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Key dates

• 2001. National Spatial Development Policy Perspective (NSDPP)
• 2003. New Act on Spatial Planning and Development
• 2004-2005. NSDPP actualization (Euroreg), finally not approved
• 2005. new Ministry of Regional Development (MRD)
• 2006-2007. Theses and Assumptions for NCDS
• 2007. MRD appointed the Team of Scientific Experts under prof. P. Korcelli (IGSO PAS)
• 2007-2008. Over 40 expert reports
• 2008. Experts draft of NCDS
• 2009. Public debate in 16 regions
• 2009-2010. Work on government draft of the NCDS 2030
• 2010. Environmental Impact Assessment for the implementation of NCDS 2030
• 2010-2011. Government draft public consultation
• 2011. Last consultancy with other Ministries and corrections…
• XII.2011. Adoption of NSDC 2030 by the Council of Ministers
• 2012. Positive opinion of the Parliament
Main bodies

• Ministry of Regional Development - Department of Structural Policy Coordination (under dr Piotr Żuber)
• Task Force (representatives from several Ministries)
• Team of Scientific Experts under prof. P. Korcelli
• National Spatial Management Council
Scientific background

• Over 40 expert reports
• ESPON I results
• Some parallel studies (including IGSO PAS grants; eg. *Functional linkages between Polish Metropolises*; dedicated accessibility analysis)
Why New Document?

• New external conditions:
  – EU accession
  – New administrative division of Poland
• New Act on Spatial Planning and Development
• Problem (not sectorial) approach
• Base of the future decision, not just postulates
• European dimension, compatibility with European documents
• New vision of the Polish space (accessibility versus transit; networks versus belts)
• Sea space inclusion
• Document as part of the integrated development policy
The target hierarchic planning system in Poland
Actors

- **Regions** – position of the main metropolises, infrastructure development plans, participation in bipolar structures

- **Ministers**
  - Ministry of Infrastructure/transport (changes in previous infrastructure development plans)
  - Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (separate position for rural areas)
  - Ministry of Finance (last months – economic crisis)

- **Some experts** (alternative concepts, lobbing)
Main changes (from experts draft to final documents)

- Document structure
- Diagnostic part reduction
- Some changes of aims structure
- Reduction of the role of so called „Network Metropolis”, inflation of the regional centers rank
- Less changes in the infrastructure development policies
- Alternative vision of the functional and problem areas (number)
- Larger implementation chapter
Linkages between metropolises (is Polish settlement system really polycentric?)

ownership  
migration  
scientific  
internet
Experts draft – Central Hexagon
Central Hexagon
Final document structure

• Introduction
• Background
• Vision of the Spatial Development of Poland until 2030
• Principles and Objectives
• Typology of Functional areas
• Implementation system
Objectives

• **Objective 1.** To improve the competitiveness of Poland major urban centres in the European context through functional integration while preserving the pro-cohesive polycentric settlement structure

• **Objective 2.** To enhance internal cohesion and balance the territorial development of the country across regions by promoting functional integration, creating conditions for spreading development factors, multifunctional development of rural areas and using the internal potentials of all territories.

• **Objective 3.** To improve Poland’s connectivity in different dimensions by developing transport and telecommunications infrastructure

• **Objective 4.** To develop spatial structures supporting the achievement and preservation of Poland’s high-quality natural environment and landscape.

• **Objective 5.** To enhance spatial structure’s resistance to natural disasters and loss of energy security and to develop spatial structures supporting national defence capabilities

• **Objective 6.** To restore and consolidate spatial order
The Polish space is competitive and innovative owing to the potential of the polycentric network of metropolises.

In 2030, the key nodes of the network of functional connections between cities include:

- the capital, Warsaw, and the largest Polish cities: Upper Silesian Agglomeration (Katowice and other cities comprising the Metropolitan Association of Upper Silesia), Łódź, Cracow, Tricity (Gdańsk – Sopot – Gdynia), Wrocław, Poznań, Szczecin, the emerging duopoly Bydgoszcz – Toruń, and Lublin;
- capitals of voivodeships of national significance where metropolitan functions of national and international importance consistently concentrate: Białystok and Rzeszów, Opole, Olsztyn, Kielce, Gorzów Wielkopolski and Zielona Góra.

The core settlement network also comprises regional centres connected to the main nodes which contribute to the sustainable development of the country: Częstochowa, Radom, Bielsko-Biała, Rybnik, Płock, Elbląg, Wałbrzych, Włocławek, Tarnów, Kalisz with Ostrów Wielkopolski, Koszalin, Legnica, Grudziądz, Słupsk.

Sub-regional and local centres are also connected to the metropolitan network.
Final document – functional linkages
NSDPP 2001 and NSDC 2011
Final document – European position

Functional areas discussion

• Terminology
• The lack of the Metropolitan Act
• Metropolitan Areas List
• Bydgoszcz-Toruń problem
• No delimitation
• Rural areas problem
Final document – 4 general types of functional areas

• defined in relation to the entire settlement system, delimited based on the degree of urbanisation, covering urban areas – core cities and their functional zones – and functional rural areas,

• delimited based on the type of development potential related to the presence of a particular spatial development phenomenon and conditions for development policy on the macroregional scale,

• delimited based on the possibility of spatial conflicts related to the method of using their environmental and cultural potential,

• requiring restructurisation and development of new functions with the use of regional policy instruments. Those are the areas where socio-economic problems accumulate raising a barrier to the achievement of spatial cohesion of the country.
Functional areas

- No final delimitation
- Requirement / recommendation / coordination
- Presently (2013) delimitation criteria in elaboration
Example: Border areas

- Base: Location criteria
- Negative criteria (elimination):
  - Size
  - No-peripheral location
  - Border prosperity
- Delimitation unit – commune (gmina)
Location criteria

communes  counties
No-peripheral location and size criteria

- 45 minutes +
- 50,000 inhab.:
  - Suwałki,
  - Biawa
  - Chełm
  - Przemyśl
  - Jastrzębie
  - Wałbrzych
  - Jelenia Góra
  - Szczecin
Border prosperity criteria

Limits:
- Value of exports to neighboring country per capita
- Internal EU border – 1000 USD
- External EU border – 500 USD
Border areas – delimitation results
TRANSPORT ISSUES
Accessibility studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kategoria</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB1</td>
<td>Toruń-Gdańsk, Stryków-Gorzyczki</td>
<td>Toruń-Stryków</td>
<td>Mińsk Maz.-Terespol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB2</td>
<td>Świecko-Mińsk Maz.</td>
<td>Świecko-Mińsk Maz.</td>
<td>Płońsk-(Płock) - Bydgoszcz-Szczecin-Lubieszyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB4</td>
<td>cała</td>
<td>Grudziądz-Znin-Poznań-Wrocław-Lubawka</td>
<td>Piaski-Dorohusk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB6</td>
<td>obwodnica Szczecina</td>
<td>Gdańsk-Warszawa-Kraków</td>
<td>Warszawa-Piaski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB8</td>
<td>obwodnica Wrocławia</td>
<td>Wrocław-Piotrków Tryb.-Warszawa-Białystok</td>
<td>Lublin-Rzeszów-Barwinek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB18</td>
<td>Krzywa-Olszyna</td>
<td>Gdańsk-Warszawa-Kraków-Rabka</td>
<td>Lublin-Barwinek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB1A</td>
<td>Pyrzowice-Bielsko-Biała-Ciezsyn</td>
<td>Nowa Sól-Legnica, Szczecin-Swinoujście</td>
<td>Legnica-Lubawka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB3</td>
<td>Szczecin-Gorzów, Gorzów - Nowa Sól</td>
<td>Wrocław-Boboszów</td>
<td>Bolków-Jelenia Góra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB5</td>
<td>Grudziądz-Znin</td>
<td>Piaski-Hrebenne</td>
<td>Rabka-Chyżne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB6</td>
<td>obwodnica Słupska</td>
<td>Elbląg-Tczew</td>
<td>Kołobrzeg - Poznań-Pyrzowice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB7</td>
<td>Gdańsk-Warszawa-Kraków-Rabka</td>
<td>Kraków-Bielsko-Biała</td>
<td>Grudziądz-Olsztyn-Mragowo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB8</td>
<td>Wrocław-Kępno, Piotrków-Warszawa-Białystok,</td>
<td>Zachodnia obwodnica Łodzi</td>
<td>Krosno-Sanok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB14</td>
<td>Kępno-Lódź</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opole-Częstochowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB17</td>
<td>Warszawa-Piaski</td>
<td></td>
<td>Łomża-Pisz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB19</td>
<td>Lublin-Barwinek</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kielce-Tarnów-Nowy Sącz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB22</td>
<td>Elbląg-Grzechotki</td>
<td></td>
<td>Piotrków Tryb.-Kielce-Nisko</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Expert draft - Rank- stages tables (road infrastructure)
Expert draft - Rank- stages tables (rail infrastructure)
Main points of discussion

• Development policy versus transport
• New priorities and criticism of previous paradigm's
• Stages of infrastructural investment
• New elements of infrastructure network
• New investment or modernization
• Division for motorways and expressways
• High Speed Rail problem
• Central Airport problem
Final document road infrastructure
Final document rail infrastructure
Monitoring of the road accessibility 1995-2000

Monitoring of the road accessibility 2000-2005
Monitoring of the road accessibility 2005-2010
Monitoring of the road accessibility 2010-2015

Žródło: Monitoring spójności terytorialnej..., 2012, autorzy: Rosik P., Komornicki T., Stępniak M., Pomianowski W.
Monitoring of the road accessibility 2015-2030
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES
Environmental issues

• Evaluation of the state of the environmental elements
• Territorial system of nature and landscape protection and national ecological network
• Natural resources
• Environmental hazards
• Adaptation of socio-environmental system to climate change
Territorial system of nature and landscape protection and national ecological network
Functional areas with high value of cultural landscape
Functional areas with reach nature under protection
Area with strategic mineral deposits
Renewable energy resources

MAPA 15
ZASoby ENERGII ODNAWIALNEJ

A) ENERGIA WODNA
Średnie oceny obiektów jednostki
(na podstawie dostępnych danych IMiGW za lata 1951-1970, według J. Stachyry i B. Biem)

B) ENERGIA Wiatrowa (na lądzie)
Strefy-osłonności wiatru
(według H. Lorenc, IMiGW, na podstawie okresu obserwacyjnego 1971-2000)

C) ENERGIA SLONECZNA
Średnie całkowite promieniowanie słoneczne w roku
(według J. Paszyńskiego i K. Mary, 1994)

D) ENERGIA GEOTERMALNA
Gęstość obniżenia ciepłego
(według J. Szwaczka i D. Gercik, 2000)

Opracowano w Instytucie Geografii i Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania PAN dla Ministerstwa Rozwoju Regionalnego
Natural hazards

Opracowano w Instytucie Geografii i Przestrzennego Zagospodarowania PAN dla Ministerstwa Rozwoju Regionalnego
Thank you for your attention!