding for integrated sustainable urban development led to the launch of an open call for Integrated and Sustainable Urban Development Strategies (*Estrategia de Desarrollo Urbano Sostenible e Integrado*). Applications were selected by means of a process coordinated by the Ministry of Finance and Public Administration and the Ministry of Public Works. The European Social Fund plays an important role in urban development, being used for measures fostering social cohesion and economic activity and employment, especially in the most vulnerable neighbourhoods exposed to urban poverty and exclusion.

In Spain, substantial importance is accorded to deprived urban neighbourhoods. There is an informal definition of vulnerable neighbourhoods as spatial urban units whose Basic Indicators of Urban Vulnerability are above the national average. Those indicators cover socio-demographic, socio-economic, housing and subjective perception vulnerability. The Urban Vulnerability Observatory (*Observatorio de la vulnerabilidad urbana*), developed by the Ministry of Public Works, provides maps and indices

of urban poverty and vulnerable neighbourhoods. It includes the GIS-based Atlas of Urban Vulnerability in Spain 2001-2011, the Urban Analysis of Vulnerable Neighbourhoods (for cities with more than 50,000 inhabitants), the Map of Roma Population and Housing Conditions, and the Urban Audit (for the 16 cities with more than 250,000 inhabitants).

Integrated and Sustainable Urban Development Strategies are obligatory for the receipt of ERDF funding. Also, the Preamble to the Urban Rehabilitation, Regeneration and Renewal Act explicitly mentions the principle of an integrated approach, as introduced by the Leipzig Charter and further developed by the Toledo Declaration.

The urban regeneration areas that apply for funding from the National Housing and Rehabilitation Investment Plan 2013-2016 have to present an Area Report including a comprehensive diagnosis of the social, economic and environmental situation of the area. This assessment needs to be justified on the basis of comparative indicators like the Atlas of Urban Vulnerability. Further, the Area Reports contain an Integrated Action Programme, endowed with a set of monitoring indicators.

## Sweden

Urban development policies are mostly related to the Ministry of the Environment and Energy, but other ministries also have responsibilities – such as the Ministry of Enterprise and Innovation for planning and building, and the Ministry of Culture for architecture. The National Board of Housing and Planning (*Boverket*) and the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (*Naturvårdsverket*) are concerned with urban development in their respective sectors.

The main competence for spatial planning and building is legislatively assigned to municipal and local authorities as Sweden does not have any multi-sector planning for land at the national level (Boverket 2017b). Nonetheless, the state identifies national objectives in relation to geographical areas (Boverket 2016). The Planning and Building Act points out that the county administrative boards have the responsibility to coordinate, control and secure national interests in planning processes. Municipalities provide a comprehensive planning plan that must mention how national interests relevant to sustainable development will be taken into account (Boverket 2017b). Regional-level planning, which involves at least two municipalities, is rather limited. It is implemented on a voluntary basis in all municipalities except in the Stockholm county, where it is mandatory (*idem*).

Participation processes within local communities depend largely on the respective municipality's agenda and ambition. However, with regard to land-use plan development participation is mainly regulated by law. Many non-governmental organisations are engaged in urban development, and private companies such as architecture and consultancy firms also participate. Apart from competence and role definitions within the legislation on spatial planning and building, the relations between these actors are mostly unregulated.

In 2014, the government launched a Platform for Sustainable Urban Development (*Plattform för hållbar stadsutveckling*), aimed at the creation of better coordination between five national authorities: the *Boverket*, the Swedish Energy Agency, the *Naturvårdsverket*, the Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth, and the Swedish Transport Administration. The platform intends to foster knowledge development, dissemination and exchange at the national level (Boverket 2017a) and to develop a long-term and holistic cross-sector approach to sustainable urban development (Boverket n.d.). The focus areas addressed by the platform are the human dimension in sustainable development, capacity building, cooperation, and a financing framework (Boverket n.d.). The platform builds on the experiences of the Delegation for Sus-

tainable Cities (*Delegationen för hållbara städer*), which was appointed by the government for the period 2008–2012. The Delegation provided financial support to 98 projects with total funds of 357 million Swedish kronor (approx. 37.5 million euros) (The Delegation for Sustainable Cities n.d.). The asserted need for collective and integrated engagement at the national level to stimulate sustainable urban development gave rise to the Platform for Sustainable Cities (idem). Another forum in which urban development is addressed nationally is the Innovation Partnership Programme (*Strategiska samverkansprogram*) that deals with smart cities.

The overall Swedish budget for urban development is difficult to estimate as there is no exact dividing line between urban development and other policy areas. Within the total annual budget for housing of around six billion Swedish kronor (approx. 635 million euros), around one sixth is targeted to promote renovation and energy-efficient solutions in deprived urban neighbourhoods. So-called Urban Environment Agreements (*Stadsmiljöavtal*) aim to facilitate investments in public transportation and cycling infrastructures. Those agreements, which

have been running since 2015 (Regeringskansliet 2015), benefit from a funding of 2.75 billion Swedish kronor (approx. 289 million euros) for the period 2015–2018 (Boverket 2017c).

A number of rather informal definitions of deprived neighbourhoods have been used in recent years, mainly to point out certain areas that the government has targeted via different initiatives. At the moment, no such initiatives exist. However, the two grant schemes concerning renovation and energy efficiency define deprived areas as neighbourhoods with socioeconomic challenges, meaning that more than 50 per cent of the households living in the area have poor purchasing power (combined with e.g. low voter turnout in the elections).

One of the main issues that Sweden tackles today regarding the implementation of effective sustainable urban development policies consists inter alia in the improvement of coordination between and within sectors of government levels, which Sweden has addressed with the creation of the Platform for Sustainable Cities (URBACT 2017).

#### Additional references

Boverket, 2016: Rikssintressen är nationellt betydelsefulla områden. Available at: <http://www.boverket.se/sv/samhallsplanering/sa-planeras-sverige/riksintressen-ar-betydelsefulla-omraden>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Boverket, 2017a: Cooperation for a better life in the cities. Available at:

<http://www.boverket.se/en/start-in-english/planning/platform-for-sustainable-cities>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Boverket, 2017b: How Sweden is planned. Available at: <http://www.boverket.se/en/start-in-english/planning/how-sweden-is-planned>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Boverket, 2017c: Stadsmiljöavtal 2.0. Available at: <http://www.boverket.se/sv/samhallsplanering/sa-planeras-sverige/nationella-mal-for-planering/miljomalsarbete/regeringsuppdrag-att-na-miljomalen/stadsmiljoavtal-2.0>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Boverket, n.d.: Four focus areas, Platform for Sustainable Cities. Available at:

<http://www.boverket.se/contentassets/b70dc5ef8b9f456fac54ad82fc135448/focus-areas.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Regeringskansliet, 2015: New urban environment agreements for Swedish cities. Available at:

<http://www.regeringen.se/debattartiklar/2015/10/nya-stadsmiljoavtal-lyfter-sveriges-stader>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

URBACT, 2017: URBACT in Sweden. Available at: <http://urbact.eu/sweden>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

## Switzerland

Swiss cantons and municipalities have considerable freedom in designing their urban development plans. The Spatial Planning Act however does oblige the cantons to have a structural plan (*Richtplan*) that functions as a steering instrument and is examined and approved by the Confederation. Furthermore, each municipality is required to have its own land-use plan. These plans are examined and approved at regional (cantonal) level.

The main national-level institutions responsible for urban development policy are the Federal

Office for Spatial Development (*Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung, ARE*) and the Federal Office for Housing (*Bundesamt für Wohnungswesen, BWO*). The ARE is responsible for the supervision of cantons' compliance with national spatial planning laws. The Spatial Planning Act sets guiding principles, while the cantons carry out the actual planning tasks.

The current version of the Swiss Agglomeration Policy is called the Federal Agglomeration Policy 2016+ (*Agglomerationspolitik des Bundes 2016+*). It

consolidates and further develops the 2001 version of the policy, which was temporary in nature, in order to address modern-day challenges in spatial development. The policy identifies the following priority themes: political management in functional spaces, the coordination of settlements and traffic, the sustainable development of cities and free space development, the strengthening of social cohesion, the strengthening of competitiveness, and the financing and compensation of specific burdens. To address these priorities, the Agglomeration Policy suggests a number of instruments and programmes to be employed in agglomerations, metropolitan regions and strategic subspaces.

Proposals for new urban development laws usually initiate a consultation process. At the national level, the federal offices conduct an internal consultation first, followed by an open consultation. In that respect, cantons, cities, associations or private persons can comment on proposals before they are submitted to parliament. New planning documents often involve public consultations as well, meaning that all stakeholders, including NGOs and civil society groups, can get involved. Generally, the transport sector and developers play an important role in Swiss urban development policy.

In addition to traditional administrative and judicial processes, Switzerland has institutionalised forms of direct democracy. For example, citizens can launch initiatives or referenda at the municipal level. Many municipalities have created advisory planning committees which represent executives and legislatures, political parties and other relevant associations. In many small municipalities decisions are taken by a citizens' assembly, instead of an elected local council.

The most important coordination mechanism for the Swiss Confederation, cantons, cities and municipalities is the Tripartite Agglomeration Conference, founded in 2001 by the Federal Council (*Bundesrat*), the Conference of Cantonal Governments (*Konferenz der Kantonsregierungen*), the Swiss Cities Association (*Schweizerischer Städteverband*), and the Association of Swiss Communes (*Schweizerischer Gemeindeverband*). In December 2016, it was decided to continue this cooperation involving rural areas within the framework of the Tripartite Conference.

As regards cooperation within EU networks and programmes, Switzerland participates in URBACT, Interreg programmes on cross-border, transnational and inter-regional cooperation, and ESPON within the framework of its regional policy, called the New Regional Policy. The Swiss Confederation supports projects within those programmes on the condition that the projects' goals align with the New Regional Policy.

The main national-level funding for urban development in Switzerland stems from the Agglomeration Programme (*Agglomerationsprogramm*), which encourages a coordinated and integrated approach to traffic, settlement and land planning. It is fed by a fund supplied by petrol taxes and highway tolls (Fischer 2014). Responsible bodies in agglomerations can apply for federal contributions to develop their traffic infrastructure.

In addition, the Funding Programme Sustainable Development (*Förderprogramm Nachhaltige Entwicklung*) supports projects that advance the implementation of the United Nations' Agenda 2030 for sustainable development at the local level. In 2016, the thematic focus was on sustainable nutrition (ARE n.d.a).

From 2007 to 2015, there was a social integration programme called *Projets urbains*, which aimed at the development of neighbourhoods located in 16 small and medium-sized municipalities. *Projets urbains* was led by five federal bodies: ARE, BWO, the State Secretariat for Migration, the Federal Service for Combating Racism and the Federal Commission for Migration Issues. By employing an interdisciplinary and participative approach, the programme aimed to increase the quality of life of residents in all participating neighbourhoods (ARE n.d.b). Moreover, the policy has resulted in a platform for exchanging experiences for the project partners and a national conference on social cohesion in urban areas (ARE 2016). The different project phases have been evaluated with largely positive results; an encompassing evaluation of the entire project is under way (idem). The Federal Office for Spatial Development has received a mandate from the national government to develop a new programme within the Agglomeration Policy 2016+, but the concrete design is as yet unknown (idem).

#### Additional references

ARE – Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung, n.d.a: Förderprogramm Nachhaltige Entwicklung 2016. Available at: <https://www.are.admin.ch/are/de/home/nachhaltige-entwicklung/programme-und-projekte/foerderprogramm-nachhaltige-entwicklung/2016.html>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

ARE – Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung, n.d.b: Projets urbains – Gesellschaftliche Integration in Wohngebieten. Available at: <https://www.bwo.admin.ch/bwo/de/home/wie-wir-wohnen/integration/projets-urbains.html>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

ARE – Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung, 2016: Infobrief Programm Projets urbains. Available at:

[https://www.are.admin.ch/dam/are/de/dokumente/agglomerationspolitik/dokumente/bericht/infobrief\\_programmprojetsurbains-juni2016.pdf.download.pdf/infobrief\\_programmprojetsurbainsjuni2016.pdf](https://www.are.admin.ch/dam/are/de/dokumente/agglomerationspolitik/dokumente/bericht/infobrief_programmprojetsurbains-juni2016.pdf.download.pdf/infobrief_programmprojetsurbainsjuni2016.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

Fischer, Susanne, 2014: Agglomerationsprogramm Schweiz: Integrierte Planung durch Balance zwischen Verkehr und Stadtentwicklung. IFHP Congress in Singapur. Available at: [http://www.ifhp.org/sites/default/files/field/files\\_news/Susanne%20Fischer\\_0.pdf](http://www.ifhp.org/sites/default/files/field/files_news/Susanne%20Fischer_0.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

## Turkey

The most pressing challenge for Turkish urban development policy today is the rapid urbanisation. This, for instance, leads to strains on the environment, housing, security, employment, education and mobility. Another great challenge for Turkey is the omnipresent threat of earthquakes. The Disaster and Emergency Management Administration (institutionalised in 2009) and the National Earthquake Strategy and Action Plan (adopted in 2011) are both part of the governance structure that manages natural disasters and their effects on the urban fabric.

The spatial planning system in Turkey spans four administrative levels: national, regional, provincial and municipal. In 2011, the Ministry for Environment and Urbanisation received the authority over large parts of the spatial planning system, including the definition of regeneration areas (Güzey 2016). In addition, the Ministry of Development and the Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communications have responsibility for urban development policies.

The Ministry for Environment and Urbanisation prepares the national and regional spatial strategy plans in cooperation with the Ministry of Development. The National Spatial Strategy Plan (*Ülke Mekansal Strateji Planı*) is currently being established. This plan aims to develop comprehensive national and regional spatial strategies, taking into account socio-economic and spatial dynamics on a national and international level.

Through regional-level Development Agencies, the Ministry of Development prepares national and regional development plans. Regional plans aim to reduce inter-regional disparities. Territorial plans, developed by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation and metropolitan municipalities, establish land-use decisions concerning settlements, housing, industry, agriculture, tourism, and transport. Among their objectives is the prevention of irregular urbanisation. Municipalities prepare their own master plans and implementation plans.

The National Integrated Urban Development Strategy and Action Plan (*Bütünleşik Kentsel Gelişme Stratejisi ve Eylem Planı, KENTGES*) provides a

national roadmap on urbanisation and planning that runs until 2023. An action programme sets out efforts necessary at the central and local levels along three thematic axes: restructuring the planning system, improving the quality of space and life in settlements, and strengthening economic and social structures in settlements. KENTGES came into being through consultation work that was carried out by the Urbanisation Council in 2009. The Council gathered 500 experts to discuss Turkey's urbanisation challenges.

In 2013, the amended Land Development Law placed high-quality living spaces, the preservation of natural, cultural and historical assets, and innovative planning higher on the political agenda. Most of the current high-quality living spaces are privatised flats in gated communities. Besides, urban transformation became a planning tool with the Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risks (2012) that aims to create safe living spaces especially in high-risk areas.

In Turkey, there are no administrative mechanisms in place to coordinate different levels of government. City Councils represent a voluntary governance mechanism, established with reference to the Agenda 21 (a non-binding action plan of the United Nations with regard to sustainable development). Within these councils, central and local authorities, professionals' chambers, and civil society actors gather to develop solutions for urban development. In addition, legal provisions, such as the Municipality Law (2005) and the Regulation for Voluntary Participation in Special Provincial Administration and Municipal Services (2005), regulate participation at the local level.

In recent decades, the position of local authorities on sustainable urbanisation has been strengthened. A series of changes has extended their regions of authority and increased their planning jurisdictions. Also, with an amendment brought in the Metropolitan Municipality Law in 2014, the shares taken from the central budget and the self-income generated locally were increased. The Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risks provides a national framework that gives financial support to house owners whose houses are in high-

risk zones (Turkish Ministry for Environment and Urbanisation 2014).

Currently, two laws provide definitions of deprived neighbourhoods in Turkey: the Law on Transformation of Areas under Disaster Risks and the Municipality Law. According to the Transformation Act, so-called risky areas are areas with insufficient public order and security provision, inadequate infrastructure and a high proportion of illegal housing. Turkey's Housing Development Agency TOKİ (*Toplu Konut İdaresi Başkanlığı*) plays an important

role in housing-related policies, which in large part become effective in *gecekondu bölgesi*, the Turkish expression for shantytowns. It is the Ministry for Environment and Urbanisation that directs TOKİ's activities, cooperating closely with (private) construction agencies. Against the backdrop of anticipated massive further urbanisation and subsequent housing needs, TOKİ's interventions entail resettlement, demolition, and reconstruction, often resulting in increasing property prices and subsequent displacement of former inhabitants in the renewal areas (Kuyucu/Ünsal 2010).

#### Additional references

Güzey, Özlem, 2016: The last round in restructuring the city: Urban regeneration becomes a state policy of disaster prevention in Turkey. *Cities*, 50(1), p. 40–53.

Kuyucu, Tuna; Ünsal, Özlem, 2010: 'Urban Transformation' as State-led Property Transfer: An Analysis of Two Cases of Urban Renewal in Istanbul. *Urban Studies*, 47(7), p. 1479–1499.

Turkish Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation, 2014: Turkey Habitat III National Report. Available at: <https://unhabitat.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Turkey-national-report.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

## United Kingdom

Urban areas face a number of pressing issues in the UK, no differently from other countries. One of these challenges lies in the large regional disparities between and within the UK nations that call for efforts to increase cities' economic and social development. In addition, UK voters' decision in June 2016 to leave the EU will have as yet unknown effects on various governance issues, urban policies included.

The UK's approach to urban development policy follows different patterns in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Each country has its own dedicated authorities for local and community matters. The political frameworks differ in various ways, but mostly in the degree of devolution of budgets and responsibilities. The UK Parliament passes laws relevant for urban development, such as the 2016 Cities and Local Government Devolution Act or the 2016 Neighbourhood Planning Act, but the powers they contain relate only to England.

There is a growing effort to bolster sub-national governance performance all over the UK. In England, devolution has not been as far-reaching as in the other parts of the country, with the city and metropolitan area of London being an exception (Harding/Nevin 2015). The Devolution Deals, established in the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act, currently cover twelve English Combined Authorities and represent tailored frameworks for assigning budgetary responsibilities to local levels so that they can decide how public money should be spent in their area (Local Government Association

2016). These Combined Authorities have recently emerged with the aim of integrating cities and their surrounding areas into metropolitan governance structures. As set out in the Devolution Deals, six Combined Authorities directly elect Metro Mayors in mid-2017. These mayors will be responsible for housing and planning, education, transport, and in some cases also health care (Centre for Cities 2016). After the 2015 General Election, 38 proposed Devolution Deals were put forward by cities, towns and counties across England.

Greater London operates its own Strategic Plan which sets out an integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the city's development over the next two decades (Greater London Authority 2016).

There are various stakeholders providing professional input to the policy debate, such as the Local Government Association (LGA) and the Welsh LGA, the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities, the Core Cities network, and the Centre for Cities. As part of a fairly recent development in England, residents can now get involved in local planning by co-creating Neighbourhood Plans once they have a Neighbourhood Forum formally designated by the local planning authority (Department for Communities and Local Government 2016).

Public-private partnerships are an important delivery mechanism for urban and local (economic) development policy in the UK. In 2011, 39 Local Enterprise Partnerships succeeded the nine Re-



gional Development Agencies. These business-led partnerships should spark “economic growth in inter-municipal territories that are argued to be ‘natural economic areas’” (Harding/ Nevin 2015: 16).

City Deals and Growth Deals add to the tool-kit of area-based initiatives by establishing the funding conditions for local development. City Deals for English cities started in 2011. They are “bespoke packages of funding and decision-making powers negotiated between central government and local authorities and/or Local Enterprise Partnerships and other local bodies” (Ward 2016: 3). The first wave, completed in 2012, covered the eight largest cities outside London; a further 20 medium-sized cities followed in the second wave, completed in 2014 (idem). In 2016, City Deals involving the devolved administrations and the UK Government were agreed in Wales and Scotland with more in the pipeline (idem). The Growth Deals have been extended to rural as well as urban areas through the Devolution Deal process.

Next to private funding, public schemes exist. Local authorities can receive loans from the UK Municipal Bonds Agency and from the European Investment Bank to finance local projects. Lastly, there are a vast number of thematic projects financed via different sources, such as dedicated programmes addressing poverty, or EU funding schemes that focus on urban development.

In the four countries, there are various programmes and approaches that aim to support local communities and particularly deprived neighbourhoods.

In England, deprived areas are addressed by a variety of policies and funding mechanisms. An Index

of Multiple Deprivation captures various aspects of deprivation in English towns' and cities' neighbourhoods (Department for Communities and Local Government 2015). The Troubled Families Programme is a targeted intervention for families experiencing multiple problems, such as crime, anti-social behaviour, mental health problems, domestic abuse and unemployment. It is operated at a local authority level on a payment-by-results model.

Scotland adopted the Community Empowerment Act in 2015, setting out a framework for community planning, public participation and community land-ownership. The Scottish approach to deprived neighbourhoods follows the Regeneration Strategy, defining regeneration as a holistic process. Hence, deprivation is to be tackled by a broad alliance of local and national actors (Scottish Government 2011).

In Wales, the Vibrant and Viable Places Programme (Welsh Government 2016) forms the framework for various anti-poverty policies, such as the Tackling Poverty Action Plan (Welsh Government 2012). The Communities First approach represents a governance arrangement based on local partnerships to help the most disadvantaged people in the most deprived areas.

The Northern Irish Urban Regeneration Community Development Framework (Department for Social Development 2013) sets out an integrated medium-term strategy aiming to tackle area-based deprivation, strengthen local competitiveness, and create cohesive communities. Dedicated Neighbourhood Renewal Partnerships have established local plans for the 36 most deprived areas (Department for Communities n.d.).

## References

- Centre for Cities, 2016: Everything you need to know about metro mayors: an FAQ. Available at: <http://www.centreforcities.org/publication/everything-need-know-metro-mayors/#whois>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Department for Communities, n.d.: Introduction to Neighbourhood Renewal. Available at: <https://www.communities-ni.gov.uk/articles/introduction-neighbourhood-renewal>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Department for Communities and Local Government, 2015: The English Indices of Deprivation 2015. Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/465791/English\\_Indices\\_of\\_Deprivation\\_2015\\_-\\_Statistical\\_Release.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/465791/English_Indices_of_Deprivation_2015_-_Statistical_Release.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Department for Communities and Local Government, 2016: Neighbourhood planning in a nutshell. Available at: <http://www.neighbourhoodplanning.org>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Department for Social Development, 2013: Urban Regeneration and Community Development Policy Framework. Available at: <https://www.communities-ni.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/dsd/urcd-policy-framework.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Greater London Authority, 2016: The London Plan. The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011. Available at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/current-london-plan/london-plan-overview-and-introduction>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Harding, Alan, Nevin, Brendan, 2015: Cities and public policy: a review paper. Available at: <http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/118170/>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Local Government Association, 2016: Devolution deals. Available at: <http://www.local.gov.uk/devolution-deals>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Scottish Government, 2011: Achieving a sustainable future: regeneration strategy. Available at: <https://beta.gov.scot/publications/achieving-sustainable-future-regeneration-strategy/pages/9>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Ward, Matthew, 2016: City Deals. House of Commons Library Briefing Paper No. 7158. Available at: <http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN07158/SN07158.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Welsh Government, 2012: Tackling Poverty Action Plan 2012-2016. Available at: <http://gov.wales/topics/people-and-communities/tackling-poverty/taking-forward-tackling-poverty-action-plan/?lang=en>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Welsh Government, 2016: Vibrant and Viable Places. Available at: <http://gov.wales/topics/housing-and-regeneration/regeneration/vibrant-and-viable-places/?lang=en>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

## 7 Integrated urban development in Brazil, China, India, South Africa and the USA

Following the descriptions of European urban policy, this chapter complementarily focuses on global examples. The way the five countries presented in this chapter develop and approach urban challenges in the future will have a global impact, not only because of their population numbers. Due to rapid and unprecedented urbanisation processes in Brazil, China, India and South Africa, the climate and environmental impact of these developments is massive. Socio-economic changes in these countries and their cities fundamentally affect global flows of natural resources, products, capital, technology, information, and people.

### Brazil

Brazil is one of the fastest growing economies in the world, with levels of urbanisation reaching 85 per cent, surpassing that of many European countries. Brazil also has one of the highest levels of economic and social inequality. Many city dwellers live in informal settlements, *favelas*, with poor living conditions at precarious locations.

In Brazil, the federal and state government set the policy guidelines regarding urban development and concentrate the financial resources needed for urban infrastructure. Local governments have prominent roles in service delivery and implementation. Moreover, private companies have a concession agreement in service delivery. From the 1990s onwards, with the return of democracy and public accountability, Brazil took urban growth and its associated social and environmental problems more seriously. A process of legal and constitutional reforms resulted in governance arrangements that stimulated dialogue to promote democracy and reduce inequality in urban areas. In 2001, this process led to the promulgation of the City Statute, a milestone for the recognition of the social function of property, the fight against inequality and the implementation of urban development policies (Barros et al. 2010; Marques 2013).

In 2003, president Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva established the Ministry of Cities (*Ministério Das Cidades, MCID*). The Ministry is responsible for: 1) sectoral policies for urban development, housing, environmental sanitation and urban transportation, 2) cooperation with various levels of government, the private sector and non-governmental organisations. Its mission is to make cities more humane,

Environmental degradation, housing shortages, and migration movements induced by climate change hazards or by the search for better living conditions are some of the challenges affecting (urban) societies worldwide. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals define the creation of inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable cities as a global challenge. Zooming out of the European perspective, a discussion of global trends with a distinct urban dimension can help to clarify the broader context of European urban developments and can inspire new solutions.

socially and economically just, and environmentally sustainable through democratic management and integration of public policies of urban planning, housing, sanitation, urban mobility, accessibility and transit. The Ministry of Cities cooperates closely with federated entities and the civil society.

In 2004, the National Council of Cities was created. The elected members of the Council represent different segments of society including urban movements, NGOs and professional associations. With the Ministry of Cities, the Council has developed an urban agenda focussing on: 1) institutionalising the democratic management of cities, 2) the public regulation of urban land, and 3) reversing priorities concerning urban investment policy to promote socio-spatial justice. New urban policies were adopted, such as the National Environmental Sanitation Plan, the National Housing Plan, the National Fund for Social Housing and the National Social Housing System, the National Urban Mobility Policy, and the National Plan for Risk Management and Response for National Disasters. The democratically established Municipal Councils of Cities, composed of different segments of civil society, had a direct impact on the formulation and implementation of urban development policies. The federal government supports municipalities to combat erosion, flash floods and landslides by focusing on disaster risk planning.

Participatory budgeting promotes inclusive urban management. In many Brazilian cities, civil society is directly involved in determining the division of municipal budgets and the main strategic decisions in terms of urban development. One of the best-known cities that participate in this approach is



Photo: Mario Roberto Durán Ortiz – Curitiba

Porto Alegre (Leubolt/Novy/Becker 2008), one of the many growing cities. The city has maintained a high-quality living environment thanks to innovative environmental policies. The municipality strongly supports citizen participation, resulting in high government accountability, good public health and strong environmental management. Porto Alegre's environmental indicators are comparable to those of Western European cities.

The Growth Acceleration Programme (*Programa de Aceleração do Crescimento, PAC*) from 2007 encourages bottom-up integrated urban planning and participatory decision-making. The investments are financed by the federal government, state governments and municipal governments. The programme aims to promote basic sanitation and water networks, urban mobility, access to affordable housing, the urbanisation of precarious settlements and public service facilities, schools' health units, leisure and cultural areas, and the relocation of communities from risk areas. These priorities have been combined with strong social objectives such as access to economic opportunities, community strengthening, and environmental awareness and access to basic public services such as schools and vocational centres, health services and cultural activities. The PAC was extended to its third stage, for the 2015-2018 quadrennial period. Worldwide, it represents one of the major slum upgrading programmes, reaching approximately 2.5 million families (UN-Habitat 2016).

The My House, My Life (*Minha Casa, Minha Vida – PMCMV*) housing programme was introduced alongside the PAC Slum Upgrading, in 2009, financed by the Brazilian federal government (idem). The programme offers low-income families the chance to own a home, based on the allocation of public subsidies and reduced home loans. The need for more housing is urgent: the XII Demographic Census in 2010 (*CENSO 2010*) estimated a housing

deficit of 6.49 million housing units. The PMCMV aims towards economic growth with fairer income distribution that reduces poverty and absorbs millions of Brazilians into the formal job market (UN ECOSOC 2014). However, concerns about the implementation of this programme have been expressed. Standard public housing units have mostly been built in remote locations – in cities' distant peripheries, where land is cheap, but where people have poor access to public services, transport and urban resources such as job opportunities (Rioonwatch 2013; Selvanayagam 2014). Moreover, effective implementation and coordination run the risk of being undermined by conflicting financial and political interests, e.g. between developers and local residents (Novacich 2011; Santos Junior/Montadon Todtmann 2011).

Despite the country's pioneer role and significant progress, urban problems in Brazil remain challenging and socio-spatial inequality still exists (UN-Habitat 2016). Progressive laws for integrated urban development and citizen participation are a start. Sustainable changes need large investments, full implementation, institutional support for local governments, and strong planning and coordination capacity (Ministério do Planejamento 2014). They also require a robust system of multi-level and multi-stakeholder governance. The federal government was heavily criticised when preparing for the FIFA World Cup and Olympic Games for providing massive support for international sport tournaments while investment in urban development, social housing and basic services was urgently needed and asked for by the citizens (Rioonwatch 2016). The main challenge remains good multi-level urban governance and sound financial management.

#### Contributors

Paulo Alas, Housing Specialist, Ministry of Cities, Brazil

Isabela Baião Dowsley, Urban Policy Advisor

## China

China is among the most rapidly urbanising countries: five of the cities with the largest population growth in absolute terms are Chinese, and Shanghai and Beijing are in the top ten of the largest urban agglomerations worldwide. The 2014 urbanisation rate is estimated at around 55 per cent, while urbanisation levels are expected to continue rising steadily. The urbanisation pace puts high demands on urban planning and development, especially against the backdrop of serious challenges concerning unbalanced urban-rural regional development, environmental degradation, an ageing society, social inequality, energy and food insecurity and, in the longer run, a decline in economic growth (The World Bank/Development Research Center of the State Council, P.R. of China 2014).

In recognition of these challenges, the Chinese government has defined key urban development priorities: strengthening the urban-rural relationship, improving urban design, achieving sustainable urban development, creating resilient and smart cities, and promoting urban regeneration. Those priorities are reflected in the New Urbanisation Plan of 2014, China's latest and most encompassing urban development strategy (Chinese Government 2014). The plan describes four main tasks:

- Turning rural migrants into urban citizens, granting them the same rights as urban residents to access public facilities such as education, medical insurance, housing, pensions, etc.;
- Improvement of urban planning to promote urban agglomerations and to create a balanced urban-rural regional development focusing on small- and medium-sized cities;
- Fostering environmentally sustainable urban development;
- Accelerating the development of rural areas, seeking diversified economic development and achieving agricultural modernisation.

The New Urbanisation Plan emphasises the development of the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei, Yangtze River Delta, and Pearl River Delta metropolitan regions, creating so-called city clusters (Hu/Chen 2015). It is the central government's responsibility to promote the development of these inter-provincial clusters, while each provincial government is responsible for the development within its own province (*idem*). China's government considers urbanisation as a way of promoting economic growth. Thus, urban development policy is to release the economic potential of urbanisation, while making it more efficient, inclusive and sustainable.

Within China's administrative system, sub-national governments have no inherent power, and the national government exerts authority over regional authorities. While mandates can be imposed by the national government, cities carry a lot of responsibilities and local governments are usually expected to finance centrally designed policies. The Chinese administrative system is strongly hierarchical and based on delegation. Bigger cities can make more autonomous decisions and have more access to public funds. However, smaller cities and rural areas have insufficient access to government funds for, *inter alia*, the provision of public services (OECD 2015b).

In China, the spatial planning system consists of urban planning, land-use planning and economic development planning. These different planning responsibilities belong to different government departments across all government levels. Discord among these three aspects causes inefficiency of investment, of land-use, and of the viability of planning. A clear inter-departmental coordination mechanism is needed both from a legislative and an administrative point of view.

In terms of expenditure responsibilities, China is a very decentralised country (*idem*). By 2011, local government tax revenue represented 47 per cent of general government tax revenue and 34 per cent of general government total revenue (*idem*: 189). In such a decentralised fiscal system, with limited financial support from national government, provincial and municipal governments experience difficulties in maintaining infrastructure, education, health, pensions, unemployment insurance and social welfare, for which they are fully responsible within their territorial boundaries (*idem*). In order to compete with other regions in achieving a high urbanisation rate and to fulfil the investment and spending responsibilities, local government borrows excessively, often through state-owned banks and through leasing its own land. Due to the lack of supervision by authorities at national and local levels, there is poor expenditure control and reporting (*idem*: 197). All in all, the highly centralised and hierarchical decision-making results in excessive borrowing and misallocation of resources, undermining the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery.

Deprived urban neighbourhoods as such do not represent defined units or targets for intervention. Urban regeneration has not featured prominently in Chinese urban policy in any way comparable to approaches in many European countries. However,





Photo: Pexels/@little boy

it has recently been emphasised by national urbanisation policy. In general, municipal governments assign regeneration projects to private developers and state-owned companies. Because of high land prices in the city centre, these projects are usually profitable for investors. However, the cultural and historical values of redeveloped areas and residents' economic and social rights often require better protection.

Local governments have to reach annual targets for completing urban regeneration projects according to the central government's plan. Recently, the central government has been developing alterna-

tive schemes to address the interests of all actors involved, as in the case of the redevelopment and relocation of the so-called urban village in Shenzhen. Urban village is an expression for an informal neighbourhood or shantytown, often built by immigrants. The municipality government's approach to such informal settlements has shifted from demolition to more gradual redevelopment and improvement of infrastructure, green spaces, public space and facilities.

#### Contributor

Xiaocun Ruan, East & West Urban Consultancy, The Hague, The Netherlands

## India

With an urbanisation rate of approx. 33 per cent (The World Bank 2013), India is primarily a rural society. The country is, however, among the fastest urbanising nations in the world: by 2050, India's urbanisation rate is expected to exceed 60 per cent, which would imply a growth of the urban population from 373 million to 814 million (UN Population Division 2014). The number of metropolitan cities has risen from 35 in 2001 to 52 in 2011 (MoHUPA 2016), and the urban share of GDP is expected to rise from 52 per cent in 2005 to 75 per cent in 2031 (idem). The government has launched an ambitious 100 Smart Cities project to boost the urban knowledge economy. However, along with the growth of the urban population, urban inequality and poverty also rise (Padam/Singh 2004; UN-Habitat n.d.).

Indian cities can be described as highly populated areas with insufficient supply of public services.

India's urbanisation is mainly driven by high fertility rates, accounting for 55-60 per cent of net increase in urban population and the reclassification of rural settlements into urban, while 20-22 per cent is due to rural-urban migration (MoHUPA 2016). A quarter of India's urban population lives in slums (The World Bank 2016). These areas are characterised by substandard housing, lack access to basic services and infrastructure, and are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and natural hazards.

Lacking legal status in their occupancy, the inhabitants tend to be vulnerable to the threat of eviction. Moreover, the actions needed to protect the inhabitants from climate change have been criticised as weak in most cities (Revi 2008; Sharma/Tomar 2010). Despite participatory approaches to urban planning involving non-governmental organisations,

civil society organisations, indigenous people, private entities and the government, the rewards of urban renewal have been described as unattainable for the urban poor, who struggle to access basic amenities (Human Settlements Group 2015). India's housing market has been criticised as intransparent and insufficient in providing sustainable living conditions (Kumar 2001).

In India, the Ministry of Urban Development and the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation are responsible for the formulation of policy frameworks, the implementation of centrally sponsored schemes and the provision of technical support and advice for promoting orderly urbanisation. State governments are principally responsible for implementing policies and projects, while the central government still plays a role in allocating funds and resources. The Urban Local Bodies are seen as the third tier of government, with acquired political, functional and fiscal empowerment. However, state-level bodies define their functions, powers and responsibilities (MoHUPA 2016). In general, the governance landscape in India is characterised by the existence of several agencies with overlapping responsibilities, sometimes lacking a clear demarcation of authority.

The 74th Constitutional Amendment Act was launched in 1992 to “empower municipalities functionally, financially and politically” (MoHUPA 2016: 24), followed by the Urban Reform Incentive Fund (URIF) launched in 2002 to “eliminate systemic weaknesses so as to strengthen municipal finance and functioning” (ibid.) to give states assistance in

accelerating the process of urban reforms, poverty alleviation and improvement in housing. The URIF fund can be allocated to states on the basis of progress towards reform. If a state fulfils specific policy conditions, a pre-determined amount will be paid to it. Thereafter, the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM) was launched in 2005 to develop infrastructure and the provision of basic services while empowering urban local bodies (idem). The JNNURM mandates the preparation of a City Development Plan and eligible cities can access funding from the programme. While contributing in terms of revived focus on urban development and financial investment, it has also been criticised for “failure to mainstream urban planning, incomplete reforms and slow progress in project implementation.” (Bhagat 2014: 7)

The National Urban Housing and Habitat Policy was launched in 2007 and aimed at providing affordable housing to the vulnerable sections of society. This was followed by the *Rajiv Awas Yojana (RAY)* launched in 2011 by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation envisaging a “slum free India” (MoHUPA 2016). RAY's focus is on urban housing aiming to create inclusive and equitable cities. The programme will run until at least 2022. Thereafter the National Urban Livelihoods Mission was launched by the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation in 2013 aiming at reducing the poverty of the urban poor by providing employment opportunities (idem). In 2015, the government set up the National Investment and Infrastructure Fund (NIIF). The NIIF receives funds from domestic investors, multilateral institutions, sovereign wealth



Photo: commons.wikimedia.org/Palava City – Palava City

funds, pension funds, policy institutions and infrastructure bodies. The NIIF can be used to invest in infrastructure projects. Another urban infrastructure investment project is the Public Private Partnership (PPP) initiative launched by the Ministry of Finances in 2005. Urban infrastructure projects implemented through PPP facilitate market engagement and can take advantages of the private sector's expertise, efficiency and low-cost solutions. The government of India has set up guidelines for the formulation, appraisal, approval and structuration of PPP projects (Department of Economic Affairs 2013; MoHUPA 2016). Lastly, the *Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana* plan was launched in 2015 and builds upon the Housing for All programme. It is a central government scheme mainly aiming to construct 20 million housing units for the urban poor over a period of seven years (MoHUPA 2016).

Apart from the Smart Cities project, other major initiatives and schemes launched to finance urban infrastructure include the Swachh Bharat Mission, the National Heritage City Development and Augmentation Yojana programme, the Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation, and public-private partnership initiatives, to name but a few (UN ESCAP 2016).

India has huge potential for sustainable urban development. The estimated urban population growth could boost economic growth. However, integrated urban policies, supported by a robust system of multi-level and multi-stakeholder governance, are urgently needed to alleviate the current urban issues.

#### Contributor

Charu Joshi, Cecoedecon

## South Africa

With 62 per cent of the population of 50 million living in cities, South Africa is one of the most urbanised and most rapidly urbanising countries in Africa. Over the past 20 years, the urbanisation rate has risen by 10.3 percentage points, and expectations are that the urbanisation rate will reach around 80 per cent by 2050 (OECD 2015a; UN-Habitat 2014).

In the 23 years since South Africa achieved its watershed non-racial and democratic political transition, the nation remains marked by the legacy of apartheid. The historical imprint of legally enforced socio-economic and spatial inequality is particularly visible in modern South African cities (Harferburg/Huchzemeyer 2014). While it is acknowledged that South Africa's largest cities are drivers of the national economy, generating more than 70 per cent contribution towards the nation's Gross Domestic Product, these spaces, paradoxically, are also spatially fragmented with insufficient housing, inadequate infrastructure and high levels of income inequality (CoGTA 2016; SACN 2016).

Strikingly, formal urban policy in the democratic era is relatively recent. In 2016, after more than a decade of preparation, South Africa published the Integrated Urban Development Framework (IUDF). This framework builds on elements of the National Development Plan (NDP) that aims to eliminate poverty and reduce inequality by 2030, based on the urban development policy that was initiated in the late 1990s (CoGTA 2016; NPC 2011; SACN 2016). The IUDF specifically extends the NDP's vision for urban South Africa, aspiring liveable, safe, resource-efficient cities and towns that are socially integrated,

economically inclusive and globally competitive, where residents actively participate in urban life (CoGTA 2016). The framework has four overall strategic goals: 1) better access to social and economic services, opportunities and choices; 2) inclusive, sustainable economic growth and development; 3) better governance to enhance the capacity of state and citizens to advance social integration; 4) spatial transformation in settlement, transport, social and economic sectors. These goals anchor the policy priorities articulated in the framework which include urban planning, mobility, human settlements, governance, livelihoods and sustainable finances (idem).

The IUDF is a policy initiative of the national government and coordinated by the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (CoGTA). CoGTA's vision is "to build a functional and developmental local government system that delivers on its constitutional and legislative mandates within a system of cooperative governance" (idem). Under the 1996 post-liberation constitution, the South African state is organised into three autonomous but interdependent spheres of government: national, provincial and local levels.

Local government, which was reorganised in 2000, is categorised into metropolitan, district and local municipalities. South Africa has eight metropolitan municipalities which are distinct in that they each have higher capacity and revenue than other local authorities. However, like their smaller counterparts, their service delivery and effectiveness require cooperation on policy formulation, imple-





Photo: commons.wikimedia.org/Andres de Wet – Cape Town

mentation, and corresponding budget allocations. Local authorities play the critical roles of implementing national policies and responding to specific regional contexts. Municipalities face the complex task of integrating the constitutional mandates of the state and the service delivery expectations of communities on the ground in a context of limited financial resources.

Despite the recognition of each sphere of government, a major challenge to urban development in the South African context is that of overlapping mandates and ineffective intergovernmental relations that can undermine governance efficiency (SACN 2016). Some examples of these inefficiencies are the duplication of roles at the local and provincial levels of government, the lack of systematic engagement among the cabinet members and cities, and weak approaches in planning and budgeting (CoGTA 2016: 84). The IUDF also states that national monitoring of municipal performance should be streamlined.

Metropolitan councils have single metropolitan budgets, common property ratings and service-tariff systems (Government Communications 2015). The main revenue source of South African cities is service fees, property rates, surcharges and other taxes, levies and duties (SACN 2015). In addition, local governments are entitled to an equitable share of nationally raised revenues, and they can receive additional revenues from national and provincial governments. Also, there are city-specific conditional grants, such as the Urban Settlements Development Grant, the Public Transport Infrastructure and Systems Grant, The Neighbourhood Develop-

ment Partnership Grant and the Integrated Cities Development Grant.

In 2004, the Department of Human Settlements, formerly the Department of Housing, developed a guiding framework entitled “Breaking New Ground: Comprehensive Plan for the Development of Sustainable Human Settlements”, which aimed to move beyond housing provision. The Comprehensive Plan and the subsequent IUDF both articulate a vision for human settlements which address apartheid spatial geography and enable the creation of integrated communities. Specifically, these documents consider the need to address the proliferation of informal dwellings and spatial fragmentation. The lack of integration, two decades after democracy in South African cities, remains a tangible reminder of the past. Currently, there are several programmes in place that aim to improve the status quo. The National Upgrading Support Programme (NUSP) specifically deals with informal settlements and is funded by the Human Settlements Development Grant and the Urban Settlements Development Grant. The NUSP aims to upgrade living conditions by involving both civil society and the municipality in the implementation of sustainable solutions. The IUDF stresses that the participation and integration of national, provincial (particularly planning commissions) and local levels actors, is crucial for the continued operation of the NUSP, while the involvement of commercial finance institutions, NGOs and grassroots movements is also important. The Urban Network Strategy, which is currently developed as part of the Neighbourhood Development Partnership Programme is an example of an integrative approach

to linking townships with other economic centres and infrastructure projects (CoGTA 2016). This integrative approach linking public investments and government sectors could be extended to improve public health and education facilities in townships.

#### Contributors

Ntombini Marrengane, Project Coordinator, African Centre for Cities, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa

Tjaart Andries Goosen, Professional Town and Regional Planner, ECDOE/SAPI (Eastern Cape Department of Education/South African Planning Institute)

## USA

Today, the United States of America is the third most populated country in the world, after China and India. After a period of rapid rural-urban migration, 81 per cent of the US population now lives in urban areas. This percentage has stabilised over the past few years: the national urbanisation rate has grown by only 0.2 percentage points in the 2010-2015 period. At local level, there are important differences though: some US cities continue to grow, other cities are declining or recovering from a period of decline (Hill et al. 2012; UN Population Division 2014).

In the US, the federal government has power over national and interstate concerns; states, counties and municipalities decide upon local concerns. The federal government's role is to take the lead in tackling major challenges that transcend geographic areas. Moreover, the federal government should empower metropolitan areas and maximise their performances (The White House n.d.; The White House 2009). However, both Congress and localities can enact policies and regulations on urban entities. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is mainly responsible for the creation of strong and inclusive communities and affordable housing for all people. In 2014, the HUD launched a strategic plan for 2014-2018 presenting

four goals: 1) strengthening the housing market to bolster the economy and protect consumers, 2) meeting the need for affordable rental homes, 3) using housing as a platform to improve the quality of life, and 4) building strong, resilient and inclusive communities (HUD n.d.a).

Since 2009, the US Federal Government has launched several place-based initiatives to reduce economic inequality and to stimulate local development. The most relevant initiatives are elaborated below.

The Partnership for Sustainable Communities, a joint programme by the HUD, the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Department of Transportation, coordinates policies, programmes and resources to assist cities in building sustainable communities, including investments in housing, transport, and water infrastructure.

The Neighbourhood Revitalisation Initiative (NRI), launched in 2010, is a place-based strategy that helps to transform disadvantaged neighbourhoods into so-called neighbourhoods of opportunity through integrated support. The NRI focuses on four action points: 1) integrating place-based programmes in distressed neighbourhoods, 2) provid-



Photo: Mart Grisel – Bryant Park, New York City



ing flexible Neighbourhood Revitalization Grants, 3) building neighbourhood capacity through technical assistance, and 4) sharing best practices. The NRI served as a genesis for the Choice Neighbourhoods and Promise Zones programmes initiatives.

The Strong Cities, Strong Communities initiative was launched in 2011 with the aim of helping localities to improve fiscal effectiveness and efficiency through leveraging federal funds and expertise and to spark economic growth and integrate different levels of decision-making.

The Community Development Block Grant, led by the HUD, provides grants to local governments. The programme aims to provide affordable housing, services and jobs for vulnerable communities. The size of the grant is determined by the local communities' need, level of poverty, housing quality and population growth. The grant consists of different programmes that target either non-entitlement or entitlement communities. Entitlement communities are larger cities and urban counties which can be allocated annual grants. Moreover, states distribute the funds also to communities that are not qualified as entitlement communities (HUD n.d.b).

The HOME Investment Partnerships Program is another grant focusing on creating affordable housing for low-income households. This fund is used for building, buying or rehabilitating rental or self-owned houses, specifically targeting low-income people. HOME funds are allocated to eligible states

based on the level of inadequate housing supply, the level of poverty and the fiscal distress of a jurisdiction (HUD n.d.c).

Promise Zones is a place-based programme, built upon both public and private funds, to provide support to deprived urban, rural and tribal communities. The programme creates jobs, offers education programmes for young people, strengthens local economic development, and improves safety and security. The Choice Neighborhoods Program is a grant programme helping local leaders to transform low-income neighbourhoods into mixed-income neighbourhoods by means of affordable housing, education and improved safety (HUD 2016).

The future of these and other initiatives is uncertain due to the political structure changes which occurred in the US in 2017 with the election of President Trump. When considering regulations on construction and development, the U.S. federal government has a limited impact compared to mayors and councils. However, it can influence the trends regarding projects on highways and mass transit, and given the current President's preferences, the funding could be channelled predominantly to roads. US urban policy in the next four years will have to withstand many challenges, specifically with regard to building cities on a human scale. Generally, it is probable that the Trump administration might fundamentally change the urban policy programmes launched by the Obama administration since 2009.

## Summary

The analyses illustrate that the developments in the countries presented above cannot be straightforwardly compared with Europe, not just by reason of their much later and faster urbanisation processes. The US conditions for urban development show some resemblance to those of Europe, though. However, in the U.S., urban governance is engaging closely with the private sector, while private involvement in urban development in European countries is a lot less prominent.

The observed countries have adopted various urban governance arrangements. In Brazil, India, South Africa and the US, federal and state governments set the policy guidelines and provide financial resources. The local government plays its role in service delivery and implementation, often within private partnerships. Chinese urban governance is unique with its strong fiscal decentralisation, high centralisation of political power, and uneven patterns of sub-national actors' levels of autonomy. India is at an early stage of its urban transition and

is learning fast from other countries' experiences. Lastly, urban governance in the US is characterised by strong private sector involvement, while mayors have considerable power within US cities. Yet again, the future of US urban policy faces some uncertainty due to the recent political changes in the country.

An increase in social inequality and in the number of people living in informal settlements, especially in Brazil, China, India, and South Africa, has accompanied urbanisation processes, asking for governance solutions. In order to sustain people's quality of living in the long term, cities require effective transformative measures towards social and environmental sustainability. Measures taken already cover the themes of safety in cities, climate change mitigation, the promotion of renewable energy sources, sustainable transportation solutions, the reduction of poverty and the support for deprived neighbourhoods, etc. In the next decades, these efforts will have to be even broader,

stronger, and more determined in order to tackle the complex urban challenges appropriately. Integrated approaches to global urban governance, promoted inter alia by the New Urban Agenda, can provide a framework and cooperation platform for this highly demanding endeavour.

## 8 Discussion and conclusion

In May 2007, the signing of the Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities marked a new era in European urban policy. The Charter presents two key principles for policy-makers to advance the sustainable development of cities:

- 1) Make greater use of integrated urban development policy approaches, and
- 2) Pay special attention to deprived neighbourhoods within the context of the city as a whole.

This study identifies to what extent the principles of the Leipzig Charter have been applied in all EU Member States, EU candidate countries, and Norway and Switzerland over the past five years (2012-2016). To this end, thirty-five countries from the European continent have been examined. A tailor-made expert survey served as the main tool for data collection. Additional analyses were performed based on desk research. Also, three case studies were conducted, illustrating the practical implementation of an integrated approach to urban development in the cities of Brno (Czech Republic), Brussels (Belgium), and Vantaa (Finland). In addition, a focus was put on the national urban policies in five countries outside Europe (Brazil, China, India, South Africa and the United States of America).

To answer the main research question, several sub-issues were addressed in each country under analysis. These sub-issues correspond to various components of integrated urban development, namely multi-level governance (including the role of the state and sub-state actors in urban policy), stakeholder involvement and public participation, an area-based approach and a focus on deprived urban neighbourhoods, and the pooling of resources for urban development.

This concluding chapter presents the aggregated, substantial findings of the individual analyses against the backdrop of the main elements of an integrated approach. Hereby, general trends in European urban governance are discussed, as well as some observable regional clusters and common dynamics. Then, the presentation of the five extra-European countries illustrated the global dimension of urban policy with regard to major global challenges. In closing, this chapter indicates what lessons can be learnt from the main findings, and more specifically what the outcomes imply for the future of integrated urban development in Europe.

### The main findings at a glance

The Leipzig Charter stresses the importance of area-based approaches in urban development. The country analyses in this study show that, despite a considerable heterogeneity concerning national urban policy frameworks, the general idea of integrated urban development with a strong area-based logic has entered the political mainstream in Europe. The acknowledgement of this approach also reflects in and is shaped by EU policies, not least the requirements of EU structural funds.

The existence of deprived urban neighbourhoods and their effects on people's quality of living represent an enduring challenge. Deprived neighbourhoods are defined via varying sets of indicators, which are highly context-specific. Generally, they cover mostly socio-economic aspects like unemployment or income, but also the availability of services or the quality of housing and/or public space. It is in the countries of South Eastern Europe that informal settlements are seen as functional equivalents of deprived neighbourhoods. Countries in this region also often employ an explicit focus on Roma communities and other ethnic minorities and their living conditions via dedicated strategies.

In a nutshell, policies, strategies and measures targeted at deprived neighbourhoods exist in almost all European countries, while the scope, quality and general orientation of these approaches differ greatly. Dedicated, comprehensive national funding schemes for deprived neighbourhoods as in France or Germany are the exception rather than the rule.

Comprehensive, integrated and predominantly area-based urban development approaches with the status of a national urban policy are to be found in a number of countries that traditionally followed such approaches, such as Germany, France and Switzerland. These policies – and related funding schemes – have been in place for a long time and have experienced different degrees of reform. Poland adopted a new and explicit national urban policy in 2015. Ireland, Serbia and Slovakia are working on national urban policies, to be adopted throughout 2017. The scope and degree of the integrated nature of these policies cannot yet be discerned. The general trend suggests a shift from national urban policy approaches to new modes of multi-level urban governance and the assignment of responsibilities to regional or local levels of government. This trend often goes hand in hand

with state decentralisation and the devolution of tasks and budgets. Accordingly, comprehensive regional and local approaches partly replace national policy and funding schemes. This trend can be observed in Belgium, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, especially with regard to the national approach to deprived urban neighbourhoods. Decentralisation efforts often imply increased tasks for the local level, but they may also strain local budgets. In this regard, the ongoing reform efforts in Belgium, Cyprus, Ireland, Macedonia, the Netherlands, Portugal and the United Kingdom deserve further scrutiny in future comparative studies in order systematically to assess their effects in retrospect.

The relevance of spatial planning regulation has been reinforced, with numerous countries in predominantly Southern Europe, Central and Eastern, and South Eastern Europe having introduced legislative reforms and amendments to strengthen their planning regimes. An open question is to what degree spatial planning regulation can give rise to and support comprehensive, integrated urban policy frameworks. The developments in younger EU Member States or candidate countries are characterised by highly context-specific socio-economic situations relating to cultural and historical heritage, and need to be evaluated against that background.

There are various forms of multi-level and multi-stakeholder cooperation mechanisms among the European countries analysed. These approaches are often underpinned by specific agreements or contracts that are either vertical, between the local and the national or regional levels of government, or horizontal, between local authorities themselves. In Belgium or France, such vertical contracts give rise to area-based, cross-sectoral approaches focusing on deprived neighbourhoods. French City Contracts signed by the state, cities and other local stakeholders define tailored strategies aiming at the social, economic and urban development of deprived neighbourhoods. City Contracts in Belgium represented the main federal programme supporting a multi-level approach to urban development until their termination in 2014. They have been superseded by regional approaches like the Sustainable Neighbourhood Contracts and Urban Renewal Contracts made between the Brussels-Capital Region and municipalities in that Region. Another form of vertical state-city contract is sectoral and focuses on local and regional economic growth. The City Deals and Growth Deals of the United Kingdom assign more competences to cities in order to promote local economic growth. The Finnish Growth Agreements intend to foster economic growth based on metropolitan regions'

specific strengths. Lastly, more horizontal and sectoral forms of cooperation and agreements between cities have emerged. In the Netherlands, local authorities and other stakeholders partner each other within specific thematic City Deals that tackle urban challenges. The Dutch government acts as a facilitator. This pattern is close to the Finnish Six City Strategy, an thematic partnership between the six biggest Finnish cities. Inter-municipal cooperation emerges as a particularly meaningful form of collaboration in many countries in the survey (e.g. for Austria, Cyprus, Finland, Macedonia, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia and Slovenia), and is often stressed as a means of more efficient local-level resource and capacity usage. Furthermore, a distinct focus on metropolitan, especially capital, regions, and on functional urban areas in urban policy is applied in several countries.

Many countries maintain dedicated fora, platforms, advisory boards or working groups providing arenas for exchange on urban policy for various actors and stakeholders. The exact composition of such bodies varies from a state-level governmental setup (e.g. inter-ministerial committees) to more inclusive platforms reaching out to a wide range of stakeholders, such as officials on various levels, researchers and experts, business representatives and civil society organisations. In this respect, countries acknowledge the importance of participatory approaches to urban (district) development, showing how this aspect of an integrated approach has been mainstreamed into European urban policy. Even in countries without comprehensive urban policies, basic legal requirements within the planning law attach meaning to stakeholder involvement. The same applies to the conditions of the EU structural funds, which formally require the fulfilment of the partnership principle, stakeholder involvement and integrated approaches.

It is important to keep in mind that the recent economic crisis and reduced public spending represent an important background condition for the evaluation of integrated urban development approaches in European countries. Stagnation or decrease in terms of attention to urban development policies might reflect a change in political priorities, the restricted financial leeway of countries, or a combination of the two. The country surveys indicated distinct crisis effects for countries such as Cyprus, Greece, Portugal and Spain, while certain crisis effects are to be found in almost all European states, regions and cities.

While the national budgets for urban development differ greatly and often could not be specifically defined by survey respondents, European funding plays a decisive role in urban (district) develop-

ment in many European urban areas. The funding logic in EU cohesion policy, including the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the European Social Fund (ESF) and the Cohesion Fund, is both area-based and people-based. The respective frameworks entail a strong focus on integrated approaches based on multi-level governance, the partnership principle, subsidiarity and proportionality. During the seven-year programming period, which is streamlined with the general EU Multiannual Financial Framework, various territorial and other measures are eligible for co-funding.

Countries in Southern, Central and Eastern Europe in particular stressed the importance of the structural funds for programming and financing urban policy or for measures targeting deprived areas in the survey. Distinctly urban-focused instruments within structural funds, such as the Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas (JESSICA) scheme (for the establishment of revolving funds in urban development) and the Integrated Territorial Investments (ITI) instrument (for multi-fund programming of measures in specified urban neighbourhoods and areas), have been taken up by a number of countries, but this take-up differs in scope.

To sum up, despite the mainstreaming of the fundamental principles of the Leipzig Charter in European urban policies, the successful implementation of comprehensive integrated policies represents an enduring challenge to countries. This applies specifically to the following areas:

- Achieving a functioning combination of area-based and people-based approaches, especially with regard to the development of deprived neighbourhoods;
- Establishing cross-sectoral structures and working methods within and between administrations;
- Allowing for the effective participation of the civil society and stakeholders at adequate planning stages;
- Making effective use of public-private partnerships in urban development, yielding mutual benefits;
- Ensuring a sustainable, stable financial base for urban development, drawing from a number of resource and co-funding providers.

## Governance trends

The findings illustrate some fundamental developments in European multi-level urban governance. These entail a changing role of the state, of sub-national actors (cities, regions, metropolitan regions), of the EU, and of non-governmental civil and private

actors with a view to urban development. Depending on national contexts, these trends may vary in direction and scope.

Vertical forms of cooperation illustrate the trend towards devolution, while horizontal deals represent new forms of intercommunal cooperation. Both vertical and horizontal cooperation underline the increasing role of cities and regions, while the state acts as a partner or an enabler, stepping back from a dominating role in favour of providing frameworks for cooperation, funding and strategies in urban policy. The new forms of cooperation emphasise the importance of the partnership principle. The governance structure of the Urban Agenda for the EU draws from these forms of cooperation, providing a multi-level, multi-stakeholder and cross-border cooperation framework. Generally, the EU is a provider of key strategic, regulatory and financial frameworks for urban development in Europe. In light of the significance of structural funds for territorial development, the new European cohesion policy framework after 2020 will represent a crucial condition for national urban policy development. Synergies between national urban policy approaches and the future EU cohesion policy's urban dimension should help to achieve a most efficient allocation of funding to address cities' challenges.

Cities emerge as strong actors in their own right, taking part in various governance arrangements and cross-border cooperation. However, there are also developments of stronger centralisation tendencies in some countries, effectively curtailing sub-national and often also non-governmental room for manoeuvre. The adequate and effective inclusion of business and private actors and of the civil society in the planning, design and implementation of territorial and urban policies continues to challenge policy-makers all over Europe.

## Global challenges

Cities in Europe can learn from the experiences of the five extra-European countries discussed in this study in terms of sustainable and integrated management of urban development, as these countries need to implement viable solutions under complex and challenging conditions. Creative social innovations and initiatives of several Brazilian cities have brought positive changes in the urban environment. Examples are the city of Porto Alegre and its participatory planning approach, and the city of Curitiba with its innovative Bus Rapid Transit System, an effective transport solution created with limited financial resources. Chinese cities are large urban laboratories and testing grounds for new implementing technology at a pace and scale unseen in





Photo : Mart Grisel – Speicherstadt Hamburg

other parts of the world, especially in the field of construction. India has launched an ambitious 100 Smart Cities project to boost the urban knowledge economy, while South Africa is home to two of the greenest and most CO<sub>2</sub>-neutral cities in the world, Cape Town and Johannesburg. In the US, the public participation approach is strong, while partnership with private actors is more advanced compared to European governance and funding structures. With state funding becoming less prominent in many European countries, looking overseas can provide interesting indications of mixed funding structures.

Regardless of the different characteristics of these countries, their experiences underpin the immense importance of finding efficient and equitable ways of managing (rapid) urbanisation. They highlight the need for pro-active planning and integrated urban policies once more. Given the inherently complex nature of current European urban challenges, a new urban governance is required, based on multi-level and multi-stakeholder cooperation.

The reference document for sustainable global urban development, the United Nations' New Urban Agenda, promotes effective national urban policies combined with decentralisation of both political

powers and financial means. In accordance with the Leipzig Charter and the New Urban Agenda, this study reiterates the need for high governmental commitment in urban policy, but finds national urban policies to constitute a multi-dimensional policy area. This area is determined by at least three different axes: centralised/decentralised, sectoral/integrated, and top-down/bottom-up, giving rise to a range of possible hybrid forms.

### Looking ahead: the future of the Leipzig Charter principles

The massive European and global challenges such as social inequality, the destruction of the environment, climate change, resource scarcity, migration, demographic change, globalisation and digitalisation require a firm system of multi-level urban governance. Despite the general acknowledgement of the relevance of integrated structures and approaches to urban development and despite successful initiatives, it emerges clearly that their implementation continues to represent a big challenge for countries in and outside of Europe.

New initiatives should be checked against the Leipzig Charter fundamentals. The newly established governance structure of the Urban Agenda for the EU with its thematic Partnerships between various levels of government and stakeholders offers a new and promising approach to the governance of societal and city-related topics in a European context. However, a stronger focus on cross-cutting issues is needed to prevent work in thematic silos. As many of the priority themes are interlinked with each other, as well as with other social, economic and environmental challenges, the integration of solutions and trade-offs remains a key task for all involved. In addition, the inclusion of a broad stakeholder base should be safeguarded and continuously monitored in the implementation of the Urban Agenda process. The acknowledgement of the Partnerships' recommendations and the establishment of an inclusive multi-level governance approach to sustainable integrated urban development will be crucial in making the Urban Agenda for the EU the functional framework in support of the Sustainable Development Goals.

The key principles of the Leipzig Charter, suggesting an integrated, area-based approach to urban development with high-level political support and broad stakeholder involvement, are as relevant today as they were ten years ago. In order to link up the basic idea of integrated urban development with contemporary societal topics and challenges more effectively, while achieving a stronger consideration of urban issues in European policy-making,

ing, the further development of the Leipzig Charter seems advisable. An advancement should consider the priority themes and governance structures of the Urban Agenda for the EU and the New Urban Agenda as important milestones of European urban development policy. Building on these structures, the advancement of the Leipzig Charter should, according to its key statements formulated in 2007, promote the sustainable vertical and horizontal integration and interlinking of actors, structures and policies.

## References

- 6Aika, 2016: Open and Smart Services. Available at: <http://6aika.fi/in-english>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- ARE – Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung, n.d.a: Förderprogramm Nachhaltige Entwicklung 2016. Available at: <https://www.are.admin.ch/are/de/home/nachhaltige-entwicklung/programme-und-projekte/foerderprogramm-nachhaltige-entwicklung/2016.html>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- ARE – Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung, n.d.b: Projets urbains – Gesellschaftliche Integration in Wohngebieten. Available at: <https://www.bwo.admin.ch/bwo/de/home/wie-wir-wohnen/integration/projets-urbains.html>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- ARE – Bundesamt für Raumentwicklung, 2016: Infobrief Programm Projets urbains. Available at: [https://www.are.admin.ch/dam/are/de/dokumente/agglomerationspolitik/dokumente/bericht/infobrief\\_programmprojetsurbainsjuni2016.pdf.download.pdf/infobrief\\_programmprojetsurbainsjuni2016.pdf](https://www.are.admin.ch/dam/are/de/dokumente/agglomerationspolitik/dokumente/bericht/infobrief_programmprojetsurbainsjuni2016.pdf.download.pdf/infobrief_programmprojetsurbainsjuni2016.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Barros Bretas Fuhrino, Ana Maria; Carvalho Santos, Celso; Montandon Todtmann, Daniel, 2010: Commentary on the City Statute (Law N° 10. 257 of 10 July 2001). Available at: [http://www.citiesalliance.org/sites/citiesalliance.org/files/CA\\_Images/CityStatuteofBrazil\\_English\\_Ch6.pdf](http://www.citiesalliance.org/sites/citiesalliance.org/files/CA_Images/CityStatuteofBrazil_English_Ch6.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- BBSR – Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung im Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung, 2012: 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, published by the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development. Available at: [http://www.nationale-stadtentwicklungspolitik.de/NSP/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/\\_Anlagen/leipzigcharta\\_en.pdf?\\_\\_blob=publicationFile&v=1](http://www.nationale-stadtentwicklungspolitik.de/NSP/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/_Anlagen/leipzigcharta_en.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=1). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Betsill, Michele M.; Bulkeley, Harriet, 2006: Cities and the Multilevel Governance of Global Climate Change. *Global Governance*, 12(2), p. 141–159.
- Bhagat, B. R., 2014: Urban Policies and Programmes in India. Retrospect and Prospect. In: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting (ed.): *Yojana*, New Delhi, 58, p. 4–8. Available at: [http://yojana.gov.in/2014%20-9-%20September%202014%20\(including%20cover\)%20Yojana.pdf](http://yojana.gov.in/2014%20-9-%20September%202014%20(including%20cover)%20Yojana.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Binek, Jan; Opravil, Zdenek; Chmelar, Roman; Svobodova, Hana, 2016: Cooperation and mutual relationships of cities and their hinterlands with regard to the operation of EU integrated development instruments. *Quaestiones Geographicae*, 35(2), p. 59–69.
- BMVBS – Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Bau und Stadtentwicklung; BBR – Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnung, 2007: Towards a National Urban Development Policy in Germany – A Prerequisite for Urban Sustainability in Europe. Available at: <http://d-nb.info/984960236/34>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Bouzarovski, Stephan; Salukvadze, Joseph; Gentileits, Michael, 2011: A Socially Resilient Urban Transition? The Contested Landscapes of Apartment Building Extensions in Two Post-communist Cities. *Urban Studies*, 48(13), p. 2689–2714.
- Boverket, 2016: Riksstressen är nationellt betydelsefulla områden. Available at: <http://www.boverket.se/sv/samhallsplanering/sa-planeras-sverige/riksintressen-ar-betydelsefulla-omraden>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Boverket, 2017a: Cooperation for a better life in the cities. Available at: <http://www.boverket.se/en/start-in-english/planning/platform-for-sustainable-cities>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Boverket, 2017b: How Sweden is planned. Available at: <http://www.boverket.se/en/start-in-english/planning/how-sweden-is-planned>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Boverket, 2017c: Stadsmiljöavtal 2.0. Available at: <http://www.boverket.se/sv/samhallsplanering/sa-planeras-sverige/nationella-mal-for-planering/miljomalsarbete/regeringsuppdrag-att-na-miljomalen/stadsmiljoavtal-2.0>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Boverket, n.d.: Four focus areas, Platform for Sustainable Cities. Available at: <http://www.boverket.se/contentassets/b70dc5ef8b9f-456fac54ad82fc135448/focus-areas.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Centre for Cities, 2016: Everything you need to know about metro mayors: an FAQ. Available at: <http://www.centreforcities.org/publication/everything-need-know-metro-mayors/#whois>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- CESS – Center for Economic and Social Studies, 2012: A Needs Assessment Study on Roma and Egyptian Communities in Albania. Available at: <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/albania/docs/Roma%20Needs%20Assessment.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Chinese Government, 2014: 国家新型城镇化规划 (2014–2020年). Available at: [http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2014-03/16/content\\_2640075.htm](http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2014-03/16/content_2640075.htm). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- CoGTA – Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, 2016: Integrated Urban Development Framework: A New Deal for South African Cities and Towns. Available at: [http://www.cogta.gov.za/cgta\\_2016/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/The-Integrated-Urban-Development-FrameworkIUDF.pdf](http://www.cogta.gov.za/cgta_2016/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/The-Integrated-Urban-Development-FrameworkIUDF.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- CoR – European Committee of the Regions, 2016: Opinion of the European Committee of the Regions – Concrete steps for implementing the EU Urban Agenda. Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52015IR5511&from=EN>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- CREAT-UCL – Centre de recherches et d'études pour l'action territoriale de l'Université catholique de Louvain, 2016: Quartiers Nouveaux. Available at: <https://www.ciu2016quartiersnouveaux.be/index.html#WINNER>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Department for Communities, n.d.: Introduction to Neighbourhood Renewal. Available at: <https://www.communities-ni.gov.uk/articles/introduction-neighbourhood-renewal>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Department for Communities and Local Government, 2015: The English Indices of Deprivation 2015. Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/465791/English\\_Indices\\_of\\_Deprivation\\_2015\\_-\\_Statistical\\_Release.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/465791/English_Indices_of_Deprivation_2015_-_Statistical_Release.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

Department for Communities and Local Government, 2016: Neighbourhood planning in a nutshell. Available at: <http://www.neighbourhoodplanning.org>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Department for Social Development, 2013: Urban Regeneration and Community Development Policy Framework. Available at: <https://www.communities-ni.gov.uk/sites/default/files/publications/dsd/urcd-policy-framework.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Department of Economic Affairs, 2013: Guidelines for Formulation, Appraisal and Approval of Central Sector Public Private Partnership Projects. Available at: [https://www.pppinindia.gov.in/documents/20181/21751/PPPAC\\_GuideLines\\_2013.pdf/d6232a0e-9776-4067-9c17-3778983d6cff](https://www.pppinindia.gov.in/documents/20181/21751/PPPAC_GuideLines_2013.pdf/d6232a0e-9776-4067-9c17-3778983d6cff). [accessed 21/04/2017].

Dias, Nuwan; Curwell, Steve; Richard, Eric, 2014: The Current Approach of Urban Design and its Implications for Sustainable Urban Development. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 18, p. 497–504.

EC – European Commission, 2010: Commission of the European Communities: Communication from the Commission. Europe 2020. A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. Available at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/DE/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52010DC2020&from=en>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

EC – European Commission, 2011: Cities of tomorrow. Challenges, visions, ways forward. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/docgener/studies/pdf/citiesoftomorrow/citiesoftomorrow\\_final.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/studies/pdf/citiesoftomorrow/citiesoftomorrow_final.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

EC – European Commission, 2013: Neighbourhood renovation boosts community spirit in Magdolna. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/en/projects/hungary/neighbourhood-renovation-boosts-community-spirit-in-magdolna](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/projects/hungary/neighbourhood-renovation-boosts-community-spirit-in-magdolna). [accessed 21/04/2017].

EC – European Commission, 2014: Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA II): Indicative Strategy Paper for Serbia (2014-2020). Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key\\_documents/2014/20140919-csp-serbia.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_documents/2014/20140919-csp-serbia.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

EC – European Commission, 2016: European Structural and Investment Funds – Hungary. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/policy/what/investment-policy/esif-country-factsheet/esi\\_funds\\_country\\_factsheet\\_hu\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/what/investment-policy/esif-country-factsheet/esi_funds_country_factsheet_hu_en.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

EC – European Commission, 2017a: Operational Programme for Cohesion Policy Funds 2014-2020. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/en/atlas/programmes/2014-2020/estonia/2014ee16m3op001](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/atlas/programmes/2014-2020/estonia/2014ee16m3op001). [accessed 21/04/2017].

EC – European Commission, 2017b: Territorial and settlement development OP. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/en/atlas/programmes/2014-2020/hungary/2014hu16m2op001](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/atlas/programmes/2014-2020/hungary/2014hu16m2op001). [accessed 21/04/2017].

EC – European Commission; UN-Habitat – United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2016: The State of European Cities 2016. Cities leading the way to a better future. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/policy/themes/cities-report/state\\_eu\\_cities2016\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/themes/cities-report/state_eu_cities2016_en.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

El-Asmar, Jean-Pierre.; Ebohon, John O.; Taki, Ahmad, 2012: Bottom-up approach to sustainable urban development in Lebanon: The case of Zouk Mosbeh. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 2(1), p. 37–44.

Eltges, Markus, 2009: Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities – A Work in Progress. *European Spatial Research*, 16(2), p. 63–78.

Emberi Erőforrások Minisztériuma, 2014: Magyar Nemzeti Társadalmi Felzárkózási Stratégia II. Tartósan Rászoruló – Szegény Családban Élő Gyermekek – Romák. Available at: [http://www.kormany.hu/download/1/9c/20000/Magyar%20NTFS%20II%20\\_2%20mell%20NTFS%20II.pdf](http://www.kormany.hu/download/1/9c/20000/Magyar%20NTFS%20II%20_2%20mell%20NTFS%20II.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

EUKN – European Urban Knowledge Network, 2011a: Urban Development in Europe: A Survey of National Approaches to Urban Policy in 15 EU Member States. Available at: <http://www.eukn.eu/fileadmin/Lib/files/EUKN/2012/EUKN%20key%20publication%20urban%20development%20in%20Europe.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

EUKN – European Urban Knowledge Network, 2011b: Cohesion Policy in Urban Practice. An Ambitious Urban Agenda? Available at: [http://www.eukn.eu/fileadmin/Files/EUKN\\_Publications/EUKN\\_Cohesion\\_Policy\\_Interior\\_HR.pdf](http://www.eukn.eu/fileadmin/Files/EUKN_Publications/EUKN_Cohesion_Policy_Interior_HR.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

EUKN – European Urban Knowledge Network, 2014: The inclusive city. Approaches to combat urban poverty and social exclusion in Europe. Available at: [http://www.eukn.eu/fileadmin/Files/EUKN\\_Publications/EUKN\\_report\\_InclusiveCity\\_Final.pdf](http://www.eukn.eu/fileadmin/Files/EUKN_Publications/EUKN_report_InclusiveCity_Final.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

EUKN – European Urban Knowledge Network, 2015: State of Play on urban development – EU Urban Agenda. Available at: [http://www.eukn.eu/fileadmin/Files/EUKN\\_Documents/State\\_of\\_Play\\_Revised.pdf](http://www.eukn.eu/fileadmin/Files/EUKN_Documents/State_of_Play_Revised.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

EUROCITIES, 2004: The Pegasus files: A practical guide to integrated area-based urban planning. Brussels.

Fischer, Susanne, 2014: Agglomerationsprogramm Schweiz: Integrierte Planung durch Balance zwischen Verkehr und Stadtentwicklung. IFHP Congress in Singapur. Available at: [http://www.ifhp.org/sites/default/files/field/files\\_news/Susanne%20Fischer\\_0.pdf](http://www.ifhp.org/sites/default/files/field/files_news/Susanne%20Fischer_0.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

Government Communications, 2015: South Africa Yearbook 2014/2015. Available at: <http://www.gcis.gov.za/content/resourcecentre/sa-info/yearbook2014-15>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Government of Hungary, 2015: Convergence Programme of Hungary 2015-2018. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/csr2015/cp2015\\_hungary\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/csr2015/cp2015_hungary_en.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

- Greater London Authority, 2016: The London Plan. The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011. Available at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan/current-london-plan/london-plan-overview-and-introduction>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Güzey, Özlem, 2016: The last round in restructuring the city: Urban regeneration becomes a state policy of disaster prevention in Turkey. *Cities*, 50(1), p. 40–53.
- Haferburg; Christoph; Huchzermeyer, Marie, 2014: Urban Governance in Post-apartheid Cities. Modes of Engagement in South Africa's Metropolises. 1. Auflage. Stuttgart.
- Harding, Alan, Nevin, Brendan, 2015: Cities and public policy: a review paper. Available at: <http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/118170/>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Hill, Edward W.; Wolman, Harold L.; Kowalczyk, Katherine; St. Clair, Travis, 2012: Forces Affecting City Population Growth or Decline: The Effects of Interregional and Inter-municipal Competition. In: Mallach, Allan (ed.): *Rebuilding America's Legacy Cities: New Directions for the Industrial Heartland*. New York, p. 31–79.
- Hu, Biliang; Chen, Chunlai, 2015: New Urbanisation under Globalisation and the Social Implications in China. *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies*, 2(1), p. 34–43. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- HUD – U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, n.d.a: Mission. Available at: <http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/about/mission>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- HUD – U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, n.d.b: Community Development Block Grant Program. Available at: [http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program\\_offices/comm\\_planning/communitydevelopment/programs](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/communitydevelopment/programs). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- HUD – U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, n.d.c: HOME Investment Partnerships Program. Available at: [http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program\\_offices/comm\\_planning/affordablehousing/programs/home](http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning/affordablehousing/programs/home). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- HUD – U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2016: The U.S. 20/20 Habitat III Report. Available at: <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/ipi/habitat-iii.html>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Human Settlements Group, 2015: Urbanisation, rural-urban migration and urban poverty. Available at: <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/10725IIED.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Kearns, Ade; Forrest, Ray, 2000: Social Cohesion and Multilevel Urban Governance. *Urban Studies*, 37(5-6), p. 995–1017.
- Kumar, Sunil, 2001: Social Relations, Rental Housing Markets & the Poor in Urban India. Available at: [http://www.lse.ac.uk/asiaResearchCentre/\\_files/summarySunil.pdf](http://www.lse.ac.uk/asiaResearchCentre/_files/summarySunil.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Kuyucu, Tuna; Ünsal, Özlem, 2010: 'Urban Transformation' as State-led Property Transfer: An Analysis of Two Cases of Urban Renewal in Istanbul. *Urban Studies*, 47(7), p. 1479–1499.
- Latvian Presidency, 2015: Informal Meeting of EU Ministers Responsible for Territorial Cohesion and Urban Matters. Declaration of Ministers towards the EU Urban Agenda. Riga, 10 June 2015. Available at: [http://www.eukn.eu/fileadmin/Files/News/2015/Ministerial\\_Declaration\\_26052015.pdf](http://www.eukn.eu/fileadmin/Files/News/2015/Ministerial_Declaration_26052015.pdf). [abgerufen am 21. 04. 2017].
- Leubolt, Bernhard; Novy, Andreas; Becker, Joachim, 2008: Changing patterns of participation in Porto Alegre. *International Social Science Journal*, 59(193-194), p. 435–448.
- Local Government Association, 2016: Devolution deals. Available at: <http://www.local.gov.uk/devolution-deals>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Marques, Eduardo, 2013: Government, Political Actors and Governance in Urban Policies in Brazil and São Paulo: Concepts for a Future Research Agenda. *Brazilian Political Science Review*, 7(3), p. 8–36.
- McEwen, Nicola; Swenden, Wilfried; Bolleyer, Nicole (eds.), 2010: Multi-level Government & the Politics of Climate Change. Economic & Social Research Council. Available at: [http://www.institute-of-governance.ed.ac.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0012/72120/MLG\\_and\\_Climate\\_Change\\_briefing.pdf](http://www.institute-of-governance.ed.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0012/72120/MLG_and_Climate_Change_briefing.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Ministério do Planejamento, 2014: PAC2 – A Gente Faz Um Brasil De Oportunidades. Balanço 4 anos. Available at: <http://www.pac.gov.br/pub/up/relatorio/f9d3db229b483b35923b338906b022ce.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment, 2016: Growth agreements. Available at: <http://tem.fi/en/growth-agreements>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Ministry of Local Self-Government, 2014: Citizens & the Municipality. Available at: <http://mls.gov.mk/en/publications/local-self-government/210-citizens-and-the-municipality>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Ministry of Local Self-Government, 2016: Inter-Municipal Cooperation in the Republic of Macedonia. From Norms to Practice. Available at: <http://mls.gov.mk/en/publications/local-self-government/774-inter-municipal-cooperation-in-the-republic-of-macedonia-from-norms-to-practice>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Ministry of National Development: National Development 2030, 2014: National Development and Territorial Development Concept. Available at: [regionalispolitika.kormany.hu/download/b/c9/e0000/OFTK\\_vegleges\\_EN.pdf](http://regionalispolitika.kormany.hu/download/b/c9/e0000/OFTK_vegleges_EN.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, 2016: Health, Social Services and Regional Government Reform. Available at: <http://alueuudistus.fi/en/frontpage>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Ministry of Social Welfare and Youth, 2015: National Action Plan for Integration of Roma and Egyptians in Albania. 2016–2020. Available at: <http://www.alundp.org/content/dam/albania/docs/misc/Plani%20i%20Veprimit%20ENG.PDF?download>. [accessed 21/04/2017].
- Ministry of the Environment, 2016: Land use and building. Available at: <http://tem.fi/en/growth-agreements> [accessed 21/04/2017].



MoHUPA – Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation, 2016: India Habitat III National Report 2016. Available at: <http://mhupa.gov.in/writereaddata/1560.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Novacich, Samuel E., 2011: Minha Casa, Minha Vida Development. Available at: <http://riotimesonline.com/brazil-news/front-page/minha-casa-minha-vida-development/#>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

NPC – National Planning Commission, 2011: National Development Plan. Vision for 2030. Available at: [http://www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/devplan\\_2.pdf](http://www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/devplan_2.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

OECD – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2015a: South Africa Policy Brief: Regional, urban and rural development. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/southafrica/south-africa-territorial-development-for-more-inclusive-growth.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

OECD – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2015b: OECD Urban Policy Reviews: China 2015. Available at: [http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/urban-rural-and-regional-development/oecd-urban-policy-reviews-china-2015\\_9789264230040-en#page1](http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/urban-rural-and-regional-development/oecd-urban-policy-reviews-china-2015_9789264230040-en#page1). [accessed 21/04/2017].

Padam, Sudarsanam; Singh, Sanjay K., 2004: Urbanization and Urban Transport in India: The Search for a Policy. Available at: [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=573181](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=573181). [accessed 21/04/2017].

Regeringskansliet, 2015: New urban environment agreements for Swedish cities. Available at: <http://www.regeringen.se/debat-tartiklar/2015/10/nya-stadsmiljoavtal-lyfter-sveriges-stader>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Regional Cooperation Council, 2013: South East Europe 2020 strategy. Available at: <http://www.rcc.int/pubs/20/south-east-europe-2020-strategy>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Revi, Aromar, 2008: Climate change risk: an adaptation and mitigation agenda for Indian cities. *Environment and Urbanization*, 20(1), p. 207–229.

Rio Fernandes, José A., 2011: Area-based initiatives and urban dynamics. The case of the Porto city centre. *Urban Research & Practice*, 4(3), p. 285–307.

Rioonwatch, 2013: Minha Casa Minha Vida-Entidades: Federally-Funded Housing Solutions Through Self-Managed Cooperatives. Available at: <http://www.rioonwatch.org/?p=12707>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Rioonwatch, 2016: A Close Look at the International Awards and Recognition of the Olympic City. Available at: <http://www.rioonwatch.org/?p=28309>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

SACN – South African Cities Network, 2015: State of City Finances: Basics + Innovation. Available at: [http://www.sacities.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/SACN\\_SOCF\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.sacities.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/SACN_SOCF_FINAL.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

SACN – South African Cities Network, 2016: State of South African Cities Report. Available at: <http://www.sacities.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/SOCR/SoCR16%20Main%20Report%20online.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Santos Junior, Orlando A.; Montandon Todtmann, Daniel, 2011: Os planos diretores municipais pós-estado da cidade: balanço crítico e perspectivas. Available at: <http://bibspi.planejamento.gov.br/handle/ிடitem/302>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Scottish Government, 2011: Achieving a sustainable future: regeneration strategy. Available at: <https://beta.gov.scot/publications/achieving-sustainable-future-regeneration-strategy/pages/9>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Sejdini, Mirjana K., 2016: An Overview of the Reformed Local Government in Macedonia. *Macrothink Institute Business and Economic Research*, 6(1), p. 440–463.

Selvanayagam, Ruban, 26. 03. 2014: No better than the slums? What went wrong with Brazil's social housing? Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2014/mar/26/brazil-social-housing-favelas-slums>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Sharma, Divva; Tomar, Sanjay, 2010: Mainstreaming climate change adaptation in Indian cities. *Environment and Urbanization*, 22(2), p. 451–465.

The Delegation for Sustainable Cities, n.d.: Take action now! The Delegation for Sustainable Cities. Conclusions from the government assignment September 2008 – December 2012. Available at: <http://www.hallbarastader.gov.se/Uploads/Files/806.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

The Netherlands Presidency, 2016: Urban Agenda for the EU: Pact of Amsterdam. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/sources/policy/themes/urban-development/agenda/pact-of-amsterdam.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/policy/themes/urban-development/agenda/pact-of-amsterdam.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

The White House, 2009: Executive Order 13503 – Establishment of the White House Office of Urban Affairs. Available at: <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/DCPD-200900097/content-detail.html>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

The White House, n.d.: Office of Urban Affairs Principles. Available at: <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/administration/eop/oua/about/principles>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

The World Bank, 2013: Urbanization beyond Municipal Boundaries. Nurturing Metropolitan Economies and Connecting Peri-Urban Areas in India. Available at: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/13105/757340PUB0EPI0001300pub-date0201013.pdf?sequence=1>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

The World Bank, 2016: Population living in slums. Available at: <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.POP.SLUM.UR.ZS?locations=IN>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

The World Bank; the Development Research Center of the State Council, P.R. of China, 2014: Urban China: Towards Efficient, Inclusive and Sustainable Urbanisation. Available at: <http://www.iberchina.org/files/WEB-Urban-China.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Turkish Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation, 2014: Turkey Habitat III National Report. Available at: <https://unhabitat.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Turkey-national-report.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

UK Presidency, 2005: Bristol Accord. Conclusions of Ministerial Informal on Sustainable Communities in Europe. UK Presidency. Available at: [http://www.eib.org/attachments/jessica\\_bristol\\_accord\\_sustainable\\_communities.pdf](http://www.eib.org/attachments/jessica_bristol_accord_sustainable_communities.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

UN ESCAP – United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, 2016: Financing urban infrastructure in India an overview of policy lessons. – Incheon. Available at: [https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/4.Financing%20urban%20infrastructure\\_Mahesh%20Purohit.pdf](https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/4.Financing%20urban%20infrastructure_Mahesh%20Purohit.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

UN ECOSOC – United Nations Economic and Social Council, 2014: Brazil Contribution to the 2014 United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) Integration Segment. Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/integration/pdf/Brazil.en.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

UN-Habitat – United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2014: The State of African Cities. Re-imagining Sustainable Urban Transitions. Available at: <https://unhabitat.org/books/state-of-african-cities-2014-re-imagining-sustainable-urban-transitions>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

UN-Habitat – United Nations Human Settlements Programme, 2016: The Evolution of National Urban Policies. A Global Overview. Available at: <http://www.citiesalliance.org/sites/citiesalliance.org/files/National%20Urban%20Policies.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

UN-Habitat – United Nations Human Settlements Programme, n.d.: India. Available at: <https://unhabitat.org/india>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

UN Population Division, 2014: World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision, Highlights. Available at: <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/cd-rom>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

URBACT, 2015: Integrated regeneration of deprived areas and the new cohesion policy approach. An URBACT contribution to the European Urban Agenda. Available at: [http://urbact.eu/sites/default/files/20150909\\_urbact\\_deprived-areas\\_gb\\_md\\_1.pdf](http://urbact.eu/sites/default/files/20150909_urbact_deprived-areas_gb_md_1.pdf). [accessed 21/04/2017].

URBACT, 2017: URBACT in Sweden. Available at: <http://urbact.eu/sweden>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Varró, Krisztina; Faragó, László, 2015: The Politics of Spatial Policy and Governance in Post-1990 Hungary: The Interplay Between European and National Discourses of Space. *European Planning Studies*, 24(1), p. 39–60.

Ville de Bruxelles, n.d.: Contrats de quartier Durables. Available at: <https://www.bruxelles.be/contrats-de-quartier>. [accessed 10/05/2017].

Ward, Matthew, 2016: City Deals. House of Commons Library Briefing Paper No. 7158. Available at: <http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN07158/SN07158.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Welsh Government, 2012: Tackling Poverty Action Plan 2012-2016. Available at: <http://gov.wales/topics/people-and-communities/tackling-poverty/taking-forward-tackling-poverty-action-plan/?lang=en>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

Welsh Government, 2016: Vibrant and Viable Places. Available at: <http://gov.wales/topics/housing-and-regeneration/regeneration/vibrant-and-viable-places/?lang=en>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

World Bank – International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; IFC – International Finance Corporation; MIGA – Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency, 2014: Country Partnership Strategy for the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for the Period of FY2015 – FY2018. Available at: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/870671468053680320/pdf/895560CPS0P147020Box-385310B000U0090.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].

World Bank Group, 2015: Republic of Serbia. Public Finance Review 2015: Toward a Sustainable and Efficient Fiscal Policy. Available at: <http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/pubdocs/publicdoc/2015/11/776271446462342355/PFR-eng-web-final.pdf>. [accessed 21/04/2017].