

# *The Design of an Urban Structure for Integrated Regional Development*

**Irina POPESCU, Assistant Lecturer, Ph.D**  
*Public Administration and Management Section  
Management Department  
Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies*

## **1. Objectives**

One of the objectives of experts in this area is *to build regional development not only on a single European urban centre or region, but on a range of centres able to favour a more balanced urbanisation and territorial development process throughout the European Union*. In order for this polycentric development to be effective, it is necessary to *identify those cities with the highest potential to become the engines of regional development*.

Reaching this objective requires **an assessment of the cities' capacity to generate and share development opportunities**. This capacity is strongly influenced by (a) the size of the city, often related to the level and scope and its infrastructures and services; (b) the activity profile; and (c) the orientation to innovative activities, revenue sources and jobs.

The cities in the European Union manifest a great diversity as far as their size, activity profile and change trends are concerned. This diversity is the product of a long urban history and at the same time is a pre-requisite for their permanent development. The polycentric urban development has to be based on and encourage this diversity, in order to make sure that the development process occurs in various ways and in many places. In turn, this requires gathering comparative data and in depth knowledge of the specific features of the cities.

The scope of the four classifications (included in *Revista de Administrație și Management Public [Public Administration and Management Review]*, no. 4/2005, tables 1-4) broadly covers the definition of the territorial functions and the economic potential of the European city system necessary for an integrated regional development. The most important aspects that need to be included in the preparation of regional planning policies are covered by the indication of the city position in the European urban system, as well as by the indicators of the urban regions trajectory dynamics in their evolution related to the transition from one economic cycle to the next. An initial draft framework for a classification of urban poles could be designed using the results of these in depth scientific studies, which show the position of various urban poles in complementary and converging terms.

## **2. Method**

The initial design of a classification of the most influential urban poles would build on the results of four scientific studies. *A position is defined for each city, taking into consideration both its place in the functional structure of the European urban system, according to Brunet (1989) and Cattani, Purnai, Rozenblat and Saint-Julien (1994), and the trajectory of its urban region in the dynamic of urban development, as described by Conti and Spriano (1994) and Cheshire, Hay, Carbonaro and Bevan (1988).*

Tables 1 to 5 describe a system of variables defining the position of each city under each classification. In using this system it is possible to identify high degrees of complementarity between these classifications and to build a broad design of the architecture of these urban regions in the European Union.

**Classification of European cities according to the score on a set of indicators  
(Source: Brunet, 1989)**

**Table 1**

Class 1 = 1
Class 2 = 2
Class 3 = 3
Class 4 = 4
Class 5 = 5
Class 6 = 6
Class 7 = 7
Class 8 = 8

**Prospective classification of European cities  
(Source: Cattan, Pumain, Rozenblat, Saint-Julien, 1994)**

**Table 2**

<p><b>1. Dominant international metropolitan areas with very good accessibility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>1.1 High concentration of decision makers</li><li>1.2 Diverse activities, high concentration of international enterprises and/or institutions</li><li>1.3 Generally specialised activities. Specialised or incomplete international functions</li><li>1.4 Inadequate metropolitan services; less developed international functions</li><li>1.5 Inadequate metropolitan services</li></ul> <p><b>2. Specialised international metropolitan areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>2.1 High concentration of decision makers</li><li>2.2 Diverse activities, high concentration of international enterprises and/or institutions</li><li>2.3 Generally specialised activities. Specialised or incomplete international functions</li><li>2.4 Inadequate metropolitan services; less developed international functions</li><li>2.5 Inadequate metropolitan services</li></ul> <p><b>3. Regional metropolitan areas with strong international influence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>3.1 High concentration of decision makers</li><li>3.2 Diverse activities, high concentration of international enterprises and/or institutions</li><li>3.3 Generally specialised activities. Specialised or incomplete international functions</li><li>3.4 Inadequate metropolitan services; less developed international functions</li><li>3.5 Inadequate metropolitan services</li></ul> <p><b>4. Peripheral regional metropolitan areas with limited international influence</b></p> <p><b>5. Regional metropolitan areas with limited and highly specialised international influence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>5.1 High concentration of decision makers</li><li>5.2 Diverse activities, high concentration of international enterprises and/or institutions</li><li>5.3 Generally specialised activities. Specialised or incomplete international functions</li><li>5.4 Inadequate metropolitan services; less developed international functions</li><li>5.5 Less developed international services</li></ul>
---

**Functional classification of the 48 main urban functional regions  
(Source: Conti and Spriano, 1990)**

**Table 3**

<p><b>1. International urban regions of global influence</b></p> <p>Pure Complete</p> <p><b>2. Urban regions under positive industrial and technologic transition</b></p> <p>2.1 Pure 2.2 Complete 2.3 Incomplete</p> <p><b>3. Urban regions under negative industrial transition</b></p> <p>3.1 Strong tertiary activity 3.2 Harbour vocation 3.3 Traditional</p> <p><b>4. Urban regions under structural crisis</b></p> <p>4.1 Urban functional ageing process 4.2 Preserved industrialisation</p>
--

**Classification according to the occurrence of urban crisis and change in population 1971-1984**  
(Source: Cheshire, Hay, Carbonaro and Bevan 1988)

**Table 4**

Urban crisis index	Population variation			
	1 Strong Decline	2 Moderate decline	3 Moderate Increase	4 Strong Increase
1. Serious urban crisis	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4
2. Moderate urban crisis	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4
3. Strong urban dynamism	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4

### **3. Urban configuration for integrated regional development**

The configuration developed using the existing classifications takes into consideration the above mentioned indicators for each urban pole and region.

The categories were determined using the classifications set in the studies relevant to polycentric development issues. Thus, we tried to differentiate between levels of influence (global, European, regional, or intra-regional) and position of cities, as well as level of international openness. Within each level we considered the degree of specialization of the activity profiles and identified the profiles more or less diversified or specialized. Also, the qualitative trend of the change was considered, according to the existing and future circumstances, more or less favourable to development.

Types of European cities with a view to polycentric urban development

Table 5

- A. Brunet Classification (1989)  
 B. Cattan, Pumain, Rozenblat and Saint-Julien Classification (1994)  
 C. Conti and Spriano Classification (1990)  
 D. Cheshire, Hay, Carbonaro and Bevan Classification (1988)

1. High level and global influence international functions

	A	B	C	D
<b>London</b>	1	1.1	1.1	2.2
<b>Paris</b>	1	1.1	1.2	3.4

2. European metropolitan areas specialised in certain international functions

	A	B	C	D
<b>Amsterdam</b>	3	2.2	1.1	4.2
<b>Berlin</b>	4	2.2		3.2
<b>Birmingham</b>	5	3.3	4.2	1.2
<b>Brussels</b>	3	2.2	1.1	4.3
<i>Düsseldorf</i>	5	2.2	1.2	4.2
<i>Rhein-Main</i>	3	2.2	1.2	4.2
<b>Geneva</b>	4	2.2		
<b>Hamburg</b>	4	2.2		3.2
<b>Manchester</b>	4	3.3	4.1	1.2
<b>Milan</b>	2	3.2	1.2	4.2
<b>Munich</b>	3	2.2		4.3
<i>Rhein-Ruhr</i>				
<b>Rome</b>	3	3.3	1.1	3.3
<b>Strasbourg</b>	5	2.2	2.2	4.3
<b>Zurich</b>	4	2.2		

3. European metropolitan areas of high influence and internationalised activity profile

3.1 National capitals

	A	B	C	D
<b>Athens</b>	4	4.4		
<b>Copenhagen</b>	4	2.2	1.1	3.2
<b>Dublin</b>	6	4.4	3.1	
<i>Helsinki</i>				
<b>Lisbon</b>	5	4.4		3.4
<b>Luxembourg</b>		3.2		
<b>Madrid</b>	3	3.3		3.4
<i>Stockholm</i>				
<b>Vienna</b>	5	2.2		

3.2 Strong integration of new technologies, positive transition

	A	B	C	D
<b>Antwerp</b>	5	3.2	3.2	3.2
<b>Bâle</b>	5	3.2		
<b>Barcelona</b>	3	3.3		1.4
<b>Bologna</b>	5	3.3	1.3	4.2
<b>Köln-Bonn</b>	5	3.2	1.2	3.2
<i>Dresden</i>				
<b>Edinburgh</b>	5	4.3	4.1	2.2
<b>Hanover</b>	6	3.2	1.2	4.2
<b>The Hague</b>	5		3.1	2.3
<i>Leipzig</i>				
<b>Lyon</b>	4	3.2	2.3	4.3
<b>Nuremberg</b>	6	3.2	2.2	3.2
<b>Rotterdam</b>	4	3.2	3.2	2.2
<b>Stuttgart</b>	4	3.2	2.1	4.2
<b>Turin</b>	4	4.4	2.1	2.2
<b>Utrecht</b>	5		3.1	2.3

3.3 Tertiary activities, cultural and tourist

	A	B	C	D
<b>Florence</b>	5	3.3		4.2
<b>Nice</b>	6	3.3		4.3
<b>Salzburg</b>		3.3		

3.4 Crisis situation, incomplete transition

	A	B	C	D
<i>Liverpool</i>	7			1.4
<b>Marseilles</b>	5	3.2	3.2	2.3
<b>Naples</b>	5	3.3	4.1	1.3

4. Regional metropolitan areas of limited international influence, but diversified activity profile

4.1 High level tertiary activities and high integration of new technologies, positive transition

	A	B	C	D
<b>Bilbao</b>	6	4.4		1.4
<b>Bordeaux</b>	6	4.3	1.3	2.3
<b>Bristol</b>	6	3.3	4.2	2.3
<i>Gothenburg</i>				
<b>Grenoble</b>	6	4.5	2.3	3.4
<b>Glasgow</b>	5	4.4	4.1	1.1
<b>Lille</b>	6	4.4	4.1	1.2
<b>Munster</b>	7	4.3		3.3
<b>Nantes</b>	6	4.3	4.2	3.4
<b>Seville</b>	5	4.4		1.4
<b>Toulouse</b>	5	4.3	1.3	3.4
<b>Valencia</b>	5	4.4		2.4
<b>Venice</b>	5	4.4		4.2

#### 4.2 Incomplete transition

	A	B	C	D
<b>Belfast</b>	8	4.4		1.1
<b>Gênes</b>	5	4.4	3.2	2.2
<b>Porto</b>	6	4.4	1.3	

### 5. Large cities of regional influence, low international profile

#### 5.1 Diversified activity profile, positive transition

	A	B	C	D
<b>Bari</b>	6	5.4		3.3
<b>Lausanne</b>	7			
<b>Malaga</b>	7	4.4		1.4
<i>Mayence- Wiesbaden</i>	7	4.4		4.3
<b>Montpellier</b>	6	4.5		3.4
<b>Nancy</b>	7	4.5	4.2	2.2
<b>Palermo</b>	6	4.4		2.3
<b>Rennes</b>	6	5.5		3.3
<b>Thessaloniki</b>	7	4.4		
<b>Southampton</b>	7	4.3		2.2
<b>Trieste</b>	6			

#### 5.2 Specialised activity profile, incomplete transition

	A	B	C	D
<b>Bremen</b>	7	3.2		3.2
<i>Dortmund</i>	7		1.3	2.2
<i>Essen</i>	6		2.3	
<b>Liege</b>	6	5.4	3.1	1.2
<b>Newcastle</b>	7	4.4		1.2
<i>Tampere</i>				
<b>Valladolid</b>	7	5.5		1.4

### 6. Large cities of limited regional influence

#### 6.1 Strong integration of new technologies, positive transition

	A	B	C	D
<b>Brescia</b>	8			3.2
<i>Cambridge</i>				
<b>Leicester</b>	8			3.3
<i>Oxford</i>				

6.2 Diversified activity profile

	A	B	C	D
<b>Amiens</b>	8			
<b>Caen</b>	8			
<b>Eindhoven</b>	6	5.3		
<b>Linz</b>	8	4.4		
<b>Modena</b>	8			
<b>Orleans</b>	7			3.4
<b>Parma</b>	7			
<b>Rouen</b>	7			2.3
<b>Saint-Sebastien</b>	8	5.5		
<b>Saragossa</b>	7	5.4		2.3
<i>Turku</i>				

6.3 Tertiary specialisation (especially tourism)

	A	B	C	D
<b>Alicante</b>	8	5.4		3.4
<b>Cannes</b>	8			
<b>Las Palmas</b>	7			
<b>Santa Cruz</b>	8			

6.4 Older industrial specialisation, incomplete transition

	A	B	C	D
<b>Brest</b>	8			
<i>Bochum</i>	7		1.3	2.2
<b>Cadiz</b>	7			
<b>Cagliari</b>	7			1.3
<b>Cardiff</b>	7	5.3		2.2
<b>Le Havre</b>	8	5.5		1.3
<b>Liverpool</b>	7			1.1
<b>München-Gladbach</b>	8			3.2
<b>Nottingham</b>	8			3.2
<b>Oviedo</b>	8			
<i>Rostock</i>				
<b>Wuppertal</b>	8			2.2

Note:

1. The figures in table represent the position of the city for each classification.
2. The cities marked in italics were either repositioned in the classification, at the request of national experts, or were not included in any of the classifications presented here.

The proposed classification has certain limitations determined by the comparability between the pre-set types and the specificity of the cities, which are not entirely similar and use different classification methodologies.

**Bibliography:**

1. PARKINSON, M.; HUTCHINS, M.; SIMMIE, J.; CLARK, G.; VERDONK, H., *Competitive European Cities: Where do the Core Cities Stand?*, Report to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, Great Britain, 2004
2. WEBSTER, D.; MULLER, L., *Urban Competitiveness Assessment in Developing Country Urban Regions: the Road Forward*, Urban Group, IFUD, The World Bank, Washington D.C., 2000
3. \* \* \* European Spatial Development Planning Report – *Annex 1*, Stockholm, February 1999
4. \* \* \* European Spatial Development Planning Report – *Annex 2*, Nijmegen, June 1999