TEME, г. XLIII, бр. 3, јул – септембар 2019, стр. 719–731

Прегледни рад https://doi.org/10.22190/TEME190515044D
Примљено: 15. 5. 2019. UDK 316.334.56:711.4(48)
Ревидирана верзија: 5. 10. 2019.
Одобрено за штампу: 20. 10. 2019.

STEERING URBAN POLICY FOR REACHING DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL WELFARE – LESSONS FROM SCANDINAVIA

Snežana Đorđević

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Political Science, Belgrade, Serbia
sneska152@gmail.com

Abstract

This article analyses the way of managing urban policy in Scandinavian countries, as an example for Serbia. By analyzing urban policy as complex activity, because it demands contextual approach, democratic governmental capacities, good management with capacities to tail services according to the needs of citizens in their community, we could understand cities as stimulators of development and creators of welfare.

This analysis tries to identify how Serbia, as transitional country can learn lessons from Scandinavian countries, to modernize management, democratize political system (decentralization and strengthening local government capacities), as well as to decrease corruption and misuses in public affairs.

In methodological sense this article includes analysis of the system, the way of creation and steering urban policy in Scandinavian countries with affirmation of knowledge (evidence based public policy) and professionalism. Case study of Copenhagen city and experiences from other cities from this region, will procure in view of potential benefits of such an approach. On this basis comparison is made with similar processes in Serbia, which give us possibility to identify necessary corrections in our system.

Some of the results of this paper are better knowledge of Serbian system weaknesses (especially in way of managing cities), loss of benefits which democratic and decentralized society enables, modern management, creation of policies on evidence, and creative searching for solution.

One can conclude that reform changes, which turn out to be impossible for implementation in our society, do not demand great material investments, but demand the changing of values, priorities and model of behavior.

Key words: urban policy, strategic management, mission and results driven management, sustainable development, citizens participation.

ВОЂЕЊЕ УРБАНЕ ПОЛИТИКЕ У ПРАВЦУ РАЗВОЈА И БЛАГОСТАЊА ГРАЂАНА – ЛЕКЦИЈЕ ИЗ СКАНДИНАВИЈЕ

Апстракт

Овај чланак анализира начина вођења урбане политике у скандинавским земљама као узор за Србију. Анализом урбане политике као комплексне, јер захтева контекстуални приступ, демократске капацитете власти, квалитетан менаџмент уз креирање услуга према потребама конкретних грађана у датој средини – моћи ћемо да сагледамо градове као покретаче развоја и креаторе благостања. Ова анализе је покушај да се идентификује у којој мери Србија као транзициона земља може од скандинавских земаља да научи лекције модернизације управљања, демократизације читавог система (децентрализација и јачање капацитета локалних власти), те смањивања корупције и злоупотреба у јавној сфери. У методолошком смислу истражује се анализа система, начина креирања и вођења урбане политике у скандинавским земљама уз афирмацију знања (evidence based policy making) и професионализма. Студија случаја града Копенхагена и искуства других градова овог региона омогућиће увид у конкретне користи оваквог приступа. На тој основи ће бити урађена компарација са овим процесима у Србији, што нам омогућава да идентификујемо неопходне корекције у нашем систему. Неки од резултата овог рада су јаснији увид у слабости система у Србији, посебно у управљању градовима, увид у губитке користи које доноси демократски уређено, децентрализовано друштво, модерно управљање, креирање политика засновано на добрим подацима, те креативно налажења решења за проблеме. Може се закључити да реформске промене које наше друштво не спроводи, већ пред њима скоро две деценије немоћно стоји – не траже велика материјална улагања, већ представљају пре свега промену вредности, промену приоритета и модела понашања.

Кључне речи: урбана политика, стратешко управљање, управљање вођено мисијама и резултатима, одрживи развој, партиципација грађана.

INTRODUCTION

Cities as local government units in various countries in the world, got in importance in crisis times (from 1970's) when it became clear that growing social problems must be solved locally. It is identified that the city is one local governmental unit between the state, which is far from citizens, and municipality, which often does not have enough capacities for implementation of great projects and for procuring more complex public services. In that sense cities became important creators of new policies, the space for appearance of new entrepreneurial institutions, instruments and methods of work (Đorđević, 2012, p. 173).

The way of managing cities (especially greater ones) and procurement of public services represent a very complex activity because of great concentration of citizens, numerous challenges which ask for solutions and complex services which have to be permanently procured. In that sense, city government has to have excellent leaders, great management (managing data, human recourses, capital, finance,

budget and projects), as well as well-educated and skilled administration and service. Public service package is created with citizens who actively help in identification of priorities and needs (participative decision making) and city governments are dedicated to public good, attending transparent way of work and responsibility (efficiency, effectiveness, rationality, equality in provision of services).

IMPORTANCE OF URBAN POLICY AND CONDITIONS IN SCANDINAVIA

In political and legal systems, cities must have enough competencies, fiscal and financial autonomy and organizational models which enable them to use entrepreneurial instruments (for example, directly elected mayor, affirmation of professionalism with city manager or urban architect, etc). Cities, other levels of local government and state have to be partners in creation of strategies, in implementation of policies and procuring welfare and development for society.

In European countries subsidiary principle is used for transferring public affairs to the level of government which is the closest to citizens, and finally the service is procured by the level of government which has the greatest capacity for it (Đorđević, 2017). In practice that means that cities must cooperate with municipalities (and municipalities with local communities - wards), in order to procure best identification of citizens' needs in each public policy fields. City and its municipalities have to be a functional entity and to procure partnership in creation of strategy and, mission with focus on results (identification of standards, creation of indicators and measurement of results) if they want to be successful.

Scandinavian countries and cities have democratic and decentralized system with modern system of management. They are focused on creative solving of problems. Numerous researches pointed out that with the fall of welfare state, huge changes appear in the nature of urban policy. From attitude that city itself is a problem (with loss of jobs, unemployment, overpopulation, pollution, criminal, etc), new leaders see city as a potential for development. Instead of focusing on zoning, and physical, spatial growing, which was characteristic of the old way of spatial planning[1]

[1] From centralist and hierarchical model of planning in which state defines standards for planning and stipulates general plan to which all other plans, which are created by local governments, have to be in accordance, it is transferred to more flexible model in which local governments (cites, municipalities) have rights to plan while state only gives consultative suggestions (guide for planning). It turns out that in contemporary world bureaucratic, engineering and centralistic planning is not functional, and it is changed with participative planning (bottom up approach) with including citizens, civil society, enterprises, experts and interested groups.

(Nylund, 2014, p. 44-46; Reimer, Getimis, & Blotevogel, 2016, p. 25, 46), greater attention is paid to regeneration of the existing urban space for multipurpose use in order to increase quality of citizens' life inside more densely populated settlements. Additionally, the way of management is changed from sectional to inter-sectional, holistic and partner approach, which turned out to be more productive one. (Jorgensen, Ero, 2008, p. 30) In that context, instead of universal solutions implemented on all problems, specific solutions are created for specific local problems, which are always understood contextually.

Table 1 Changing trends in implementation of strategies

From	*To*
Universal solutions	Specific solutions for local problems
Redefined problems	Contextual problems
Regulation	Inspiration and examples
Control	Partnerships based on agreements and contracts
Equality	Quality accomplished by variations

Jorgensen, G., Ero, T., (2008). Urban Policy in the Nordic Countries - National Foci and Strategies for Implementation, Taylor and Francis, p. 32.

This approach is very practical, focused on social problems of inhabitants and on procuring sustainable development, which is in accordance with approaches of EU and Swedish state, too. Therefore, the questions of *economic crises, loss of jobs and investments, unemployment, poverty, social marginalization and segregation, degradation of settlements, pollution, climate changes and necessity for transfer on green energy*, are set as priorities. Part of packages of public services made for solving these problems are *programs for affordable housings*, especially for socially vulnerable groups. As the homelessness is most frequently caused by loss of employment and wages, city leaders pay great attention to inclusive solving of these problems with stimulation of economic development and employment. In these programs sustainable development is an important standard, covering social, economic, and environmental aspects of development (Lars, Yerko, 2012).

Spatial and urban plans are developed in a participative way, often together with debates on budget. Great attention is always paid to this process because these plans are the base for creation of public policies and projects (local economic development) (Reimer et al., 2016, p. 25, 46).

Cities and other levels of local government are main actors in participative creation of projects (with citizens and other social actors like NGOs, professional and interest groups, business leaders, etc). State has supportive function by creating ambience, negotiating, contracting projects, and coordinating activities of local governments, in order to procure optimization of final results. In this context, cities are laboratories

of innovations and creative solution which are justified to special needs of society, of citizens and to each specific case.

COPENHAGEN – CASE STUDY OF SMART CITY

Copenhagen has successfully been transformed from an industrial, ruined city burdened with unemployment, to a prospering city with developed service economy. This city is exceptionally beautifully designed, with nice public spaces created for meetings and socializing, with lovely residential settlements, with rich cultural performance. It is one of the most attractive cities in world, in which one can procure nice life (livable city)[2] (Caragliu, DelBo, Nijkamp, 2011, p. 65-82; Gehl, 2016, p. 1-41).

In the opinion of city leaders, holistic strategy, which they prepare, is of a crucial importance for good results procured in the city. They stress that they further carefully work with citizens, civil society and various social actors on master plan, which is the 'fine tuning' of strategy, focused on creative solving of defined priority problems. In this process, the city officials use big data basis and IT packages, in order to procure good quality of management and good quality of services to citizens. All communal systems in city (transport, heating, cooling, sewage, water supply, energy facilities) are connected with these date basis (evidence based policy making).[3] It is interesting to see how they manage that.

This city, as other Scandinavian cities (Oslo, Stockholm, Reykjavik and Helsinki), paid special attention to development of *green transport* and with the attained results, they belong to leaders in the world. They stimulate buying electric cars or cars with mixed fuels (subventions), decreasing use of cars on oil or gas (higher taxation), and totally expel the use of cars on diesel. They installed on streets batteries for charging cars for free, public transport is green, and they also actively stimulate biking and walking. Service of identified free parking places enables drivers to park easily, sparing their time and energy and sparing city from CO2 emission. Additionally, sensors measure traffic density, which help better regulation, with stimulation in cases of traffic jams, etc. Bikers are procured with permanent green wave without necessity to stop during riding (Willson, 2015, p. 11, 14, 53, 169). Leaders in this city are focused on 'densification

[2] Livable city is a concept with which analysts and practitioners in city management field measure citizens' quality of life in one city: availability of jobs, housing, quality of traffic, all sort of services, environmental conditions, democratic ambience and openness of the city for foreigners, etc.

[3] Evidence based policy making is a concept which pay special attention to good and comprehendable data basis in all policy fields, with affirmation of rational and scientific approach in analyses of these data. In this process, more alternative solutions are offered and the final choice of optimal alternative is made with obligatory inclusion of users.

of city' around public transport system, in order to decrease use of cars (care for accessibility and affirmation of public transport).

Additionally they are dedicated to establishing *functionally mixed spaces* (residential, commercial and business) in the city. Sensors fallow *patterns of citizens' movement in various parts of the city,* and these data are used by urban planning in order to optimize use of resources and to upgrade security in city. In that sense interesting urban solutions are created. The brigde *Dronning Louises,* built in 1887, has been regenerated in project of decreasing number of cars in city, narrowing streets and widening biking lanes, and pavements for pedestrians. The sunny part of the bridge 'taken from cars', became one of the most popular places for gathering and socializing.

Sensors also indicate the *quality of water, air, and level of noise.* City administrative services pay great attention to decreasing the emission of CO2 *(reaching the standard of zero carbon city)*. Copenhagen is dedicated to *production and using green energy* so in that context has built over 100 wind and bio-generators (Fraker, 2013, p. 11-43).

This city builds smart buildings which are very functional, beautiful, built with natural materials, having IT sensors which procure high quality of life for their inhabitants. Their sensors measure temperature and start cooling in summer and heating in winter, procuring optimal temperature. Copenhagen offices calculate that summer temperatures will end up in 2050 with average increase of 3 degrees (global warming). They noticed that the demand for air conditioners are growing. Therefore, they decided to create central cooling system covering the whole city. It is a green solution because it uses huge quantities of cold sea water, and is not expensive at all. On similar green projects and solutions, Copenhagen has, from 1995 till now, decreased half of CO2 emission.[4]

Additionally, in smart buildings sensors measure the level of garbage in containers, which indicate garbage service when to collect it. Scandinavian countries have numerous powerhouses which use garbage as row material, and because of the lack of their own garbage (developed cyclic economies), they often must import it from other countries, for using powerhouses' capacities.

Great climate changes bring numerous problems to all Scandinavian societies and cities. In that sense city governments prepared *Climate Action Plan* together with citizens and interested social agents. In this plan they identify problems, offer the course against climate changes, define numerous

[4] Reykjavik, capital of Island, built a centralized, cheap and affordable, cooling system which uses geothermal water. Energy production and supplying system in the city is also self-sustainable and green. Public and private transport is stimulated to become green and this city tries to become a zero carbon city in 2040. See: https://www.dw.com/en/oslo-starts-2019-as-europes-eco-capital/a-46786866

activities and stimulate citizens to be more responsible in their behavior. For example, *huge and unexpected rains* force city government to include sensors for gathering data on possible repetition of such situations, starting an immediate prevention system (surface and underground drainage pipes and tunnels). Streets and pavements are formed in a way to make it hardly possible for water to get into cellars. New blue and green oases are planted in the city, because plants and trees have the capacity to absorb a great quantity of water.

Copenhagen ambitiously put in strategic plan as an aim to become a zero carbon city and to get a rid of dirty technology and fuels in order to upgrade the quality of air, water, soil, as well as quality of housing, living and working[5] (Fraker, 2013, p. 43-69).

City leaders developed the concept of affordable housing, which they maintain from the time of welfare state. They make effort to procure affordable housing to citizens, fighting against homelessness which is a raising problem in numerous developed, European and even Scandinavian societies and cities (Hedin, Clark, Lundholm & Malmberg, 2012, p. 460). City governments additionally develop the concept of *mixed housing*, including in each settlement, besides private housing, a number of renting housing for foreigners or social vulnerable groups to enable them to integrate. In that way they prevent segregation (great example of open city). This kind of intervention is possible because of the existence of data base on housing property structure, and determination of city officials to create mix neighborhoods.

Copenhagen government has developed great *leader potential*, increasing enthusiasm for innovative and participative solution of various problems.[6] In that sense *Laboratory for solutions for smart city project* was established as a new city managerial body, which stimulates citizens, civil society, enterprises, educational institutions, artistic associations and other interested social agents, to be included and to participate in creating

[5] All Scandinavian societies and their cities and settlements have this kind of ambition, and invest great efforts in that sense. Therefore, Oslo is proclaimed an *eco city* for 2019 because of great dedication to decreasing of pollution. Oslo adopted the *budget* for decreasing CO2 emission, which is used for supporting citizens to use clean energy fuels, electric or car on mixed fuel, stimulate smart building and settlements, etc. In 2020 they will halve emission of CO2 with ambitious, but feasible plan, of final expelling it in 2030. Oslo distinguished itself with innovative buildings, decreasing presence of cars in the centre, innovative using of IT packages with enrichment of services. Therefore, for example, when a baby is born, parents get from the city service all data about nurseries and kindergartens in their neighborhood, or if an elderly person gets ill, useful data about support network is sent to him/her, and their family. See: https://www.euractiv.com/section/climate-environment/interview/oslo-mayor-heres-how-we-plan-to-become-a-carbon-neutral-city/

[6] This is model which can be implemented in cites in Serbia.

innovative solutions for smart city problems. Danish architectural center[7] is an important cooperator in this process, which has already enriched Copenhagen with great spatial, urban and architectural objects and solutions. The laboratory is directly connected with *digital infrastructure platform* as a part of great data basis (data are affordable for citizens, business and public sector), which stimulate that solutions can be functional, sustainable and original.[8]

Traditionally, Scandinavia is well known for good design, dedication to creating pleasant living spaces which are characterized by simplicity, functionality and good balance of form and purpose. Copenhagen is an inspiring example of excellently designed urban space, it is 'a city of architecture', in which there are established sightseeing tours for visiting innovative urban and architectural solutions and buildings. It is hard to single out any of them, because they are all beautiful, interesting, original and very well incorporated in a harmonious entity, but for better understanding some of them will be presented. The harbor *Kvaestuhusmolen* by Danish King Theater is designed for promenade, hanging over, enjoying on stairs which lead to the level of water, with coffee shops, restaurants, open stage… Near this Theater is situated a yachting harbor, with boat taxies which enable sightseeing from the water. *Harbur Nordhavnen* used to be a neglected part of the city, and slowly, but systematically has been regenerated (part of the strategy and plan), transforming into a great and smart residential and business settlement (with the capacity of 40 000 housing units and the same number of offices). In this lovely settlement, situated on a number of small islands and canals, one can find numerous innovative urban, architectural, and IT solutions.

The city has permanently opened a program for including citizens in adjusting urban solutions to everyday life and needs of people. This city is seen as a space for recreation and socializing: on pavements are installed mini *trampolines* for jumping, stairs are formed for *exercising*, on sand playing spaces for children are placed, as well as comfortable deckchairs and swings, which parents can use. All around the playing space are placed benches, turned toward playing space but also toward street, where parents as well as passers-by can rest. In such a way multifunctional spaces are desinged which enable people from all generations to know each other better and to enjoy together[9] (Đorđević, 2017, p. 99, 109-111).

[7] See: www.dac.dk/eng.
[8] See: www.cphsolutionslab.dk
[9] See more on: www.dac.dk/eng.

Development of cooperation

Scandinavian cities have a culture of cooperation with other cities and settlements, not only in their countries, but also in the region, which can stimulate cities in Serbia to cultivate this practice more. Thus, Copenhagen is connected to *Malmö* (Swedish city) with the magnificent *Öresund bridge*[10] which has strengthened political, economic and all other forms of strategic cooperation. Often, people live in one, and work in the other city, because there is a distance of only half an hour by car between them. These two cities established common, the greatest university region in Europe, they have impressive cooperation in rising IT industries (new technologies, implemented natural sciences, communication technology, innovations) and intensive cooperation with commercial sector in attracting innovations and knowledge (Nylund, 2014).

Additionally, Denmark is infrastructurally connecteded with Germany, building the greatest underwater tunnel (*Fehmarn belt*) between two islands: Danish island *Loland* and German island *Fehmarn* (in Schleswig Holstein state, near cities *Luebek* and *Hamburg*).[11] This project is a base for intensive cooperation between Copenhagen and Hamburg in the field of green technology, climate, energy tourism, culture and creative activities.

URBAN POLICY IN SERBIA

Serbia does not pay enough attention to cities as important levels of government, which can be, and in spite of system's obstacles, are engines of economic development. Besides implemented reforms, Serbia is still a not enough decentralized country and there is a lack of numerous important factors for procuring good urban policies. The model of government's organization is, besides attempt to procure strong executive government, in order to strengthen leadership and professionalism, to decrease party voluntarism and upgrade quality of work, returned to model of a weak mayor. System has still retained a part of reform package, which procures election of *city manager* in order to strengthen project management and local economic development (Đorđević, 2014: 16), and *city architect*

[10] Öresund bridge is one of the greatest infrastructural projects, which was implemented with the help of EU. It was built from 1995 to 2000 and bridged the distance of Baltic bay connecting two closest cities, but also Europe and Scandinavia. The bridge is 8 kilometers long and combines a highway on the bridge, and a rail conducted through 4 kilometers long underwater tunnel. For the project were used small natural island Saltholm and artistic island Peberholm (both in Denmark).

[11] This 18 kilometers long tunnel will be built by 2021 and will consist of three tunnels: two of them have highway with 4 lanes each, and the third one is aimed for rail with two tracks.

in order to procure decreasing of urban disorder, upgrading standards in spatial planning and building[12] (Đorđević, 2018, p. 78).

Local government, as well as cities, still do not have fiscal and financial autonomy, although the law on local finance has stipulated such standard (2006). In practice however, since 2008, the Ministry of Finances has distributed voluntary budget means for local governments, using sublegal regulations.

Between state and local governments there still has not been established partnership relations, practice of mutual creation of strategies, missions, nor correction of public policies and projects. Finally, subsidiary principle has not been implemented as an instrument of bottom up creation of policies (Đorđević, 2017, p. 213-230). Instead, in our system hierarchy and power of the state to decide and control have persistently been protected. Occasionally, state and cities establish partnership on the basis of belonging to the same political orientation, procuring good results, although sometimes, a project will have better results if created by the city. More frequently state and local governments (cities) which belong to different parties, turn out to be in serious conflict, and the price is always paid by citizens.

In public administration of the city (state, too) in practice there does not function merit system in order to strengthen professionalism, and creation of policies on knowledge (*evidence based policy making*). Data bases have been developed in all policy fields, but still one cannot tell that decision making is based on good analyses and plans. Our system and practice lack participative creation of strategies, policies, projects and identification of priorities in communication with citizens. Rarely, one can find creation of indicators and active measurement of effects and results from the implemented policies and projects. Political elites in the state and in cities created *ad hoc projects* and therefore one cannot find positive, holistic effects. Our political institutions mostly work separated (rule driven government), poorly cooperate and rarely solve problems as a team.

In Serbia the creation of strategies and plans has been neglected, and these documents are created in close groups. Citizens are poorly included in the process of planning, and sometimes, even professionals are excluded when "higher interests" appear (Đorđević, 2018, p. 82,83; Stojkov, et al., 2015).

[12] Urbanism and building are fields in which great disorder appeared during 1990: irregular zoning and building were allowed. With privatization processes stimulated after 2000, process of misuses continued with changing purpose of lots. City officials, together with investors enable that bought factories can be demolished (against the law), the purpose of the lots on which factories were settled were changed to lucrative residential and commercial facilities. In such a way investors and officials got huge profits and city budgets lost great sums of money which could be gathered if land had been sold at market prices.

Since 2011 great efforts have been made in Serbia for inclusion of Integrated Urban Development Strategy, as modern and democratic method for spatial planning. This method is participative, multidisciplinary, it affirms practical solving of mutually defined priority problems. Its implementation upgrades quality of management, strengthening of legitimacy and effectiveness of projects and actions [13] (Čolic R., 2015, p. 8-24).

However, this method can be accepted and can function as a sustainable practice only with great system changes, acceptance of democratic values, which demand huge social and political efforts and long time. Opponents of this approach are numerous, having in mind that the increase of transparency in this method highly decreases space for malpractice, manipulation, and directly threatens huge profits enabled by hierarchical and nontransparent way of planning and management.

Serbia has for a long time been a country with the poorest condition of building and issuing building permits. This situation was improved (from 189th place it transferred to 50th position). However, these encouraging data do not mean that corruption in this field has been decreased (it was the soil for cultivation of demanding and long procedures). Investors are still in the position to break building standards as, for example, building in prohibited zones, and breaking standard of number of floors (they often added several floors more), as well as standard of occupation of a lot. Investors often do not let obligatory free part of building lot for green spaces or parking, but build on the whole lot. These offences contribute to a higher load of power, heating, waterway, sewage, IT network, in the settlement.

CONCLUSION

All researches suggest that weaknesses of strategic development in Serbia can be seen in the poor care for environment, for green energy and in almost non-existent state and local governments' efforts to activate the battle against *climate changes*. Climate changes get to this region warmer winters (which is a pleasant change) but very hot summers with temperature over 40 degrees. It is especially unbearable in cities which have to develop package of creative solutions for mitigation this unpleasant

[13] Pilot projects are implemented in Kragujevac, Užice (2013) and Kraljevo (2015), with inclusion of citizens, civil society and various social partners in planning. They created mutual strategy, respecting pluralism of interests, but demanding compromise regarding key topics. Instead of sectoral approach, ***multidisciplinary approach*** is affirmed, covering all policy fields important for quality of life in local community. On the basis of these excellent experiences, a number of documents were improved, such as: Strategy of Sustainable Urban Development for Republic of Serbia until 2030 (Official Gazette RS, Nb. 47/2019), some laws, such as: Amendments on Law on Planning and Construction (2018) and Law on Planning System (2019).

aspect (widen green spaces, plants on roofs, on terraces, etc). These topics are not even open in public. Transfer to green energy is highly threatened by interests of influential groups, who earn from exploitation of dirty energy products (lignite).

It can be concluded that state and local governments are still in the early phase of urban policy and spatial planning, which developed countries left as inferior. Instead of preventing problems, our governments solve problems when they appear. Sometimes, European projects include elements of prevention, but still our political elites and institutions do not adopt them as their way of work.

REFERENCES

Brannstrom, L.,& Yerko, R. (2012). Rethinking the Long-Term Consequences of Growing Up in a Disadvantaged Neighbourhood: Lessons from Sweden. *Housing Studies*, *27*(6), 729–747. doi:10.1080/02673037.2012.714460

Caragliu, A., Del Bo, C., & Nijkamp, P. (2011). Smart Cities in Europe. *Journal of Urban Technology*, *18*(2), 65-82. doi:10.1080/10630732.2011.601117

Čolić, R. (2015). Integrated Urban Development Strategy as an Instrument for Supporting Urban Governance. *Serbian Architectural Journal SAJ.7*(3), 317-342.

Đorđević, S. (2018). *Urban Regeneration Policy - Case Studies from Belgrade, Forum of Foreign Languages, Politology, and International Relations*. Danubious University.

Đorđević, S. (2017). *Primena principa subsidijariteta u Srbiji* (Implementation of Subsidiary Principle in Serbia). Čigoja, Beograd.

Đorđević, S. (2014). *Položaj i kapaciteti gradskih i opštinskih menadžera u Srbiji* (Position and Capacities of City and Municipality Managers in Serbia). Čigoja, Beograd.

Đorđević, S. (2012). *Savremene urbane studije* (Contemporary Urban Studies). Čigoja, Beograd.

Fraker, H. (2013). *The Hidden Potential of Sustainable Neighborhoods: Lessons From Low-Carbon Communities*. Island Press, Washington.

Gehl, J. (2016). *Gradovi za ljude* (*Cities for People*), PALGO centar, Inženjerska komora prostornih planera, Beograd.

Hedin, K., Clark E., Lundholm E., & Malmberg, G. (2012). Neoliberalization of Housing in Sweden: Gentrification, Filtering and Social Polarization. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *102* (2), doi:10.1080/00045608.2011. 620508.

Jorgensen, G., & Ero, T. (2008). *Urban Policy in the Nordic Countries - National Foci and Strategies for Implementation*. Taylor and Francis.

Nylund, K. (2014). Conceptions of justice in the planning of the new urban landscape – Recent changes in the comprehensive planning discourse in Malmo. *Planning Theory & Practice*, *15*(1), 41–61. doi:10.1080/14649357.2013.866263.

Reimer, P., Getimis, H.H., & Blotevoger H. (2014). *Spatial Planning Systems and Practices in Europe - A Comparative Perspective on Continuity and Changes.* Routledge, Akademie fuer Raumforschung und Landesplanung, London and New York.

Sandstrom, U. (2002). Green Infrastructure Planning in Urban Sweden. *Planning Practice & Research*, 17(4), 373–385, doi:10.1080/02697450216356.

Stojkov, B., Damjanović, D., Križanić, T, & Petrović, M. (2015). *Mogućnost unapređenja javnog uvida kod pripreme i donošenja prostornih i urbanističkih planova*, (Possibility for upgrading public in-view in preparation and stipulation of spatial and urban plans). PALGO centar, SKGO, Beograd.

Willson, R. (2015). *Parking Management for Smart Growth.* Island Press, Washington, Covelo, London.

ВОЂЕЊЕ УРБАНЕ ПОЛИТИКЕ У ПРАВЦУ РАЗВОЈА И БЛАГОСТАЊА ГРАЂАНА – ЛЕКЦИЈЕ ИЗ СКАНДИНАВИЈЕ

Снежана Ђорђевић
Универзитет у Београду, Факултет политичких наука, Београд, Србија

Резиме

Овај чланак анализира начина вођења урбане политике у скандинавским земљама као узор за Србију. Анализом урбане политике као комплексне, јер захтева контекстуални приступ, демократске капацитете власти, квалитетан менаџмент уз креирање услуга према потребама конкретних грађана у датој средини – можемо да сагледамо градове као покретаче развоја и креаторе благостања. Ова анализе је покушај да се идентификује у којој мери Србија као транзициона земља може од скандинавских земаља да научи лекције модернизације управљања, демократизације читавог система (децентрализација и јачање капацитета локалних власти), те смањивања корупције и злоупотреба у јавној сфери. У методолошком смислу истражује се анализа система, начина креирања и вођења урбане политике у скандинавским земљама уз афирмацију знања (evidence based policy making) и професионализма. Студија случаја града Копенхагена и искуства других градова овог региона омогућили су увид у конкретне користи оваквог приступа. На тој основи је урађена компарација са овим процесима у Србији, што нам омогућава да идентификујемо неопходне корекције у нашем систему. Неки од резултата овог рада су јаснији увид у слабости система у Србији, посебно у управљању градовима, увид у губитке користи које доноси демократски уређено, децентрализовано друштво, модерно управљање, креирање политика засновано на добрим подацима, те креативно налажења решења за проблеме. Може се закључити да реформске промене које наше друштво не спроводи, већ пред њима скоро две деценије немоћно стоји – не траже велика материјална улагања, већ представљају пре свега промену вредности, промену приоритета и модела понашања.