8. Boosting national urban policies by European integration. The case of Poland¹

Piotr Żuber, Katarzyna Szmigiel-Rawska and Joanna Krukowska

1. INTRODUCTION

Poland is an example of a country in which national urban policy has been developing gradually over the last 20 years, heavily influenced by the Europeanisation process and an internal decentralisation agenda. Both processes have been fuelled by political and economic integration, as well as by the direct participation of central and local government organisations in implementing a variety of EU policies. The cohesion policy has had the most significant impact.

National urban (and regional) policy is one of the policy areas which has been most ‘affected’ by the adaptation and absorption of EU goals and procedures and transfer of know-how. It has undergone changes along an intellectual path extending from support for general aims, through removing barriers to development, to a conditional and differentiated place-based policy that addresses the strengths and weaknesses of different types of territory. This transformation was in line with the changing focus of the European Commission and the EU as a whole. In practical terms, it means that national regional policy has evolved from a policy supporting the development of the country and regions via major, centrally planned infrastructural investments, into a territorial multi-dimensional system in which different actors (national, regional and local authorities, academia, civil society and the private sector) play a role in defining and implementing goals, priorities and projects.

Historically, urban matters fell within the remit of a number of ministries and organisations dealing with urban transport, housing and social or economic development issues at the national level. Although these matters were part of the centrally planned agenda and country-wide or macroregional spatial development plans, the planning actors operated largely independently. In terms

of programming processes, this was changed by Europeanisation (mostly the cohesion policy) and decentralisation of the state (the emerging and growing power of local and regional governments). A comprehensive national urban policy emerged in 2010 as a vital component of national regional policy, in the *National Regional Development Strategy 2010–2020: Regions, Cities, Rural Areas* (KSRR2020), which was adopted by government.

Following European logic in terms of territorialisation in public policy, a separate document setting out objectives and instruments was adopted by the central government in 2015, entitled *National Urban Policy 2023* (NUP2023). Following this, Parliament adopted a legislative act on drafting urban regeneration plans as a tool for the new urban policy (*Ustawa* 2015).

The NUP2023 (*Krajowa Polityka Miejska* 2015) sets out goals and ways of achieving them. The policy is intended to be implemented by various actors ranging from central government to regional and local urban authorities themselves. Central government supports the implementation of the urban policy goals by channelling money (mostly made available through the cohesion policy) towards priorities, projects and specific urban instruments. These include Integrated Territorial Investments (ITIs), local urban renewal plans and projects which involve networking between cities. The operational programmes managed by the state and regional authorities, and implemented by various actors including urban authorities, are the tools for this policy. These interventions include a special programme for small and medium-sized cities which are in the process of losing their socio-economic and administrative functions. The scheme has been operating since 2017 and is still in the early stages of implementation. A number of activities supported by central government aim to improve the quality of urban governance by providing proper advice and training, as well as by promoting networking between cities within the country and within the wider EU context (*Partnerska Inicjatywa Miast* 2017). Since 2017, the government has also been addressing housing issues in cooperation with local authorities, by providing free plots of land from the state treasury to impoverished families and individuals for the construction of cheap housing.

The main thesis of this chapter is that urban policy in Poland has been shaped under heavy pressure to adapt to EU principles. Top-down and bottom-up processes have been intertwined during this adaptation. The fact that financial means were granted on merit via a formal framework meant that authorities had to bow to externally created rules, especially at regional and local level. When the pressure became too great, it became clear that public actors were apparently relabelling aspects of central-, regional- and local-level policies. Most of the measures implemented by central government provide preconditions for policy formulation. The intervention tools put into operation were mainly driven by European policy.

The next parts of the chapter are organised as follows. The second section consists of a general description of the institutional context of urban policy in Poland. The third section shows the evolution of national urban policy since the collapse of the centrally planned economy in 1989. Next, the current challenges for urban areas in Poland are defined and explained. The fifth section describes the activity of the main actors in terms of policy, and the sixth describes examples of specific thematic areas of urban policy in Poland dealing with climate change, metropolitan areas and urban renewal. The chapter closes with some general conclusions.

2. URBAN AREAS IN POLAND'S TERRITORIAL GOVERNANCE SYSTEM

Since January 1999, territorial organisation in Poland has consisted of three tiers of management (as of 1 January 2020²):

1. 16 units of regional government (Pol.: *województwo*) run by an indirectly elected government executive and elected councils. These are responsible for strategy design and implementation in terms of socio-economic development, and for delivering some regional level services (such as regional roads, regional railway transport and hospitals). This level of subnational government in Poland also has a governor's office. It represents central government, and has legal powers of control over local and regional government.
2. 380 meso-tier units of county-type government (Pol.: *powiat*), involving:
 - (a) 66 major cities (the smallest of which has 36 800 inhabitants) exercising municipal and county functions. These are formally called 'cities with county rights' (Pol.: *miasto na prawach powiatu*), since the municipal level is the basic, constitutionally embedded tier of local government in Poland. They always consist of one municipality and always have urban characteristics;
 - (b) 314 ordinary counties, usually consisting of several (on average eight) municipalities of an urban and rural nature.

Counties are also run by an indirectly elected government executive (*starosta*) and directly elected councils. In the case of cities with county rights, executive power is invested in the mayor, and the municipal council takes on the functions of a county council.

3. 2477 municipalities (Pol.: *gmina*), of which:
 - (a) 302 units have city status (including 66 cities with county rights);
 - (b) 642 units are of mixed urban-rural character, where a town and surrounding villages can be identified;

(c) 1533 are rural units.

There is no direct legal subordination where the three tiers are concerned, as they have distinct tasks and are generally expected to supplement each other's activities.

Municipalities are managed by a directly elected mayor (called *prezydent* in bigger cities, *burmistrz* in smaller cities and towns and *wójt* in rural municipalities, but with very similar scope in terms of their competencies) and by a local council. There are 944 units with city/town status, though they vary greatly in size; the biggest is Warsaw, which officially has 1.765 million inhabitants (unofficial research estimates this number at 2.2–2.5 million), plus there are 4 cities with between 500 000 and 1 million inhabitants (Kraków, Łódź, Wrocław, Poznań) and 11 cities with 200 000–500 000 inhabitants (in descending order of size: Gdańsk, Szczecin, Bydgoszcz, Lublin, Białystok, Katowice, Gdynia, Częstochowa, Radom, Sosnowiec, Toruń). Together, these cities form a quite territorially balanced network in terms of major economic hubs. They are relatively well connected with each other and with the EU. At the other end of the spectrum, there are 336 towns with populations of fewer than 5000 inhabitants.

The official urbanisation rate of 60.1 per cent (2020) is based on administrative characteristics, though according to estimates (urban functional characteristics) the real rate is higher, at 72–75 per cent (Śleszyński 2019), and comparable with other EU countries. The trend is that, while the functional urbanisation rate is growing, favouring further metropolisation and the development of regional capitals, the majority of rural areas and towns (around 75 per cent) have lost at least some of their population over the last 20 years, mostly due to migration to big agglomerations or abroad.

3. EVOLUTION OF NATIONAL URBAN POLICIES

In 1989 the centrally planned economy collapsed and a 'systemic transformation' was introduced based on the principles of democratisation and liberalising economic activity. This led to a widely shared political and academic consensus at the beginning of the 1990s that the country needed hardly any comprehensive public policy, not even with a territorial dimension, other than privatisation and a legal framework in which the free market could operate. This belief, along with a lack of substantial public money for investment, hampered any drafting or implementation of pro-development public policy for many years, with the exception of some reactive responses to workers losing their jobs, especially in politically sensitive sectors like coal mining or steel production.

Even if the government was aware of the rising social and economic problems of some territories, it made no systemic investment on a broader scale until the country joined the EU in 2004. This was despite the fact that some regions with traditional industries and mono-industrial cities were unable to remain competitive in the new, free market economic system. The only territorially oriented instruments in Poland in the late twentieth century were those tackling the issue of unemployment and industrial restructuring in a limited number of municipalities and regions. In addition, in some medium-sized cities, pro-development action of limited size and scope (including the establishment of business-support institutions) was financed by the EU through the pre-accession PHARE (*Poland and Hungary Assistance for the Restructuring of the Economy*) programme (and after 1999 also through the *Special Accession Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development* (SAPARD) and the *Instrument for Structural Policies for Pre-Accession* (ISPA)). However, these were mostly pilot schemes, and were unable to support the deteriorating situation in Polish cities in any substantial way.

Urban issues hardly ever appeared on the government agenda at that time. No real action was planned or undertaken, despite increasingly strong voices from the academic community and international organisations (EU, World Bank) pointing out the need to address processes such as metropolisation, sub-urbanisation, spatial fragmentation, the physical decay of dwellings and urban infrastructure, and the economic decline of some industrial cities.

After the re-establishment of local government in the 1990s (which was regarded as a necessary step towards democratisation), in conceptual terms regionalisation sparked much more political interest than the urban issue. Poland in the 1990s was still divided into 49 rather small region-like units (created in 1975), run by a representative of the central government with extensive responsibilities and direct control over local governments. Consideration was given to establishing bigger and stronger regional units of self-government, which would be 'visible on the map of the EU', as a step towards improving the accountability of the state and creating optimal conditions for making effective use of the EU cohesion policy after Poland eventually joined the EU. The reform of 1 January 1999 included the creation of 16 regions with a mix of powers that involved both self-government (headed by the regional assembly and the board) and central government control (headed by the regional governor). It also created additional local-level county units (*powiat*). In terms of indirect effects on urban issues, the reform strengthened the administrative role of the new regional capitals and created conditions for their further socio-economic development. At the same time, it potentially undermined the prospects of many medium-sized cities, which lost the previous functions they had exercised as the capitals of quasi-regions when Poland had been divided into 49 units.

In its preparations for EU membership, the Polish government began to elaborate (after the end of the twentieth century) a number of programming documents in different policy areas. These included regional policy, which was treated as a political priority. Self-governing areas also started to prepare this type of document which, at the beginning of the process, was considered a precondition for applying for EU grants. Therefore, after 1999 regional authorities started to prepare their first regional development strategies (required by law), while the majority of local units, including cities, began to draw up local-development strategies and plans on a voluntary basis.

These first planning documents were little more than a wish list for a number of investments, which were largely infrastructural. Put simply, financing of any concrete actions by regional and urban authorities was very limited at that time, as there were few funding options. In other words, the strategies were not used as tools for coordination but as lobbying documents to attract the attention of central government or other donors.

The process of profound change to the content and methods of programming and implementing public policies at national, regional and local levels, including cities, accelerated after Poland joined the EU in 2004 and started to participate in programming, monitoring and implementing the EU cohesion policy. In parallel, changes in the status of a number of territorial partners can be observed. Throughout this time, regional governments have become more powerful, but over the last ten years the socio-economic and political power of big cities has also strengthened, as well as that of the biggest metropolitan regions and cities, especially the capitals of the respective regions.

Gradually, regional policy fuelled by EU funds became one of the government's most important public policies, providing money for the realisation of socio-economic objectives (including territorial ones) and setting standards for planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of all public interventions. It regulated and provided funds which enabled the government to fulfil its territorial objectives, and to comply with its planning standards, monitor implementation and evaluate all public interventions. It also helped in further decentralising the state; in 2007, regional authorities became the conduit for European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) funding (and also for European Social Fund (ESF) funding in 2014). Co-financed regional programmes currently (as for 2020) account for 43 per cent of total EU cohesion policy funds in Poland.

The role and status of cities in EU regional policy have been growing since the beginning of the twenty-first century, and they have also had an impact on national institutional patterns. In fact, cities and urban areas, particularly the biggest metropolitan areas, have increasingly been regarded as the drivers of the country's socio-economic development, and this has improved their importance in the system of national regional policy. It has also had an impact on the

priorities of operational programmes financed by the EU. Since Poland joined the EU, funding has been available for projects proposed by urban authorities. However, only in the financial period 2014–2020 has it been possible for them to adopt more complex urban strategies and plans, including urban regeneration and plans aimed at enhancing cooperation within metropolitan areas under a new EU mechanism – Integrated Territorial Investment (ITI).

The government's first attempt to see cities as an important target of, and actor in, public policy was in its 2010 *National Regional Development Strategy 2010–2020: Regions, Cities, Rural Areas* (KSRR2020; *Krajowa Strategia* 2010). This document saw the urban dimension, alongside the regional and the rural, as one of the elements in a wider territorial approach required to increase competitiveness, ensure cohesion and improve efficiency in the country as a whole.

Cities were given an important role in improving regional competitiveness through:

- strengthening the metropolitan functions of regional capitals and integrating their metropolitan areas;
- promoting diffusion from regional centres to other parts of regions which, among other things, focuses interventions on sub-regional urban centres.

Under the cohesion objective, two major directions were proposed for cities:

- strengthening the urbanisation process and urban functions (delivery of sub-regional and regional services) of cities in rural and remote areas of Poland (mostly in the east of the country);
- complex activities for urban regeneration elsewhere in Poland, tailored to specific needs and situations.

Cities were also mentioned in this document as important agents in building a multi-governance system focused on realising territorial goals, and as partners in improving the effectiveness of public policies. The strategic national spatial development document *Concept of Spatial Development for Poland 2030* (*Koncepcja* 2011), adopted by the government in 2011, took a similar approach to the role of cities in the socio-economic and spatial development of the country as a whole.

The main background document for planning and implementing national regional policy, co-financed by the EU at both national and regional level, was KSRR2020, which was binding for almost ten years (in 2019 it was replaced by the new *National Regional Development Strategy 2030*). It also inspired the further development of a complex national urban policy and called for further work on the urban agenda. The latter ultimately led to the drafting of a national urban policy paper acknowledging the increasing role of cities in

the country's development process and the growing role of urban policy at European level.³ As a follow-up to this approach in 2011, at the request of the Polish government, the OECD prepared an urban policy review on Poland (*OECD Urban Policy Review: Poland*), proposing a number of activities to tackle identified deficiencies in the functioning of urban areas (including the governance system, spatial chaos, environmental and social issues, physical degradation and economic decline).

In 2013 the government adopted assumptions on Urban Policy, and in 2015, after extensive public consultation, it adopted the document *National Urban Policy 2023* (NUP2023) (*Krajowa Polityka Miejska* 2015).

Like previous documents, it presents urban policy as part of the wider territorial approach needed to improve the effectiveness of a number of financial and legal instruments and the actions of central, regional and local governments, and to ensure coordination between them. In fact, the document provides guidance for territorial governments and national-level policy makers, but is not directly linked to any new financial means.

The following principles were established in line with the EU cohesion policy and urban policy: an integrated territorial approach, multi-level governance and subordination of urban policy to wider economic policy. The eclectic strategic aim of the document is to strengthen the ability of Polish cities and urban areas to implement sustainable development, create employment and improve quality of life. This strategic aim is divided into five specific goals, as follows: multi-level governance and partnership; a compact and sustainable city; socio-economic and physical regeneration of degraded areas, including brownfield sites and city centres; competitiveness of urban areas through the integration and diffusion of metropolitan areas; and support for sub-regional and local urban centres which are losing their economic functions.

It is important to note that until recently there had been widespread political consensus for many years on the objectives and priorities for action under broader regional and urban policy goals. The focus was on supporting factors involved in both competitiveness and socio-economic development, and it was underpinned by a cohesive approach, though mainly in Eastern Poland (where the five poorest regions are located). Some elements of this approach have recently been modified as a result of new factors, such as globalisation, outmigration from the rest of the country and the fact that the European Common Market has further concentrated activities in the biggest metropolitan areas. According to the mid-term national social development *Strategy for Responsible Development* (*Strategia Odpowiedzialnego Rozwoju* 2017), adopted by the government in 2017, and the new *National Regional Development Strategy 2030*, adopted in September 2019 (*Krajowa Strategia Rozwoju Regionalnego* 2019), urban policy remains part of the overall territorial approach. However, in addition to promoting competitiveness and

the multi-governance model, there is a greater emphasis on ensuring more balanced spatial and social development throughout the country, including support for areas and cities which are in the process of losing their functions, jobs and position. In fact, this problem has been detected in at least a quarter of cities (255 out of 942) elsewhere in Poland (Śleszyński 2019).

In 2017 the ministry in charge of EU cohesion and regional policy in Poland (currently, since late 2019, the Ministry of Funds and Regional Policy) issued the so-called Middle-Sized Cities Package (*Pakiet Dla Miast Średnich*). This proposes preferences, and shows how these cities, which national policy documents have identified as threatened with further deterioration, can benefit from the cohesion policy in terms of national and regional operational programmes co-financed by the EU. Cities are also offered support in developing their restructuring strategies and projects, undertaking public private partnership projects and participating in knowledge-sharing networks (*City Partnership Initiative*, Pol.: *Partnerska Inicjatywa dla Miast*). This is financed by EU funds, the Polish Development Fund (*Polski Fundusz Rozwoju*), and EEA (European Economic Area) and Norway grants.⁴ It is too early to assess the outcomes of these efforts.

As national integrated urban policy focuses very much on socio-economic development, it is difficult to find any policy issues which are widely discussed in the EU. For example, state-wide urban policy touches only to a limited extent on the issue of housing policy (although over the last 20 years there have been several attempts to change this situation), largely only mentioning housing as an aspect of integrated regeneration plans. Historically, housing has always been treated as an important sectoral problem separate from mainstream urban policy, and unfortunately this approach appears to have been maintained. Even an affordable housing development programme (*Mieszkanie Plus*), introduced by the government in 2017 to offer treasury land to developers free of charge to build cheap housing, did not change the situation.

Another issue which is difficult to find in official government policy documents is the integration of migrants from abroad. This is due to the indifferent attitude of the government. On the one hand, it allows immigrants from Ukraine and other countries to fill gaps in the labour market, and on the other it is against the system of obligatory reallocation of asylum seekers and has not formulated any broader immigration policy.

An additional issue of importance to all cities, but one which has not yet been properly addressed in official state documents or activities, is spatial fragmentation (Kowalewski et al. 2018). The malfunctioning of the spatial planning system (and pricing of land) has been a disputed issue since as far back as the 1980s. However, all attempts at systematic reorganisation of the legislation have failed, largely for political reasons. The last attempt (2016) to reorganise the system by changing both the *Law on Planning and Spatial Development*

(*Ustawa o Planowaniu i Zagospodarowaniu Przestrzennym*) and the *Law on Construction (Prawo Budowlane)* by proposing a new integrated code was halted after two years' work within government and intensive consultation with partners. The failure was partly the result of disagreements between the main stakeholders over the definition of a proper balance between ownership rights and public interest. The main aim of the reform was to improve the local spatial planning system and to make the process of investment more transparent and efficient.

4. CURRENT CHALLENGES FOR URBAN AREAS

The economic situation in Polish cities has been evolving rapidly since the political transition of 1989. Several regions (mostly industrial and rural ones) were particularly touched by crises related to the economic transition from a socialist to a capitalist economy. However, general wealth indicators have been growing constantly since the early 1990s, with a slight slowdown from 2001 to 2003. The global economic crisis that began in 2007 had little influence on the economic situation of the state, specific regions or localities, and the trend has been opposite to the global one. Over the last few years the Polish economy, and especially the largest agglomerations, has suffered from the lack of a labour force, and the unemployment rate in metropolitan areas has been below 3 per cent (according to Statistics Poland data for 2017). This is a result of rapid economic development, but also considerable emigration which began in 2004 with Poland's accession to the EU. The gap was subsequently filled by immigrants, mostly from Ukraine. Their number is estimated at about 2 million, or about 6 per cent of the total population.

Nowadays, the main challenge faced by all cities is to create opportunities for new investment in terms of restructuring their economic fabric and attracting people to settle there, or at least not to move away. Opportunities for individual cities are limited in this regard. Local and regional budgets rely mostly on grants from the central budget and European funding. Local revenues (based mostly on property tax) exist only at municipal level and provide on average 20–25 per cent of the total budget. However, the existing system in which all regional and local governments are gradually receiving a more significant share of Personal Income Tax (49.83 per cent in 2018, with 38.08 per cent for municipalities) and a stable share of Corporate Income Tax (22.86 per cent, of which 6.71 per cent goes to municipalities, 1.4 per cent to counties and 14.75 per cent to regions) provides incentives for all local governments to promote new investment and cooperate with central government, the private sector and other institutions. Some local government services and tasks are also carried out through a variety of inter-municipal partner organisations

(unions, companies, associations). However, they are responsible for no more than 4 per cent of the current total of local government spending.

Moreover, not all city governments are equally successful in creating economic opportunities. Four groups of cities can be distinguished, along with their associated challenges.

1. The first group, the '*winners*', consists of almost all regional capitals and their metropolitan areas, as well as smaller cities which are functionally well connected to them (Żuber 2018).

For this group of cities, significant challenges identified in various recent official documents include:

- (a) Attracting more investment, in particular for the high-productivity trade and innovation sectors;
- (b) Developing regional and international functions (economic, social, cultural and educational) to improve integration with European and global markets and to make the cities an attractive place to live and work;
- (c) Functional integration of the largest metropolitan areas, to address the issue of the uncontained, and for many years chaotic, suburbanisation that causes transport problems and raises the cost of social services;
- (d) Dealing with present and future challenges involving economic immigration from abroad, attracting and integrating migrants socially and culturally. The gap in the labour force is increasingly visible in metropolitan markets. It is perceived as a bottleneck in the process of attracting investment.

National regional policy considers the cities and metropolitan areas in this group to be growth poles which make the greatest contribution to most aspects of socio-economic development in the country as a whole. Although they are no longer as high on the political agenda, they receive continuous support from national and EU funds for modernising and developing new key infrastructure. This allows them to carry out important functions (such as those relating to environmental infrastructure, motorways, railway transport, metro or tramlines and, in the past, airports), to develop human resources and innovation and research facilities (universities, research and technological centres), and to draft complex plans for social regeneration of their inner-city areas or reconversion of brownfield sites. Under the ITI programme, all regional capitals currently receive special support towards functional integration of their metropolitan areas through cooperation between municipalities.

2. The second group, the '*strugglers*', consists of a number of former industrial towns which, with the demise of the centrally planned economy

(in 1989), were either hot spots of traditional heavy and light industries (such as coal mining, steel production, textile and clothing companies) or dependent on one large state-owned company which collapsed or experienced major problems. Alongside the rapid economic development and structural change throughout the country in the last 20 years, some of these cities (such as Łódź) were able to transform their economic fabric and development path and catch up with the positive trends experienced by the first group. Nonetheless, several of them are still shrinking in relative terms and losing their previous strong position in the urban system (e.g. Radom, Częstochowa, many cities and towns in Upper Silesia like Bytom, Sosnowiec and others). The biggest challenges for this group include:

- (a) Continuing to restructure their economic fabric by attracting new investments in the productive sectors. This is especially difficult for cities which are still economically very much dependent on publicly owned enterprises where investment decisions are in the hands of central government (coal mining, production of energy from coal, the defence sector). To some extent, this slows down the restructuring process and fails to offer a sustainable solution or long-term prospects for growth. This is despite a number of government plans for new public infrastructure (e.g. the recent 2018 *Plan for Upper Silesia*, signed by all development stakeholders) such as roads, railways, airports and cultural and social buildings.
- (b) Almost all cities in this group are in need of massive infrastructural investment and socio-economic regeneration, as well as integrated projects that would help them to attract investment in their previously heavily used brownfield sites and to convert degraded city centres into modern-day agoras. Some years ago, cities in the first group were also experiencing this problem, but it has largely been resolved by a number of regeneration projects (financed by the EU and others), favourable economic situations and good management practices.

Cities in this group can receive support for modernising or developing new infrastructure, developing human resources or supporting their business in competing with other municipalities for grants. However, they are not a special target under regional or urban policy. Some of them are supported by the government and, with funding from Norwegian and EEA grants, have contracted the Institute of Urban and Regional Development (*Instytut Rozwoju Miast i Regionów*)⁵ to prepare and carry out their urban regeneration plans. Others are included in the list of cities which are in the process of losing their

socio-economic functions, so they receive special additional funds under the Middle-Sized Cities Package.

3. The third group of cities, the 'losers', consists of the majority of middle-sized and smaller cities (from 10 000 to 100 000 inhabitants), which have for many centuries acted as sub-regional and local centres of administration and economic activity for their surrounding areas. Due to globalisation, the way the Common Market operates and metropolisation processes underway elsewhere in Europe, the majority of cities of this size are currently losing their economic function, their jobs outside the public sector and their citizens. The only exceptions are any which are well connected to metropolitan areas or have developed a unique niche. The process is visible in almost all central and western regions of Poland, with challenges particularly concentrated in areas like Lower Silesia, which have been highly urbanised for a long time. Of these 942 cities, the government currently considers 255 to be in need of specific national counteracting measures.

Despite attempts to find their development niche, to build a consensus around it among development partners (including national and regional actors) and to implement a development strategy, two significant challenges can be identified for these cities:

- (a) The need for a balance between their shrinking capacity for good-quality public services and a growing demand for them. In recent years, EU funds have made it possible for many cities to improve their infrastructure. This has increased their own revenues and borrowing, but not reversed negative economic or demographic trends. In the coming years, the challenge will be to guarantee proper maintenance and delivery of good-quality public services where there is no fair equalisation mechanism or state-level subsidies.
- (b) The development of links and cooperation between these cities and rural areas. This means improving connections between cities, and also developing the services and administrative functions essential to both the urban and rural population.

This group of cities is currently receiving the most political attention, and is one of the priority areas for action under the new regional development strategy (*Krajowa Strategia Rozwoju Regionalnego* 2019). They benefit from a dedicated Middle-Sized Cities Package, which means that funding is reserved for their projects under national operational programmes financed by the EU for institutional development, development of infrastructure, human resources and businesses. They also benefit from additional financing (refund-

able) from national sources coordinated by the Polish Development Fund (*Polski Fundusz Rozwoju*).

4. The fourth, *dysfunctional*, group consists of middle-sized and small cities located mostly in Eastern Poland. Due to unfinished urbanisation processes in this still predominantly low-productivity agricultural region, and despite their city administrative status, they do not have the same types of function as other cities, and in fact have never had them. Ongoing structural changes in rural areas (decreasing numbers of people employed in agriculture, outmigration of young people, growing productivity and size of plots of land), together with massive investment in public infrastructure, are contributing to the rapid development of regional capitals (such as Lublin, Białystok, Rzeszów and Kielce). Most smaller cities are being left behind, with fewer opportunities to grow and serve the citizens of surrounding areas. It is also important to note that companies in this area (especially from the rural hinterland) have much more limited ability to take advantage of the European Common Market than those from larger metropolitan areas and those operating in other Polish regions. This is largely due to their geography (their location on the peripheral eastern border of the EU) and history (they have been less open to economic development). In this context, the biggest challenge for cities in this area involves continuing to support a balanced urbanisation process and providing additional incentives for investment throughout the area. This can be done by improving transport connections and collaborative partnerships (economic, cultural and educational) with the rest of the country and the EU, as well as by mitigating barriers (including political ones) to economic cooperation with neighbouring countries outside the EU.

Although they are in a category of their own in terms of the national spatial development (*Koncepcja* 2011), cities in this group do not benefit from any special recognition in urban or regional policy, which places them in the category of peripheral marginalised areas. These areas are considered to require broader, sub-regional territorial approaches, rather than support at the level of individual municipalities. Specific activities for these areas (including cities) are planned as part of regional development strategies and regional operational programmes co-financed by the EU, and they vary from region to region. Some medium-sized cities (ranked about 12th or 15th in terms of inhabitants in the case of county capitals) are included in the Middle-Sized Cities Package described above.

5. ACTORS: WHO IS DRIVING THE CHANGES?

The idea of a specific contemporary urban policy in Poland is perceived as an element of European politics aimed at influencing local, regional and national policy making. Decisions made at central government level are sometimes presented to the public as being the result of broader pan-European procedures. This was the case with the introduction of ITI (Integrated Territorial Investment). The ministry responsible for the implementation of cohesion policy made a vague and voluntary mechanism proposed by the European Commission a prerequisite for granting EU funds to 17 Polish metropolitan areas. Thus, despite deadlock in developing metropolitan management tools, metropolitan cooperation was enforced on the pretext of the EU support management system.

European institutions and relations are also important for regional and local authorities, thanks to a network of bilateral and multilateral cooperation (URBACT, EUROCITIES). However, this mostly involves the strongest regions and the biggest cities. The extent to which the urban agenda has been prioritised in the hierarchy of national government policies has varied across time, with no clear direction. In 1997 the national government created a separate Office for Housing and Urban Development, responsible for spatial policy and formulating urban and regional development tools. However, it did not last more than six years, and in 2004 its competencies were transferred to (and/or distributed between) the Ministry for the Economy, the Ministry of Regional Development and the Ministry of Infrastructure. In general, even over the last 15 years, the institutional background of urban policies at national level has been modified several times as part of broader deconstructions or reconstructions of the central institutional pattern. Currently, the central player in designing and implementing national urban policy is the Minister of Funds and Regional Policy, who is responsible both for EU funds and for coordinating all central government activities involving territorial development. Although very much emphasised in all strategic documents adopted by the government, and despite constant efforts in this regard, the real ability within government to coordinate the national sectoral policies that most significantly affect whether urban policy goals are achieved is still limited.

Regional authorities are responsible for preparing and carrying out obligatory regional development strategies and setting goals and priorities for their respective regions (including cities). They are also responsible for managing operational programmes for regional development, which represent in total more than 50 per cent of the value of all ERDF and ESF transfers to Poland under the current financial perspective (2014–2020). The specific objectives and methods of implementation can differ from one region to another. Apart

from being responsible for managing a significant share of the EU funds, the role of regional authorities in implementing national urban policy is limited to a number of activities such as organising regional transport (which can affect the functional integration of agglomerations and their respective hinterland) and organising specialised healthcare and education systems at regional level. They can also play an important role in facilitating, lobbying for and promoting both public and private investment in cities.

Given that the financial capacities⁶ of local governments are much greater than those of regional authorities (excluding EU funds), they are important players in carrying out national urban policy. In addition, they are direct beneficiaries of grants for projects implemented under national or regional operational programmes co-funded by the EU. Not surprisingly, bigger cities can pursue a more integrated and complex approach to urban issues than smaller ones, due not only to their size, but also to their role in the system of settlement and human resources. Smaller cities are often able to do little more than ensure provision of essential public services, and are usually the beneficiaries of a limited number of EU grants for technical or social infrastructure that is regarded as a priority. Thus, in terms of their participation in formulating national urban policy, apart from the few biggest cities, local governments intervene mostly through the associations that group them by type and size: the Union of Polish Metropolises (12 members, very active), the Association of Polish Cities (300 members, very active), the Union of Rural Municipalities (621 members, moderately active) and the Union of Small Towns (17 members, marginally active). However, most of Poland's 2477 municipalities are not involved in any kind of representative body.

In general, urban policy is not directly promoted as a priority by political parties. There were only a few traces of this approach, such as the idea of de-agglomeration (de-concentrating state-level institutions) or different (but mostly imprecise) proposals for solutions relating to metropolitan management. The urban agenda features in political parties' manifestos rather than in their sectoral proposal for environmental policies or tools for increasing public participation, for example participatory budgeting. Relatively new actors in national urban policy formulation include urban movements, which have a presence in several of the biggest cities (Warsaw, Poznań, Wrocław).

6. SPECIFIC POLICIES

For the purpose of this section, three thematic policy areas have been selected which are of special relevance to current global challenges. There are clearly other policy areas where central government intervenes in specific local government policies. These include spatial planning and transportation policy. However, we decided to focus on those which are common in the European

space: (1) local climate change policy, (2) metropolitan area management policy and (3) urban regeneration policy.

6.1 Climate Change Policy

To date, in 2020, there has been no comprehensive climate change adaptation policy in Poland. The document entitled *Strategic Plan for Adapting Sectors and Areas Sensitive to Climate Change by 2020 with Projections towards 2030* (SPA2020) was initiated in 2013, but it had minimal influence on government action. There is no central document on climate change mitigation. The SPA2020 indicated the areas in which local governments are responsible or co-responsible for actions towards climate change adaptation. These are:

- flood and landslide risk management
- developing opportunities for alternative energy production at the local level
- limiting the effects of thermal stress on health
- increasing the number of areas with water, green areas and ventilation corridors in cities
- rainwater management
- revitalisation of the natural environment
- education.

The SPA2020 is a policy instrument which aims to improve the general capacity of urban and rural areas, describing climate change through the lens of problems. Since no subordinated operational or implementational instruments were created, it is more of a tool for identifying preconditions than developing interventions.

The commitments undertaken towards climate change adaptation and mitigation in Polish urban policy are the consequence of political isomorphism and Europeanisation (Szmigiel-Rawska 2017; Gendźwił 2017). Poland's national political leaders during the 2015–2020 period, members of the 'Law and Justice' political party, have been sceptical of the climate change paradigm, and their attitude has been mirrored by local governments ruled by party representatives (Swianiewicz et al. 2018). The remaining local governments have implemented climate change policy measures mainly as a consequence of processes of diffusing policy innovation in Europe. In line with diffusion pattern theory, it was mostly large, affluent cities that risked introducing a climate change policy (Klausen and Szmigiel-Rawska 2017).

Policy for adaptation to climate change is directly connected to three policy labels in Poland: thermo-modernisation, sustainable development and climate change adaptation itself. These labels result from the influence of the EU's cohesion policy on Polish cities and on local government investment policy

in general. Thermo-modernisation action (adapting existing buildings for thermal-energy consumption) aims to decrease energy use by combining economic and climate issues. The plan is to reduce the volume of air pollution through financial incentives designed to produce energy and cost savings. The central and regional authorities manage the programmes which put these actions into practice, financed by European cohesion funds. The programmes at national level (two budget perspectives: 2007–2014 and 2014–2020) encompass urban areas, and at the regional level mainly urban and mixed rural–urban areas. During the 2007–2013 period, around 700 million euros were spent on thermo-modernisation of public and business buildings (EU funds support more than 62 per cent of these). The evaluation estimations show that the greatest EU-funded reductions in CO₂ emissions in Poland in the years 2007–2013 can be accounted for by investment in renewable energy installations (61 per cent reduction in CO₂ emissions) and projects for improving energy-efficiency (34 per cent reduction in CO₂ emissions, of which 17 per cent involved thermo-modernisation of public buildings and 10 per cent modernisation of heating systems). Activities included co-financing the modernisation of heating systems in 98 cities, building or modernising 724 km of the heating network, modernising 35 heat plants and co-generating high-efficiency energy in 12 heating plants. Around 70 per cent of these projects were financed by the centrally managed operational programme and 30 per cent by the regional operational programmes (*Efekty inwestycji* 2017).

International rather than national events have inspired the remaining two labels involved in urban policy aimed at adapting to climate change: sustainable development and climate change adaptation. These include the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the so-called *Agenda 21* (in 1992), as well as an agreement between mayors for sustainable energy at the local level (in 2008) known as the *Covenant of Mayors*. Even if city authorities undertake initiatives aimed at climate change adaptation, they do not refer to it as such. Alternatively, they only use the label for different kinds of activity if they believe it can help in acquiring EU funds (Szmigiel-Rawska 2017).

In the last 20 years, Polish cities have invested considerably in water quality and tackling pollution caused by waste, so the most significant current threat to citizens is air quality. According to the European Environmental Agency and many other sources, Polish cities sit alongside Bulgarian cities at the top of the list of the EU's most polluted cities. This is the result of widespread use of coal for heating private houses (though the situation varies greatly from region to region) and increasing air pollution caused by transport, which is especially acute where there are large metropolitan areas like Warsaw and Kraków. Some cities have already prepared their environmental and/or transport plans and have even started to tackle this type of problem with public funds (including loans and money from the Environmental Protection Fund and the EU).

However, investments are still too small to counter the rapid growth in motorisation that results from unrestricted access of cars to city centres and the fact that public transport solutions are not being updated. The process of changing sources of domestic heating has been rather slow until now, due to a reliance on coal throughout the Polish economy (the first regulation on environmental standards of coal-fired and other types of heater was only introduced in 2018) and a lack of incentive schemes for inhabitants. The first such solution was developed for Silesian cities in 2017 with the support of the EU. In 2018 the government launched a programme known as ‘Clean Air’ (*Czyste Powietrze*) for the whole of Poland. It allows money from a city’s budget to be combined with the Environmental Protection Fund (state-wide) and EU sources in the form of grants and loans. Particularly aimed at people on low incomes or threatened with social exclusion, it provides for thermo-modernisation of private houses, changing heating systems and/or improving environmental and energy-efficiency.

6.2 Integrating Metropolitan Areas: Integrated Territorial Investments

The new EU urban dimension of cohesion policy (2014–2020) has led to a number of measures in national politics, including the need to develop principles for a national urban policy, adopted in 2015 as the *National Urban Policy 2023* (NUP2023). This policy is based on the provisions of the Leipzig Charter (2007) and the Toledo Declaration (2010). NUP2023 relates not only to cities in their administrative boundaries but also to broader urbanised functional areas around them. This approach involves a need to coordinate activities between administrative units, in particular between municipalities on the one hand and municipalities and cities with county rights on the other. About 5 per cent of structural funds was allocated to urban policy in 2014–2020. It has contributed to administrative and organisational activities aimed at preparing public institutions for spending funds in Poland. One such undertaking has involved developing an organisational and substantive basis for implementing ITIs. The instrument is used in the functional urban area of regional capitals and sub-regional poles. The idea triggered activity aimed at building structures for cross-sectoral cooperation between metropolitan municipalities. Establishing ITIs is voluntary, but without this type of cooperation, municipalities in metropolitan areas would not be eligible for a broad range of European support. Thus, taking into account the key role of EU funds in infrastructure development and public perception of local authorities’ effectiveness, ITIs became mandatory for metropolitan areas in practice.

In Poland, the ITI instrument is implemented by regional authorities and city governments, as well as by central government itself. Local governments

have a certain autonomy in terms of the territorial and institutional shape of the ITI. Eligible urban areas were delimited through a consultation process which gathered expert opinions and negotiated with regional and city governments. The resulting delineation is no longer seen as a source of conflict, despite heavy clashes at the beginning of the negotiation process and the fact that some borders remain controversial (Wolański et al. 2018; Krukowska and Lackowska 2017). There are 24 ITI associations in two legal forms: (1) an agreement for joint implementation of an ITI, concluded between local government units located in the area where the ITI will be implemented (the weakest form of local government cooperation allowed by national law), and (2) an association which constitutes a separate legal entity, and is therefore a stronger form. The *sine qua non* condition is the participation of the core city (cities) in the urban area in the association, or as leader of the cooperation agreement. The condition for implementing an ITI is that the ITI association must establish an ITI strategy with the approval of the respective ministry and regional government. The ITI must cover at least two thematic areas of the EU cohesion policy in order to avoid a narrow, sectoral approach to cooperative activities. The regional government fulfils the role of management authority (MA – as defined in Article 125 of Regulation No. 1303/2013 of the European Parliament and the Council of 17 December 2013) for the regional operational programme, and at the same time for the ITI instrument.

The instrumental role is intended to build capacity for cooperation and management in metropolitan areas, but challenges remain with the policy. These include establishing the ITI association, disputes on the subject and ultimate solutions to these disputes (including preparing the ITI strategy before developing structures for cooperation, and differences in terms of delimiting the urban areas in existing regional policy and those accepted for ITIs). The most important issue is the one noted by Tosics:

‘Delephobia’ – this new expression (born in 2014) describes the hesitation of MAs to share management and implementation functions with local authorities. To delegate some functions (power) to the local level is an important aspect of integrated development; in order to genuinely involve all actors, some role or responsibility should be given to them. However, many MAs consider local authorities as inexperienced in cohesion policy matters and thus as having the potential to endanger the financial accountability of the programmes. (2016, p. 292)

Despite some concerns in the initial phase (Krukowska and Lackowska 2017), the ITI instrument has generally been assessed quite positively by local governments located within the metropolises it covers.

6.3 National Urban Renewal Policy

Urban renewal⁷ featured more prominently in the Polish political and academic debate as recently as 15 years ago. This coincided with Poland's accession to the EU and the launch of European financial support for urban renewal initiatives. Paradoxically, it responded to emerging bottom-up needs related to the economic collapse of many cities (especially mid-sized and industrial ones) and central districts of metropolises. It is worth mentioning that for several years the national level was almost absent from the debate on urban renewal, despite being a formal gatekeeper for the flow of EU money. Since 2011, national-level institutions have been trying to catch up in terms of the process launched before the comprehensive regulatory framework and national standards were developed.

A relatively short but intensive experience of urban regeneration has led researchers to several conclusions (Swianiewicz et al. 2011; Kolsut 2017). First, they have observed huge inconsistencies between the official discourse concerning urban renewal and its day-to-day practice. There are examples of a number of projects which purport to have broad urban regeneration goals but are limited in practice to simple technical infrastructure refurbishment. In this way, Polish urban regeneration policies have for many years suffered from a lack of complexity in thematic and territorial terms. The soft, social part of urban renewal projects was treated as additional and less essential or, conversely, in the case of failure to attract external funding, a substitute for 'real' (infrastructural) intervention.

Second, for many years the process of selecting areas to be covered by urban regeneration projects suffered from a weak evidence base and, as a result, was not sufficiently transparent. Most municipalities had little or no access to statistical data on the social and economic situation of specific parts of their territory. Territorial patterns used in different sectoral policies (social care, education, poverty, unemployment) did not (and still do not) correspond to one another. Thus, faced with a lack of hard data, the process of selecting areas for support was dominated by political stakeholders. The choice was often rationalised *post factum* using some incoherent, ad hoc statistical data (Swianiewicz et al. 2011). All this led to an emerging risk of gentrification, increased polarisation of city development and a lack of transparency in the process. Also, limited financial resources led to a series of fairly spectacular, albeit incidental, undertakings. However, as the urban regeneration policy was – and still is – perceived as something new and supplementary to the ordinary scope of a local authority's remit, it was not seen as a controversial process.

Third, Polish experience with local urban renewal programmes revealed that the social and business sectors were barely involved. In most cases, formulation and implementation of the policy were dominated by local

government authorities, with only a few examples of initiatives involving a broad public–private partnership. Examples of the latter include shopping and cultural centres such as Manufaktura in Łódź and Stary Browar in Poznań, and the adaptation of a former factory for housing (Lofty Scheiblera in Łódź). Apart from this kind of incidental cross-sectoral cooperation, most of the urban regeneration projects only mobilise business or societal actors to a limited extent (Kołsut 2017).

All these problems resulted in an emerging need to elaborate national standards for urban regeneration projects and policies. The topic had been trickling into state-wide strategic documents since early 2010. It appeared⁸ in the *National Regional Development Strategy 2010–2020: Regions, Cities, Rural Areas* (KSRR2020), which includes a set of data analyses indicating the localities most in need of urban renewal intervention. A year later, the national government adopted the document *Concept of Spatial Development for Poland 2030*⁹ (see section 3). Two out of six strategic goals indicated in this document relate more directly to the problem of territorial cohesion and urban regeneration (*Koncepcja* 2011).

However, the most significant step forward was made in autumn 2015 with the adoption of the Act on Revitalisation, which introduced a set of guidelines and tools for local authorities. Primarily, it stipulates an obligation to prepare a local urban renewal programme, which needs to be complex in terms of types of action and based on a reliable diagnosis of internal spatial differences. It proposes (but does not impose) establishing a Local Renewal Committee composed of local politicians and officials, but also representatives of non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and businesses. It also enables the creation of Special Urban Revitalisation Zones, where municipalities can support the refurbishment of private buildings to a greater extent than they can outside the zone. The NUP2023 followed this document. Nevertheless, both documents – the Act on Revitalisation and the NUP2023 – were adopted by the government of the Civic Platform just a few days before parliamentary elections were won by the opposition Law and Justice Party headed by Jarosław Kaczyński. Thus, the future of these regulations was thrown into doubt.

On the one hand, the flow of EU funds, and the programming framework elaborated for them by the previous government, established a friendly environment for developing the new urban renewal tools. A considerable number of local governments have applied – or are planning to apply – for this type of funding. Consequently, the Act on Revitalisation was supplemented by a set of *Urban Renewal Guidelines for Operational Programmes 2014–2020*, which were adopted by the Law and Justice government. The document specifies a requirement which has to be met to make a local revitalisation programme eligible for cohesion funds operating at the national and regional levels. According to the guidelines, programmes have to be developed within

a framework of cross-sectoral public consultation. Their thematic scope must be interdisciplinary, and the area covered must be selected according to a precise, but locally adapted, procedure. Also, the ministry responsible for regional policies supports urban renewal initiatives through a set of programmes. One of them, known as *Model Revitalisation of Cities*, is oriented towards popularising local revitalisation policies and developing best practice for implementing them in urban areas. Twenty localities of different sizes are involved, from Dobięgniew (3000 inhabitants) to Warsaw (almost 2 million inhabitants). Programmes conducted by municipalities differ in their focus, and might involve financial engineering, social policy, public participation, housing, space shaping, environmental protection, economic stimulation, urban mobility or heritage preservation (*Krajowe Centrum* 2018).

On the other hand, a closer look at the national strategic documents and initiatives indicates that the urban agenda appears to be losing its importance on the national priority list. The state-wide *Strategy for Responsible Development* adopted in 2017 (Strategia 2017), which is the main strategic document formulated at country level, mentions ‘revitalisation’ a mere 17 times, and the word appears for the first time on page 177 of 418. In July 2017, the Prime Minister established a thematic advisory board known as the National Urban Renewal Committee. However, just one year later (in November 2018) the committee had been dissolved after only a few meetings (Zarządzenie 2018). The newly adopted *National Regional Development Strategy 2030* seems to shift the focus of regeneration policy from intra-urban to inter-regional and cross-country (equalisation policy, special support for marginalised areas and medium-sized cities).

7. CONCLUSIONS

National urban policies have been implemented in the dynamic context of regional and county reforms, changes in competences at state level (i.e. division of tasks between ministries), pressure for Europeanisation, and the processes and results of socio-economic and political transformation in the 1990s. Since the accession of Poland to the EU, national urban policy has been developing under the heavy influence of the European integration process, and in particular under the influence of EU cohesion policy. During this period, the territorial focus of the latter moved from the regional level and regional authorities towards recognising the strong socio-economic role of big cities and the importance of local authorities, including mayors as agents of growth and job creation.

National urban policy emerged as – and is still considered to be – part of the overall integrated territorial approach to socio-economic development governing present thinking about national regional policy goals and instruments. This

approach sees urban policy as a complex, multi-level governance policy for tackling specific issues and realising the potential of urbanised areas (not just areas within the administrative borders of cities). Urban authorities have taken on board a growing role in carrying out projects and programmes co-financed by the EU (as both beneficiary and decision-maker in shaping the programme and selecting projects), although they have not acquired a role in managing funds comparable to that at regional level.

Existing national intervention tools in the area of urban policy (such as clean air policy, ITIs or urban renewal plans) were inspired by, and have been dependent on, financing from the EU. The extent to which they fulfil urban policy goals must be assessed within the context of EU cohesion policy goals, as opposed to tools for purely national initiatives, like the programme for building cheap houses on state treasury land that started only recently. For this reason, it is difficult to assess their effectiveness.

The urban dimension can also be found in the majority of national public policies, and three cases have been presented: climate change policy, the integration of metropolitan areas and national urban renewal policy. Cities are important beneficiaries of nationwide schemes and programmes, as well as being actors responsible for preparing their own strategies and organising the process of cooperation between local stakeholders. However, tensions between major political forces and fluctuations in the institutional contexts often result in the discontinuation of medium- and long-term policy agendas, including urban policies.

At present, the main territorially sensitive national policy issue concerning cities is closely connected with political arrangements in the country. It involves the tension between metropolitan areas, which have been at the heart of regional policy for some years and offer the best opportunities for high living standards and finding good jobs, and small and medium cities which are losing their functions and are threatened with further socio-economic decline and outmigration (around one-third of all cities).

In terms of governance, a struggle can also be observed between the regional and metropolitan levels over their socio-economic role (including their role in managing EU funds) and political significance. Regional authorities fear losing political significance as the value of the cohesion policy diminishes in Poland over the next multi-annual perspective of 2021–2027. At the same time, this fear is perceived by the metropolises as an opportunity to become more visible and more important socio-economic and political players.

NOTES

1. This project received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 727058.

2. TERYT-TERC database <http://eteryt.stat.gov.pl/eteryt/raporty/WebRaportZestawienie.aspx>, accessed 04.05.2020.
3. Poland signed the *Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities* in 2007.
4. EEA and Norway grants are funding for 15 beneficiary countries of the EU (mainly Central and Eastern European countries). They are paid by Norway, Liechtenstein and Iceland as part of the agreement granting the three states access to the European Single Market. The goal is to reduce social and economic disparities. <https://eeagrants.org>.
5. The Instytut Rozwoju Miast i Regionów is a state-financed advisory body for cities and regional governments, <http://irmir.pl/en/>.
6. The financial data illustrate well the role of local, county and regional government in the national institutional structure and in public service provision. Local government spending is about 13 per cent of GDP. It is the highest share in Central Eastern Europe, and similar to that of France. The aggregated data on total local, county and regional spending show the dominant role of the municipal level: regions spend less than 10 per cent, counties 12.5 per cent and municipalities slightly under 80 per cent (35 per cent of these are cities with county status, and 43 per cent represent all other municipalities). The scope of local, county and regional competencies is comprehensive, ranging from transportation infrastructure and services, education and healthcare, to culture and preservation of heritage. A number of public tasks are almost entirely carried out by the local government sector, for example more than 94 per cent of spending on primary and secondary education, more than 99 per cent on social care and about 80 per cent on transportation (Misiąg 2015).
7. Several English terms are used in the academic literature for this type of policy: urban renewal, urban regeneration, revitalisation. However, despite differences in their meaning, they are all translated into Polish in the same way as *rewitalizacja* (Kolsut 2017). This chapter uses all three English terms interchangeably.
8. The word 'revitalisation' appears in this document 31 times.
9. The word 'revitalisation' appears here 28 times.

REFERENCES

- Efekty inwestycji w obszarze energetyki finansowanych w ramach polityki spójności 2007–2013 [Effects of Investments in the Area of Energy Financed under Cohesion Policy 2007–2013]* (2017), FUNDEKO Korbel, Krok-Baściuk Sp. J., Ministry of Development, Warsaw.
- Gendźwiłł, A. (2017), 'Zdecentralizowana adaptacja? Opinie władz lokalnych o zmianach klimatu i lokalnej polityce adaptacji do zmian klimatycznych' [Decentralized adaptation? Opinions of local authorities on climate change and local policy of adaptation to climate change], *Studia Regionalne i Lokalne*, 2(68), 30–49. doi: 10.7366/150949956802.
- Klausen, J. E. and Szmigiel-Rawska, K. (2017), 'The rabbit and the tortoise. Climate change policy development on the local level in Norway and Poland', *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, No. 52 E/2017, 38–58. doi: 10.24193/tras.52E.3.
- Kolsut, B. (2017), 'Główne problemy i wyzwania rewitalizacji miast w Polsce' [Main problems and challenges of urban regeneration in Poland], *Rozwój Regionalny i Polityka Regionalna*, 39, 29–46.

- Koncepcja Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania Kraju 2030 [Concept of Spatial Development of Poland 2030]* (2011), Uchwała Rady Ministrów nr 239 z dnia 13 grudnia 2011, Warsaw.
- Kowalewski, A., Markowski, T. and Śleszyński, P. (eds) (2018), 'Studia nad Chaosem Przestrzennym' [Studies on spatial chaos], *Studia PAN KPZK*, t. CLXXXII (2018), t.1–3.
- Krajowa Polityka Miejska do roku 2023 [National Urban Policy 2023]* (2015) Uchwała Rady Ministrów numer 198 z dnia 20 października 2015, Warsaw.
- Krajowa Strategia Rozwoju Regionalnego 2010–2020: Regiony, Miasta, Obszary Wiejskie [National Regional Development Strategy 2010–2020: Regions, Cities, Rural Areas]* (2010), Uchwała Rady Ministrów z dnia 13 lipca 2010, Warsaw.
- Krajowa Strategia Rozwoju Regionalnego 2030: Rozwój społecznie wrażliwy i terytorialnie zrównoważony [National Regional Development Strategy for Socially Sensitive and Territorially Sustainable Development]* (2019), Warsaw.
- Krajowe Centrum wiedzy o Rewitalizacji [National Centre of Knowledge about Revitalization]* (2018), website available from: <https://www.miiir.gov.pl/strony/zadania/polityka-rozwoju-kraju/rewitalizacja/krajowe-centrum-wiedzy-o-rewitalizacji/> [20 January 2019].
- Krukowska, J. and Lackowska, M. (2017), 'Metropolitan colours of Europeanization? Institutionalization of Integrated Territorial Investment structures in the context of past cooperation in metropolitan regions', *Raumforschung und Raumordnung – Spatial Research and Planning*, 75 (3), 275–289.
- Misiąg, W. (2015), *Finanse samorządowe po 25 latach – stan i rekomendacje*, The Ministry of Finance, Warsaw.
- Partnerska Inicjatywa Miast, Zasady realizacji Partnerskiej Inicjatywy Miast – Miasta uczące się. Projekt Strategiczny SOR* (2017), Ministry of Development.
- Śleszyński, P. (2019), *Aktualizacja delimitacji miast średnich tracących funkcje społeczno-gospodarcze (powiększające dystans rozwojowy) [Updating the Delimitation of Medium-Sized Cities Losing Their Socio-economic Functions (Increasing the Development Distance)]*, study prepared for the Ministry of Fundings and Regional Policy, Warsaw.
- Strategia na rzecz Odpowiedzialnego Rozwoju do roku 2020 z perspektywą do roku 2030 (SOR) [Strategy for Responsible Development (SRD)]* (2017), Uchwała Rady Ministrów numer 8 z dnia 14 lutego 2017, Warsaw.
- Swianiewicz, P., Krukowska, J. and Nowicka, P. (2011), *Zaniedbane dzielnice w polityce wielkich miast w Polsce [Neglected Districts in the Politics of Big Cities in Poland]*, Warsaw: Elipsa.
- Swianiewicz, P., Lackowska, M. and Hanssen, G. S. (2018), 'Local leadership in climate change policies', *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, No. 53 E/2018, 67–83. doi: 10.24193/tras.53E.5.
- Szmigiel-Rawska, K. (2017), 'Mechanizmy polityki klimatycznej polskich samorządów' [Mechanisms of the climate policy of Polish local governments], *Studia Regionalne i Lokalne*, 67(1), 48–64. doi: 10.7366/1509499516703.
- Tosics, I. (2016), 'Integrated Territorial Investment. A missed opportunity? in: Bachtler, J., Berkowitz, P. and Hardy, S. (eds), *EU Cohesion Policy: Reassessing Performance and Direction*, London: Routledge, pp. 284–296.
- Ustawa z dnia 9 października 2015 r. o rewitalizacji [Act on Revitalisation] (Dz.U. 2015 poz. 1777 z późn. zm.).
- Wolański, M., Ledzion, B., Borowczak, A., Płoszaj, A., Kupiec, T., Popis, Z., Haber, A., Mrozowski W. and Borkowska-Waszak, S. (2018), *Ewaluacja systemu*

realizacji instrumentu ZIT w perspektywie finansowej UE na lata 2014–2020. Raport końcowy [The Evaluation of the System for the Implementation of ITI Instrument Implementation in the 2014–2020 Perspective. Final Report], Ministry of Development, Warsaw.

Zarządzenie nr 200 Prezesa Rady Ministrów z dnia 28 listopada 2018 r. w sprawie zniesienia niektórych organów pomocniczych Rady Ministrów i Prezesa Rady Ministrów [Regulation No. 200 of the Prime Minister of November 28, 2018 on the Abolition of Certain Subsidiary Bodies of the Council of Ministers and the Prime Minister], available from: <https://www.prawo.pl/akty/m-p-2018-1191,18785154.html> [20 January 2019].

Żuber, P. (2018), 'Nowe cele, kierunki i sposoby prowadzenia polityki rozwoju polskich regionów i miast' [New goals, directions and ways of conducting the development policy of Polish regions and cities], in: Szlachta, J. and Woźniak, J. (eds), *Rola Wielkich Miast w Rozwoju Społeczno-Gospodarczym Polski* [The Role of Big Cities in the Socio-economic Development of Poland], Studia PAN KPZK, t. CLXXXVI, Warsaw, pp. 67–85.