



The 9th International Conference “ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING”

22–23 May 2014, Vilnius, Lithuania

SELECTED PAPERS

eISSN 2029-7092 / eISBN 978-609-457-640-9

Available online at <http://enviro.vgtu.lt>

Section: Sustainable Urban Development

Dynamics of Changes in the Urban Space

Cezary Kowalczyk

Faculty of Geodesy and Land Management at the University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Prawocheńskiego Str. 15, 10-724 Olsztyn, Poland

Abstract

This study analyzes urban areas which comprise an urban center and neighboring municipalities. As an administrative unit, a city is an organism full of internal and external connections, and it undergoes constant change at the micro and macro level. A city's internal structure is modified over time in response to changes in the local environment, and those changes often affect the surrounding territories. This article proposes a methodology for analyzing the dynamics of urban space in five Polish cities which were surveyed in 2002–2012. The analysis was based on the assumption that dwellings constitute the largest part of a city, and that they are most susceptible to change. An observer examining the city from within will note that a critical level has been reached (an observer positioned in a rural area will report a decrease in the surface tension of the urban/rural boundary). In consequence, progressing residential development in areas adjacent to the city contributes to urban sprawl. In view of the above, a research hypothesis was proposed that residential area per capita is the most robust indicator of economic and spatial changes in an urban area.

Keywords: urban space; dynamics; residential area; spatial structure.

Nomenclature

X_0	the analyzed phenomena (population, residential area per capita, total residential area) in base period of time was the first year (2002) of observations
X_n	the analyzed phenomena (population, residential area per capita, total residential area) in following period of time of observations
X_{n-1}	the analyzed phenomena (population, residential area per capita, total residential area) in before the next period of time of observations

1. Introduction - structure of urban space

Europe, including Poland, is characterized by significant diversity of urban areas, and the structure of dwellings changes over time and subject to demand. European cities face challenges of the 21st century such as globalization, economic restructuring, social changes and problems of social exclusion. Cities exert considerable pressure on suburban areas which are incorporated into the urban structure [4].

The diversity of urban structures and zoning requirements influence the directions of urban growth. The compact city is a popular urban design concept in Europe which promotes the preservation of the existing urban boundaries. Urban structures are carefully managed to prevent urban sprawl. Growth is concentrated in the urban center to encourage mixed land use in cities and create attractive and user-friendly environments for the local community. New and planned structures should blend into their surroundings. A state of equilibrium has to be maintained by introducing new planning standards to improve living conditions, reduce commuting time, lower energy consumption and improve urban economics [1].

The expansion of development outside the administrative boundaries of a city is an opposite trend in urban planning. The suburban zone is closely bound to the urban center, and it is an attractive location for investors. Regardless of the existing planning concept, investors are increasingly likely to embark on development projects outside the urban center due to the ease of land acquisition, the availability of mixed land-use options and lower costs. Attractive locations and the proximity of nature encourage many people to buy and build their homes in suburban areas [5].

Corresponding author: Cezary Kowalczyk. E-mail address: cezary.kowalczyk@uwm.edu.pl

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/enviro.2014.124>

© 2014 The Author. Published by VGTU Press. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

The dynamics and directions of urban growth have to be investigated in relation to both urban sprawl and inner-city development. Analyses of urban growth have to rely on certain paradigms. The growth process has to be closely correlated with living standards in the urban center. The concept of development is strongly linked with the quality of life, the residents' expectations and aspirations, their level of cultural and technological development and the fulfillment of their needs. The first group of developmental factors is related to the size of the urban area, the second category of factors is associated with demographics, and the third – with social and economic growth. Each group of factors has to be analyzed to identify current trends and phenomena in contemporary cities [3].

This study relies on the assumption that evaluations of urban growth dynamics should not rely solely on the size of the urban area. Changes in size are not directly correlated with the discussed concept of urban development. This observation can be illustrated with an example of two cities, Karachi (area of 3 527 km², population of 21.2 million) and New York (area of 1 213 km², population of 8.2 million), which clearly shows that social and economic growth is not directly linked with territorial expansion. It should, however, be noted that urban development does require space.

An analysis of urban demographics over time reveals characteristic developmental trends. It is a reflection upon historical events and long-term phenomena that contribute to our understanding of the significance and background of growth processes [6].

Territory and population size are not direct indicators of urban growth. For this reason, other developmental factors, including social and economic growth, have to be considered. Mercer Human Resource Consulting conducts annual Quality of Living surveys based on detailed assessments of 39 criteria grouped in 10 key categories:

- political and social environment,
- economic environment,
- socio-cultural environment,
- medical and health considerations,
- schools and education,
- public services and transport,
- recreation,
- consumer goods,
- housing,
- natural environment.

The urban development process encompasses changes that affect many areas of life. Housing is a priority which supports the fulfillment of physiological needs, including shelter, sleep, consumption of meals and relaxation. Housing also satisfies the need for security: it protects an individual's privacy and creates a supportive environment for family life and social contact [2].

Residential area per capita is a robust indicator of living standards. It has been assumed that changes in this metric reflect changes in urban development. Evaluations of urban growth should not rely solely on **changes in the usable residential area per capita** because a steady drop in the urban population will increase residential area per inhabitant. The above is not indicative of an improvement in living standards. The reverse applies – a progressing decrease in living standards prompts local residents to migrate from the urban center and abandon residential property. The **urban population** has to be analyzed in conjunction with **total residential area** in the city to avoid interpretational errors.

2. Analytical methods in studies of urban dynamics

Indicators for monitoring urban dynamics were used to evaluate the rate of changes in dependent variables over time. In statistics, an indicator is a metric or a measure which characterizes a dependent variable in time or space, where an independent variable represents time. Indices are characteristic metrics of urban dynamics, and they are popularly used in surveys of social and economic well-being [8]. Indices are relative measures which can be applied in analyses of irregular changes. The discussed metrics are intuitive and comparable regardless of the type of the evaluated process and its magnitude [7].

The first step in the analysis involved the calculation of a series of chain indices. The term preceding the analyzed term was adopted as the base unit in a time series.

$$X_{1/0} = \frac{X_1}{X_0}; X_{2/1} = \frac{X_2}{X_1}; \dots; X_{n/n-1} = \frac{X_n}{X_{n-1}}$$

In successive stages, the dynamics (changes in indicator) of the examined variables was analyzed in a time interval, where the base period of time was the first year of observations (series of fixed base indices). It has been assumed that in the first year of the study (2002), the analyzed phenomena (population, residential area per capita, total residential area) have the value of one, and in successive years of the analysis, the value of the indicator will be a product of a dimensionless quantity in a given year and the change indicator.

Table 1. Algorithm for the determination of change dynamics

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 11
Observed value	X_1	X_2	X_3	X_{11}
Series of chain indices		$X_{2/1} = \frac{X_2}{X_1}$	$X_{3/2} = \frac{X_3}{X_2}$	$X_{11/10} = \frac{X_{11}}{X_{10}}$
Change dynamics from the value of 1	1	$1 * X_{2/1}$	$1 * X_{2/1} * X_{3/2}$	$1 * X_{2/1} * X_{3/2} * \dots * X_{11/10}$

Table 2. Dynamics of changes in residential area per capita in the city of Olsztyn

	Year										
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Residential area per capita	20,3	20,8	21,2	21,5	22,0	22,4	23,0	23,3	23,5	23,8	24,4
Series of chain indices	----	1,025	1,019	1,014	1,023	1,018	1,027	1,013	1,009	1,013	1,025
Change dynamics from 2002	1,0	1,025	1,045	1,060	1,085	1,105	1,135	1,150	1,160	1,175	1,205

3. Surveyed urban areas

This study analyzed five urban areas of Olsztyn, Białystok, Lublin, Kielce and Rzeszów (the geographical location of the surveyed cities is shown in Figure 1). The studied areas comprise the territory situated within the cities' administrative boundaries and the neighboring municipalities. The surveyed objects were characterized by similar area, population and residential area (Table 3).




Fig. 1. Geographic location of the surveyed areas

Table 3. Specification of the surveyed cities – data for 2002

City	Administrative area [km ²]	Residential area [m ²]	Population	Residential area per capita [m ² /person]
Lublin	148	7 346 257	358 354	20.5
Rzeszów	54*	3 179 841	159 791	19.9
Białystok	94	6 154 026	291 660	21.1
Kielce	109	4 193 838	211 810	19.8
Olsztyn	88	3 501 080	172 467	20.3

* - in 2011, the city's area increased to 117 km² following the incorporation of neighboring territories.



Graph 1. Residential area in the surveyed cities

Olsztyn is the administrative capital of the Region of Warmia and Mazury. It is situated in the central part of the region, and it has a population of 175 420 (Central Statistical Office 2011). As an urban county, Olsztyn does not have administrative boundaries, and it comprises 22 residential estates. Olsztyn has the area of 87.9 km², and the predominant forms of land use include developed and urban land (39%), forests and woodlands (25%). The city does not have a ring road, which significantly increases traffic intensity in downtown and peripheral areas. This study analyzed the administrative area of Olsztyn and six neighboring municipalities (Dywity, Barczewo, Purda, Stawiguda, Giętrzwald, Jonkowo).

Białystok is the capital of Podlaskie region, and it is presently the capital of Białystok county. In 2013, the city had the population of 294 925 (Central Statistical Office 2013). It has the area of 102 km², and it incorporates 28 residential estates. Białystok has a well-developed transport infrastructure. This study analyzed the administrative area of Białystok with ten neighboring municipalities (Choroszcz, Dobrzyniewo Duże, Juchnowiec Kościelny, Supraśl, Turośń Kościelna, Wasilków, Zabłudów).


Kielce is the capital of the Świętokrzyskie Region and the seat of county authorities. It has the population of 201 814, and it is the center of the Kielce Metropolitan Area. The city has not been divided into administrative districts, and it features 55 area units which occupy the total area of 109.45 km². Kielce is a major transportation hub which is intersected by international roads S7 and S74 and national road No. 73. The city features a railway junction converging routes to Warsaw, Kraków and Częstochowa. This study analyzed the administrative area of Kielce with seven neighboring municipalities (Daleszyce, Górnio, Masłów, Miedziana Góra, Morawica, Piekoszów, Sitkówka-Nowiny).

Rzeszów is the capital of the Region of Podkarpacie and the rural county of Rzeszów. Situated in south-eastern Poland, the city has the population of 182 232 (Central Statistical Office 2011). In recent years, neighboring areas have been gradually incorporated into the urban structure, and Rzeszów's area was expanded from 53.69 km² in 2006 to 116.37 km² in 2011. Rzeszów is intersected by the planned A4 motorway (Dresden–Kiev) and expressway S19 (Suwałki–Barwinek). This study analyzed the administrative area of Rzeszów with six neighboring municipalities (Boguchwała, Chmielnik, Krasne, Świlcza, Trzebownisko, Tyczyn).


Lublin is a city with county status. It has the area of 147 km² which is divided into 27 administrative districts. In 2013, Lublin had the population of 347 678 (Central Statistical Office 2013). This study analyzed the administrative area of Lublin with seven neighboring municipalities (Głusk, Jastków, Konopnica, Niedrzwica Duża, Niemce, Skrzyżewice, Wólka).

4. Results

In the first stage of the study, the dynamics of changes in population (Graph 2), residential area (Graph 4) and residential area per capita (Graph 3) were compared in the surveyed cities (within the administrative boundaries).



Graph 2. Population dynamics in cities




Graph 3. Dynamics of changes in residential area per capita in cities

In the analyzed period (2002–2010), the most rapid increase in population (around 5%) was observed in Rzeszów in 2008–2010. The previous period (2002–2008) was marked by stagnant population growth and a 1% population decline in selected years. More stable population trends were noted in the remaining cities. Olsztyn's population increased steadily

between 2002 and 2009, and a 1% decrease in the local population was observed in 2010. Kielce's population remained relatively stable, and an increase of 1% was reported in 2010. Bielsko-Biala and Toruń were characterized by a steady population decline which reached 2.5% in Toruń.

An in-depth evaluation of population changes in the surveyed cities (Graph 2) requires an analysis of changes in local residential area (Graph 4).

In 2002–2012, total residential area increased in the majority of the surveyed cities (Lublin, Białystok, Kielce, Olsztyn) by more than 15% regardless of the noted demographic trends. An estimated 40% increase in total residential area was observed in Rzeszów (in 2011, the city's area increased to 117 km² following the incorporation of neighboring territories). Our findings prompt the search for factors which contribute to an increase in residential area despite a drop in population. The following question arises: what factors or metrics would be indicative of urban growth or urban decay?



Graph 4. Dynamics of changes in residential area

The dynamics of changes in residential area per capita are shown in Graph 3. In 2002–2012, a significant increase in residential area per capita was noted in all of the analyzed cities. Reliable conclusions about the directions and dynamics of urban growth cannot be formulated based only on the above data because an increase in residential area per capita can also result from a population decline, as it is the case in Kielce and Lublin.

A city's administrative area does not support a reliable evaluation of urban dynamics because administrative boundaries do not constitute physical barriers that obstruct the construction of residential and commercial property. Urban development can be effectively regulated through legal measures. The dynamics of changes in urban areas, comprising the urban center and the neighboring municipalities, are presented in Table 3. Every circle represents an administrative unit, and the circle in the center marked with a dashed line represents the administrative area of the city.

Table 3. Series of chain indices (dynamics) where 2002 is the base unit. The respective calculations were performed for 2012 data

City	Population	Residential area	Residential area per capita
Olsztyn			

City	Population	Residential area	Residential area per capita
Białystok			

5. Conclusions

In the surveyed areas, a population drop or population stabilization can be attributed to changes in the structure of urban areas which comprise the urban center and the neighboring municipalities. The above conclusion is justified by a significant increase in the population and residential area in neighboring municipalities. The most dynamic changes in urban space

were observed in Olsztyn in 2002–2012 when total residential area increased by more than 50% in three neighboring municipalities and by only 40% in the urban center. The lowest dynamics of changes in residential space were noted in Kielce and Lublin.

The highest increase in residential area (more than 40%) was observed in a municipality which borders the city, whereas the growth in the urban center was estimated at only 20%. Table 3 indicates that a greater increase in residential space was observed in urban areas which are not characterized by a negative growth rate (Olsztyn, Rzeszów). Analyses of the dynamics of urban space in areas comprising an urban center and neighboring municipalities reveal the predominant directions of change in the spatial structure. The results presented in Table 3 do not support conclusive observations regarding the symmetry of changes in urban areas.

The above results indicate that demographic trends are not directly correlated with urban development if the analysis covers only the area within a city's administrative boundaries.

References

- [1] Bajwoluk, T. 2008. Creating the space in the suburban zone, *Czasopismo Techniczne Architektura*, Wydawnictwo Politechniki Krakowskiej 5: 106-113.
- [2] Bartkowicz, B. 2005. Cele i zasady w planowaniu przestrzennym i urbanistyce a projekty unijne w Małopolsce, Rola Planowania Przestrzennego w Świetle Polityki Spójności Unii Europejskiej. Wnioski dla teorii i praktyki, *Czasopismo Techniczne, Politechnika Krakowska* 15/2005, Kraków s.10.
- [3] Mironowicz, I. 2010. Czynniki przestrzenne, kulturowe i społeczno-ekonomiczne w zarządzaniu rozwojem miast, *Miasto-Metropolia- Region, Politechnika Gdańska*, 120–127.
- [4] Rząd, E. 2005. *Polityka i działania Unii Europejskiej na rzecz zdegradowanych obszarów miejskich*, [w:] T. Parteka (red.), Transformacja zdegradowanych struktur przestrzennych metropolii polskich „Biuletyn KPZK PAN” 233: 370–400.
- [5] Stachura, E. 2012. *Cultural determinants of housing architecture. Based on Poland and Turkey*, *Czasopismo Techniczne. Architektura*, Wydawnictwo Politechniki Krakowskiej, zeszyt 2/2012.
- [6] Chandler, T. 1987. Four Thousand Years of Urban Growth, *St. David's University Press*, 1 sty 1987–656.
- [7] Okólski, M.; Timofiejuk, I. *Statystyka Ekonomiczna, Elementy teorii*, PWE, Warszawa 1983, 26–27.
- [8] Timofiejuk, I. *Pomiar dynamiki mierników ekonomicznych*, Wydawnictwo WSE-1, Warszawa 2006.
- [9] http://www.stat.gov.pl/bdl/app/strona.html?p_name=indeks