

BEST METROPOLISES

Best development conditions in European metropolises: Paris, Berlin and Warsaw

Targeted Analysis 2013/2/14

Inception Report | Version 02/03/2011



This report presents a more detailed overview of the analytical approach to be applied by the project. This Targeted Analysis is conducted within the framework of the ESPON 2013 Programme, partly financed by the European Regional Development Fund.

The partnership behind the ESPON Programme consists of the EU Commission and the Member States of the EU27, plus Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland. Each partner is represented in the ESPON Monitoring Committee.

This report does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the members of the Monitoring Committee.

Information on the ESPON Programme and projects can be found on www.espon.eu

The web site provides the possibility to download and examine the most recent documents produced by finalised and ongoing ESPON projects.

This basic report exists only in an electronic version.

© ESPON & Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization, Polish Academy of Sciences, 2011

Printing, reproduction or quotation is authorised provided the source is acknowledged and a copy is forwarded to the ESPON Coordination Unit in Luxembourg.

List of authors

Lead Partner – Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

Mirosław GROCHOWSKI, Grzegorz WEŃCŁAWOWICZ, Przemysław ŚLESZYŃSKI, Ewa KORCELLI-OLEJNICZAK, Piotr ROSIK, Magdalena GÓRCZYŃSKA, Marcin STĘPNIAK, Dariusz ŚWIĄTEK

Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning, Erkner, Germany

Sabine ZILLMER

Paris Region Planning and Development Agency, Paris, France

Martine LIOTARD

Nordregio – Nordic Centre for Spatial Development, Stockholm, Sweden

Peter SCHMITT

Spiekermann & Wegener, Urban and Regional Research, Dortmund, Germany

Michael WEGENER

Table of contents

1. Overview of the analytical approach	5
2. Methodology and research questions	6
3. Best Metropolises and use of other ESPON projects' results	16
4. Work packages and project's budget	18
5. Additional clarifications concerning content and implementation related issue	19
6. Deliveries and outputs	20
7. Sources of information	22
8. Literature	25

1. Overview of the analytical approach

The primary objective of the Project Best Metropolises is to identify factors that determine specific development of three metropolitan areas: Paris, Berlin and Warsaw. The comprehensive diagnosis is: i) to provide a set of data and information that enables identification of trends of metropolitan development both European-wide and particularly in the three metropolises; ii) to serve as a base for assessment of policy measures used to guide development processes.

Results of the Project will provide knowledge on how to efficiently incorporate the concept of sustainable development into economic development strategies, and how to approach multidimensional development problems in complex, multi-layer organizational and institutional contexts of European metropolises.

The Project will address policies concerning the following three themes :

1. Living conditions and factors that influence the choice of habitual residence in metropolitan areas,
2. Trends and reasons of intra-metropolitan mobility and mobility between the metropolitan region and adjacent municipalities,
3. Governance of the metropolitan area.

The three metropolitan areas that are in the centre of our study have formed very distinct profiles of so-called metropolitan functions, due to their different, and partly also unique, geo-political, economic and socio-cultural development-paths. Those functions do not only localise in the central or inner parts of such metropolitan areas, they tend to spread around within a larger urban or semi-urban area. As a consequence we can observe a kind of re-configuration of the spatial-functional setting, since new centralities are emerging (others are becoming less important), which leads to new morphological and functional urban patterns.

The overall guiding questions for the Project are:

1. What are the consequences of metropolisation processes for the three cities and their metropolitan areas in the three themes listed above?
2. What is the impact of metropolisation processes on their potential development in relation to the housing conditions and quality of life, socio-spatial structures, residential migration, accessibility and daily mobility?
3. How do political, organizational, spatial and socio-economic contexts influence processes of formulating development policies and their performance?
4. How to evaluate development policies in terms of their efficiency in achieving sustainable development goals?

The structure of the Project follows the logic of the overall guiding questions related to the three general themes. The Project is divided into 9 activities. This report presents in details approaches, methods, and instruments to be used to fulfill all research tasks and deliver good quality products.

Although studies conducted under the Best Metropolises Project will primarily focus on current development processes, the history of development of the three cities will be examined in order to identify paths of development that led to current situation, determinants of development trends, and policy responses to challenges occurring in different stages of development.

In order to meet expectations towards TPG it is planned, that the analysis will be conducted in Functional Urban Areas (FUAs) spatial units and later results of the analysis will be adjusted to delineated borders of metropolitan areas. This approach will allow both to use the results of the studies for Pan-European comparisons and provide stakeholders from the three cities with useful and updated information on development processes in areas they are especially interested in. The definition and geographical range of FUA in the project will be based on previous ESPON projects (especially ESPON 1.1.1 and 1.4.3).

The proposed overall approach is a comprehensive approach to address differentiation and patterns of spatial and organisational structures in European urbanized areas. It derives from the need of establishing solutions tailored to specific development circumstances (administrative subdivisions, organisation of public administration, spatial and functional structure of metropolises) that will meet requirements of economic efficiency and will respect environmental conditions of spatial, social, and economic development. Thus, the proposed holistic approach incorporates diagnostic and future-oriented components in order to contribute to the elaboration of a management model that will be based on detailed empirical analysis of relationships between living conditions, mobility and spatial accessibility.

The proposed approach is a unique approach of studies on relationships between living conditions (and attractiveness of different areas in terms of location of specific functions), spatial accessibility (with emphasis of accessibility of work places that generates daily mobility), development concepts (including concepts of central cities development, development of metropolitan areas and their specific parts in the context of development conditions of functionally integrated urban areas), and modes of governance (administrative, organizational, and management structures). Methodologically advanced research conducted in the three selected metropolitan areas will provide guidelines useful for studies of other European metropolitan areas.

2. Methodology and research questions

This part provides justification of proposed methodology, specific methods and information on formulated research questions to be answered in order to achieve research goals. All information is presented in relation to specific activities.

Activity 1: Historical background and development trends of Paris, Berlin, and Warsaw

This activity will concentrate on identification of the key factors and turning points in the urban history of the three capitals. Different and common features of development process will be identified and analysed *vis-a-vis* endogenous and exogenous factors of development, especially internationalisation and globalisation of development processes.

Consequences of the first and particularly the second world war determined for years conditions of development in Berlin and Warsaw. The collapse of the communism in Central and Eastern Europe, together with unification of Germany brought changes that had crucial impact on development of Berlin, Warsaw and the whole Europe, but not directly on Paris. New conditions for Warsaw's development resulted from accession of Poland to European Union. In the past several decades the path of development processes of Paris has been determined by evolving role of Paris

region in national, European, and global economy and by political and institutional changes (decentralization).

The geopolitical challenges deeply rooted in the history will be identified and their consequences described in the context of development processes (Paris in competition for leading position in European and global scale; Berlin aspiration for national capital and the leading role in Central Europe as a political and cultural centre; Warsaw struggle for modernization and establishment of the future financial centre and gate of the EU to the East). Then analysis of how political institution and other organisations (including business representatives) mediate, in the historical perspective, the impact of different global and European development processes on development of the three cities.

The outcome of this activity will be identification of constraints and specificity of development processes of metropolitan areas of Paris, Berlin and Warsaw. The activity will focus on the impact of historical heritage on development processes of both central cities and their metropolitan areas and on the impact of the specific place of the three cities capitals in the national settlements systems (see also Activities 5 and 6) as well as in national and global economy. Two tasks are to be carried out:

1. Analysis of origins of functional and structural development of the three metropolises and their inter-relations in national urban systems;
2. Evaluation of impact of historically determined path of development on the current position of the three cities and for their future development.

Activity 2: Theoretical and conceptual framework of spatial organization

In the current phase of globalisation it is easy to detect a view which argues for the growing appeal of 'metropolitan areas' as key places for economic growth, different kinds of infrastructures and breeding places for innovation (OECD 2006). In many countries we can observe a gradual re-hierarchisation of the national urban systems that is followed by a growing dominance and spatial extension of the capital regions and partly some prosperous second-tier urban regions on the one hand and a loss of importance of numerous towns and cities on the other. Consequently a number of metropolitan areas are being considered as important drivers for international territorial competitiveness and the socio-economic well-being across Europe (Scott 2001, Jonas/Ward 2007).

The above sketched processes challenge local, regional and state-level institutions as well as other public and private stakeholders, to develop new modes of territorial governance (Andersen 2005, Knapp/Schmitt 2003), to define new mechanisms to allocate resources, to conceal territorial competitiveness and social cohesion at the national and regional level (see also Activity 4), and finally to identify robust strategies to make their metropolitan regions attractive for investors and inhabitants (Ache et al. 2008; see Activity 8). The resurgence of debates on territorial governance and strategic spatial planning in particular considering metropolitan regions as being key assets of nation states (see Activity 7), therefore, must be understood in relation to the ongoing process of economic globalization and political re-territorialisation through which the frameworks of social life are being reconfigured (Brenner 2003, 2004; it will be studied in Activities 3 and 4).

This context constitutes the point of departure of the intended tasks within activity 2:

1. Based on numerous ESPON-studies and a number of further territorial studies, we want to capture the major development trends of the three European Metropolitan areas (Warsaw, Berlin and Paris) and try to compare them with other European metropolitan areas.
2. A literature review shall help to identify the key 'drivers' and 'impacts' of those major trends (cf. Point 1) as regards metropolitan areas in Europe. In order to deepen our understanding of these processes, we plan to consider 'four different dimensions' of metropolitan development and some of their inherent concepts and theories:
 - a) socio-economic dimension: here e.g. to explain the territorial logic of knowledge-intensive firms, the formation of the creative class
 - b) (geo-)political and institutional dimension: e.g. urban development in transformation countries, models of society, planning and policy systems
 - c) societal-behavioural dimension: e.g. post-modern consumption patterns, urban lifestyles, demographic change
 - d) physical dimension: e.g. drivers for the extension of the urban fabric, sub-, peri- and/or re-urbanisation concepts

Here the underlying question is in how far these concepts and theories can help us to understand the ongoing development processes in the three metropolitan areas that are in the centre of our study.

3. The hitherto achieved results shall be compared with those elaborated within activity 1 in order to position and contextualise the three metropolitan areas Warsaw, Berlin and Paris.

Activity 3: Housing conditions and life quality

Housing conditions have been influenced by the cities' housing policies over several decades, since housing investments imply long-term effects on housing conditions (see Activity 1). Besides public investments in e.g. social housing supply, also commercial investments have been crucial for the development of housing stocks in the three metropolitan areas. Housing supply and space differ between the metropolitan areas and also within them with regard to prices, quality etc. At the same time metropolitan housing is demanded by different groups of the population, varying according to age cohorts, family cycle, income group, nationality, ethnic groups etc. Depending on the matching process of housing supply and demand this can seriously affect local needs and the accumulation of selected population groups in some areas of the city (see also Activity 4).

The growing number of population in metropolitan areas associated with the profound modifications of households' structure (increase in the number of one-person and single-parent family households), became one of the key elements that shape the housing demand. From this perspective, the newly built estates as well as existing (older) housing stock undergo modifications in order to correspond to these new demand patterns. In case of old neighborhoods that dominate particularly in the core of metropolitan areas, a set of different actions is undertaken to improve the housing conditions (e.g. rehabilitation) and to adjust the housing offer to the new trends in the demand.

The following general research questions were formulated:

1. What are the characteristics of dwellings' supply and trends concerning location of housing estates?
2. What preferences concerning housing conditions urban dwellers have?
3. Which factors decide about the choice of the place of residence?
4. What kind of actions are undertaken by local authorities in order to improve housing conditions in metropolitan areas?

An analysis of distribution of housing stock will be conducted in order to compare the spatial housing patterns in the three metropolitan areas. Existing surveys or other respective secondary data concerning housing preferences of residents shall be utilized. These shall possibly focus on disaggregation into categories of residents such as: recent in-migrants, long-time residents, as well as different socio-economic groups. Research will be carried out according to aggregates of NUTS 3 and LAU or other spatial levels appropriate for housing issues. Distribution of housing stock will be confronted with land prices and rents.

Activity 4: Evolution of socio-spatial and economic structures

The spatial form and social structure of the three metropolitan areas have some common features, as referring to European urban tradition (see Activities 1 and 3). But each of them has specific characteristics due to history of urban development, political factors, economic, social and demographic composition, and to their role in the national and international network of cities. Mono-centrism or poly-centrism, density, wide or limited suburban expansion, relationship with rural areas, role in larger urban networks, are the main elements which differentiate settlement forms (this will be studied also in Activities 5 and 6).

The increase of social disparities within the borders of the Warsaw metropolitan area has been very well documented since early 1970s (Węclawowicz, 1975, Dangschat, Blasius 1987, Smętkowski 2009). Warsaw evolved from functions and form of the socialist industrial city to the post industrial one. The socialist type of industrialization process in Poland resulted in relatively low level of socio-spatial differentiation of Warsaw. Changes started in 1990 triggered processes that lead to rising disparities (see also Activity 1).

Since Berlin was divided until 1989, it has a heritage of differing socio-spatial structures which has strongly influenced the development of the last 20 years. This does not only apply to income levels but also to other features such as household structures, ethnic backgrounds of migrants etc. Nowadays there are considerable income disparities in Berlin, with a particularly high share of inhabitants depending on social transfers. This is not only due to the loss of the industrial base as an effect of World War II but also to the reduction of jobs in the extensive public administrations. Although economic development trends have changed especially in media and cultural businesses, the number of inhabitants under unemployment schemes is still quite high. This has led to intra-metropolitan disparities and the development of local 'clusters' with low income inhabitants and other socio-spatial structures unfavorable for these areas' development (see also Activity 1).

In Paris, physical location of the city and paths of industrialization has had crucial impact on socio-spatial and economic structures. Urban growth and social housing development after the second world war enforced the initial pattern. Shift from development based on industry to development based on services resulted in evolution of socio-spatial structure in IDF. However, the historical division of Paris

into more affluent Western and Central districts and poorer North and East areas has been retained. Moreover, this socio-spatial division of the city became even more accentuated as an effect of the growing number of the social housing neighborhoods constructed in the peripheral districts (particularly on the North and North-East, 6 out of 8 ZUS in Paris are located in these sectors) after the second world war. The close suburban area ("petite couronne") repeats the social structure of Paris, with the richest local communities on the South and West, whereas North and North-East sectors suffer from socio-economic problems. As a result new national and international metropolitan central area has been established, encompassing Paris and functionally linked other location from the metropolitan area (see Activity 1).

Four major questions are to be answered:

1. What are the old and the new forms of the socio-spatial disparities which characterise European metropolitan areas?
2. What are the principal factors that determine current socio-spatial structures in the three metropolitan areas?
3. What are the new processes that have an impact on shaping social structures?
4. What model of development contributes to reduction of social disparities and increase of social and functional cohesion of metropolitan areas?

Comparative analysis of main components of socio-spatial and economic structures and mapping of the different social and economic characteristics of metropolitan areas will serve as a base for typologies of districts and municipalities according to selected features (see also Activity 3).

Activity 5: Transport, job accessibility and daily mobility

Territorial cohesion is a key factor for functional integrity of metropolitan areas. Location of jobs, places of residence, and patterns of transportation networks are components of functional structures and have impact on spatial behaviour of firms and population. They also determine accessibility of jobs and impact daily mobility.

The methodology for accessibility measurement will be based on ESPON TRACC project (Transport Accessibility at Regional/Local Scale and Patterns in Europe /2010-2012/). Best Metropolises will use generic accessibility indicators: travel time, daily accessibility and/or potential accessibility. Two networks will be analysed: road network for individual motorization (travel times on each main road section) and public transport network (travel times on bus, tram, train or metro line section). Experience of European Metropolitan Transport Authorities (EMTA) will be utilised in the study since Paris, Berlin and Warsaw are all members cities of EMTA.

Studies on accessibility of jobs in Warsaw were performed by Niedzielski and Śleszyński (2008). The authors used gravity-model-based indicators, disaggregated by commuting mode, based on the 1998 Comprehensive Transport Survey conducted in Warsaw. They showed that, residential and employment accessibility for both automobiles and public transport exhibits a concentric though irregular pattern declining in intensity with increasing distance from the Warsaw's Central Business District.

Employment suburbanisation and mobility patterns in Paris metropolitan area are well described. There is a very efficient network of transport in the central metropolitan area and many jobs located in the suburbs with a very weak

accessibility. Aguiléra, Wenglenski and Proulhac pointed out in 2009 that in case of Paris number of reverse commuters have significantly increased due to a big loss of jobs, decreased number of working residents, and spread of employment during last 20 years to suburbs. The multi-scale and multimode improvement of the transport network in relation with metropolitan urban structure is a key element of debate on the Grand Paris.

Different studies (e.g. Wiethölter, Bogai, & Zeidler 2009) and statistical data show how the number of commuters has grown over the last decade in the metropolitan region of Berlin-Brandenburg. The number of commuters from Berlin to Brandenburg has been increasing steadily, however, the commuters in the opposite direction have increased even further and account for the majority of commuting in the Brandenburg to Berlin. An increasing number of jobs in Berlin, suburbanisation of the population and of firms as well as a growing attractiveness of Berlin contribute to this intensification of commuting structures.

The basic goal of this activity is to identify relations between transportation systems, accessibility of work places, and daily mobility of inhabitants in Paris, Berlin and Warsaw metropolitan areas.

The research questions are specifically related to three tasks to be carried out: 1. Metropolitan transportation network, 2. Job accessibility in the metropolitan area, and 3. Intra-metropolitan daily mobility (see also Activity 6).

The research questions to the first task are as follows:

1. What is the best suitable division of the metropolitan areas into communication regions for accessibility and mobility purposes?
2. Does the public transport network enable inhabitants to explore the metropolitan areas without using a car?
3. What are the public transport and motor vehicle travel times? Are they sufficient?
4. What parts of the metropolitan areas face in particular the problem of congestion?

The research questions to the second task are:

1. What is the best suitable job accessibility indicator within the set of accessibility indicators?
2. Where is the job accessibility relatively poor? Where should it be improved?

The research questions to the third task are:

1. What are the characteristics and the main barriers in mobility among the socio-economic groups of inhabitants?
2. What are the transport policy options used in the metropolitan areas (metropolitan tickets, park-and-ride systems etc.)?

Activity 6: Intra - metropolitan migrations

Migration issues are one of the most often studied issues within the geography of metropolitan areas, including Paris, Berlin (Häußerman et. al. 2010, Senatsverwaltung... 2009) and Warsaw (Potrykowska and Śleszyński 1999). The intensity of the volume and relative share of total migration in the growth of the

metropolitan area, allow to identify regularities in relation to the stage of urbanization, including the demographic cycle of city life (e.g. in Warsaw: Korcelli 1987, Lisowski 2005; in Berlin and other German cities: Schönwälder and Söhn, 2007; see also Activity 4). However, in every city intra-metropolitan migrations possess some specific features.

Besides the two most central city centres Berlin inhibits an even higher number of smaller city centres with partially very different characteristics. The two central city centres are still a heritage from the post world war II period, when Berlin was divided. There are both, central as well as suburban areas which are affected by outmigration (and vice versa). These trends are part of downward development circles in some areas. These areas are increasingly tackled by policy measures, e.g. Aktionsräume (spaces for taking actions).

In Paris metropolitan area there is an important centrifugal movement out of Paris towards the three inner districts or farther in the suburbs. Polycentrism in these suburban areas is only in emergence (three of the five new towns of the 1965 master plan have really turned into urban poles), and suburbanization has developed in the “green belt”, in rural areas and even over regional border toward the North. Outmigration is a historical and continuous phenomenon in Paris city and neighbouring districts.

A specificity of Warsaw is that the scale of residential suburbanization is reduced due to transport difficulties. In addition, another characteristic features of Warsaw are the relatively large proportion areas that are not built land within the administrative boundaries of the city, and the generally extensive spatial structure, which is also the reason for the development of single-family housing within the core area.

All three metropolitan areas demonstrate significant differences in character of migration and its impact on spatial demographic structure (see Activity 4) in the context of ‘core-suburban areas’ relation. These differences will be used as a base for formulation of hypotheses on the further development of these processes in different cities. Results of studies will provide information to be used in policies related to migration issues formulated by municipal authorities.

Primary research hypotheses are formulated in a following way:

- a) due to political and socio-economic changes (including the ongoing European integration), the level and structure of migration in the studied cities tend to become similar,
- b) the impact of international migration in Warsaw’s city structures will continue to grow, as it took place both in Berlin, and especially in Paris,
- c) in case of Paris outmigration flow will increase bringing pressure on housing, transport infrastructure and triggering daily mobility,
- d) migration flows in case of Berlin will have more and more “selective” character i.e. specific social and economic attributes of migrants’ groups will determine intensity, directions, and areas of out- and in-migrations.

Activity 7: Models of governance and social participation in development and spatial planning

Issues of public governance in metropolitan areas have taken on a new importance and visibility due to the pressures exercised by economic globalization and technological change. Pressures are also generated by rising populations, urban

concentration world-wide, the growing size and number of metropolitan regions, environmental problems, population ageing and the transition from organization of cities and settlement system based on space of places towards organization based on space of flows. In this setting the term “government” is no longer appropriate to describe the way populations and territories are organized and administered. In a world where the participation of business and civil society is increasingly the norm, the term “governance” better defines the process by which citizens collectively solve their problems and meet society’s needs, using “government” as the instrument. Decentralization, deconcentration, devolution and privatization are forcing a reassessment of the roles of government at the national, regional and local level. Reforms designed to increase the capacity of public governance are being introduced based on new spatial alliances and partnership between central government, territorial public authorities, the private sector and civil society.

There are three main goals of this activity:

1. Identification of systemic conditions and determinants that shapes models of governance and social participation in development and planning
2. Identification of main problems that have impact on management efficiency
3. Identification of factors for success – best practices

To achieve these goals detailed, comparative analysis of administrative subdivisions, tasks and responsibilities of governments, and management structures in metropolitan areas will be performed. Issues of institutional capacity and level of decentralization will be addressed. Special attention will be given to the mechanisms of policy making concerning development of metropolitan area (forms, intensity, and topics of intergovernmental cooperation among municipalities from metropolitan areas; this issues will be developed further in Activity 8). The role of social participation in decision and policy making processes at different levels of governance will be described and analysed as a part of assessment of conditions that shall be met to translate territorial development goals and policy aims into actions

Research under this activity will use strategic and other programmatic documents, results of audits, cartographic materials, and results of previous studies. Interviews with policy makers, local leaders, representatives of local communities and interests groups will be conducted.

Activity 8: Development strategies, visions and recommendations

In this activity existing documents about long-term visions and strategies for the three metropolitan areas will be reviewed, compared and evaluated with respect to feasibility and major goals, such as economic development, social equity and environmental sustainability. Based on the results of the theoretical framework defined in Activity 2 and the empirical evidence provided in Activities 3 to 7, the project team will make recommendations for each city for further development of these visions taking account of the experience and best practice in the two other metropolitan areas.

In this activity the project team could assist in developing integrated strategies and making recommendations for institutional arrangements and co-operation schemes.

Three tasks are to be carried out:

- 8.1. A review of existing strategic documents
- 8.2. An evaluation of strategic visions with respect to major goals
- 8.3. Recommendations for further development of visions

The outcome of this activity will be a documentation and review of existing strategic documents of the three cities and their evaluation with respect to the goals economic development, equity and sustainability as well as specific recommendations for each city to further develop their strategic visions.

All three metropolitan areas are equipped with strategic documents that present their development goals in the context of the regional, national, and European scale of development processes. Although the regional scale is the leading one, the importance of the broader spatial context of development is acknowledged.

The strategic documents from the three metropolitan areas show differences in terms of goals and ways of implementation.

The case of Paris Region is, at the moment, quite unusual (and very instructive for metropolises problematic), with a competition between the SDRIF - *Schéma Directeur de la Région Ile-de-France* (managed by the IAU and approved by the region Council in 2008, but not yet by the State Council) and a Grand Paris Project, established by a temporary State secretariat for the Grand Paris between 2008 and 2010. A convergence between the two documents, SDRIF and Grand Paris project (mainly a transport pattern), is currently discussed, in order to establish a renewed SDRIF.

The 2008 SDRIF formulates 3 challenges :

- (1) *supporting a social and territorial equality* to contribute to social cohesion in a solitary region,
- (2) *anticipating mutations and environmental crisis*, mainly linked with climate change and depletion of fossil resources, and organizing proactive and flexible reactions for a compact and economizing city,
- (3) *developing a dynamic Paris–region*, in order to consolidate its territorial structure and strengthen its position in the global economy.

In the case of Paris, according to the *Plan Local d'Urbanisme de Paris* (2006), the following issues are of strategic importance for urban development:

- (1) *improvement of the quality of life* of citizens through incorporation into planning procedures principles of sustainable development: to reduce energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, water, air and soil pollution; to prevent noise; to provide more green space, to protect the cultural heritage and to reduce social inequalities,
- (2) *establishment of cooperation* among local authorities to support the development of Paris as the heart of the agglomeration.

In the case of Berlin's strategic document, the *Berlin-Studie* (2001), the following future strategies were chosen as prior to face the challenges of the 21st century:

- (1) *competitiveness*: create the preconditions for global economic activity,
- (2) *employment for more people*: create jobs to permanently reverse employment decline,
- (3) *knowledge society*: become the learning region for continuous innovation,
- (4) *information and communication technologies*: enhance access and creative potential,

- (5) *attractiveness for young people*: prevent the ageing society,
- (6) *migration*: foster targeted management of immigration and integration,
- (7) *social equity*: balance opportunities and burdens for social cohesion,
- (8) *environment*: reduce pollution and traffic congestion,
- (9) *system transition*: move towards social and sustainable market economy,
- (10) *participation*: delegate responsibility to citizens and civil organizations,
- (11) *intercity co-operation*: integrate into to European city networks,
- (12) *capital city*: prepare for new challenges and integrate into the region.

The development of Warsaw is guided by the *Development Strategy for the city of Warsaw until 2020* (2005). In it the strategic goals for Warsaw are defined as follows:

- (1) *to improve the quality of life* and safety of the residents,
- (2) *to consolidate the residents' sense of identity* by fostering tradition, developing culture and stimulating social activity,
- (3) *to develop metropolitan functions* by strengthening Warsaw's position at the regional, national and European level,
- (4) *to develop a modern economy* based on knowledge and scientific research,
- (5) *to achieve sustainable spatial order*.

These goals indicate the themes that are crucial for the future of the three metropolitan areas. Regardless of the development history and development potential in these strategic documents, the importance of the 'issues quality of life' (studied in Activity 3), mobility (see Activities 5 and 6), quality of the natural environment, and governance is emphasized in all of them.

Therefore, the review of the strategic documents in the first task of this Activity will focus on these issues and some others defined by policy makers as important for their metropolitan areas or identified in earlier studies as spheres of dynamic transformation with strong impact on the development of metropolitan areas.

In the second task of the Activity, the strategies presented in the documents will be evaluated with respect to the development goals defined in them as well as with respect to overarching goals defined by the project team for all three metropolitan areas derived from the literature and from the stakeholder involvement in Activity 9.

Finally, in the third task of the Activity, recommendations for further developing the visions and strategies of the three cities based on the comparison between the three metropolitan areas and other metropolitan goal systems derived from the literature will be made.

Activity 9: Stakeholders' involvement

Stakeholders will play a key role in the project implementation being engaged in different activities on various stages of the project. Initially during collecting data processes series of In-Depth Interviews (IDI) with respective representatives of cities will be conducted. Interviewees will be chosen according to their experience and areas of expertise. They will be consulted on two main issues: firstly on their perception of main bottlenecks that hinder development processes and generate conflicts of different types; secondly on their approaches to development problems and instruments they possess and use to solve these problems and meet challenges related to multi-dimensional development processes. Information obtained from interviews will be a crucial supplement to data and information gathered from statistics and programmatic documents.

To maximize benefits resulting from the project series of workshops for stakeholders will be organized to create an opportunity to present results of studies and to discuss their implications for the practice of metropolitan areas management focused on three policy fields: i) living conditions and factors that influence the choice of habitual residence in metropolitan areas, ii) trends and reasons of intra-metropolitan mobility and mobility between the metropolitan region and adjacent municipalities, iii) strategic planning as a base for effective governance of the metropolitan area.

Communication channels in Best Metropolises are designed to maximize the share of knowledge among partners, stakeholders and other participants, and to provide accessible quality information on time to all interested parties. The main communication channels selected are:

- Electronic communication (especially suited for this purpose e.g. website, forum, email list). The project website will contain updated information on the project gather all the means necessary to follow up the project: events, upcoming reports, research findings, project timetable (with important dates of the project for stakeholders to be informed on upcoming events deadlines, releasing of important documents etc.)
- Local media (newspapers, web-portals).

3. Best Metropolises and use of other ESPON projects' results

The Best Metropolises project combines features of studies of geographic, economic, social and political sciences. Within the proposed methodology Best Metropolises is going to use results of already completed or ongoing ESPON projects. Among the most important are:

Project 1.1.1 which provides knowledge on identification and classification of Functional Urban Areas (FUAs) and Metropolitan European Growth Areas (MEGAs) (concepts further developed within Project 1.4.3.) Results of the analysis of the functional structure of FUAs and the distinction of five activities characterizing city regions (administrative functions, decision functions, transport functions, knowledge and tourism functions) are important elements of comparisons between metropolitan areas. They also may serve as a component of evaluation of development conditions for the three metropolitan areas.

The DEMIFER project presents the typology of regions based on demographic status (2005). Each metropolitan area from the Best Metropolises project belongs to different type: Warsaw belongs to the type "challenge of labour force" defined by a high share of young population in working age and a slight population decline, driven by a natural decrease rates that affects population growth; Berlin belongs to the type "challenge of decline" shaped by a negative natural population balance, as well as a negative migratory balance which lead the region into population decline situation; Paris belongs to the type "family potentials" – characterized by a slightly younger than average age structure and high natural population increases, as well as a positive net migration rate. Although this typology covers the NUTS-2, the differences between the three metropolises could be at least partly explained by preceding diversity. Moreover, the FOCI project shows explicitly the city differentiation in the urbanization cycle.

In case of activity 3: *Housing conditions and life quality* the ATTREG project results will be used (when available. ATTREG will deliver proposition of the regional typology of territorial attractiveness. The interim and final reports will be studied carefully in purpose of possible adaptation of a new typology for analyzes conducted within activity 3.

Project 1.4.2 presents the way how spatial differentiation of housing quality influences territorial development. A set of housing indicators is presented In the report, that will be adopted in Best Metropolises studies (housing affordability indicator, tenure structure, dynamics of housing investment and housing supply). The report stresses also the need of further researches dedicated to the question of inter-regional inequalities level and segregation as a consequence of the economic, demographic and social factors that may contribute to emerging of social tensions. Best Metropolises is going to contribute to knowledge on these issues.

For activity 4 *Evolution of socio-spatial structures* and activity 2 *Theoretical and conceptual framework of spatial organization* results of FOCI project will be critically analyzed and used.

Project FOCI, using results of in-depth literature review, identifies following indicators of socio-economical polarization: those related to the economic and labor market (level of knowledge based employment), socio-demographic characteristics of society (household composition, level and structure of international and intra-urban migrations, notably suburbanization and gentrification) and political issues (social housing system, economic development policies and place based policies). Under Best Metropolises an issues of development drivers will be analyzed in relation to FOCI findings.

The following ESPON projects are dedicated to the question of accessibility and accessibility indicators: 1.2.1, 1.1.1, 2.1.1 and 1.1.3. Recently, works on accessibility are carried out in TRACC, including available European network databases evaluation, among others. Apart of methodological questions, the draft final report will be studied in detail in order to refer the results of accessibility analyzes into the broader, European context. METROBORDER project uses the public transport indicator (number of lines and number of trips per day/week) which IS ALSO relevant for activity 5 *Transport, job accessibility and daily mobility*

In case of activity 6 *Intra - metropolitan migrations* four projects' results will be analyzed and used for research purposes of Best Metropolises, since they bring interesting information on drivers of change at the regional and subregional levels. Project 1.1.4 stresses the importance of migration as a main source of changes in regional population size and population distribution. Similar conclusions were derived from projects FOCI and DEMIFER. The previous one concentrates on demographic consequences of intra-urban mobility, while the latter infers that migration will benefit affluent regions, whereas poor regions will lose population due to migration. Further, migration will reduce ageing in affluent regions and will increase this phenomenon in poor ones. Migration, being positively related to economic growth, will be a strong factor increasing regional disparities. Results of DEMIFER project stress also the increasing importance of alternative forms of internal and international mobility (commuting, temporary migrations etc.), however the report adds that these new forms of mobility are hardly documented in official statistics. Project 1.1.2 presents a set of push factors (like expansion of transport infrastructure, ICT developments, housing market spatial differentiation etc.) which are responsible for intra-urban migrations, especially within urban-rural direction.

4. Work packages and project's budget

Distribution of work and responsibilities of partners are presented in table 1. There is a change shift among partners: IGSO and IAU (the new French partner). IGSO will take the responsibility for activity 6, and IAU will be responsible for activity 4.

Table 1: Activities and tasks

Activities and Tasks	IGSO	IRS	IAU	NORD REGIO	S&W
Activity 1: Historical background and development trends of Paris, Berlin and Warsaw					
1.1. Genesis of functional and structural development of metropolitan regions and their inter-relations in national urban systems	Lead	M	M	M	M
1.2. Evaluation of metropolization impact on sustainable economic and social development		M	M	M	M
Activity 2: Theoretical and conceptual framework of spatial organization					
2.1. Identification of current development trends and their determinants under the impact of: national interests, different stages of globalization and European integration	S	S	S	Lead	S
2.2. Conceptual explanation of existing metropolitan development patterns	S	S	S		S
Activity 3: Housing conditions and life quality					
3.1. Identification of trends in housing demand and preferences of current urban dwellers	M	Lead	M		
3.2. Evolving attractiveness of residential areas	M		M		
Activity 4: Evolution of socio-spatial structures					
4.1. Typology of social and spatial changes	M	M			
4.2. Studies on the formation of a new socio-spatial structure of the metropolitan areas	M	M	Lead		
4.3. Analysis of socio-spatial exclusion in different metropolitan contexts	M	M			
Activity 5: Transport, job accessibility and daily mobility					
5.1. Metropolitan transport network		S	S		M
5.2. Job accessibility in the metropolitan area	Lead	S	S		M
5.3. Intra-metropolitan daily mobility		S	S		M
Activity 6: Intra-metropolitan migrations					
6.1. Migration trends		M	M		
6.2. Migration flows between districts and municipalities	Lead	M	M		
6.3. Spatial typology of migration in the living condition context		M	M		
Activity 7: Models of governance and social participation in development and spatial planning					
7.1. Analysis of administrative organization and structures of management		M	M		M
7.2. Analysis of legal conditions for coordination of policy making and evaluation of current practices in this field	Lead	M	M		M
7.3. Analysis of conditions and practice of citizens participation in policy making		M	M		M
Activity 8: Development strategies, visions and recommendations					
8.1. Review of existing strategic documents	S	S	S	M	
8.2. Evaluation of strategic visions with respect to major goals	S	S	S	M	Lead
8.3. Recommendations for further development of visions	S	S	S	M	

Activity 9: Stakeholders' involvement					
9.1. Preparation of a program for a series of workshops on metropolitan areas development problems for stakeholders tailored to their specific needs	Lead	M	M	S	S
9.2. Organization of a series of workshops		M	M	S	S
9.3. Design of sustainable communication channels for policy makers and practitioners from every metropolitan area		M	M	S	S

Table 2: Project's budget

ESPON Best Metropolises Project									
		Staff cost			Travel & Accommodation	Equipment	External expertise & services	Administration	Total
		WP1	WP2	WP3					
1.	IGSO	7657.3	56308	7108.17	13036	0	20800	7990.53	112900
2.	IRS	1152	48121	6512.29	3862	0	0	13852.71	73500
3.	IAU	0	55600	6580	4550	0	0	7770	74500
4.	Nordregio	1600	24062.9	1921.35	4500	0	0	6615.75	38700
5.	S&W	1600	32721.5	3128.42	4100	0	0	8150.08	49700
	Total	12009.3	216813.4	25250.23	30048	0	20800	44379.07	349300

5. Additional clarifications concerning content and implementation related issue

Several programmatic and organizational issues were raised in the Annex III to the contract. Some of them had technical character and require slight corrections in documents submitted to ESPON as response to the call. Some however need additional explanations:

Implementation activities Partner 5: the budget for the S&W was calculated with assumption that in activities to be performed junior experts will be involved. Thus the budget is sufficient and there is no threat for implementation of this significant task.

European dimension: urban policy and governance challenges in metropolitan areas have their roots in the differentiated and evolving national territorial development policies. The national dimension of territorial policies is an important element of differentiation between the three metropolises as well as other European metropolitan areas. Research under activities 1, 2 and 4 (as described earlier) will be coordinated in order to expose much better the European dimension of metropolitan areas development processes. The position of the three metropolitan areas will be analyzed in the wider European urban network. Also results of mentioned activities will indicate global and European drivers impacting metropolisation processes.

Dissemination of project results outside stakeholder metropolises: TPG has established already contacts with national and European network of metropolitan areas. The website, workshops planned and other media will serve as vehicles to reach broad European audience.

Importance of the toolkit and policy recommendations: the toolkit will take a form of tailored to specific needs policy recommendations. These recommendations as well as the whole toolkit will be results of both studies conducted and cooperation with stakeholders, including workshops. Thus the toolkit will be one of final outputs of the project. Since the three metropolitan areas are managed by experienced professionals who work in different systemic conditions it will be pointless to provide stakeholders with advice on solving just problems related to day-to-day activities. The toolkit will address strategic issues crucial for development of metropolitan areas. .. how to solve

6. Deliveries and outputs

Deliveries and outputs are related to specific activities:

Activity 1

1. Report on origins of functional and structural development of Metropolitan areas of Berlin, Paris and Warsaw (including evaluation of history impact on their current position).

Activity 2

1. The identification of current development trends and their determinants under the impact of: national interests, different stages of globalization and European integration;
2. A conceptual explanation of existing metropolitan development patterns
3. The identification of driving forces of metropolitan development processes in the pan-European perspective

Activity 3

1. Spatial classification of existing housing stock
2. Identification of housing (and life style) preferences of residents
3. Identification of factors determining the choice of the place of residence
4. Model of spatial change in the housing and living conditions for three metropolitan areas which reveals spatial outcomes of inherited legacy and contemporary processes

Activity 4

1. Diagnosis of the socio-spatial and economic structures and its social and political consequences for future development
2. Assessment of urban policy and its efficiency on the European, national, regional and sub-regional levels
3. Formulation of recommendation for differentiated spatially social policy,

Activity 5

Specific outcomes of the first task:

1. the division of the metropolitan areas according to travel surveys and socio-economic data (particularly work places and population density) into communication regions;
2. the identification of a set of sections and nodes of three metropolitan transportation systems (one node in each communication region);
3. the identification of travel times (including public transport times and average motor vehicles travel times) as attributes of each section of the transportation network;
4. the assessment of three travel times matrices between origins (homes) and destinations (work places) located in Functional Urban Areas: matrix for

public transport and individual transport (all including intraregional average travel times).

Specific outcomes of the second task:

1. the map of the distribution of work places in communication regions in three metropolitan areas;
2. the identification of typology of job accessibility within metropolitan areas based on such generic accessibility indicators as travel time, daily accessibility or potential accessibility;
3. maps of job accessibility (public transport and individual transport) irrespectively of socio-economic group of households.

Specific outcomes of the third task:

1. the analysis of three travel surveys (National Travel Survey on Transport and Travel 2007-2008 in France, Mobility in Germany 2008 and Warsaw Traffic Survey 2005) ending up with the identification of differences in daily intra-metropolitan mobility between metropolitan residents of three cities;
2. the identification of patterns of daily traffic volumes within the metropolitan area in the context of citizens' mobility and assessment of transport habits by passengers distinguishing on the basis of socio-economic characteristics (age, education, income, ethnic group);
3. the identification of number of maps of job accessibility taking into account mobility patterns between socio-economic groups;
4. identification of a range of transport policy options based on passenger flow data (metropolitan tickets, park-and-ride systems etc.).

Activity 6

1. identification of patterns of migration trends, including the scale and intensity of residential movements;
2. detailed cartographic analysis of the intensity of migration;
3. detailed cartographic and typological analysis of trends in population movements in origin-target system;
4. the spatial typology of migration;
5. assessment of the migration processes from the perspective of shaping the spatial structures and urban policies
6. identification of regularities and trends, cartographic analysis, mapping and explanation of the reasons for displacement, will not only provide better understanding of the mechanisms of migration. Those analyses should also identify barriers and limitations associated with the change of domicile. In effect, this becomes the basis for, suggested in application form, design of the promotion of mobility within the metropolitan area and creation of conditions for sustainable development of spatial mobility.

Activity 7

1. description of administrative and management structures
2. evaluation of the level of decentralization of the governance system and its impact on performance of metropolitan areas
3. identification of approaches to metropolitan areas development and evaluation of the level of cohesion of these approaches;
4. identification of horizontal and vertical links between governing bodies and assessment of inter-governmental cooperation with emphasis on inter-municipal cooperation
5. identification of mechanisms of citizens involvement in policy making
6. identification of barriers and incentives for social participation;
7. assessment of the level of citizens participation in policy making.

Activity 8

The results of the activity will be presented in one deliverable with three parts, each belonging to one of the three tasks of this Activity:

8.1 *Review of strategic documents.* This part of the report will summarise the existing strategic documents of the three cities in terms of their cohesion and adequacy with respect to the goals economic development, equity and sustainability.

8.2 *Evaluation of strategic visions.* This part of the report will present the results of the evaluation of the strategic visions of the three metropolitan areas by their own and a set of overarching goals applied to all three metropolitan areas.

8.3 *Recommendations for strategic visions.* This part of the report will summarise the recommendations for each city to further develop their strategic visions resulting from the review of strategic documents and the stakeholder involvement in Activity 9.

Activity 9

1. workshop materials
2. articles and information materials for stakeholders and other interested parties (associations and networks of metropolitan cities, professional groups – planners, city managers)

7. Sources of information

The basic source of information for different analysis will be a set of statistical data bases (national and European). Already published results of the research on development history, socio-spatial differentiation, migrations, management, etc. in the three metropolitan areas will also serve as a source of information. All partners will also make use of official planning and programmatic documents concerning development of metropolitan areas.

Activity 7 will require not only review of documents but also properly structured interview's scenarios with actors active on metropolitan scene and other direct interactions with stakeholders.

In case of activity 8 the following list contains strategic documents nominated by the stakeholders of the three metropolitan areas to be analysed. The list will be extended and presented in full in the Interim Report.

Paris

Atelier parisien d'urbanisme, 2008, Paris 21ème Siècle.

[http://www.apur.org/etudes.php? visu-livres.php?id=8](http://www.apur.org/etudes.php?visu-livres.php?id=8)

Conseil Régional d'Ile-de-France, 2008, Projet de Schéma directeur de la Région Ile-de-France.

[http://www.sdrif.com/fileadmin/unloud file/doc accueil/SDRIF.PDF](http://www.sdrif.com/fileadmin/unloud_file/doc_accueil/SDRIF.PDF)

Institut d'aménagement et d'urbanisme Ile-de-France, 2006, Les conditions de logement en Ile-de-France en 2006.

http://www.iauidf.fr/fileadmin/Etudes/etude_620/Conditions_de_logement200avec_si_gnets.pdf

Institut d'aménagement et d'urbanisme Ile-de-France, 2009, Les études de comparaisons internationales. <http://www.iau-idf.fr/nos-etudes/themes/theme/comparaisons-internationales>

Ville de Paris, 2006, Plan local d'urbanisme parisien.

http://www.paris.fr/portail/Urbanisme/Portal.lut?page_id=7020

Ville de Paris, 2007, Plan de déplacements de Paris.

http://www.paris.fr/portail/deplacements/Portal.lut?page_id=7619

Le Grand Paris de l'agglomération Parisienne, 2009, Logement.

<http://www.legrandparis.net/sites/default/files/dossierthematiques/GrandParis-Logement.pdf>

Le Grand Paris de l'agglomération Parisienne, 2009, Fleuves et Cours d'Eau.

<http://www.legrandparis.net/sites/default/files/dossierthematiques/GrandParis-Fleuves.pdf>

Le Grand Paris de l'agglomération Parisienne, 2009, Espaces Verts.

http://www.legrandparis.net/sites/default/files/dossierthematiques/Espaces_verts.pdf

Le Grand Paris de l'agglomération Parisienne, 2009, Transport et

Mobilité;

http://www.legrandparis.net/sites/default/files/dossierthematiques/Transports_et_mobilite_0.pdf

Berlin

Senatskanzlei Berlin, 2000, The Berlin Studie: Strategies for the city. Berlin: Regioverlag.

Senatskanzlei Berlin, 2003 (2000), Die Berlin Studie. Strategien für die Stadt. Erfurt: DRV.

<http://www.berlin.de/rbmskzl/berlinstudie/>

Land Berlin, Land Brandenburg, 2009, Gesamtverkehrsprognose 2025 für die Länder Berlin und Brandenburg.

http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/verkehr/politik_planung/step_verkehr/index.shtml

Senatskanzlei Berlin, Staatskanzlei Brandenburg, 2009, Political and administrative cooperation between Berlin and the surrounding State of Brandenburg (Fortschrittsbericht über die Zusammenarbeit zwischen den Ländern Brandenburg und Berlin und die weitere Zusammenlegung von Behörden und Sonderbehörden.)

<http://www.berlinbrandenburg.de>

Senatsverwaltung für Inneres und Sport, 2009, 2. Fortschrittsbericht ServiceStadt Berlin.

http://www.berlin.de/imperia/md/content/verwaltungsmoernisierung/publikationen/2_fortschrittsbericht_verwaltungsmoernisierung_neu.pdf

Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, 2003, Mobil2010 Stadtentwicklungsplan Verkehr Berlin.

http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/verkehr/politik_planung/prognose_2025/download/GVP2025_Ergebnisbericht_2009.pdf.de/imperia/md/content/bbhomepage/fortschrittsbericht_2009.pdf

Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, 2009, Berlins Zukunft gestalten, Flächennutzungsplanung für Berlin.

<http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/planen/fnp/de/bericht/fnpbericht09.pdf>

Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, 2009, Demografiekonzept.

http://www.berlin.de/imperia/md/content/demografiekonzept/demografiekonzept_berlin.pdf

Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, 2009, Ergebnisbericht zur Rahmenstrategie Soziale Stadtentwicklung.

http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/soziale_stadt/rahmenstrategie/download/ergebnisbericht_soizstadteilentw_2008.pdf

Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, 2009, New Opportunities for 33 Quarters.
<http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/wohnen/quartiersmanagement/de/download.shtml>

Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, 2010, Handbuch Sozialraumorientierung.
http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/soziale_stadt/rahmenstrategie/download/SFS_Handbuch_RZ_screen.pdf

Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, 2010, Stadtprofil Berlin – Berlin profil miasta.
http://www.eunop.eu/news/750/berlinprofil_titel-s32.pdf

Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, Investitionsbank Berlin, 2010, Berliner Wohnungsmarktbericht 2009.
http://www.ibb.de/portaldata/1/resources/content/download/ibb_service/publikationen/IBB_Wohnungsmarktbericht_2009.pdf

Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, Res Urbana GmbH, 2008, Monitoring Soziale Stadtentwicklung.
http://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/planen/basisdaten_stadtentwicklung/monitoring/download/2008/EndberichtMoni2008pdf.pdf

Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Technologie und Frauen, 2009, Wirtschafts- und Arbeitsmarktbericht 2008/2009.
<http://www.berlin.de/imperia/md/content/senwirtschaft/publikationen/berichte/wab2009.pdf?start&ts=1259921548&file=wab2009.pdf>

Warsaw

City of Warsaw, 2008, The Local Revitalisation Programme for the City of Warsaw for 2005-2013.
<http://rewitalizacja.um.warszawa.pl/en/the-local-revitalization-programme-for-the-city-of-warsaw>

City of Warsaw, 2008, Social Strategy for the City of Warsaw for 2009-2020.
http://strategia.um.warszawa.pl/pl/sub/57_dokumenty_.html

City of Warsaw, 2008, Sustainable Development of Transport System Strategy for the City of Warsaw until 2015.
<http://www.um.warszawa.pl/wydarzenia/szrstw/>

City of Warsaw, 2008, Warsaw Metropolitan Area.
http://www.mbpr.pl/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=225&Itemid=55

City of Warsaw, 2010, Warsaw Development Strategy until 2020.
http://www.um.warszawa.pl/v_syrenka/ratusz/strategia.php

City of Warsaw, 2010, Land use and management plans in Warsaw.
<http://www.um.warszawa.pl/wydarzenia/studium>

Mazovian Voivodeship, 2004, Land use and management plans in Mazovian Voivodeship.
<http://www.mbpr.pl/images/zpp/PZPWOJMAZ.pdf>

Mazovian Voivodeship, 2010, Development Strategy until 2020.
<http://www.mazovia.pl/?a=news&id=2342>

Activities 3, 5, and 6 require detailed and reliable data on socio-economic situation of population, housing conditions, location of jobs, transport system, daily mobility and migration in appropriate spatial units and covering the time span of the last 20 years. Results of preliminary investigation of data available from statistical offices proves that many important information is missing. Some of them are in the possession of regional and local governments, that collect this information for management

purposes. Thus TPG prepared initial list of data that are needed to perform studies planned:

- in-flow and out-flow of population to and from metropolitan area, annually, 1989-2009
- number of population of metropolitan area, annually, 1989-2009
- structure of population of metropolitan area (number of pre-working, working, post-working age), annually, 1989-2009
- in-flow and out-flow to and from metropolitan areas, by the smallest possible units, 1989, 1994, 1999, 2004, 2009 or five-year range: 1990-1994, 1995-1999, 2000-2004, 2005-2009
- number of population of metropolitan areas by the smallest possible units, 1989, 1994, 1999, 2004, 2009
- migration matrix (number of displacements, by origin/target by the smallest possible units, 2008 or 2008-2009 period)
- number of people living in cities' districts and in municipalities around the central city (according to age groups)
- technical infrastructure accessibility (water mains, sewage systems, gas pipelines, heating system, etc.)
- rent
- rent debts and evictions
- forms of ownership (apartments, houses)
- communal housing stock
- average size of apartment (in the smallest possible spatial units)
- average living space per capita
- age of housing stock,
- number of house / apartments built, annually, 1989 – 2009
- detailed GIS layouts for accessibility maps.

8. Literature

- Ache, P./Andersen, H.T./Maloutas, T./Raco, M./Tasan-Kok, T. (Eds.), 2008, *Cities between Competitiveness and Cohesion: Discourses, Realities and Implementation*, The GeoJournal Library V93. Springer: Dordrecht.
- Aguilera, A., S. Wenglenski, and L. Proulhac. 2009. "Employment suburbanisation, reverse commuting and travel behaviour by residents of the central city in the Paris metropolitan area." *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 43(7):685-691
- Andersen, H.T., 2005, *Urban transformation and urban governance. Shaping the competitive city of the future*. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, vol. 20, 93-94.
- Brenner, N., 2003, *Metropolitan institutional reform and the rescaling of state space in contemporary Western Europe*, *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 10(4), 297-325
- Brenner, N., 2004, *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*, Oxford University Press: London and New York.
- Dangschat J., Blasius J., 1987, *Social And Spatial Disparities in Warsaw in 1978: An Application of Correspondences Analysis to a 'Socialist' City*. *Urban Studies*, 24, pp. 173-191.
- Häußermann, H. et.al., 2010, *Monitoring Soziale Stadtentwicklung Berlin 2009*. Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung (Ed.), Berlin.

- Jonas, A. E. G. / K. Ward, 2007, Introduction to a debate on city-regions: new geographies of governance, democracy and social reproduction, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 31(1), 169-178.
- Knapp, W./Schmitt, P., 2003, Re-structuring Competitive Metropolitan Regions in North-west Europe: On Territory and Governance, *European Journal of Spatial Development*, Refereed Articles Oct 2003-no 6. www.nordregio.se/EJSD/refereed6.pdf
- Korcelli P., 1987, Growth fluctuations and alternative trajectories of future population change: a case study of the Warsaw region, *Papers of the Regional Science Association*, 61, p. 131-144.
- Lisowski A., 2005, Centralization and decentralization processes in Warsaw's agglomeration, 1950-2002, *Studies in Geography*, 35, University of Warsaw, Faculty of Geography and Regional Studies, p. 13-34 (in Polish).
- Niedzielski M.A., Śleszyński P., 2008, Analyzing accessibility by transport mode in Warsaw, Poland, *Geographica Polonica* 81 (2), 61-78.
- OECD, 2006, *Competitive Cities in the Global Economy*; OECD Territorial Reviews. OECD. Paris, OECD.
- Potrykowska A., Śleszyński P., 1999, Internal migration in Warsaw and Warsaw Voivodship, *Atlas of Warsaw*, 7, Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization of Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, 212 pp. (in Polish)
- Schönwälder K., Sohn J., 2007, *Siedlungsstrukturen von Migrantengruppen in Deutschland: Schwerpunkte der Ansiedlung und innerstädtische Konzentrationen*, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH, Arbeitspapier, Berlin
- Scott, A. J., 2001, Globalization and the rise of city-regions, *European Planning Studies* 9, 813-826.
- Senatsverwaltung für Stadtentwicklung, 2009, *Demografiekonzept für Berlin*. Berlin
- Smętkowski, M., 2009, Zróżnicowania społeczno-przestrzenne Warszawy – inercja czy metamorfoza struktury miasta?, *Przegląd geograficzny*, 81, 4, s. 461-482.
- Węclawowicz G., 1975, *Struktura przestrzeni społeczno-gospodarczej Warszawy w latach 1931 i 1970 w świetle analizy czynnikowej*, *Prace Geograficzne*, nr 116, Instytut Geografii i Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania PAN, Ossolineum, Wrocław-Warszawa.

www.espon.eu

The ESPON 2013 Programme is part-financed by the European Regional Development Fund, the EU Member States and the Partner States Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Switzerland. It shall support policy development in relation to the aim of territorial cohesion and a harmonious development of the European territory.

ISBN