

URBAN GOVERNANCE, STRATEGIC PLANNING AND DEMOCRACY IN POST-SOCIALIST TRANSITIONAL SOCIETY

Ján Buček

*Comenius University in Bratislava, Department of Human Geography
and Demography, e-mail: bucek@fns.uniba.sk*

Abstract: Two important conceptual innovations have penetrated into managing of urban affairs and urban development in late post-socialist transition and early post-transition periods. These two concepts are governance and strategic planning. They are interacting in parallel in cities generating various effects as a part of extensive modernization processes. Besides positive effects on social and economic dimensions of local life, their combination can have positive effects on local democracy and innovative approaches to local development. Governance combined with strategic planning in praxis offers tool for better aggregation of interest and satisfaction of more needs, as well as their co-ordination. In their well developed application we see potential for application of positive aspects of governance and strategic planning in favor of more balanced, democratic and, at the same time, also efficient urban development. We debate various aspects of interplay among governance, strategic planning and democracy in theoretical perspective as well as based on experiences of Slovak cities, predominantly during first decade after year 2000.

Key words: cities, governance, strategic planning, democracy, participation, Slovakia, Bratislava

1 INTRODUCTION

The post-socialist transition societies after introduction of democratic local self-government and decentralisation of powers to lower levels of government have started to be more extensively influenced by governance based approaches in managing local affairs. Locally based effort to improve own social and economic situation and to strengthen its position in inter-urban competition also led to application of more advanced forms of planning of local economic and social development. Such progress has accompanied introduction of strategic planning into managing practices of many cities. Reflecting this development, the main aim of this contribution is to outline the development of strategic planning processes and its reinforcing effect to urban governance and participatory democracy especially under the late phase of

transition and early post-transition period in first decade after year 2000 (key turning events include joining EU in 2004 and financial and economic crisis in 2008-2010). We also follow the idea outlined by Pierre (2005) that different social, political, and economic forces tend to produce different models of urban governance. Governance in this context put emphasis on participation, building networks and partnership of various actors in managing cities and urban development.

The intention of this paper also is to disclose links among two important conceptual innovations that emerged in managing urban policy and development in post-socialist late transition and early post transition societies. Strategic development planning and governance are meeting together in parallel in cities generating interesting interactions that can have both positive as well as negative features. We suggest that these two directions in local life modernization can positively influence urban development in this social setting if appropriately applied. Besides positive effects on basic social and economic aspects of local life, it can have positive effects on local democracy. Governance is considered as important source of innovative approaches to local development (e.g. Dente, Bobbio and Spada, 2005). It is especially linked to preference given to participatory oriented approaches in strategic planning and expansion of these participatory practices across local social environment. Governance combined with strategic planning in praxis offers tool for better aggregation of interest and satisfaction of more needs and their co-ordination. We see potential for application of positive aspects of governance and strategic planning in favour of more balanced, democratic and, at the same time, also efficient urban development.

This contribution also reacts on less extensive debate on nature of strategic planning and governance in post-socialist cities. This is in contrast to quickly growing number of cities with development strategies and inter-sectoral partnerships in this region. Among rare case of such studies/authors we can mention for example Maier (2000) - focusing on strategic planning in Czech cities, Buček (2007) – dealing with Slovak cities, or Tsenkova (2011) – focusing on set of post-socialist capital cities. Particular aspects of strategic planning were discussed also in Sýkora (2006), or Buček and Bleha (2013). Collaborative strategic planning had been applied in more Central Eastern European cities. Sýkora (2006) emphasized that strategic development plan of Prague adopted already in 1999, is result of agreement among politicians, specialists, corporate sector representatives and citizens. Despite existing studies on local governance in this region (e.g. Lankina, Hudalla and Wollman, 2008), they are not focusing in deep to strategic planning context. Widespread application of collaborative approach to strategic planning in this region (e.g. Buček, Borárossova and Sopkuliak, 2010) offers opportunity for this route to governance. Rare case of reflection concerning governance in Slovak literature we can find in Klimovský (2010).

An attempt to debate governance and strategic planning knowledge in transition society in this study is drawn from experiences of Slovak cities, predominantly during first decade after year 2000. Nevertheless, they can be inspiration for many other transition societies, not only in Central Eastern Europe. We focus more on funda-

mental theoretical suppositions, basic conditions, structure and processes, and less on real quality of planning outcomes, or normative evaluations of final achievement of the planning processes (e.g. fields of concrete activities), not mentioning implementation of planning measures. It would require research shaped in different way. We avoid answer the question if strategic plans are really change oriented, or they are only “softer” plans serving as part of process to have access to external resources, or legitimising certain actions, or only obligatory task formally completed under the pressure of central state.

Strategic planning approaches are analyzed focusing on group of the largest Slovak cities (11 cities with population exceeding 50 thousand inhabitants, or close to this size). We are reviewing their approaches to strategic planning, used procedures and methodology in strategic plans elaborations, as well as actors involved. As main source of information were used strategic plans of cities (in Slovak praxis it is the case of document officially called – Programme of Economic and Social Development), related decisions adopted by City Councils and available media coverage of strategic planning processes in cities (predominantly local media). Within these documents we were searching for governance, collaborative, participatory, partnership based approaches to urban development. They reflect shift in institutional development and in favour of governance in managing their development. As a showcase of the current development are presented strategic planning experiences in capital city of Slovakia – Bratislava. It is concentrated on its latest strategy adopted in 2010, already respecting new approaches in strategic planning and requirements set by national legislation.

2 LINKING URBAN GOVERNANCE, STRATEGIC PLANNING AND DEMOCRACY

Within last decades there emerged widespread movement in favour of engagement of citizens, civil society organizations, and business, with government in the formulation and delivery of public policy (e.g. Skelcher, 2010). Governance and strategic planning are approaches that are adopted in decision-making praxis in many cities all over the world. They are outcomes of well intended innovations that were initiated in many countries as a result of central level intervention and/or local initiative. They can have manifold effects, including fact that they can substantially influence local democracy and development processes. We suppose that within a time there is strong level of integration of both key approaches. Nevertheless, it is important to exploit their positive and reduce negative features.

The linkages between governance and urban planning are known for a longer period. It is closely associated to rising role of participation, communication, and collaboration of various actors (in wide sense) in planning. It is well expressed in opinions on planning as interactive process and governance activity in complex environment (e.g. Healey, 2004). Within various levels and directions in urban planning, strategic development planning is among the most suitable for such ap-

proaches. The most progressive attitudes to urban strategic planning can be clearly perceived as governance based. For decades are known showcases in urban strategic development planning that document participatory and stakeholders' involvement approach (Borja and Castells, 1997; Williams, 1999; Pinson, 2002). The growing attention to governance in various meaning has gone in parallel with expansion of strategic planning in cities. The nature of governance and shift to collaborative participatory based planning have some joint features. With certain generalization, we can consider strategic planning as one possible form of institutionalization and formalization of governance in cities.

Governance is currently extensively used concept, known in different meanings. It is predominantly crossing and bridging sometimes divided arenas of public and private, or central and local. It is often perceived as multi-organizational, multi-governmental and multi-sectoral relationship (e.g. as summarized by Roiseland, 2011). As it is sometimes outlined, it can be considered as mixture of various old and new organisational forms and governmental approaches (as it can be derived from many authors in long term perspective, e.g. Leitner, 1990; Stoker, 1998; MacLeod and Goodwin, 1999; Davies, 2011). In more practical terms, we can observe fusion of horizontal and vertical linkages among actors as typical for governance. "Horizontal" perspective, in urban context, means co-operation among various local actors active within the city. In multilevel governance perspective (see e.g. Kokx and van Kempen, 2010) cities are strongly influenced by central state legislation, related regulation, existing financial transfers, as well as by other levels of government and theirs' agencies involvement, not mentioning multi-national corporations, or nationwide association etc. As contradiction to extensive perception of governance, we can find narrower meaning that emphasize public services provision by private sector, or public-private based partnership projects. If extracting from above mentioned authors, among the most frequent features of governance at urban/local level we can highlight involvement of institutions and actors that are outside local government. It is accompanied by blurred borders and responsibilities among actors involved. Expected are inter-institutional relationships and collective action. It led to various more or less formal forms of collaboration e.g. as network(s) of actors. The motivation in favour of urban governance is based on expectations that it should increase available capacities, resources and tools comparing to sole local government.

Governance form of managing public affairs can generate serious challenge to traditional local government, based on principles of representative democracy, with complementary role to direct and participatory democracy tools. Pierre (2009) argues that most of emergent models of governance reflect objectives based on performance and efficiency and less on democracy and accountability. Such regressive potential can emerge in a case of elite based, exclusive networks, non-transparent or even clientele structure of governance, with selectivity of participation (e.g. in Hohn and Neuer, 2006). It can be less openly accessible to various groups and their representatives. There are also limits in willingness to participate within public, and power asymmetry of those involved. The influence of those involved in shaping final joint decisions can be not equally distributed. It is matter of local government

practices and legislation to which extent it is providing legitimacy or intervenes into governing processes. It is matter of legislation and local practice, if we can talk on strong or weak participation (less power to influence final decisions) in a case of various actors, or citizens and their representatives.

Rising attention to strategic spatial planning is visible and maybe even fashionable for at least last two-three decades in Europe. Its importance and possible applications presented e.g. Albrechts (2004) and Albrechts, Healey and Kunzmann (2003). They also mentioned among effect of such planning shift in governance culture. Strategic planning is now considered as standard tool in global scale and its most developed version we can observe in large cities and metropolitan regions. It focuses on change, modernization, realistic perception of development trends (opportunities and threats), and implementation of adopted measures by mobilization of local actors. It is different comparing to traditional physical planning, with stronger regulatory, land-use framework. Strategic planning meets current meanings of governance especially in its participatory, collaborative, coproduction form. However, it is still predominantly local government led and finalized form of planning.

Despite very positive shift in favour of participatory approaches, there are important limits of participation within strategic planning processes. If we focus on this aspect of strategic planning and governance, two important points are frequently mentioned – stakeholder involvement and community engagement (e.g. Baker, Hincks and Sherriff, 2010). The nature of participation in strategic planning is specific. It offers stage mostly to significant and recognized actors, usually referred as stakeholders. There still is problem – How to deal with public, who represent all citizens, what mechanism is the best in responding to their needs and ideas, and convert it into planning procedures and finally into democratically adopted strategies? From this point of view, as key requirements – strategic planning cannot be perceived in any elitist quasi representative form, as well as it cannot be applied in its purely professional form “plan as product delivered by experts”.

Stakeholders are considered as one of core features of current approaches to strategic urban planning (e.g. de Graaf and Dewulf, 2010). Their role is crucial in shaping strategic plan priorities and measures, as well as in its implementation. Stakeholders improve development capacities, for example thanks to access to resources, or providing additional know-how for more efficient development. They have direct interests in urban development process and are interested in strategic planning outcomes. For them, strategic planning means participation in building consensus needed also for their future development intentions. Stakeholders represent what we can consider as strong participation (have power to influence final decisions and measures in strategic plan).

Despite their big influence, it is clear that stakeholders do not represent whole public and their position is somewhat susceptible (e.g. as a result of arbitrary and subjective selection). From democracy perspective, key point is definition, or selection of stakeholders. Pierre (2012) mentioned problem of “stakeholderism” as granting one group of actors privileged position and disaggregating the polity. We need to define reasonable and democratic rules, acceptable in selection of stakeholders.

Otherwise whole outcome of the strategic planning process can be disputed. We need to move from simplified stakeholderism (arbitrarily selected, or “self-invited”), to respected stakeholders. Strategic planning procedures should include transparent and well defined process of stakeholder identification, based on available set of criteria. Besides those representing key individual interests, there should be preferred representatives of aggregated interests (e.g. in a case of business community it should be various business associations, councils, chambers...). Stakeholders should be those important, influential (in various senses), responsible for important tasks in the city and prepared to be actively involved also in implementation of plans.

There is still important point – how to arrange suitable community involvement. Among stakeholders we should find also those representing important section of the community or local spatial communities. They can be those with less implementation capacities, less professional, but still crucial. There can be representatives for strong participation as well as for weak consultative participation. Under certain conditions their role can cover well established representative local non-profit organizations which are included into stakeholders. However, it does not mean sufficient scope of participation of various groups of citizens e.g. at the neighbourhood level. Strategic planning usually uses many tools available in order to attract citizens, their communities to participate and express their views on future. Besides direct participatory possibilities (meetings, exhibitions, e-voting), there is opportunity for more detailed research on their opinions and needs.

We cannot forget the position of experts (e.g. planners, facilitators, analysts, consultants), which is still very important. They still bear professional responsibility for balancing social, economic and environmental objectives in this more complicated planning framework, with competing interests of local politicians, businessmen, NGO-s, various institutions and communities (see e.g. Mace, 2013). In a case of strategic planning traditional conflict among politics, science, expertise and democracy (e.g. Kornberger, 2013) is in a specific composition. Currently prevailing approaches give much wider floor to other actors and politicians, and less to scientists and planners. Nevertheless, their role is still very important, however it is more in the field of consultancy, argumentation and convincing other actors, not mentioning methodology for problem and conflict solving. They have the role to induce shift of those involved (stakeholders, other participants) into the position of responsible “strategist”. Their role is to develop “holistic” perception of the city, or city region, able to form joint vision and goals. Also the composition of experts involved in strategic planning is different comparing to more traditional physical planning. Besides usual role of urban planners and geographers, much wider role can have (depending on needs) representatives of more social, economic and technical disciplines.

On the other hand, strategic planning and governance in its well shaped intersection can fill existing shortage of democracy concerning decision making over concrete and important local issues. It can be another important way providing new content to local democracy. We have to refuse too simplistic perception of local democracy reduced to numerical electoral democracy (public cannot express their will regarding more concrete issues). Strategic planning and governance provide

suitable base for active participatory democracy. It is in fact joint decision-making over very concrete development issues and their future implementation based on those that are interested and competent (and bear partial responsibility for particular field of local life – e.g. as school masters responsible for local schools, local entrepreneurs providing local jobs etc.). This is combined and balanced by involvement of elected representatives and final adoption of strategies by local councils. There is still important role for local government in such strategic planning induced governance (see also e.g. Pinson, 2002). Comparing to other mentioned forms of alternatives to traditional democracy (e.g. Pierre, 2012) it offers more democracy. Within strategic planning there are clear procedural steps, interim and final documents are available, stakeholders are known, as well as their key positions are publicly presented. Representative democracy has to be strengthened at the local level in this way, especially when well working political parties are often absenting at the local level, or are represented by small groups of local citizens. Local democracy is changing into more diverse in general and can have many locally unique forms. It is accompanied by opened debate on the role of political institutions within the governance models (see e.g. Pierre, 2009). It is clear that strategic planning as other local decisions and policies needs democratic legitimacy. As Albrechts (2012) mentioned – strategic planning does not reject representative democracy but complements it, as it is leading to certain kind of agreement (on measures, actions) and sharing power and responsibility.

3 GENERAL AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF URBAN GOVERNANCE AND STRATEGIC PLANNING IN SLOVAKIA

Local self-governments in Slovak cities had faced many difficulties under the pressure of post-socialist transition. They concerned internal issues (public services provision, financial scarcity), as well as local social and economic development. It resulted in introduction of more diverse and innovative approaches into managing of local affairs. Part of local self-governments turned to expansion of co-operation with partners outside their own structures – they have entered into the “terrain of governance”. The relations with various local actors based on local self-government powers (e.g. various permissions and regulation), or on contractual base (mostly in services delivery) expanded quite quickly. However, less developed had been co-operation focusing on economic and social development of cities. During later phases of post-socialist transition (before the global economic and financial crisis), especially larger cities have had to cope with rising economic development dynamics (including their impatient proponents within business) and uneasy co-ordination of many competitive interests. Part of them has understood that it is hardly possible without clearer vision of their future. They also recognised that they could influence much wider scope of local development issues and achieve more ambitious goals, if deeper co-operation with partners outside local self-government will be

reached. Besides well established planning in form of master plans, they started to experience with strategic planning. After period of expert based, or internally prepared development strategies, there has emerged shift in favour of more collaborative, partnership based strategic planning. This progress has also influenced rising pressure of the central state for more efficient collaborative local development practices required by legislation.

3.1 Conditions of local governance

It has to be pointed out that Slovak local self-governments, as autonomous bodies, were quite free in setting co-operation with other actors since their introduction in 1990. According to major legislation on local self-government (Act No. 369/1990 as amended), cities have not faced any limits in their co-operation with other potential partners. It has been explicitly declared that cities can co-operate with other legal entities, as well as for example with other local self-governments within their development interests. They have been also allowed to finance their tasks with resources that were put together with other legal entities. Only later were introduced regulations concerning this collaboration. They concerned protection of financial interests of cities and launch more rigorous budgetary rules (e.g. Act No. 583/2004), primarily as prevention to rising local debt. For example, local self-governments cannot guarantee credits taken by private entities. There also have been formal rules that such joint inter-sectoral activities have to be approved by City Council. It can be concluded that local self-governments had open activity space but they had not been motivated to governance based approaches by legislation during most of transition period.

Cities under the transition situation had turned towards selected forms of governance quite early after 1989. There prevailed managerial forms of governance (e.g. in sense of Pierre, 1999). Already within early transition period, numerous local self-governments had developed extensive inter-sectoral relations in public services provision. It was related to narrow perception of local self-government role on own tasks and services provision at that time. Besides introduction of specialised service delivery companies under own control, the cities facing scarcity of resources or lack of know-how, decided to provide public services by means of various forms of contracts with private and non-profit sector entities. There also emerged joint companies, with participation of local self-government and private companies (partly also as a result of post-socialist privatisation processes, see e.g. Buček, 2002 on a case of Bratislava). Later on, in order to achieve wider societal goals, local self-governments have started to co-operate with non-governmental not-for-profit organizations mostly in culture, sport, social affairs and environmental issues (including, for example, their support by regular competitive grant schemes).

Slow shift towards governance in local social and economic development had internal reasons during early transition period. Local self-government institution building processes had been priority. There prevailed more or less understandable effort to build well established, stronger, autonomous local self-government, accepted as leading local actor, able to co-operate with other actors. As a significant factor

we can consider the fact that local self-governments could be considered as not so attractive partners at that time. They had less powers and resources available during nineties. Such weakness caused that for a long time there sustained prevailing “centralistic” perception of main responsibility of central state for economic and social development also at the local level. Local political elites also were careful in entering into co-operation with partners “without history” and lack of experiences, due to short time of market economy functioning, as well as short term familiarity with non-governmental sector. More activity of local self-governments in favour of inter-sectoral co-operation prevented also cases of bad experiences with “naive partnerships” from early transition times. There were cases of inexperienced local self-governments that lost money in joint activities with private partners (e.g. participated in unsuccessful entrepreneurial projects). The situation started to change large scale decentralisation of powers (since 2001), completed by fiscal decentralisation working since 2005. The central state development policy also had transformed in favour of higher respect to bottom up form of development, partly under the influence of pre-accession processes to EU. Since the beginning of the second decade of transition (2000+), rising number of local self-governments in cities started to be more aware of their responsibility and possibilities in managing their economic and social development, including wider collaboration with partners outside local public administration.

Besides expanding scope of powers, growing financial base, change in central state approaches, it had been rapid social and economic development that led to changing opinions and rising interests in cities to go closer to the governance model. The urban physical, economic and social development progressed into different scale especially after years 2004-2005. Set of the largest Slovak cities started to be much more attractive for investors and property developers. It has been related to outcomes of decentralisation and improved international position of the country. Well-shaped nationwide economic and social reforms, joining to EU, NATO, Schengen zone, accompanied also positive phase of economic cycle. We could observe new character of urban development processes as outlined for example by Matlovič (2000), Buček (2005), or Ondoš and Korec (2008). Under very dynamic urban development processes, there emerged many disputes and conflicts (e.g. with developers, environmentalists, heritage protectionists) almost in all cities (for example in Bratislava, Košice, Žilina, Nitra). Some of them were documented e.g. by Buček (2006), or Šuška (2008). Financially strong corporations, property developers, activists groups have advocated strongly their interests. There emerged discussions concerning signs of selective approach to different local actors and theirs’ activities. As a result, such poorly organised and non-transparent multi-actor involvement generated less efficient and less generally accepted urban development, with many contradictory outputs. Not surprisingly, there has been need for suitable framework to co-ordinate many different interests in urban development. Strategic planning offered cities potential promising solution.

3.2 Strategic planning

The move towards strategic urban development planning in its collaborative form had not been easy and quick process in Slovakia. Certain negative role had initial reluctance to any kind of planning (after decades of centralist socialist planning before 1989) and absence of strategic planning tradition at the local level. Local self-governments used to work within urban physical planning framework. However, this form of planning has been typical by reduced, procedurally regulated and indirect role of external participants. Key role has had professional urban planners working in specialised planning companies and self-governmental institutions (City Councils, its specialised commissions and professionals working within City Offices). From practical reasons, cities concentrated on updating of their inherited “socialist”, or elaboration of new Master Plans during nineties (e.g. Slavík, Kožuch and Bačík, 2005). Strategic planning had been almost unknown in general and less frequently used in praxis during nineties.

Although first urban strategic plans were prepared already in nineties, they were based on own initiative of very small number of cities (e.g. city of Trenčín). There was no legal framework adopted in this field during nineties. It had been introduced as fully respected form of planning after new legislation adoption in 2001 (within the Act No. 503/2001 on Support of Regional Development). According to this Act, local self-governments are obliged to prepare *Programme of Economic and Social Development* (in Slovak – Program hospodárskeho a sociálneho rozvoja, or “PHSR”) as binding document approved by their Local/City Councils. These documents (with certain generalisation) bear typical signs of strategic economic development planning at the local level (e.g. Buček, 2007). Even after this legislation adoption, PHSR elaboration had been very free process, without more strict guidelines. After period of slow progress in number of adopted strategies (as PHSRs), it rapidly increased thanks to pressure imposed from above. This rising number of strategic plans had been motivated by legislation amendment defining necessity that each development project asking for financial support from state budget or EU funds must be in consent with PHSR. It meant that PHSR in fact became almost necessary for all cities (access to external resources is inevitable for most of larger investment activities in cities).

Very diverse quality, less spectacular and less efficient implementation of PHSRs led to important legislation amendment in 2008 (as Act No. 539/2008 Coll.). Now it represents more demanding legislation from the point of view of strategic and development planning. Simplifying – the section focusing on the programming phase of economic and social development at the local level is much longer and more precise (for example, instead of one paragraph in 2001 legislation, there is eight paragraphs in amended version). New legislation explicitly lists required parts in analytical and strategic sections, as well as in programming section of PHSRs. In particular, programming section specification had been absenting in previous version of legislation. Now it more extensively focuses on implementation and requires listing of measures, institutional backing, financial breakdown, indicators and monitoring system, time table etc.

We also can observe important steps forward from the point of view of governance and motivation to its general expansion. The legislator in 2008 amendment (as Act No. 539/2008 Coll.) explicitly promotes more collaborative principles in strategic planning. Local self-governments are obliged to prepare PHSR on a principle of partnership. This obligation forces them to co-operate with other local partners. According to this Act (in its other section), local self-governments also should create conditions for initiation and development of territorial co-operation and partnership. They also should support entrepreneurial activities in favour of local development. More clearly is required vertical cooperation with regional self-government, in order to harmonize local and regional programs of economic and social development. This shift should lead to compulsory move in favour of participative and partnership based form of strategic planning. The central state strongly intervened in favour of collaborative planning and indirectly supported strengthening of governance in Slovak cities.

4 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE IN PRACTICE

Strategic planning emerged in Slovakia as an opportunity that offers reasonable framework for moving into different stage of managing local affairs and urban development close to prevailing understanding of the term governance. It seems that strategic planning initiated voluntary and later forced expansion of governance in Slovak cities. Strategic planning is upgrading this collaboration into more direct and systematic forms, able to follow more ambitious goals. It can generate long term forms of collaboration and provide opportunity to be really multi-actor based. Besides various managerial forms, cities move to participation and partnership understanding of governance focusing on crucial social and economic development issues. Participation in strategic planning is not only stakeholder based, but cities try to involve other actors and citizens as well.

We can think about several generation of urban strategic development planning elaboration in Slovakia (Buček, 2007; Buček et al., 2010). They are different also from governance point of view. The “zero generation” strategic plans appeared already in nineties based on own, slightly improvised initiative of cities (Bratislava, Trenčín). There were no legal requirements and previous experiences with such kind of planning at that time. Plans were prepared by internal capacities of local self-government in cities and invited experts, without systematic citizens’ participation or other actors’ involvement. They served more for better understanding of own potential, and should provide inspiration and ideas in quickly changing transitional “times of uncertainty”. Their role has been limited since they were not adopted by City Councils as binding documents. Any executive, or implementation parts have been missing, mostly due to the lack of resources, powers and know-how. The “first generation” of strategic plans emerged after year 2000. In this stage, an important role had foreign assistance. International institutions like USAID, as well as World Bank

with Bertelsmann Foundation offered resources for elaboration of pilot strategies in selected Slovak cities (e.g. in Trnava, Prešov, Poprad). These strategies had brought more standard know-how into still missing legal environment in this field, including much more attention to implementation and financing. Their important feature had been effort for involvement of other local actors. The following “second generation” is the most typical by rapid expansion in number strategies completed after 2004. This growth in number of PHSRs did not reflect only legal obligation known already since 2001, but mentioned obligation to have PHSR if asking for financial contribution from state budget or EU funds (project competing for support must be in agreement with development directions and measures included within PHSR). Especially availability of EU funds for cities in programming period 2007-2013 led to mobilisation of activities in strategies elaboration and adoption. It should be mentioned that despite listing of some details of PHSR content in legislation, methodology of its elaboration had been quite free, usually depending on city councils decision and negotiated by assisting consultancy companies and their experiences.

Already within “first generation” strategic plans, there appeared cases that applied more participatory and partnership based approach with ambition to involve external partners as stakeholders. It had been partly caused by foreign assistance and consultants/facilitators that preferred such approach to strategy preparation. Within the planning procedures they formed planning commissions (as main planning group, steering committee), as well as working groups based on multi-partner principles. They included all sections of local institutional environment. These stakeholders were not only involved in shaping development priorities, but were often explicitly mentioned in implementation of individual measures. In more cases their collaboration did not finish by adoption of strategic plans in City Councils. Composition of stakeholders and other participants depended on local situation. Within business sector representative are as individual companies (industry, banking, business services, network companies), as well as representatives of business association – regional chambers of commerce and industry, entrepreneur associations. Often are there business advisory institutions. The process of stakeholders’ selection is usually not presented. However, in most cases based on knowledge of local social and economic, institutional milieu, we can conclude that it very well express majority of important local actors. We can find cases of participation of similar stakeholders, represented by the same persons (e.g. Prešov) in later revisions of PHSR, or in monitoring of plans implementation.

Besides stakeholder approach, applied strategic planning procedures attempted to involve selected larger section of local community. Usual form had been survey among local business sector focusing on local business environment, or satisfaction survey among citizens concerning selected fields of local life (e.g. public services, quality of life). Such surveys were usual form of limited participation techniques also within expert based strategy elaboration. Later on, besides direct surveys, we could observe web based questionnaires. Nevertheless size of samples or response to questionnaires was often less sufficient. As certain kind of “intermediary actors” linked more extensively to the public, we can consider representatives of well esta-

blished community organizations, or environmental groups. They have more direct links to particular citizens' interests, but at the same time, they had been included into stakeholders' structures. We can conclude that their position had been much more influential, comparing to prevailing forms of community involvement.

Citizens are not only direct participants but they also have to be informed about the planning progress and its outcomes. Usually plans contain sections focusing on communication with various local communities and citizens' within strategic planning processes. It is well expressed by frequent separate sections of strategic plans focusing on information, or communication strategy. It is working during plan preparation until its adoption. It also provides various kinds of tools for citizens' participation. Within the last years, there prevails internet based form of participation. Citizens have opportunities to propose, comment, or argue by means of active web page interface to already available sections. In some cities, specific public opinion polls were executed. Standard forms of communication are series of public meetings where particular stages of strategies/PHSR elaboration are presented for large audiences. Strategic planning processes are quite extensively covered by media in larger cities. Special reports and interviews inform on the strategies in local newspapers. These forms are less influential comparing to direct involvement, but can generate particular public pressure, which cannot be overlooked.

5 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND GOVERNANCE IN CAPITAL CITY OF BRATISLAVA

Strategic planning has been traditionally most developed in large metropolitan cities and metropolitan regions. The capital city of Slovakia Bratislava is a good case documenting strategic planning development and its influence on urban governance during entire post-socialist transitional period. Representatives of this city started to focus on more elaborated strategies of its development quite early, even comparing to many cities in other post-socialist countries. It is not surprising that first case of urban development strategy in Slovakia we could find in Bratislava. Its first strategy had been prepared in fact already in 1993, the next one in 1999 and the latest strategy had been adopted in 2010 (already as PHSR of the city). This development reflects specific position of capital city, as well as changing nature of strategic urban planning in Slovakia.

Bratislava as a capital city has its own legislation adopted by the Slovak Parliament in 1990 (Act No. 377/1990). Already in its original wording there were expressed expectations concerning strategic planning (not existing in legislation concerning other Slovak self-governments at that time). Central state ministries should consult their strategies with Bratislava's self-government. On the other hand, legislation requires Bratislava self-government to consult its development strategy with them as well. In 2008 amendment of this legislation, adoption of PHSR moved into forefront of Bratislava self-government powers.

Strategic planning in Bratislava influences its two-tier structure of local self-government. It consists of one city-wide self-government and 17 city quarters self-governments. Bratislava is also included into Bratislava self-governing region (with part of its hinterland). However, they are far less influential levels of government (less powers, resources, personal capacities) comparing to city-wide self-government. Nevertheless, they are autonomous levels of self-government and prepare their own development strategies. According to 2008 legislation amendments, activities at the city-quarter level have to respect framework outlined by city-wide development documents. In general, strategic plans adopted at the lower level should follow goals and priorities defined in central state and regional level strategic development documents. In following sections, we are leaving aside existing strategic planning activities of city quarters, as well as Bratislava region regional self-government. We pay more attention to strategy adopted 1999 and especially to strategy adopted in 2010. Despite progressing perception of strategic planning, the impact of the first two strategies has been limited. The character of the third one is different and outlines more advanced approach, including its more collaborative “governance” nature. It is in question, if the latest one will be more respected and fully implemented, including opportunity to shift towards more efficient and continued governance oriented model of managing urban development affairs.

5.1 Earlier development strategies

First two strategies are sometimes considered as one strategy, because first one was not accepted by the City Council (although being submitted to the City Council). Nevertheless, both documents had been different and submitted to City Council with long time gap. Of course, they represent certain continuity in strategic planning in Bratislava. Both were prepared by local experts – mostly invited academics (predominantly from local universities and research institutes) and specialists working at City Magistracy (office of the city-wide self-government). They also were concentrated on wider strategic assessments and less on real strategic economic development plan ready for practical implementation. These two strategies had serious limits and can be considered more as cases of urban strategic thinking formation in Bratislava.

The first strategy had been elaborated already in 1992-1993 (Bratislava City Magistracy, 1993). However, submitted document (as principles of strategic development of the city) had not been adopted by the City Council. The role of this first strategy is important as the first attempt for strategic planning. It had been source of ideas and inspiration for the city government decision-making needed in times of uncertainty during the first years of post-socialist transition and new state formation (since 1993 Slovakia has been independent state after splitting former Czechoslovakia). The activities in strategic planning had been initiated again in 1996. The first reading of the next – “second” strategy (Bratislava City Magistracy, 1999), available for city self-government leadership and City Council Commissions was already in 1997. After consideration of comments, the second reading had been done in 1998 and strategy had been submitted to comments in city quarters self-governments, state

administration bodies at all levels, main local corporations, various non-governmental bodies etc. It was decided that this document will be submitted to new City Council (local election were in December 1998). After submission to City Council Commissions, strategy had been adopted by City Council in April 1999. These adopted strategic objectives of the city development had been valid in fact until new strategy was adopted in 2010.

These two early strategies had series of considerable limits. They were not adopted as binding documents by the City Council. They represented earlier approaches to strategic planning, focusing on visions, ideas, opportunities, analysing and clarifying previous development. There were no implementation strategies, clear priorities, no detailed measures, no words about needed financial resources, no system on reporting, or monitoring etc. They were considered as more general framework strategic document needed for co-ordination of intentions in various fields. Under preparation of the second plan, important reason mentioned has been expected new city Master Plan completion and needed harmonization with hierarchically higher planning documents (at regional and national level). The second plan has been result of work of more than 90 experts (external experts and representatives of local self-government and state administration). It fulfilled only basic requirement of participation in planning – document had been available in advance, open for comments. No specialised consultant company had been involved. There was no wider citizens' participation, no direct involvement of more local actors in shaping development objectives.

Nevertheless, “1999 Strategy” included an attempt to introduce certain model of governance oriented institutional structure. The recommendation to establish City Development Corporation (in Slovak – Mestská rozvojová spoločnosť) had been inspired by experiences of western cities. Its inter-sectoral nature should guarantee its organisation as association of various actors involved in urban development, including main corporations, civic and non-governmental organisations. It should have advisory role to the mayor, formulate programmes of development according to particular spheres of local life (transport, housing, economic restructuring), improve access to resources as well as to provide organisational capacities. However, this outcome of the strategy never went into the praxis. On the other hand, it documents awareness that for the progress in urban development processes wider co-operation with many other partners is needed in Bratislava. This strategy had served as freely respected guidance and selected suitable ideas were used in Master Plan drawing and city decision making.

5.2 Development strategy adopted in 2010

The different scope and dynamics of urban development has appeared in Bratislava since 2000-2002. It has been decentralisation and new dynamics of social and economic development that substantially changed the nature of the economic and social development. Regional gross domestic product in Bratislavský region (besides city it includes three smaller hinterland districts) increased from 109 percent in 2000 to 167 percent in PPS per inhabitant of the EU-27 average in 2008 (Eurostat, 2011). City started to be more attractive for investors in various fields of economy. With

certain time shift comparing to western cities, Bratislava turned to urban entrepreneurialism featured by many authors (e.g. Leitner, 1989; Brenner, 1999). The city government followed neoliberal approaches typical by less regulated local development environment (e.g. in physical planning) and important role of public-private co-operation. Probably inevitable conflicts in urban development documented, for example, Buček (2006) or Šuška (2008). Mayor of Bratislava Andrej Ďurkovský (mayor in 2002-2010) had been strong backer of large scale private property development projects (see e.g. Buček and Korec, 2013).

The city has been eager for any development after years of slow post-socialist development in the 1990's. New development dynamics has been best visible in turn towards globalised property led development. Series of large development project included those located at the premium Danube river front. Two flagship projects (in total both investment exceeded EUR 500 mil) have been Eurovea (developer Ballymore Properties, architects – Bose International, Slovak ReSpecT, Irish Murray O'Laoire Architects) and River Park (developer J&T and architect Erick van Egeraat). Local self-government supported success of private projects in more ways. It sold them weakly regulated land and participated in their international promotion. City self-government also participated with other private partners in other property based projects (National Tennis Centre, Ice Hockey Stadium). Such local governmental entrepreneurialism led in combination with financial and economic crisis to sharp increase in city self-government debt.

Strategic planning under such “booming” conditions has had multiplied role. It should address group of problems outside usual priorities in strategic planning. For example, the relations of mayor of the city with some developers were criticised. It generated feeling that certain group of businesses are closer to the city government, having better chance to progress with their interests. As a show-case had been criticized flight of city mayor to MIPIM property market exhibition in Cannes by private jet of one of leading developers active in Bratislava (Parkrova, 2006). So besides immanent goals of strategic planning, there were needs in the field of transparent, equal access and fair treatment of various local actors by local self-government. Strategic planning potentially provides partially regulatory environment in multi-actor and competitive local environment. It should assist in managing such issues like – How to organise good relations with many partners? How to coordinate so many interests? How can they participate in collaborative urban development?

It has been long term known that new development strategy is needed. Already during the latest Bratislava Master Plan elaboration (finally adopted in 2007), there emerged need for new strategic development document. This has been multiplied by pressure imposed by legislation. Development strategy adopted in 2010 already respected new legal framework. Its full name is *Programme of economic and social development of the capital city of Slovakia Bratislava for years 2010-2020* (in Slovak – Program hospodárskeho a sociálneho rozvoja hlavného mesta SR Bratislavy na roky 2010 – 2020; Academia Istropolitana Nova, 2010). This strategy has been under preparation since Spring 2009 to June 2010. It respected principles of

participation and partnership. It followed standard framework and procedures of strategic planning.

Bratislava self-government had been aware that its strategy should be different to other Slovak cities. Its capital position and different development ambitions comparing to other Slovak cities, called for more elaborated process. City decided to acquire methodological introduction to strategic planning elaboration in advance. Academia Istropolitana Nova and Berman group, as specialised company/consortium active in this field, have been contracted to prepare principles, methodological framework that should be applied in strategy preparation (Academia Istropolitana Nova, 2007). It included evaluation of foreign approaches and experiences. Recommended had been more community based, participatory, partnership based approach. It also defined needed analytical framework (mostly economic, social, environmental), procedures, needed organisational capacities, implementation structures, identified critical points, risks etc.

The city self-government decided to progress further in 2008. After public procurement process the partners of the city in strategy elaboration were again companies AI Nova and Berman group. These companies were responsible also for analytical works as well as for facilitation the programme formulation. City slightly intervened into methods and procedures proposed by earlier methodological document (e.g. without software for managing elaboration and implementation). Bratislava city-wide self-government financed the strategy elaboration by own resources. At the beginning, analytical works were done mostly by academics and experts contracted by facilitating companies and submitted for public discussion, available at city web-page, as well as presented at public meeting.

From the point of view of governance key issue has been to attract partners outside local self-government to participation in strategic planning. During initial period, analyses of stakeholders had been executed and list of partners had been formed in collaboration of facilitating companies and city self-government. Finally, large number of stakeholders outside local self-government participated in programming. Very well it documents composition of Main Planning Group which contained 60 persons – stakeholders. Number of those representing local self-government had been limited on 17 representatives. Among them had been one representing City Magistracy, there were three city councillors, 6 representatives of city quarters (of 17 city quarters) and seven representatives of selected important city companies, contributory and budgetary organisations (e.g. city mass transport company, city forests, city museum etc.). The rest of public sector covered one representative of Bratislavský self-governing region, three representatives of main local universities, two key ministries (education and transport), four representatives of Slovak Academy of Sciences institutes, university hospital, Slovak railways, five representatives of other state institutions (e.g. Slovak National Museum, Slovak Tourism Agency, Regional Heritage Protection Office). Whole range of representatives (12) covered rich local non-governmental sector. Among them, the most extensive has been participation of five influential environmental organisations. Other stakehol-

ders were representatives of one local think tank, youth and children organisation, mother centres, handicapped, social services, sport, e-government associations.

Within the process also participated 14 representatives of the business sector. There were as representative of their associations, as well as representatives of selected corporations. Among associations we can find representatives of Regional Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Union of Employers, two entrepreneurs associations (representing small and medium sized entrepreneurs). Among participants also have been representatives of the Slovak Banking Association and Bratislava Hotel Association. Influential interests represented two professional associations (civil engineers, architects). Large businesses interests presented six large local corporations (car producer VW, regional energy distributor ZSE, gas distribution company SPP, mobile phone operator Orange, globally successful antivirus software producer ESET, and IBM as large local employer). Besides Main Planning Group, there existed six thematic Working Groups with 90 persons (that included representatives of many other institutions and companies). In total there were into the process incorporated more than 350 persons with various scope of participation (including City Councillors). Final draft of PHSR containing whole hierarchy of goals and measures was adopted in June 2011. Within particular measures we can find large number of those explicitly mentioning participation of many partners from all sectors. It is hardly to evaluate real participation of many partners in strategy preparation, not mentioning its implementation.

5.3 Strategic planning and governance in Bratislava

Strategic planning substantially contributes to expansion of governance into city management practices. It is a good case of application of widely known experiences in both horizontal and vertical meanings of governance. It offers chance for more transparent and efficient approach to urban social and economic development. It attracted many actors closer to the urban development processes. It also generated many new links and relations among representatives of many local institutions and theirs representatives. Although it is too early to evaluate significance of this shift, it introduces new and positive feature into local planning and decision making processes.

Besides stakeholder based approach and their attraction to participate in shaping future of the city, the strategic planning procedures improved position at least some of participants in public life that were marginalized, overlooked, or faced conflict with self-government during previous periods. It can re-establish balance of influence among various competing groups. It is especially non-governmental sector that obtained more possibilities to express their opinions and finally convert them into measures. For example, this process led to improved relation between city self-government and environmentalist groups. Conflict relations were reduced to minor number of issues. The invitation of their representative to participate in process of new City Architect selection confirmed improved perception of environmental associations in Bratislava. Communication and collaboration within strategic planning process helped both sides in better mutual understanding. Similar improvement

achieved some associations of small entrepreneurs. While large corporations and developers usually find their way to communicate their needs, it has been more difficult in a case of less influential actors. They were pleased by opportunity that obtained. More unclear remained position of large developers, which enjoyed a lot of opportunities in Bratislava under less regulated and strongly property oriented development. They directly did not participate within strategy elaboration processes. It seems as reflection of pragmatic approach. This field is highly competitive, with many actors not always prepared to reveal their plans too early. They tried to avoid potential disputes on concrete development projects and their functional orientation. It is also matter of fact that their relations to City Council and City Magistracy are sensitive (building procedures, need land etc.). Interim materials availability and public meetings also offered access to this process for citizens.

An approach adopted in Bratislava also reflects application of multilevel governance – when representatives of all levels of government were involved into strategic planning institutional setting. Although leading role and main responsibilities hold city wide self-government, there are representatives of central state, regional self-government, as well as self-governing city quarters. It has to be mentioned that due to the two tier model of urban government applied in Bratislava, there also already exist development strategies (PHSR) adopted by city quarters. Most of them were elaborated prior to adoption of city wide strategy adopted in 2010 (e.g. City Quarter of Bratislava-Staré Mesto, 2008). Its own strategy also has regional self-government covering Bratislavský region (Bratislava Self-Governing Region, 2007). However comparing to other sub-state levels of government (in city quarters and region), the position of Bratislava city-wide government is the most influential (thanks to its powers and larger financial capacities).

The position of capital city influenced central state involved in strategic planning in Bratislava. Central state institutions were interested in development of Bratislava especially during new state building processes in the 1990's. Activities in strategic planning had been coordinated with central state bodies and were partially initiated by an effort to formulate joint agreement on the development of the city with central government and local state administration in 1996-1999. For example in 1996, Ministry of Environment asked Bratislava self-government to submit report on problems and development intentions of the capital city. This ministry submitted this report to the meeting of the central government, after being commented by various central state institutions. Within the 2010 PHSR elaboration the role of central state was much smaller, but set of key national documents had to be respected. Central state participated as more equal partner via participating ministries. Activities were co-ordinated predominantly with more central state institutions. The role of central state and state administration in elaboration of 2010 Strategy was substantially minor. It reflects large scale reduction of the role of state within decentralization process. It also reflect change in dominant mode of governance – from dominance of vertical public actors partnerships (as during second strategy completed in 1999) to more horizontal, public-private and civic partnership in development. Weakening of central state allowed besides decentralisation also rapid economic and

social development of Bratislava and its hinterland. The central state tools and participation also changed in favour of nationwide political and regional development documents that were missing in the 90's.

6 CONCLUSION

We can conclude that set of modernization processes substantially influenced development in cities and different approaches to their management towards governance. Among them crucial general role had decentralization and positive social and economic development. Nevertheless, important partial role also have had move in favour of strategic planning, thanks to bottom up interest of city representatives, transfer of foreign experiences and suitable central state role by adoption of "strategic planning legislation". It has not only improved the quality and efficiency of urban development planning processes, but it also has supported formation of "more governance" based managing of cities with positive outcomes. The experiences of large Slovak cities provide good lesson to other transition societies searching for more efficient, partnership based and more democratic managing of urban development.

Local self-governments started to be more initiative and partnership oriented. Most of large cities turned to participatory based approach to strategic plans elaboration (or at least attempted to do so). It generated visible progress – new partners were attracted from all segments of the local society and economy. It was used as big opportunity especially by NGOs and various associations, previously overlooked. It starts to be usual practice within local economy, including leading local corporations (not mentioning chambers, or business associations). It also improved the outcomes – more complex oriented priorities were identified. Despite shorter term of application, it seems that it can establish certain tradition and "forum" for partnership, networking, co-operation among various actors in cities also outside strategic planning field. If we search for certain kind of progress towards the governance, strategic planning seems to be one of suitable cases. It also confirmed leadership of local self-governments in managing urban development.

This process has been successful in more cities, but it is still not a general practice. We still can find local self-governments that are less participative and do not used this opportunity. As a result they have strategies for local self-government in (managing) urban development (or so called "local public consumption"), but not for overall urban development. In some cases strategic planning process did not attract all important partners. They are often not interested, prefer own priorities, individual approach, or feel themselves as too global and less local (including large companies). There also appeared problems with various partners' participation (as changes of representatives, absences on meetings of working groups, acting as passive observers). There is also no chance to avoid some criticism from participants, especially those whose ideas and interests were not respected. However more balanced, informed and transparent relations among stakeholders were achieved.

Shift in favour of governance is important from the point of view of nature of the development process. Governance and strategic planning processes documents rising autonomy of cities and their local-self-governments. At present, local environment documents that it can act more autonomously, less dependent only on central state. It is important move ahead comparing to previous situation when more extensive and systematic links among local self-government and other local public institutions, private, as well as non-governmental non profit sphere were missing in the field of urban economic and social development for years. Now jointly agreed goals and measures can motivate to joint action, combination of own resources and to seek external support.

Practices of strategic planning and governance also concerns new nature of local democracy. If other parts of the society are more sophisticated also democracy has to respond. Strategic planning is part of innovations that should be combined with new meanings of democracy. It offers new forms of democratic participation and co-productive decision making. It is substantial complementary tool to already known forms of representative and direct democracy. Although not all aspects are always well developed, it can be considered as intermediary form that contribute to more democratic decision-making on concrete issues, later on also confirmed by representative institutions. It provides much wider legitimacy for action, and it is move out of “urban regime” absence of accountability.

Acknowledgements

This contribution is the result of the project implementation: Comenius University in Bratislava Science Park supported by the Research and Development Operational Programme funded by the ERDF, grant number: ITMS 26240220086 (50%); and project supported by Agency for Support of Research and Development (APVV) project No. APVV-0018-12 (50%).

References

- Act No. 369/1990 Coll. on municipalities (in Slovak).
Act No. 377/1990 Coll. on the capital of the Slovak Republic Bratislava as amended (in Slovak).
Act No. 503/2001 Coll. on support of regional development (in Slovak).
Act No. 583/2004 Coll. on budgetary rules of territorial self-government (in Slovak).
Act No. 539/2008 Coll. on support of regional development (in Slovak).
Academia Istropolitana Nova. 2007. „*Program hospodárskeho a sociálneho rozvoja mesta – metodika spracovania dokumentu pre hlavné mesto SR Bratislavu*“ Bratislava: City Magistracy, 67p.
Academia Istropolitana Nova. 2010. „*Program hospodárskeho a sociálneho rozvoja hlavného mesta SR Bratislavy na roky 2010 – 2020*“ Bratislava: City Magistracy, 423p.
Act No. 503/2001 Coll. on Support of Regional Development (as amended by Act No. 539/2008 Coll.) (in Slovak).
ALBRECHTS, L., HEALEY, P., KUNZMANN, K. 2003. Strategic spatial planning and regional governance in Europe. *APA Journal*, vol. 69, no. 2., pp. 113-129.

- ALBRECHTS, L. 2004. Strategic (spatial) planning reexamined. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 31, pp. 743-758.
- ALBRECHTS, L. 2012. Reframing strategic spatial planning by using coproduction perspective. *Planning Theory*, 12, 1, pp. 46-63.
- BAKER, M., HINCKS, S., SHERRIFF, G. 2010. Getting involved in plan making: participation and stakeholder involvement in local and regional spatial strategies in England. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, vol. 28, pp. 574-594.
- BLAKELEY, G. 2010. Governing Ourselves: Citizen Participation and Governance in Barcelona and Manchester. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34, 1, pp. 130-145.
- BLEHA, B., BUČEK, J. 2010. Theoretical issues of local population and social policy in 'shrinking' cities – some findings from Bratislava. In Kovács, Z. (ed.) *Challenges of Ageing in Villages and Cities: The Central European Experience*. Szeged: Department of Economic and Social Geography, University of Szeged, pp. 110-131.
- BORJA, J., CASTELLS, M. 1997. *Local & Global – Management of Cities in the Information Age*. London: UNCHS and Earthscan.
- Bratislava City Magistracy. 1993. *Návrh stratégie rozvoja hlavného mesta SR Bratislavy* (Proposal of the strategy of the development of the capital city of Slovakia Bratislava).
- Bratislava City Magistracy. 1999. *Stratégia rozvoja hlavného mesta Slovenskej republiky Bratislavy* (Strategy of the development of the capital city of Slovakia Bratislava). May 1999. Available at: <www.bratislava.sk> Accessed March 4, 2003.
- Bratislava Self-Governing Region. 2007. *Program hospodárskeho a sociálneho rozvoja Bratislavského samosprávneho kraja na roky 2007 – 2013* (Programme of social and economic development of Bratislava self-governing region in 2007-2013). 90p.
- BRENNER, N. 1999. Globalisation as Reterritorialisation: The Re-scaling of Urban Governance in the European Union. *Urban Studies*, 36, 3, pp. 431-451.
- BUČEK, J. 2002. The role of local self-government in local development during post-socialist period: The case study of Bratislava. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae - Geographica*, 37, 2, pp. 105-119.
- BUČEK, J. 2005. Slovakia. In Van Kempen, R., Vermeulen, M. and Baan, A. (eds). *Urban Issues and Urban Policies in the New EU Countries*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 79-108.
- BUČEK, J. 2006. Post-socialist urban development, planning and participation – The case study of Bratislava City Centre. In Enyedi, G., Kovács, Z. (eds.) *Social changes and social sustainability in historical urban centres – The case of Central Europe*. Pécs: Centre for Regional Studies of Hungarian Academy of Sciences, pp. 65-80.
- BUČEK, J. 2007. Current strategic economic development planning in cities and its application in Slovakia. *Quaestiones Geographicae*, 26B, pp. 15-25.
- BUČEK, J., BORÁROSOVÁ, Z., SOPKULIAK, A. 2010. *Local finance and local economic development* (in Slovak), Bratislava: Geo-grafika.
- BUČEK, J., BLEHA, B. 2013. Urban Shrinkage as a Challenge to Local Development Planning in Slovakia. *Moravian Geographical Reports*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 2-15.
- BUČEK J., KOREC, P. 2013. Directly elected large cities' mayors during transition: advantages, risks, leadership style and governance in Slovakia. In Pradhan, P. K., Buček, J. and Razin, E. (eds.) *Geography of Governance: Dynamics for Local Development*. International Geographical Union Commission on Geography of Governance, pp. 67-76.
- City Quarter of Bratislava-Staré Mesto. 2008. *Program hospodárskeho a sociálneho rozvoja mestskej časti Bratislava – Staré Mesto* (Programme of social and economic development of City Quarter of Bratislava-Staré Mesto), 202 p.
- DAVIES, J. S. 2011. *Challenging governance theory: From networks to hegemony*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- De GRAAF, R. S., DEWULF, G. P. M. R. 2010. Applying lessons of strategic urban planning learned in developig worlds to the Netherlands: A case study of three industrial area development projects. *Habitat International*, 34, pp. 471-477.
- DENTE, B., BOBBIO, L., SPADA, A. 2005. Government or Governance of Urban Innovation? A Tale of Two Cities. *DISP - The Planning Review*, 162, 3, pp. 41-52.

- ELANDER, I. 2002. Partnerships and urban governance. *International Social Science Journal*, 54, pp. 191-204.
- Eurostat. 2012. *Regional gross domestic product (PPS per inhabitant in % of the EU-27 average), by NUTS 2 regions*. Available at: <<http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu>> Accessed at June 11, 2012.
- HARVEY, D. 1989. From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler*, 71, 1, pp. 3-17.
- HEALEY, P. 1996. Consensus-building across difficult divisions: new approaches to collaborative strategy making. *Planning Practice and Research*, 11, 2, pp. 207-216.
- HEALEY, P. 2004. Collaborative planning in perspective. *Planning Theory*, 2, 2, pp. 101-123.
- HOHN, U., NEUER, B. 2006. New Urban Governance: Institutional Change and Consequences for Urban Development. *European Planning Studies*, 14, 3, pp. 291-298.
- KLIMOVSKÝ, D. 2010. Genéza koncepcie good governance a jej kritické prehodnotenie v teoretickej perspektíve. *Ekonomický časopis*, 58, 2, pp. 88-205.
- KOKX, A., van KEMPEN, R. 2010. Dutch urban governance: Multi-level or multi-scalar? *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 17, 4, pp. 355-369.
- KORNBERGER, M. 2012. Governing the City: From Planning to Urban Strategy. *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 84-106.
- LANKINA, T. V., HUDALLA, A., WOLLMAN, H. 2008. *Local Governance in Central and Eastern Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- LEITNER, H. 1990. Cities in pursuit of economic growth: The local state as entrepreneur. *Political Geography Quarterly*, 9, 2, pp. 146-170.
- MAIER, K. 2000. The role of strategic planning in the development of Czech towns and regions. *Planning Practice and Research*, 15, 3, pp. 247-255.
- MATLOVIČ, R. 2000. Transformačné procesy intraurbánnych štruktúr Prešova ako odraz celospoločenských zmien v ostatnom decénií. In Matlovič, R. (ed.) *Urbánny vývoj na rozhraní miléníí. Urbánne a krajinné štúdie*, 3, PU Prešov, s. 27-38.
- MACE, A. 2013. Delivering local plans: recognising the bounded interests of local planners within spatial planning. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 31, pp. 1133-1146.
- MACLEOD, G., GOODWIN, M. 1999. Space, scale and state strategy: rethinking urban and regional governance. *Progress in Human Geography*, 23, 4, pp. 503-527.
- ONDOŠ, S., KOREC, P. 2008. The rediscovered city: a case study of post-socialist Bratislava. *Geografický časopis*, 60, pp. 199-213.
- PARKROVA, J. 2006. Mayor flight to exhibition in plane with J&T (in Slovak). *SME, May 17 2006*, Available at: <www.sme.sk>
- PIERRE, J. 1999. Models of Urban Governance: The Institutional Dimension of Urban Politics. *Urban Studies*, 36, pp. 372-396.
- PIERRE, J. 2005. Comparative Urban Governance: Uncovering Complex Causalities. *Urban Affairs Review*, 40, pp. 446-462.
- PIERRE, J. 2009. Reinventing governance, reinventing democracy? *Policy & Politics*, 37, 4, pp. 591-609.
- PINSON, G. 2002. Political government and governance: Strategic planning and the reshaping of political capacity in Turin. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 26, 3, pp. 477-493.
- RØISELAND, A. 2011. Understanding local governance: institutional forms of collaboration. *Public Administration*, 89, 3, pp. 879-893.
- SKELCHER, Ch., 2010. Fishing in Muddy Waters: Principals, Agents, and Democratic Governance in Europe. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20, pp. 161-175.
- SLAVÍK, V., KOŽUCH, M., BAČÍK, V. 2005. Big cities in Slovakia – development, planning, contemporary transformation. *European Spatial Research and Policy*, 12, 2, pp. 47-69.

- STOKER, G. 1998. Governance as theory: five propositions. *International Social Science Journal*, 50, 155, pp. 17-28.
- ŠÝKORA, L. 2006. Urban development, policy and planning in the Czech Republic and Prague. In Altrock, U., Güntner, S., Huning S., Peters D. (eds.) *Spatial planning and urban development in the new EU member states: from adjustment to reinvention*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 113-140.
- ŠUŠKA, P. 2008. Urbánna transformácia a historické dedičstvo – prípad Bratislavy. *Geographia Cassoviensis*, 2, pp. 176-180.
- TSENKOVA, S. 2011. Venturing into unknown territory: Strategic spatial planning in post-communist cities. *Urbani izziv*, 22, 1, pp. 83-99.
- WILLIAMS, G. 1999. Metropolitan governance and strategic planning: a review of experience of Manchester, Toronto and Melbourne. *Progress in Planning*, 52, pp. 1-100.

Vládnutie v mestách, strategické plánovanie a demokracia v post-socialistickej tranzitívnej spoločnosti

Resumé

Mestá v post-socialistickej situácii sa najmä po procesoch decentralizácie stali otvorejšími rôznym inováciami v riadení svojho rozvoja. Medzi najvplyvnejšie môžeme zaradiť posun k aplikácii konceptu vládnutia (používam ako možný ekvivalent k anglickému termínu „governance“ – pozri poznámku) a využívaniu konceptu a postupov strategického plánovania. Cieľom príspevku je poodhaliť väzby medzi týmito dvoma inováciami, ich demokratické črty a potenciál ich využitia v rozvoji miest. Okrem diskusie o teoretických východiskách oboch konceptov, vychádzame aj stručné zhodnotenie možnosti aplikácie v slovenských podmienkach, vychádzajúc zo skúsenosti väčších miest so strategickým plánovaním (nehodnotíme pritom rôzne iné aspekty súvisiace napr. s prípravou a implementáciou programov hospodárskeho a sociálneho rozvoja na úrovni miest).

Koncept vládnutia a strategické plánovanie sa presadzujú v mestách už niekoľko desaťročí. Postupom času sa presadzujú aj v post-socialistických mestách, či už spontánne, vďaka iniciatíve samotnej miestnej úrovne, alebo vďaka tlaku centrálného štátu (napr. legislatívou). Súvislosť medzi vládnutím a strategickým plánovaním je dlhšie diskutovaná. Strategické plánovanie v rámci plánovania je asi najvhodnejšie na prepojenie s konceptom vládnutia (na rozdiel od územného plánovania s jeho regulatívnou podstatou). Je to najmä vďaka rastúcej úlohe participačných prístupov k strategickému plánovaniu, využívaniu rozsiahlejšej komunikácie a spolupráce rôznych aktérov pri plánovaní a dôrazu na realizáciu rozvojových zámerov. S určitým zovšeobecnením môžeme považovať strategické plánovanie za jednu z možných foriem inštitucionalizácie a formalizácie konceptu vládnutia (governance) v mestách.

Koncept vládnutia má viacero chápaní. V našom prípade ho vnímame ako prepojenie medzi kedysi rozdelenými sférami verejného a privátneho sektoru, či centrálnej a miestnej úrovne a pod. Kľúčovými znakmi konceptu vládnutia na mestskej/miestnej úrovni (napr. vychádzajúc z Stoker 1998) je začlenenie inštitúcií a aktérov mimo orgánov miestnej samosprávy do politiky rozvoja mesta. Vďaka spolupráci medzi inštitúciami/aktérmi a spoločnej kolektívnej aktivite sa otvára možnosť dosiahnuť v rozvoji viac, ako len aktivitami samotnej samosprávy. Typickou formou spolupráce je rozvinutá sieť aktérov. Očakávaným efektom tohto posunu v miestnej politike je zvýšenie zdrojov, posilnenie dostupných kapacít a využitelných nástrojov k dosiahnutiu potrebných vybraných cieľov v mestskom rozvoji. Jedným z efektov je zneprehľadnenie hraníc medzi oblasťami pôsobenia a kompetenciami jednotlivých aktérov. Samozrejme tento prístup znamená ohrozenie postavenia tradičnej reprezentatívnej demokracie a úlohy samosprávy. Pierre (2009) podotýka, že väčšina z modelov vládnutia sa opiera skôr o ciele z oblasti výkonnos-

ti a efektívnosti, a menej z oblasti demokracie a zodpovednosti občanom. Riziko predstavuje začlenenie netransparentne vybraných aktérov, reprezentujúcich len vybrané časti miestneho sociálno-ekonomického systému. Na druhej strane, vhodný a transparentný výber aktérov v rámci procesov strategického plánovania (napr. ako tzv. stakeholdrov), môže napomôcť miestnemu rozvoju, efektívnej realizácii cieľov, ako aj dáva legitimitu tým, čo majú záujem a zdroje konať v prospech mesta.

V podmienkach slovenských miest sa oba koncepty môžu rozvíjať a aplikovať v praxi vďaka pomerne vhodnému legislatívnemu prostrediu. Treba však uviesť, že to nie je proces bez nedostatkov a rizík. Reprezentanti miest už sú si vedomí väčších možností a vyššej dynamiky rozvoja ak zvládnu procesy vládnutia a strategického plánovania. Toto chápanie sa však viac rozvinulo až v druhej dekáde po r. 1989. Okrem vládnutia, ktoré sa môže opierať o zákon o obecnej samospráve už dlhšie, strategické plánovanie sa začalo rozvíjať v širšej miere až po r. 2001 (prijaťie zákona o podpore regionálneho rozvoja bolo hlavným iniciátorom aktivizácie). Aj strategické plánovanie sa od prvých pokusov skôr expertne pripravovaných stratégií posunulo do podoby participatívne pripravovaných Programov hospodárskeho a sociálneho rozvoja (v rámci priestorového plánovania na Slovensku sú najbližšie podstate strategického plánovania). Kým v oblasti začlenenenia hlavných aktérov „stakeholdrov“ môžeme pozorovať značný posun v prípade viacerých slovenských miest, o niečo horšie je to so začlenením rôznych lokálnych spoločností a občanov. Tu však aj dobre mienená snaha a techniky umožňujúce participáciu, narážajú na limity záujmu občanov. Napriek tomu môžeme pozorovať, napr. aj v prípade procesov spracovania PHSR hlavného mesta SR Bratislavy, zväčšený priestor pre participáciu viacerých predstaviteľov združení, napr. environmentálnych, či podnikateľských. Mnohé mestá vyvíjajú veľké snahy rôznymi postupmi pritiahnúť väčšou pozornosť aj samotných občanov (tú sú však veľké rozdiely medzi mestami).

V duchu oboch konceptov sa lepšie darí sformovať bližšie vzťahy medzi rôznymi sektormi a inštitúciami v meste. Tie sú oveľa transparentnejšie, významné otázky rozvoja sa riešia na širšej platforme, ktorá upokojuje potenciálne konflikty (resp. sú riešené v predstihu v štandardnejšom rámci). Spolupráca, spoločné hľadanie vízie mesta, či potrebných opatrení približuje názory a pochopenie iných záujmov a ich vzájomné zladenie. Ak sa podarí tieto procesy a vzťahy dlhodobo udržiavať, môže to vytvoriť ďaleko konštruktívnejšiu atmosféru v meste a najmä jeho efektívnejší rozvoj. Dôslednejšia a tvorivá aplikácia konceptov vládnutia a strategického plánovania môže prispieť v slovenských mestách k významnému zlepšeniu riadenia ich rozvoja a aj k jeho novej kvalite. V spojení s implementovaním opatrení v duchu prijatého programu rozvoja prinesie novú kultúru do procesu rozvoja a vzťahov v meste.

Pozn.: Termín „governance“ nemá zatiaľ všeobecný ekvivalent akceptovaný odbornou komunitou na Slovensku. Často sa z tohto dôvodu neprekladá a používa sa v odborných textoch vo svojej anglickej podobe. Dôležitosť tohto konceptu a vysoká frekvencia používania uvedeného termínu však vyvolávajú potrebu jeho inkorporovania do slovenského jazyka. Použitý termín „vládnutie“ je jednou z možností, ako ho uskutočniť a nezneprehľadníť pritom jeho špecifickú obsahovú podstatu. Z iných možností musíme odmietnuť alternatívy ako „vláda“ (čo môže byť vnímané napr. ako centrálna, miestna) blízke zmyslu už zavedených volených politických inštitúcií, „riadenie“ (skôr priama exekutívna činnosť), „spravovanie“ (navádza na spojenie s verejnou správou), či už zaužívaným pojmami ako verejná správa, samospráva. Nevhodné sú aj iné možné „preklady“ ako ovládanie, regulácia, kontrola a pod. Použitie pojmu „vládnutie“ dáva možnosť na jeho používanie aj v ďalších súvisiacich významoch napr. viacúrovňové vládnutie (angl. multilevel governance), dobré vládnutie (angl. good governance), sieťové vládnutie (angl. network governance) a pod. Významovo navádza na obsahovo vhodné očakávanie – spoločná

vláda mnohých aktérov a špecifický proces interakcie, neodkazuje na nejakú inštitúciu, či inštitúcie, už známu „pevnú“ administratívnu štruktúru. Ponúka teda aj určitú voľnosť, či neurčitosť obsiahnutú i v samotnom anglickom termíne. O vhodnom slovenskom ekvivalente termínu „governance“ je však potrebné ďalej konštruktívne diskutovať, možno napr. aj o používaní mechanickejšej transkripcie v podobe „governancia“.