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Concept, organisation, and guiding research questions of the BEST METROPOLISES Targeted Analysis

Concept: Slide 4
Organisation: Slides 5 – 6
Guiding questions: Slides 7 - 10
The Concept of Targeted Analyses (TA)

Developed by ESPON:
- a new type of projects supporting the use of existing results in partnership with different groups of stakeholders.
- providing an opportunity to stakeholders for:
  - Enhancing their understanding of the larger territorial context,
  - Making comparisons to other territories, regions and cities, and
  - Including a European perspective to considerations on the development of their territories.
BEST METROPOLISES TA

• **Stakeholders: The Partner Cities Paris, Berlin and Warsaw**
  – For Warsaw: European Funds Department of the City of Warsaw (Lead Stakeholder)
  – For Berlin: Senate Department for Urban Development and the Environment
  – For Paris: International Relations Department, General Secretariat, of the City of Paris.

• **Stakeholders conceptualised their application 2009 - 2010**

• **TA Budget financed by ESPON**: ca. € 349 300

• **ESPON Project Coordinator**: Michaela GENSHEIMER
  michaela.gensheimer@espon.eu

• **Project’s lifetime**: September 2010 – March 2013

• **url for to the A Reports**: http://www.espon.eu/main/Menu_Projects/Menu_TargetedAnalyses/bestmetropolises.html
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The Scientific Team

• Lead Partner – Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization, Warsaw
  Mirosław GROCHOWSKI, Magdalena GÓRCZYŃSKA, Marcin STĘPNIAK, Ewa KORCELLI-OLEJNICZAK, Grzegorz WĘCŁAWOWICZ, Przemysław ŚLESZYŃSKI, Piotr ROSIK, Dariusz ŚWIĄTEK

• Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning, Erkner
  Sabine ZILLMER, Christina MINNIBERGER

• Paris Region Planning and Development Agency, Paris
  Martine LIOTARD

• Nordregio – Nordic Centre for Spatial Development, Stockholm
  Peter SCHMITT, Asli TEPECIK DIS

• Spiekermann & Wegener, Urban and Regional Research, Dortmund
  Michael WEGENER
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The Four Guiding questions for the BEST METROPOLISES Targeted Analysis

1. What are the consequences of metropolisation processes for (a) the three cities (b) and their metropolitan areas?

2. What is the impact of metropolisation on their development potential in relation to the three policy fields mentioned below?

3. How do political, organisational, 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 Three Urban / Regional Policy Issues to be analysed (1): Living Conditions and Migrations

(1) Living conditions and factors that influence the choice of habitual residence in metropolitan areas

- Classification of districts/municipalities/boroughs in terms of attractiveness in different spheres of life;
- Determination of functional areas on district/municipalities level;
- Assessment indicators showing the districts’/communes’ attractiveness, influencing the preferences for different places of domicile within different social/income groups (of inhabitants) and styles of living;
- Understanding of suburbanisation, gentrification, social segregation, demographic change,
- Trends in social housing needs, areas for new buildings, modernisation of building stocks
(2) Trends and reasons of intra-metropolitan mobility and mobility between the metropolitan region and adjacent municipalities

- mobility conditions and public transport offer within metropolitan area and between the latter and adjacent municipalities
- patterns of daily traffic volumes in the context of citizens’ mobility
- assessment of changing transport habits by passengers.
- Identification of a range of transport policy options based on passenger flow data
The Three Urban / Regional Policy Issues to be analysed:

(3) Metropolitan Governance

- Intergovernmental cooperation among metropolises and the surrounding local communities
- Impact of metropolises partnership management concepts on metropolitan development
- Citizens’ participation in decision and policy making processes (forms of communities’ participation, e-government, forms of self-help and public participation at the decentralized levels, etc.).
- Analysis of administrative decentralization in terms of organisational possibilities of implementing horizontal policies (e.g. city and social revitalisation) in the infrastructure context as well as social context
- Coordination of different city policies aiming at optimization of revitalization process.
Some basic characteristics of the three metropolises and their metropolitan areas

a) Territory and inhabitants: slides 12 – 13
b) Economic position: slides 14 – 15
c) Housing: slides 16 – 19
d) Transport: slides 20 – 22
e) Regional planning schemes: slides 23 – 25
Governance: Historical Development of the city boundaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Population 2009</th>
<th>No. Housing units 2009</th>
<th>Area (sq. km)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin city</td>
<td>3,442,675</td>
<td>1,894,600</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUA Berlin (without city)</td>
<td>1,769,546</td>
<td>875,065</td>
<td>7675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris city</td>
<td>2,211,297</td>
<td>1,143,000</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUA Paris (without city)</td>
<td>9,559,000</td>
<td>3,748,000</td>
<td>16205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw city</td>
<td>1,714,446</td>
<td>818,874</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUA Warsaw (without city)</td>
<td>1,515,227</td>
<td>547,400</td>
<td>4461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Metropolises and metropolitan areas

Best development conditions in European metropolises: Paris, Berlin, Warsaw
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Positions in Global Network Connectivity

GLOBAL NETWORK CONNECTIVITY (GNC): City ranking by the percentage of 175 worldwide operating service companies holding own branches in the respective metropolises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>city</th>
<th>GNC</th>
<th>relative GNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>116605</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>110020</td>
<td>94.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>85080</td>
<td>72.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>79624</td>
<td>68.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>78670</td>
<td>67.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>74336</td>
<td>63.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>73121</td>
<td>62.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>71838</td>
<td>61.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>U.A.E.</td>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>71550</td>
<td>61.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>71203</td>
<td>61.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>52937</td>
<td>45.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>52867</td>
<td>45.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>51946</td>
<td>44.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>51760</td>
<td>44.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>50957</td>
<td>43.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>50607</td>
<td>43.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>50438</td>
<td>43.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>50141</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>50094</td>
<td>42.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>49569</td>
<td>42.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>44896</td>
<td>38.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>44471</td>
<td>38.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>44438</td>
<td>38.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>43498</td>
<td>37.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>43381</td>
<td>37.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>43346</td>
<td>37.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>42951</td>
<td>36.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>42882</td>
<td>36.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Tel Aviv</td>
<td>42670</td>
<td>36.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Bangalore</td>
<td>42664</td>
<td>36.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Taylor et al. 2011, amended
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Base strengths in terms of metropolises’ economic development

• Paris
  – one of Europe’s few World Cities
  – highly qualified international tertiary economy
  – highly-skilled jobs concentrated in the central area and in the south west suburbs

• Berlin
  – partly specialised in the European context (political center, culture)
  – rather weakly developed international connections of Advanced Producer Service (APS)
  – growing role of the healthcare, R&D, cultural and media branches
  – Berlin has not regained the economic importance it had prior to World War II
  – At the city level, the network of public and private R&D ‘hubs’ localised in different parts of the city, also plays a crucial role.

• Warsaw
  – nodal function for Eastern Europe
  – international firms and foreign investors significantly increased the role of the tertiary service sector within a few years
  – level of innovation is still quite low.
  – creative sector (ca. 6,000 creative enterprises) remains highly concentrated in the core city with some expansion to the south
Housing density
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Urbanisation

Urbanization rate
Share of urbanized area (%)

- 80.1 - 100
- 60.1 - 80
- 40.1 - 60
- 30.1 - 40
- 20.1 - 30
- 10.1 - 20
- 5.1 - 10
- 0.7 - 5

Change of urbanisation rate (2004 = 100%)

- 250.1 - 464.6
- 150.1 - 250.0
- 120.1 - 150.0
- 110.1 - 120.0
- 100.3 - 110.0
Changes of demographic structures
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Mindmap of factors influencing the affordability of housing
Transport: Volumes and directions of commuting flows

Number of commuters (excluding less than 500):

- 500 - 1 000
- 1 001 - 5 000
- 5 001 - 10 000
- 10 001 - 20 000
- 20 001 - 30 000
- 30 001 - 50 000
- 50 001 - 100 000
- 100 001 - 337 011
Transport: Car ownership and number of Metro lines
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Transport: Congestion and delay in rush hours
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General Regional Planning Scheme for Ile de France (2008)
Joint Spatial Development Plan for the States of Berlin and Brandenburg (2009)
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Warsaw metropolitan area development nodes (2010)
Benchmarking Results

a) Benchmarking criteria: Slides 27 – 28
b) Benchmarking for the core cities: slide 29
c) Benchmarking for the metropolitan areas: slide 30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengths of base for economic</td>
<td>Economic base and functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>Position in urban systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness in terms of working</td>
<td>Intra-metropolitan polycentricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and living conditions</td>
<td>Spatial structure and land use change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour force potential &amp; diversified</td>
<td>Demographic trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socio-spatial structures</td>
<td>Socio-spatial structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intra-metropolitan migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-dimension accessibility</td>
<td>Transport efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commuting / daily mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-level governance</td>
<td>Strategic planning &amp; policy making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governance efficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Benchmarking criteria, dimensions and values (excerpt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>FEATURE</th>
<th>QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic base and functions</td>
<td>GDP per capita(^1)</td>
<td>High, Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Growing, Declining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution of working places</td>
<td>Dispersion, Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of creative industries</td>
<td>Important, Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position in urban systems</td>
<td>Position in European urban system</td>
<td>Global city, European City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National urban system(^*)</td>
<td>Equal position, Dominant position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-metropolitan polycentricity</td>
<td>Level of polycentricity</td>
<td>Polycentric, Monocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial structure and land use change</td>
<td>Urban pattern</td>
<td>Concentration, Sprawl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing affordability</td>
<td>Living conditions</td>
<td>High, Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic trends</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Growth, Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demographic structure</td>
<td>Labour force potential, Ageing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evolution of demographic structure</td>
<td>Stable, Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-spatial structures</td>
<td>Social differentiation</td>
<td>High, Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socio-spatial segregation</td>
<td>’Mixity’, Segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic diversity</td>
<td>Low, High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-metropolitan migration</td>
<td>Relation between inflows and outflows(^*)</td>
<td>Inflow, Outflow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport efficiency</td>
<td>Pattern of technical transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Spiders web, Radial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>Good, Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share of car trips</td>
<td>Low, High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion level</td>
<td>Low, High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting / daily mobility</td>
<td>Commuting flows</td>
<td>Spiders web, Radial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distances of daily mobility</td>
<td>Short, Long</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Benchmarking for the metropolitan areas
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Recommendations for metropolitan policies and for further research

Recommendations on

a) economic performance and polycenticity: Slides 32 – 34

b) improvement of housing policy, quality of life and social composition: Slides 35 – 37

c) transport management: Slides 38 – 39

d) governance and policy-making: Slides 40 – 42

e) further research needed: Slides 43 - 44
General Principle of Policy Recommendations

(1) Your position in the national and European (or global) urban systems should be treated as a basic precondition which determines the development of metropolitan areas in various spheres.

(2) The future of your metropolises depends to a large extent on their position in the network of cities at the global, national, and regional scales.

(3) Efficiently use the specific assets and specific geographic location of your metropolis resp. metropolitan area.

Do TAs, SWOT analyses etc. for becoming conscious of your "real" position!

Improve and efficiently make use of your networking and governance capabilities!
Policy Recommendations for Economic strength and functional polycentricity

- More balanced distribution of economic activities is needed.
- This will contribute to territorial cohesion and will provide development opportunities to peripheral and sometimes neglected parts of metropolitan areas.
- The “limits to growth” spatial development model should be considered for adoption in development policies.
- The location of new jobs in the suburban areas should be in line with strategic vision and long term plans of development in order to ensure more polycentric structure for working and living places.
- Financial tools should encourage more polycentric metropolitan as well as functional linkages between nodes and hubs within the polycentric structure should be ensured.
Policy Recommendations for Compact or polycentric metropolises

- **Intra-metropolitan polycentricity** is required to reduce unnecessary movements of people and goods and to create balanced structure of metropolitan areas.

- The process of **urban sprawl constitutes a problem** that has a significant impact on the functioning of metropolises. It should be addressed by an integrated approach to the development of smaller suburban centers, the location of housing functions and the development of the transport infrastructure.

- This integrated approach might be achieved via the further facilitation of cooperation at the level of technical infrastructure management and the harmonisation of development plans.

- The **future land use plan** for the whole area should be the product of consensus and be inclusive of the various stakeholders from across the metropolitan area.
Recommendations for housing Policy, improvement of life quality and differentiation of social composition (1)

- The **public debate on housing policy** should be initiated, and different actors (public authorities, developers, tenants, etc.) ought to participate in this debate.

- **Issues such as the development of social housing, the provision of land for housing development and the correct financial mechanisms to support investments** in housing have to be addressed from the perspective of contemporary conditions and current challenges.

- **Housing development policies’ key component should be not only the delivery of apartments for people with diversified incomes in different parts of cities and their districts,**

- **but also incentives for developers (or strict rules) to differentiate their offer of apartments.**
Recommendations for Housing Policy, improvement of life quality and differentiation of social composition (2)

- The improvement of attractiveness in terms of connectivity – additional investments in infrastructure should be crucial.
- In terms of poor housing conditions – projects focused on rehabilitation, or new constructions are important.
- Moreover, the increasing number of older population poses new challenges in terms of social programmes and services towards this demographic group.
- Thus, the range of health care and social care services should be extended while transport accessibility should also be improved, in particular by adapting facilities for disabled persons.
Recommendations for Housing Policy, improvement of life quality and differentiation of social composition (3)

- Innovative projects dedicated to energy-efficiency of newly constructed buildings and neighbourhoods should become a standard in current construction in order to address the need for high quality of living conditions as well as to ensure territorial cohesion, the diversity of urban functions and compactness.

- As the development of central cities of metropolises shall be focused on maintaining high living standards, additional urban renewal schemes should be implemented.

- These projects ought to be an integral part of development policies as a measure that may, both directly and indirectly, influence the distribution of inhabitants, migrations flows and the formation of social structures.
Recommendations on Transport Management (1)

- Policy making mechanisms and legal conditions should be structured and formulated in such a way that enables close cooperation between local governments in regards to the preparation of plans and investments and their implementation.

- A partnership approach is required in order to foster efficient collaboration.

- New incentives to relocate jobs outside crowded city centers should be a key element of all economic and spatial development policies.

- Such policies must however be accompanied by improved conditions for the operation of public transport, particularly rail.
Recommendations on Transport Management (2)

- Further development of "park & ride" systems is needed.
- The rule that transport infrastructure planning depends on the settlement policy should be established.
- In order to achieve not only high levels of accessibility (respectively connectivity) but a smart transport system for metropolitan areas, it is not sufficient to provide good transport infrastructure only for individual transport. Instead low congestion and environmentally friendly transport can only be implemented in the context of a multimodal public transport network which is not restricted to the city but includes wider parts of the metropolitan area.
- Solutions may also be diversified: prescriptive spatial planning (imposed density of population, criteria for location of businesses, intensity of use of natural resources) central city areas’ renewal; alternative housing offer (provided through better transport service); policies focused on the protection of areas used for agriculture (legal constraints).
Recommendations on Governance and Policy-making (1)

- New institutional and organisational solutions have to be worked out.

- A robust legal framework should clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the various actors that are active on the metropolitan scene such as planners and policy makers.

- Specific tools and bodies are required to build comprehensive development strategies and set regulations in order to counter metropolitan disparities and territorial imbalances.

- Depending on specific national and metropolitan context, this could be supported by a specific arrangement between major authorities or a new metropolitan body: the first step should be a common understanding which emerges from an open debate.
Recommendations on Governance and Policy-making (2)

- Metropolitan tools to coordinate major thematic sectoral policies should be introduced. These may encompass instruments such as the various types of agreements and the implementation of projects dedicated to solution of problems of specific territories or,

- Tools in order to strengthen institutional and procedural innovations should be considered such as: as the councils for development and the councils in districts, which were aiming at involving the local population.

- Metropolitan policies must be designed in relation to a thorough and ongoing process of local public consultation of both the public and private actors in charge of it application.
Recommendations on Governance and Policy-making (3)

To **strengthen social participation**, the involvement of affected stakeholders from the very beginning can reduce the problem of ‘**NIMBYism**’. Since metropolitan development problems are faced by different social groups it is important to involve the key actors and give them all a voice.

Furthermore, it might make sense for a local government to foster communication with major local private sector players, both in an ad hoc and in a strategic way.

The **creation of specific platforms and/or agencies** that facilitate dialogue between different actors (representatives of vertical administration: local-regional-central as well as of different communes) are highly recommended. This kind of initiatives strengthens the development of a **culture of cooperation**.
Recommendations for further research (1)

- Based on the experience gathered in the context of the Best Metropolises project it could be stated that there is definitely a need for further research on the positioning and modes of functioning of contemporary metropolises in the European space.

- Future investigations should focus on the financial aspects of metropolises’ functioning. Inter-governmental transfers and the financial conditions of the municipalities and larger administrative bodies and organisations created for the purpose of development management should also be investigated.

- The efficiency of the instruments that support the common development efforts of both public and private entities provides another topic for future research.

- To adopt proper modes of power devolution to facilitate decentralisation processes and to create appropriate institutional and organisational arrangements within the public administration structure will be an essential for the future of metropolitan areas.
Suggestions for further Research (2)

- Thirdly, in our analysis we attempted to develop a **typology of living conditions** for metropolises. We faced several problems in the pursuit of this task related to the **lack of comparable and essential data** (e.g. household incomes in the case of Warsaw).

- Further investigation should be structured in a way that allows for the preparation of a **typology which includes an environmental dimension** as well as a reference to the level of social infrastructure development.

- Finally, the **impact of ecological conversion** has not yet been analysed in terms of urban management at the practical level. There are some crucial questions here for the metropolises’ development such as to what extent the **development of renewable energy** would contribute to the evolution of the contemporary urban structure, or what would the influence be of **sustainable transport** on our metropolises’ development paths?
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