PRACE NAUKOWE UNIWERSYTETU EKONOMICZNEGO WE WROCŁAWIU
RESEARCH PAPERS OF WROCŁAW UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS nr 476 • 2017
Local and Regional Economy in Theory and Practice ISSN 1899-3192
e-ISSN 2392-0041

Joanna Wyrwa
University of Zielona Góra
e-mail: j.wyrwa@wez.uz.zgora.pl

TERRITORIAL DIMENSION OF DEVELOPMENT AS A NEW PARADIGM OF THE EUROPEAN COHESION POLICY FOR THE YEARS 2014-2020[1]

TERYTORIALNY WYMIAR ROZWOJU JAKO NOWY PARADYGMAT EUROPEJSKIEJ POLITYKI SPÓJNOŚCI NA LATA 2014-2020

DOI: 10.15611/pn.2017.476.04

Summary: The aim of this article is to identify the fundamental changes in the approach to programming and financing the development in the years 2014-2020, to present mechanisms and instruments of urban policy supported by EU funds, as well as practical aspects concerning territorial delimitation of urban functional areas. Considerations shall be based on studies of program source documents relating to functional areas.

Keywords: regional development, integrated development, functional area.

Summary: Celem artykułu jest zidentyfikowanie zasadniczych zmian w podejściu do programowania i finansowania rozwoju w latach 2014-2020, przedstawienie mechanizmów i instrumentów polityki miejskiej wspieranych środkami unijnymi, a także praktycznych aspektów dotyczących delimitacji terytorialnej miejskich obszarów funkcjonalnych. Rozważania oparte są na studiach programowych dokumentów źródłowych dotyczących obszarów funkcjonalnych.

Keywords: rozwój regionalny, rozwój zintegrowany, obszar funkcjonalny.

1. Introduction

Contemporary challenges of the civilizational development being a consequence of the increasing economy globalization and the growing competitive pressure result in the need of the more active involvement of territorial entities in the processes of their development management. The main challenge for the effective territorial

[1] This paper is co-financed by the city of Zielona Góra.

management is the creation of institutional and organizational solutions which may lead to reaching a consensus on strategic goals of the development.

The current needs in the field of the management integration result directly from the new territorial approach to the development policy, which consists in the departure from the perception of regions defined by administrative boundaries in favour of individual potentials, barriers and interactions. This approach should enable to ensure high efficiency, added value and better use of territorial potentials.

The introduction of the territorial dimension to the management practice is becoming a challenge which requires an innovative approach to management, including innovation in the institutions responsible for programming and planning.[2]

An essential part of the new concept is the introduction of a separate cross-sectional planning category, the so-called functional planning, which is necessary due to the need to ensure planning in the areas with specific characteristics not associated with administrative restrictions, regardless of the existence of a national, provincial or local plan [Kaczmarek 2014; Kaźmierczyk 2014].

The urban areas, for which new objectives, principles and support mechanisms have been determined, are a component of the territorial dimension. The new instruments proposed in the legislative packages of the EU are supposed to improve the use of the EU funds and contribute to their more effective use in the current perspective. The territorial orientation of the public intervention in the new scheme entails both many potential benefits and poses a lot of challenges [Kogut-Jaworska 2013].

The aim of this article is to identify the fundamental changes in the approach to programming and financing the development in the years 2014-2020, to present mechanisms and instruments of urban policy supported by EU funds, as well as practical aspects concerning territorial delimitation of urban functional areas. Considerations are based on program studies of the source documents concerning functional areas.

2. Territorial dimension of development policies

The EU cohesion policy is evolving from the concept of the economic and social cohesion, which is associated with actions aimed at reduction of intraregional differences in the economic and social sphere to the concept of territorial cohesion, which is becoming the new paradigm of the regional policy [Mantey 2013].

It is in the new approach to the development that a territory understood as a dynamic, changing in time and space system of different relationships, not necessarily respecting the existing administrative divisions, is the subject of intervention. The

[2] M. Grochowski [2014, p. 125] claims that "the relationships in the system: authorities – competence – territory should be defined in a new way, taking into account the multiplicity of the entities involved in the governance, the need to share power and competence, the requirement of the cooperation between different levels of administration and management".

"territorialization" is aimed at identification of the development problem, which should be solved with the use of the endogenous territory potential in the first place, regardless of the existing administrative boundaries.

The territorial approach forces integration that is the creation of the conditions for cooperation of local governments which goes far beyond the traditional formal administrative divisions in both the hierarchical and horizontal systems. The integration for development consists in combining interventions in different sectors and at different administration levels. These are functional units instead of administrative units that are becoming the area of action more and more often, therefore the previously defined territory does not necessarily coincide with the boundaries, which are used to divide functional areas into separate, independently managed spatial units [Mantey 2013].

The key document indicating the legitimacy of the territorial approach in the EU Cohesion Policy is the report prepared by F. Barca, entitled "An agenda for a reformed cohesion policy. A place-based approach to meeting European Union challenges and expectations" [Barca 2009]. The report indicated the weaknesses of the cohesion policy, which are often associated with the sectoral thinking. The criticism was focused mainly on the unified regional policy not considering specific local conditions and the lack of coordination and integration of activities undertaken by different entities. In response to these problems, an attempt was made to reform the ways and tools to stimulate the development in the European, regional and local dimension, which was reflected in the paradigm of the *place based policy* [Noworól 2013; Nowakowska 2015].[3]

Currently, the most important strategic document relating to the territorial dimension, adopted at the intergovernmental level, is the Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020 (AT 2020), which determines "the policy framework focused on actions and supporting the territorial cohesion in Europe" [*Agenda Terytorialna*… 2011]. Its goal is to "ensure implementation of the Europe 2020 strategy in accordance with the principles of the territorial cohesion" [Żuk 2012].

T. Markowski [2011] believes that the territorial dimension of the development policy results from the role, which is assigned to the dynamic functional and spatial relationships. It is associated with the so-called "territorialization of the economy, territorialization of enterprises and the need to change the way of interaction of local

[3] According to the F. Barca's report, the place based development policy is "a long-term development strategy which is aimed at reduction of the long-term inefficiency (insufficient use of the full potential) and inequalities (the participation of people living below a certain standard of living or the range of inequalities amongst people)" in a specific area [Barca 2009]. The report assumes that the regionally oriented policy is the right and modern way to promote "the harmonious development" and reduce "disproportions" between regions as well as to limit the "backwardness of regions" through the implementation of the cohesion policy [Barca 2009]. The departure from the primacy of the sectoral approach results from the need to concentrate the public intervention in certain places (a place-based policy).

governments for the development beyond the traditional formal administrative divisions".[4]

The territorial approach is aimed at greater taking into account various development determinants and the optimal use of endogenous resources (so-called territorial capital) for encouraging development processes. In particular, it is postulated [Nowakowska 2015]: to re-evaluate development factors, to emphasize diversification and diversity of resources as a source of the socio-economic development; to focus the policy on strengthening internal and external functional relationships to increase territorial cohesion; to increase the mobilization of local/regional entities, to strengthen social dialog as well as public-private partnerships in actions for territorial development; to create an institutional partnership and to integrate actions of public entities (integration of policies towards entities and sectors, identification and implementation of common development goals); to differentiate development policies –departure from the universal development policy model in favour of the sustainable development policy determined by specific resources, problems and mechanisms of the territorial development.

The territorial approach is focused on three fundamental elements [Nowakowska 2015]. Firstly, on territorial resources and development determinants (specific and endogenous resources, internal economic relationships, relationships in local communities). Secondly, on the integration of actions undertaken in different institutional systems and strengthening the partnership for promoting socio-economic development. Thirdly, on encouraging mechanisms of the development in the functional areas forming coherent territories, regardless of the administrative and political system. Hence, the territorial development paradigm is defined as an integrated approach to shaping the development.

The integrated approach to shaping development introduces significant changes to forms, content and methods of planning and to organizational structures of the public authorities and the implementation system of the development policy. The integration of planning should be implemented both in the horizontal and cross-sectoral systems as well as between authority levels. It is network planning based on the participation of all entities acting in the given area.

[4] T. Markowski emphasizes that the functional efficiency of territorial production systems and their competitiveness determine the possibility of maintaining sustainable competitive advantages of manufacturers. Therefore, the boundaries of territories in socio-economic systems are determined by functions associated with activities of people acting as manufacturers and consumers. It is in this context that a territory – from an administrative point of view – is only one of the ways of the formal and legal determination of interests' and influences areas of communities creating structures of states and local governments. The key element of this issue is the observation that the processes associated with the economy globalization weaken the importance of formal administrative boundaries. At the same time, the importance of the dynamic and variable in space and time relationships is growing. It confirms that territories should be considered open systems being in constant interaction with the environment. Therefore, the new approach to the development policy means the acceptance of the need of the management of dynamic, functional territorial systems (citing after: [Noworól 2013]).

Integrated planning is perceived as a model more relevant for dynamic and variable in time and space territories. It is not only about holistic and integrated thinking in sectoral or spatial planning but also about the creation of a new integrated planning system and plans adequate to modern economy characteristics. It is necessary to include territorial entities of different levels and not only integrated planning procedures in the meaning of the existing dual and sectoral development planning system in the development policy.[5]

The new paradigm of the regional policy is reflected in national planning documents such as the National Strategy for the Regional Development (KSRR 2020) and the Concept of the Spatial Development of the Country 2030 (KPZK 2030).

KPZK 2030 emphasizes the strong correlation between spatial and socio-economic planning introducing a new category of functional planning. It is a "separate cross-sectional planning category due to the need to ensure planning in the areas with specific characteristics not associated with administrative restrictions regardless of the existence of national, regional local plans (plans for functional areas)" [*Koncepcja Przestrzennego*... 2011]. Consequently, the KPZK 2030 introduces functional areas to the Polish planning system and the need to keep a correlation between spatial policy objectives and regional policy objectives.

3. Urban functional areas in the cohesion policy 2014-2020

The concept of a functional area as part of the regional policy was defined in the Act on the spatial planning and development [*Ustawa z 27 marca 2003*]. It is an "area of specific phenomena in the land management or occurrence of spatial conflicts, creating a cohesive spatial system consisting of functionally related sites characterized by common conditions and projected uniform development objectives". It is associated with the theory of nodal areas whose boundaries are determined on the basis of the range of influence of its center. It is an area formed around a larger urban center (or a group of towns) connected to one another by mutual links, i.e. exchange of people, goods, services, capital, information. The integral parts of an area are its

[5] The integrated planning grew out of the criticism of the existing methods and planning procedures forming a dichotomous system in the division into spatial and socio-economic planning. The new paradigm is an attempt of a holistic approach towards the analysis and shaping territorial development processes. It is "comprehensive" planning combining different dimensions and contexts of development processes. It takes into account strong and complex interdependencies occurring in the development processes and is based on a comprehensive evaluation of costs and benefits. It is based on the territorial and functional approach and radically breaks with the sectoral approach to shaping development processes. It emphasizes mutual sustainable relationships amongst economic, social and environmental subsystems. It shows the need to take into account the impact of many elements related to functioning of various fields of human activity in the analytical procedures [Nowakowska 2015].

center (a town and a zone of its influence) and the so-called outskirts. Both parts fulfil important, complementary functions which result from the differentiation of the development level and the socio-economic potential [Szafranek 2015].

A functional area (according to the Ministry of the Regional Development) is a specially separated specific territorial complex characterized by common socio-economic and spatial features.

A. Nowakowska [2015] emphasizes that functional areas are characterized by a "common territorial capital, strong internal relationships and interdependencies in development mechanisms. These areas face also common problems and development challenges and at the same time their separateness from the environment can be noticed."

A concept related to the concept of a functional area is the concept of a strategic intervention area. It is a new concept in the development policy interpreted as an area for which an intervention of a government and/or self-government authorities is required due to its special nature and its impact on development processes.[6]

The main purpose of the creation of functional areas is the creation of conditions for starting and strengthening cooperation based on the use of endogenous potential of the given territory. The selected and focused regional policy interventions, which should remove structural problems, may be directed to functional areas.

The National Urban Policy indicates that the main direction of actions concerning functional areas is the development of the culture of the cooperation amongst local government units, which should take the form of a real, effective partnership cooperation of all development entities – both in the vertical and horizontal arrangement. Moreover, it is necessary to identify development needs accurately on the basis of the internal development potentials, resources and knowledge, which should ensure the implementation of the measures responding to specific challenges and at the same time be precisely tailored to local circumstances.

The concept of the Spatial Development of the Country 2030 sets the typology of functional areas, among which urban functional areas (MOF) play a key role in the regional development. The urban functional area is a spatially continuous settlement system consisting of separate administrative territorial units. Hence, it includes a central town (the main town-the core) and the outskirts surrounding it and connected to it functionally and spatially. It is a highly-urbanized area with the

[6] Two different main areas of strategic interventions are distinguished. Firstly, the areas in which a significant problem has been identified, which blocks development processes and the self-government is not able to solve it. Secondly, the areas which due to the social, economic or environmental potential concentrated in them, have or may have a significant impact on the development of the country/region/district in future. Therefore, the main criteria for the delimitation of the strategic intervention areas in development strategies are [Nowakowska 2015]: common, specific development conditions and social, economic and environmental characteristics; the existence of common barriers and similar development problems (so-called problem areas); the possibility of applying common types and tools of a public intervention, the possibility of applying a common development policy.

highest population density and the most important functions in the settlement system including all types of territorial local units [Heffner 2015].[7]

According to the ESPON definition, the functional urban areas (FUA) consist of urbanized areas, a town core within administrative borders and adjacent areas in the commuting zone. Each of the functional areas is organized around an urban agglomeration of European or national importance, which is supplied by immediate functional surroundings and supported by local development centers [Heffner 2015].

From the normative point of view, the functional urban areas may be treated as a tool for aggregating preferences in the public choice concerning the effectiveness of allocation of resources. Normative functions associated with the aggregation of preferences in the public choice concentrated in functional urban areas, may concern [Klasik et al. 2013]: stimulating the efficient use of regional growth factors, elimination of negative external effects, concentrated in the functional area, management of public transfers as well as preparing a location offer for the business sector.

Urban functional areas have a varied scale determined primarily by the potential of the town core. Therefore, one can distinguish in practice [Obrębalski 2014]: functional areas of metropolitan areas, functional areas of regional centres (voivodeship towns which may achieve the rank of a metropolitan center in the long run), the functional areas of the sub regional centers (designated around county towns, which are not included in metropolitan and regional centers as well as around former voivodeship towns, which are not county towns, towns with their population exceeding 50 thousand), the functional areas of local centers (around the towns, in particular county towns with less than 50 thousand inhabitants which have development potential).

Designation of urban functional areas may be based on different sets of criteria of the content-related nature associated mainly with the purpose of their delimitation. The urbanization degree of the zone supposed to be included in the functional area should be taken into account in order to include urban areas (cores and their functional zones as well as related rural areas, type of the development potential) due to the presence of a specific spatial economy phenomenon and conditions for development policy in macro-regional scale, possibility of occurrence of spatial conflicts associated with the way of the use of their natural and cultural heritage potential and identified areas in need of restructuring and development of new functions [Heffner 2015].

---

[7] In addition to provincial centers which are obligatory for planning at the provincial level, the KPZK 2030 indicates other areas which can be set due to local needs and conditions at the level of regions. These are the functional areas of regional centers, sub regional centers, local centers and two types of functional areas including two distinct categories of rural areas: rural functional areas participating in development processes and rural functional areas requiring support of development processes. Only two of them (functional areas of regional towns as well as functional areas of rural areas and requiring development processes' support) are obligatory determined by a voivodeship strategy or a spatial development plan of the voivodeship [Kaczmarek 2014].

On the basis of the definition of an urban functional area adopted in the National Spatial Development Concept 2030, the detailed definition of a functional area of a voivodeship center was created as an impact zone of the town coherent in spatial terms characterized by the existence of functional relations and advanced urbanization processes, which stands out from the environment and converges to the main town in some respects [Heffner, Gibas 2013].[8]

The need to develop delimitations of urban functional areas of voivodeship capitals resulted directly from the current National Spatial Development Concept 2030, which decided on their designation. However, according to P. Śleszyński [2013], the most important strategic goal was to lay the foundation for the better – more rational and effective – development policy in the areas coherent in terms of organization and functioning of socio-economic systems.

4. Conclusions

In the National Regional Development Strategy until 2020, one of the objectives of the regional policy is strengthening metropolitan functions of voivodeship centres and integration of their functional areas. This achievement of this goal is supposed to rely on supporting solutions consolidating the urban functional areas space, mainly in terms of spatial planning, collective transport services, municipal services and labour market.

Currently, the functional approach to the development of urban areas, assuming a departure from perceiving problems and challenges through the prism of administrative boundaries is becoming increasingly important. Nowadays, intensive spatial integration processes may be observed, which consist in complex interaction between towns and their immediate environment that result in the development of complex settlement systems of the agglomeration type.[9]

The new principles of the integrated perception of a territory understood functionally assume that each territory has its own, often very diverse set of

[8] Delimination of functional urban areas for voivodeship towns was carried out in accordance with the provisions contained in the report prepared for the Ministry of Regional Development *Criteria for delimitation of urban functional areas of voivodeship centers* [Śleszyński 2013]. This document draws attention to the need to combine conditions and knowledge on individual areas not only in their administrative borders but also within functional borders (identified geographically on the basis of a consistent profile of the socio-economic and spatial characteristics) [Kogut-Jaworska 2013].

[9] According to the classic theory of polarization by F. Perroux [Korenik, Zakrzewska-Półtorak 2011] an urban center plays the role of a growth pole affecting the surrounding area in many layers. The polarization strength of this center is associated not only with the population concentration but also with the structure and characteristics of potential of manufacturing and service sectors, while the ability of the environment to be affected by polarizing forces (absorption of polarizing impulses) is determined by, among others, communication accessibility, urbanization level and the shape of the economic structure. The current picture of various regions and countries shows clearly that a special place in the processes of their development is taken by spatially extensive urbanization processes and the polarizing impact of towns.

characteristics creating its development potential. The use of these resources in an efficient way in development processes of a given territory should be considered a key growth factor.

Functional areas should be delimited on the basis of assumptions resulting from the analysis of objective spatial characteristics and functional relations of the given territory and they do not have to necessarily coincide with the boundaries of administrative divisions. Such an approach is necessary, because the economic growth is not spread out uniformly in space. The concept of functional areas is associated with a relatively new phenomenon, which is functional planning, also carried out independently of the traditional divisions into administrative units.

The EU and national institutional and procedural solutions for supporting regions in the years 2014-2020 are based on the abandonment of the traditional redistribution measures and departure from subsidizing the least favored areas to the advantage of strengthening and using endogenous territorial potentials. In the assumption of the reformed cohesion policy of the European Union, the economic integration in the territorial dimension should be an effective way to use benefits resulting from economic concentration and to equalize living conditions [Gawroński 2014].

References

Agenda Terytorialna Unii Europejskiej 2020. W kierunku sprzyjającej społecznemu włączeniu, inteligentnej i zrównoważonej Europy zróżnicowanych regionów, 2011, Gödöllő.

Barca F., 2009, *An Agenda for a reformed Cohesion Policy. A place-based approach to meeting European Union challenges and expectations*, Independent report prepared at the request of Danuta Hübner, Commissioner for Regional Policy, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2009_2014/documents/regi/dv/barca_report_/barca_report_en.pdf.

Gawroński H., 2014, *Zintegrowane zarządzanie jednostkami terytorialnymi w perspektywie finansowej 2014-2020*, Rozprawy Naukowe i Zawodowe Państwowej Wyższej Szkoły Zawodowej w Elblągu, tom. 18, pp. 51-67.

Grochowski M., 2014, *Samorządność lokalna a terytorialny wymiar rozwoju. Zarządzanie obszarami funkcjonalnymi*, Mazowsze Studia Regionalne, nr 15, pp. 119-136.

Heffner K., 2015, *Obszary funkcjonalne miast – problemy z kształtowaniem i funkcjonowaniem obszarów wiejskich*, Studia Komitet Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju, nr 161, pp. 59-74.

Heffner K., Gibas P., 2013, *Obszary funkcjonalne ośrodków regionalnych w Polsce*, [in:] A. Nowakowska (ed.), *Zrozumieć terytorium. Idea i praktyka*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź.

Kaczmarek T., 2014, *Miejskie obszary funkcjonalne w świetle krajowych dokumentów strategicznych i planistycznych*, [in:] T. Kaczmarek (ed.) *Delimitacja poznańskiego obszaru metropolitalnego*, Biblioteka Aglomeracji Poznańskiej, nr 26, Bogucki Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Poznań.

Kaźmierczyk J., 2014, *Centralizacja działalności jako czynnik zmniejszający jej regionalny charakter (przykład banków w Polsce)*, Zeszyty Naukowe Polskiego Towarzystwa Ekonomicznego w Zielonej Górze, nr 1, pp. 119-132.

Klasik A., Kuźnik F., Szczupak B., 2013, *Polityka miejska w regionie*, [in:] A. Nowakowska (ed.), *Zrozumieć terytorium. Idea i praktyka*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź.

Kogut-Jaworska M., 2013, *Miejski wymiar polityki spójności Unii Europejskiej w nowej perspektywie finansowej 2014-2020 – implikacje dla polskich regionów*, Zarządzanie i Finanse, Rok 2013 (11), nr 2, cz. 3, pp. 223-233.

Koncepcja Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju 2030, 2011, Ministerstwo Rozwoju Regionalnego, Warszawa.

Korenik S., Zakrzewska-Półtorak A., 2011, *Teorie rozwoju regionalnego – ujęcie dynamiczne*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, Wrocław.

Mantey D., 2013, *Potrzeba zintegrowanego zarządzania miastami i obszarami metropolitalnymi*, Samorząd Terytorialny, nr 6, pp. 5-14.

Markowski T., 2011, *Funkcjonowanie gospodarki przestrzennej – założenia budowy modelu zintegrowanego planowania i zarządzania rozwojem*, Studia Komitetu Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju PAN, t. CXXXIV, pp. 25-44.

Nowakowska A., 2015, *Zintegrowane plany rozwoju – w stronę terytorialno-funkcjonalnego podejścia do rozwoju jednostki terytorialnej*, [in:] A. Nowakowska (ed.), *Nowoczesne metody i narzędzia zarządzania rozwojem lokalnym i regionalnym*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź.

Noworól A., 2013, *Ku nowemu paradygmatowi planowania terytorialnego*, Wydawnictwo CeDeWu, Warszawa.

Obrębalski M., 2014, *Kontrowersje wokół zintegrowanych inwestycji terytorialnych*, Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, Gospodarka regionalna w teorii i praktyce, nr 333, pp. 63-70.

Szafranek E., 2015, *Zintegrowane inwestycje terytorialne jako narzędzie budowy potencjału obszarów funkcjonalnych. Przykład Kędzierzyńsko-Kozielskiego Subregionalnego Obszaru Funkcjonalnego*, Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, Gospodarka regionalna w teorii i praktyce, nr 392, pp. 109-118.

Śleszyński P., 2013, *Delimitacja Miejskich Obszarów Funkcjonalnych stolic województw*, Przegląd Geograficzny, nr 85(2), pp. 173-197.

Ustawa z dnia 27 marca 2003 r. o planowaniu i zagospodarowaniu przestrzennym, Dz. U. z 2016 r. poz. 778, 1579.

Żuk A., 2012, *Ukierunkowane terytorialnie zintegrowane podejście do rozwoju Unii Europejskiej w kontekście roli polityki spójności do 2020 r.*, Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, Dziś i jutro polityki spójności w Unii Europejskiej, nr 269, pp. 241-248.