

**PAULINA LEGUTKO-KOBUS**

Warsaw School of Economics

## **STAKEHOLDERS AND TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SELECTED TOWNS IN THE WARSAW METROPOLITAN AREA**

**Abstract:** The contemporary trends in the management of the development of urban and functional areas tend to implement the participation and stakeholder theory. Public governance and metropolitan governance assume a vertical cooperation between the various levels of public government (local, regional, national and EU) and the inclusion of private and public actors of development. These processes have a particular importance in the planning of both local and metropolitan areas. This paper aims to analyse the trends and development objectives as well as identifying the actors of the urban development policy programming in the Warsaw Metropolitan Area.

**Keywords:** Governance, stakeholders, Warsaw Metropolitan Area.

### **Introduction**

Metropolitan areas are settlement systems based on the networks of relations between the hub city of metropolitan functions (metropolis) and its immediate neighbouring area (hinterland). An example of such a system (functional system) is the Warsaw Metropolitan Area (WMA). When identifying the actors of the programming of the WMA towns development policy, it should be borne in mind that every local government unit (LGU), comprising a part of the metropolitan area, is autonomous in defining and creating its local development policy. Based on the principles of sustainable development, such a policy should integrate the socio-economic and spatial developments. This idea is reflected in integrated planning which, at the local level, needs to tackle challenges related to the dissimilar systems of preparation and review of the commune-level strategic planning documents. The integration of development planning is also hindered by the differences in the pace of spatial and socio-economic transformations [Markowski 2013].

The literature on the subject seeks to answer the question of what model should be adopted of managing the development of metropolitan areas and what role LGUs (and

towns) have to play in this process. A remedy for the contemporary management issues (especially affecting towns and their functional areas) can become a management of development based on participation, whereby the management model evolves from the hierarchical towards the horizontal approach, based on the interplay between the public, private and NGO-like entities [Hausner 2008]. An example of such a management is metropolitan governance [Pierre 2005]. In both approaches, most emphasis is put on the interaction between the public administration (or, broadly speaking, the public sector) and civil society (both individuals and social groups). Apart from the principle of participation, of crucial importance is the principle of partnership which entails a vertical cooperation between the different levels of public authorities (local, regional, national, EU) and the inclusion of many private and public entities [Danielewicz 2014]. Of key importance in the practical implementation of these concepts is the ability to identify the stakeholders<sup>1</sup> and their expectations.

The aim of this study is to address the following research questions: what goals and development trends are pursued by the (selected) WMA towns and who should be regarded as the actors (stakeholders) of the programming of urban development policies in the WMA (including the power of influence of individual actors).

## 1. The characteristic attributes of WMA towns

The Warsaw Metropolitan Area is one of the Strategic Intervention Areas (SIA), referred to in the regional strategy as the so-called growth pole [*Strategia rozwoju województwa mazowieckiego...* 2013]. The WMA is made up of 72 communes; it covers almost 20% of the area of Mazowsze and is inhabited by 57.8% of all the region's population. 81.3% of the WMA population lives in urban areas (of which 25.3% outside Warsaw) [*Obszar metropolitalny Warszawy...* 2014]. The WMA is made up of the capital city of Warsaw, 16 urban communes, 19 urban-rural communes and 36 rural communes (these are the entire districts) of: the Capital City of Warsaw, Grodzisk Mazowiecki, Legionowo, Piaseczno, Pruszków, Warsaw West, Żyrardów and selected communes of the districts of: Grójec, Mińsk Mazowiecki, Nowy Dwór Mazowiecki, Otwock, Sochaczew, Wołomin and Wyszaków (Fig. 1).

---

<sup>1</sup> *Stakeholders* are persons or other organizations that participate in the framing of policies (i.e. take an active part in their realization) or are directly interested in having a stake in the results of their realization as well as being capable of influencing a specific organization. *Słownik języka polskiego*, <http://sjp.pl/interesariusz>; last access: 8 Oct 2014. Stakeholders are, in other words, the actors of a local policy.



Figure 1. The Warsaw Metropolitan Area

Source: Own study based on the Central Statistical Office.

Besides Warsaw, the WMA has 35 towns of all sizes which, in administrative terms, are urban communes or the seats of urban-rural communes (which has an impact on the shaping of local development policies, as the objectives set in the strategic documents of such communes do not only apply to the urban area proper but also to the nearby rural areas) (Tab. 1).

Table 1

Towns in the WMA (WMA boundaries as adopted by the Mazowieckie Voivodeship Executive Board)

City/town*	Commune and its administrative type	Total population**
<b>Capital city of Warsaw</b>	<b>Capital city of Warsaw</b>	<b>1,715,517</b>
Błonie	urban-rural, Błonie	12,570
Brwinów	urban-rural, Brwinów	13,090
Góra Kalwaria	urban-rural, Góra Kalwaria	11,685
Grodzisk Mazowiecki	urban-rural, Grodzisk Mazowiecki	29,907

City/town*	Commune and its administrative type	Total population**
Grójec	urban-rural, Grójec	16,454
Halinów	urban-rural, Halinów	3,654
Józefów	urban, Józefów	19,914
Karczew	urban-rural, Karczew	10,160
Kobyłka	urban, Kobyłka	20,855
Konstancin Jeziorna	urban-rural, Konstancin Jeziorna	17,391
Legionowo	urban, Legionowo	54,231
Łomianki	urban-rural, Łomianki	16,639
Marki	urban, Marki	29,032
Milanówek	urban, Milanówek	16,410
Mińsk Mazowiecki	urban, Mińsk	39,880
Mszczonów	urban-rural, Mszczonów	6,460
Nowy Dwór Mazowiecki	urban, Nowy Dwór Mazowiecki	28,287
Otwock	urban, Otwock	45,044
Ożarów Mazowiecki	urban-rural, Ożarów Mazowiecki	10,561
Piaseczno	urban-rural, Piaseczno	44,869
Piastów	urban, Piastów	22,826
Podkowa Leśna	urban, Podkowa Leśna	3,869
Pruszków	urban, Pruszków	59,570
Raszyn	urban-rural, Radzymin	11,378
Serock	urban-rural, Serock	4,130
Sochaczew	urban, Sochaczew	37,480
Sulejówek	urban, Sulejówek	19,311
Tarczyn	urban-rural, Tarczyn	4,127
Tłuszcz	urban-rural, Tłuszcz	7,989
Wołomin	urban-rural, Wołomin	37,505
Wyszków	urban-rural, Wyszków	27,222
Ząbki	urban, Ząbki	31,844
Zakroczym	urban-rural, Zakroczym	3,241
Zielonka	urban, Zielonka	17,398
Żyrardów	urban, Żyrardów	41,096

Colour gray indicates five towns with the largest population (excluding Warsaw)

\* given in alphabetical order besides Warsaw

\*\* in individual towns by the actual place of residence; as at 31 December 2013.

Source: Own study based on the Local Data Bank.

The towns clustered within the WMA are diverse, both in terms of function, relation to Warsaw and size (including the population – Tab. 2). With regard to the functional types of the communes within the WMA, the areas classified as urban are (apart from the capital city): Pruszków, Grodzisk Mazowiecki, Żyrardów, Sochaczew, Otwock, Mińsk Mazowiecki, Legionowo, Nowy Dwór Mazowiecki. Other towns included in the WMA are located in communes which, in terms of the functional type, are regarded as the areas of progressing urbanization [*Diagnoza* 2013].

Table 2

## WMA towns Warsaw – classification based on population

Towns by population	Number	Towns selected for analysis*
Below 5,000	5	Podkowa Leśna
5,000 – 9,999	2	Mszczonów
10,000 – 19,999	13	Zielonka
20,000 – 49,999	13	Otwock
Above 50,000	2	**

\*The towns selected for the analysis meet the following criteria:

- a different character (the analysed towns are: a garden town, a town that has lost its functions, a town with potential leisure and entertainment functions having importance to the biofield, a dormitory town)

- strategic documents in place adopted no earlier than in 2011

\*\* the towns included in this group – Pruszków and Legionowo – do not have strategic documents adopted for implementation after 2011. In Pruszków the documents still in force are the 2000 spatial development study and the 2008 development strategy. Legionowo has the 2007 strategy, consequently this group has been excluded from the analysis in Table 3.

Source: Own study.

The key player in the WMA is Warsaw: the driving force of Mazowieckie but also of the whole country. Warsaw is in the heart of Polish political, cultural, scientific and economic life as well as serving as the window for international cooperation. The entire metropolitan area is very diversified and exhibits not only positive but also many negative phenomena, both socio-economic and spatial (including the spatial chaos, excessive urban sprawl, social exclusion), also seen in the towns [*Strategia rozwoju województwa mazowieckiego...* 2013]. The WMA towns (selected for the analysis) frame their development goals differently based, for example, on their history or location within the WMA. The WMA has typical dormitory towns serving Warsaw with the housing development typical of residential areas within larger cities (*i.e.* blocks of flats) – Piaseczno, a town enjoying a health resort status – Konstancin Jeziorna, a garden town – Podkowa Leśna, or a town which has lost its summer resort or spa functions – Otwock (Tab. 3).

Table 3  
Main development trends and goals of selected WMA towns

Town selected for analysis	Distance from Warsaw*	Main developmental goals and trends**
Podkowa Leśna	25 km	<p>In accordance with the Sustainable Development Strategy for the Garden Town Podkowa Leśna 2013-2025 [Strategia zrównoważonego rozwoju miasta ogrodu Podkowa Leśna na lata 2013-2025], the main goals and development trends within the town should aim to implement the concept of Garden Town of the 21st century, in line with the principle of sustainable development (main goal). This will be made possible through the completion of strategic objectives: a modern urban infrastructure, environmental protection, conservation of the unique urban layout of the garden town, a comprehensive social development of the garden town, the development of post-industrial entrepreneurship (replacement of burdensome services with educational, social and development services supported by the so-called creative sector businesses).</p>
Mszczonów	70 km	<p>In its spatial and development policy, the town underlines its location in the WMA. It intends to grow as a strong housing and service centre (the central and western part of the town). The east part of the commune and the areas immediately adjacent are planned to accommodate logistics and non-burdensome services. The option of developing a more burdensome business activity is possible in the north part of the town.</p> <p>The town centre is expected to maintain and organize the preserved urban layout. The living standard will be raised by, for example, the establishment of new green areas and the lasting separation of the residential area from the warehouse and production zone. The town's development policy will depend on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- further development of the so-called East Industrial District (including a logistics centre of national importance based on town's accessibility for transport – a rail and road corridor)</li> <li>- planned investment in the development of training, congress, leisure and recreational functions (the commune is well-connected; moreover, the town operates the leisure complex Termy Mszczonów with hot springs).</li> </ul>
Zielonka	20 km	<p>The town's aspirations and directions of development are reflected in the vision contained in the strategy, Zielonka: Life in Its Fullness Close to Your Home. Its implementation will follow the completion of the strategic objectives:</p> <p>Objective 1: Town that is clean, spatially organized/maintained, in harmony with the environment, and with residents of high ecological culture</p> <p>Objective 2: Society that is educated, healthy, integrated, with a sense of security and influence on public affairs</p> <p>Objective 3: A wide offering of leisure activities responding to the residents' various needs</p> <p>Objective 4: Development of non-burdensome business activity</p> <p>Objective 5: Forging regional and metropolitan relations.</p>

Town selected for analysis	Distance from Warsaw*	Main developmental goals and trends**
Otwock	26 km	<p>The objectives of spatial development (as provided in the Spatial Development Trends and Conditions [Studium uwarunkowań i kierunków zagospodarowania przestrzennego]) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– to achieve a high standard of living, work and leisure</li> <li>– to achieve a desired spatial image of the city</li> <li>– to develop an important multi-function centre of supra-local character</li> <li>– to protect the most valuable natural resources</li> </ul> <p>In addition, it is expected that the social and economic growth of Otwock will be possible owing to the benefits of tourism, culture and sport. The focus is on the weekend and a one-day tourists (individuals, business, and children and youth seeking an educational offer).</p> <p>Otwock aspires to build on its early 20th-century image of a summer resort and spa centre. Moreover, due to being well-connected with Warsaw, Otwock wants to strengthen its dormitory function for Warsaw by maintaining the high quality level of residential areas.</p>

\*the shortest distance from the centre of Warsaw to the centres of the analysed towns calculated by the on-line location service [zumi.pl](http://zumi.pl).

\*\*development goals and trends contained in the existing strategic and planning documents (i.e. a development strategy and a study of trends and conditions of spatial development).

Source: Own study based on the available strategic and planning documents.

## 2. Stakeholders of urban development policies

To identify the stakeholders of local development policies, it is necessary to refer to the stakeholder theory that should be helpful in recognizing (mapping) them. Stakeholders can be categorised following different criteria, including the rates (actually experienced: benefits, profits, costs), impact, or position within an organization (in the case in the town, understood as a community dwelling in a specific territory). The drawing up of stakeholder maps and matrices in the programming of development policies is essentially intended to answer the questions: who and how should be consulted and how deep or extensive any potential cooperation should be. Active stakeholders and civil society is a prerequisite for the implementation of the participatory model of governance, including the concept of “metropolitan governance”. Table 4 brings together the identified stakeholders (actors) of the programming process in the WMA urban development. This list reflects the current situation which is far from satisfactory from the viewpoint of participatory management.

Table 4  
Identification of stakeholders in the process of urban development programming in the WMA

Internal stakeholders	External stakeholders
<b>With a strong position</b>	
Mayor Personnel directly involved in development programming Personnel of the Office/Unit for Strategy and Spatial Planning Town council	Developers Key investors Local mass-media
<b>With a weak position (influence)</b>	
Bureaucrats not involved in the drawing up of the development policy Residents Units within the communal management Commune (utility) companies Local culture and education institutions	Regional institutions: development agencies, training and advisory centres Employers' professional organizations Professional and trade unions Commune, town/city associations Universities Enterprises
<b>With an indefinite position of influence</b>	
Town movements Local public organizations	State administration bodies, including those responsible for the development and urban policies Regional authorities Capital city authorities

Source: Own study based on [Wachowiak 2012].



As indicated in Table 4, it is challenging, for part of the stakeholders in the WMA towns, to determine their strength of impact. Among the internal stakeholders, this part includes town movements and local social organizations. These are the potential social partners in development processes. Their impact is stronger thanks to their activity and efficiency but also (and largely) due to the favourable attitude of town authorities to such initiatives.

The external stakeholders whose impact is difficult to measure unambiguously are: central administration bodies (especially those in charge of the development policies – also of towns), regional authorities, and the capital city authorities. Pursuant to the concept of governance, such stakeholders should enjoy a position and impact. Yet, there are no effective mechanisms of cooperation and influencing the local policies of WMA towns – the legal setting is unfavourable and there is no metropolitan law in place yet. The National Urban Policy, its actors and addressees being: government institutions, local government units, town residents and their organizations, business entities, science and NGO entities, self-governmental corporations, and entities representing the functional areas of towns (unions, associations, etc.), is still in its infancy [*Krajowa polityka miejska* 2014]. The Integrated Territorial Investments were assumed to provide the stimulus for cooperation with the capital city, but the territorial range of the Warsaw Functional Area covered by the ITI Strategy is smaller than that of the WMA – ITI covers 40 LGUs.

## Conclusion

The programming of a local urban development policy within the WMA requires an active participation of external stakeholders, particularly the representatives of the regional authorities and the capital city. A discussion should be held – in a participatory way, long-term and continuous form – on the ultimate functions of the towns of the WMA. This model promotes a strategy of information (especially about planned investment) and cooperation rather than competition between the towns as well as involving a multi-level cooperation. These proposals are not implementable without the establishment of a platform (forum) of inter-town dialogue at the level of the WMA. There is no single and optimal model for such cooperation, and the examples of Copenhagen, Barcelona, Lisbon and Sydney can be inspirational but hardly applicable to the Polish conditions.

It should also be noted that in the development processes of WMA towns the public participatory management from the local level overlaps with that of the metropolitan level. Towns are stakeholders in the context of metropolitan governance, and the metropolis is also – and in each case – an external stakeholder for individual towns (which are influenced by the capital city with uneven intensity and by different functional relations). A large diversity of the WMA towns as stakeholders and the

metropolitan governance as such leads to the conflicts of interest and disputes over the precedence of local interests (of individual WMA towns) over the shared ones (metropolitan). There is a lack of multilateral discussion on the functions of individual towns, both from the perspective of internal and external stakeholders. It seems that a more active role in this process should be assumed by the regional and central authorities, especially in the sphere of engineering of the entire process, but also by securing the adequate legal framework, standards and financial resources.

## References

- Danielewicz J., 2014, *Udział interesariuszy w procesach zarządzania rozwojem obszarów metropolitalnych na przykładzie Wielkiej Kopenhagi*, [in:] *Partnerstwo i odpowiedzialność w funkcjonowaniu miasta*, T. Markowski, D. Stawasz (Eds.). Studia KPZK PAN, Vol. CLVII, Warsaw, pp. 154-167.
- Diagnoza. Trendy Rozwojowe Mazowsza*, 2013, Z. Strzelecki (Ed.). MBPR, Warsaw, p. 169.
- Hausner J., 2008, *Zarządzanie publiczne*. Wyd. Naukowe Scholar, Warsaw, pp. 23-25.
- Krajowa polityka miejska*, wersja I, marzec 2014, MIR, p. 6.
- Markowski T., 2013, *Flexible and Integrative Planning in Functional Urban Areas – towards a New Approach to Spatial Planning*, [in:] *Dynamika, cele i polityka zintegrowanego rozwoju regionów. Aspekty teoretyczne i zarządzanie w przestrzeni*, W. M., Gaczek (Eds.). Bogucki Wyd. Naukowe, Poznań, pp. 27-41.
- Obszar metropolitalny Warszawy w 2012 r.*, 2014, GUS, Warsaw.
- Pierre J., 2005, *Comparative Urban Governance: Uncovering Complex Causalities*. Urban Affairs Review, No. 40, pp. 446-453, <http://uar.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/40/4/446>.
- Strategia rozwoju województwa mazowieckiego do 2030 roku. Innowacyjne Mazowsze*, 2013, MBPR, Warsaw.
- Strategia zrównoważonego rozwoju gminy Zielonka na lata 2014-2024 (aktualizacja)*, projekt po konsultacjach społecznych, październik 2014, Warsaw.
- Strategia zrównoważonego rozwoju miasta ogrodu Podkowa Leśna na lata 2013-2025 (aktualizacja)*, 2013, Podkowa Leśna.
- Strategia zrównoważonego rozwoju turystyki miasta Otwock na lata 2012-2022*, 2011, Otwock.
- Studium uwarunkowań i kierunków zagospodarowania przestrzennego gminy Mszczonów*, 2013, Mszczonów.
- Studium uwarunkowań i kierunków zagospodarowania przestrzennego z elementami strategii rozwoju społeczno-gospodarczego miasta Otwocka*, 2014, Otwock.
- Wachowiak P., 2012, *Jak prowadzić dialog z interesariuszami?*, e-mentor, No. 1(43), <http://www.e-mentor.edu.pl/arttykul/index/numer/43/id/898>.