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Analytical Framework

Quantitative, indicator based research
- Modelling urban size and metropolisation
  - Cost & benefit functions regarding size (n = 59 metropolises)
- Metropolitan profiles
  - Characteristics describing urban development (n=50 metropolises)
  - Discussing their meaning as strengths and weaknesses
- Polycentric structures: Morphological & relational
  - Describing and assessing polycentric features

Qualitative perception based research
- Actor survey
  - Assessing urban development trends
- 5 workshops: discussion and expertise on thematic fields
  - Elaborating perspectives, activities, metropolitan agendas
- Comparison of agendas and planning documents
  - Joint activities, programmes, cooperative activities

Note: The represented deviations from the sample's average result from selected indicators that may not draw a comprehensive picture of each factor's performance within the metropolitan area. Underlying indicators comprising these factors are listed in the annex to this report.
POLYCE Results: one year after

Polycentric development
- its meaning for urban size
- Understanding in context of metropolitan development
- the assets of 5 CE cities

Metropolitan and polycentric development
- A mutual relation?

Polycentricity and strategic efforts
- Between experiences and visions

Policy conclusions and recommendations
- A procedural logic on polycentric development
- Finding the balance: strategy versus illusion
Urban size and polycentric development
Meaning of metropolitan and polycentric features on urban size

Polycentric and metropolitan development
Polycentric features as assets
Metropolitan profiles and characteristics as assets

Elaborated by different groups of the POLYC-team
Urban size and metropolisation: findings

Positive impact on European agglomerations
• Metropolitan power functions
• Micro-level polycentricity as an important precondition

Results for POLYCE metropolises

Preconditions indicating chances and risks for future growth
• Bratislava, Ljubljana: potential for further urban growth
• Wien, Praha: increasing risks through growth

Understanding of polycentricity in context of metropolisation

**Polycentric urban system**
Several urban nodes (=cities) linked through functional relations

**Polycentricity in governance approaches**
Enhancement of mutual interests, complementarities, synergies and potentials for collaboration

**Morphological, functional and strategic relations**
Intra-urban: micro level
Inter-urban: meso or macro level

- **Core City (CC)**
  Capital cities in their administrative delimitation

- **Functional Metropolitan Area (FMA)**
  Daily urban system (area of intensive commuting to work)

- **Metropolitan Region (MR)**
  Wider economic region reflecting the territorial networks of a city’s economy (meso level)
Polycentric features as assets

- Unequal in morphological & functional polycentric development
- Predominately, national command and control centers
- Metropolis as gateways
- Vienna, Prague and Budapest: competitors for business investments
- Vienna-Bratislava as an important core of CED-region improving the polycentric conditions
- Higher-ranked functions rather situated in Vienna than in Prague and Budapest
- Ljubljana as the remote outpost of the region (more connected to Mediterranean and Balkans)
Metropolisation: profiles and benchmarking

Different aspects of the process
- Concentration of (new) economic functions and population
- Node in global networks
- Knowledge intensive economic activities
- Allocation of specialized functions as driving forces
→ Leading to similar characteristics?

Research questions:
- What do the metropolitan profiles of the five POLYCE metropolises look like? Are they similar or different/heterogeneous?

Details of empirical research
- 50 metropolises, 123 indicators → 25 factors → 5 key characteristics
- Data reflect the situation before year 2008
Metropolitan Profiles: benchmarking

Western European metropolises dominate Praha best performing under accession countries Profiles differ remarkably

5 metropolises
Living conditions show relative best values Unequal profiles as outcome of spezialisation Wien and Prague show relativ similar performance ; Data until 2008
Results of 50 metropolises

- Top metropolitan profiles: *Amsterdam, Munich, Stockholm*.....

→ **Best and worst performing fields of urban development vary across metropolises**
→ **cities show individual or at least group specific profiles;**

Assets for 5 POLYCE metropolises

- There are differences between POLYCE metropolitan profiles- with some similarities: (i) Vienna / Prague, (ii) Bratislava / Ljubljana, (iii) Budapest;
- High quality of living characterizes all of them - a common asset

→ **a clear specialization in specific fields of metropolitan development, indicating specific assets**
Metropolitan and polycentric development
A mutual relation between characteristics and level of metropolitan and polycentric development?

Elaborated by Rudolf Giffinger, Johannes Suitner

Important features of metropolitan development
• Average population growth
• Share of active population with tertiary diploma:
• Number of HQs of transnational firms:
• Accessibility of metropolitan region
Types of metropolises

T1 - robust metropolises with good accessibility:
  • Average population growth and number of HQs; very good accessibility
  • Amsterdam, Berlin, Bremen, Brussels, Cologne, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Lille, Manchester, Milan, Munich, Prague, Rome, Stuttgart, Vienna

T2 - fast-growing, transforming metropolises with lack of accessibility:
  • fast-growing highly-skilled population; below-average accessibility; disperse in terms of HQs; international integration not as advanced as for Type 1
  • Athens, Barcelona, Bordeaux, Copenhagen, Dublin, Helsinki, Luxembourg, Lyon, Madrid, Seville, Stockholm, Toulouse, Valencia, Warsaw

T3 - poorly embedded metropolises, lagging in economic restructuring:
  • below-average accessibility and HQs; population growth and human capital below Europ. average, but not significant
  • Cities: Bologna, Bratislava, Budapest, Gdansk, Krakow, Lisbon, Ljubljana, Lodz, Porto, Riga, Tallinn, Torino, Vilnius

T4 - extreme case metropolis:
  • extraordinarily high number of HQs; poor accessibility
  • Glasgow
Obviously and despite some general trends:

- Metropolisation provides comparable cities classified in Types 1, 2, and 3;

**Comparing polycentric features for about 43 metropolises across the three types**

- Distinct features of polycentric development show their selected importance for certain types;
- Polycentric preconditions on the micro-, meso- and macro level are only selective important factors influencing metropolitan development;

→ A general trend and interrelation that would be significant across all types of metropolises could not be detected

→ Very obvious for micro- and macropolycentric development for 5 CE metropolises

- On micro level between CC and region
  - Type-1-cities: little disparities, type-3-cities: strong disparities
- On macro level relations/network between cities
  - Type-1-cities promising preconditions; type-3-cities: strong deficits
Polycentric development and strategic efforts: perceptive-assessing
Indicator based place evidence
versus
stakeholders’ perceptions and visions

Elaborated by POLYCE team
Stakeholders’ perception of strategic endeavors

Polycentricity

- Competition between local authorities for business and infrastructure investments
- Vienna and Budapest: ambitions to play the role of a supranational center
- Vienna more outward West oriented, Budapest hub to South-East
- (unequal) lack of coordinated spatial planning at metropolitan level

→ differentiated understanding and assessment for metropolitan development
→ from stakeholders’ perspective: cities consider polycentric development through their function and position in different ways
  - Vienna and Bratislava are seen in a clear twin-city-situation
  - stakeholders in Praha, Ljubljana and Budapest see the position of their metropolis in a specific geographic context → hub

→ In general, a deficite of common polycentric vision and activities
Attitudes on strategic approaches to repositioning

• **Type 1**: cohesive development activities in mind
  • Prevailing infrastructural measures
  • Knowledge-based economy and growth management are most important metropolisation activities

• **Type 3**: more competition-oriented attitudes
  • Suggested activities indicate competitive behaviour
  • But, focused territory often is core city
Perception against place evidence

Confronting evidence with perceptive assessments of stakeholders

congruencies and discrepancies between activities suggested by stakeholders
and indicator-based evidence on polycentric metropolitan development

**Type 1**
- In general, Agendas and evident structures converge rather well
- But, comparably well-integrated city-regions perceived as inhomogeneous
- Hence, micro and macro polycentric development: already regarded as an asset to be enhanced

**Type 3**
- Less convergence in Agendas and evident structures
- Although evidence shows relatively weak metropolitan assets, metropolisation is only partly regarded as challenge
- Potential of macro-polycentric development is not (yet) sufficiently perceived
- Micro-polycentric development perceived as essential, while meso- and macro-polycentric development is under-emphasized, realistic vision but not realized
Policy conclusions and recommendations
A processual logic on polycentric development
Finding the balance: Illusion versus strategy as an asset

Elaborated by Rudolf Giffinger & Johannes Suitner
Conclusions in strategic perspective

Metropolitan size and its preconditions

→ Even relatively well developed polycentric structures in the metropolitan regions of Praha and Wien go along with findings on urban sprawl as a risk and potential cost factor.

→ A lack of polycentric development in future will negatively influence metropolitan development through negative external effects (costs).

Metropolitan profiles and city types are indicating challenges and chances of metropolitan development

→ Metropolitan Profiles, different types of metropolises and the stakeholders’ discussion are identifying rather specific assets for positioning.

→ Hence, strategic endeavors should be differentiated according to place based or type specific evidence in order to avoid illusions.
Conclusions in strategic perspective

Type-1-cities Prague and Vienna
• Already show clear assets in micro and macro polycentric conditions

→ **Nonetheless, stakeholders perceive future polycentric development more important than competitive metropolitan development**

→ **In front of recent growth, this perception is realistic, but remains probably an illusion if metropolis is not strengthened in its competitiveness and the allocation of metropolitan functions is not promoted in particular**

Type-3-cities Bratislava, Budapest and Ljubljana
• Already show specific assets in metropolitan features but not at all in micro and macro polycentric conditions

→ **Despite this weakness, stakeholders perceive polycentric development less important than future competitive metropolitan development**

→ **In front of deficits in recent development, this perception is realistic, but remains probably an illusion if polycentric development (micro and meso) are not promoted in addition**
Planning and policy challenge: a procedural view

Polycentric metropolitan development

- Intrinsic logic of the process
  - Polycentric features have a certain meaning for metropolitan development
  - Hence, it needs realistic strategies integrating status of metropolitan and polycentric development in which existing assets and deficits are perceived as realistic as possible

Policy-advice: need of place based approaches

- More place-based research and evidence-based strategy discussions are needed
- No general policy and planning approach possible to foster all European metropolises for same outcome
- Polycentric concepts (EU, national) should be adapted to certain city types in a place-based way
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