

THE ROLE AND DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVES OF SMALL TOWNS IN CENTRAL SERBIA

Nenad Spasić, Jasna Petrić

The link between urban centres and the countryside, including movement of people, goods, capital and other social exchanges, play an important role in processes of rural and urban change of a country. Major demographic and spatial changes have been typical for Serbia in the second half of the 20th century, caused by a dynamic primary urbanisation process, i.e. by intense migration trends between rural areas and towns (cities). A special attention in this paper is given to the small urban centres in Serbia (small towns with population of less than 20,000) as the first magnet in proximate contact with the rural surroundings, and the one that therefore could have the greatest influence on organisation structure and development prospects of the rural areas. In addition to being difficult to substantiate criteria for urban classification, small towns themselves do not represent a homogeneous group of settlements, and this makes it even harder to put up generalisations that would fit to all the settlements of this kind either within our country or cross-borders. However, here are identified certain common features for the small towns in Central Serbia and their development perspective is analysed in relation to medium towns and cities of the same territory in consideration. Finally, this paper discusses the importance of policies for small town development in light of a real risk that the process of globalisation may lead to the justification of a new concentration of activities in the large cities, increasing the already significant regional differences in living conditions and economic development.

Key words: small towns; urbanisation; Central Serbia; rural surroundings; development perspective.

WHY AN INTEREST IN SMALL URBAN CENTRES?

Within general trend among most nations to 'urbanise', there are large differences in the scale, speed and spatial distribution of urban change and development of urban centres. The immediate cause of virtually all urbanisation is the net movement from rural to urban areas. This process, labelled as the primary urbanisation has been typical for Serbia in the second half of the 20th century and will continue as long as the traditional demographic 'reservoirs' (predominantly rural areas) are exhausted.

Although, traditionally, the debate on rural-urban interactions has been dominated by interest in the ways in which very large cities influence the development of national space, small and medium urban centres are often seen as playing a crucial role in rural-urban interactions given the usually strong link and complementary relationship with their hinterland.

Small urban centres have attracted the attention of researchers and urban policy-makers ever since the 1960s. However, a current increased interest in small towns is based on the growing recognition of the importance of exchanges between rural and urban households, enterprises and economies.

Raw materials coming from rural areas provide a base for functioning of many urban enterprises, while agricultural producers rely on urban-based traders and markets. Most rural dwellers rely on retail stores and services in local (small) urban centres. Also, as it can be increasingly noticed, both rural and urban households rely for their livelihoods on the combination of rural and urban resources, including nonagricultural employment for rural residents and peri-urban farming for urban dwellers. These interactions and links are generally stronger in and around small urban centres.

General paradigms of modernisation and dependency theories justify the view about the role of small urban centres in regional and

rural development. First of all, small towns are seen as centres from which innovation and modernisation would trickle down to the rural population.

With this in view, the most effective and rational spatial strategy for promoting rural development is to develop a well-articulated, integrated and balanced urban hierarchy (Satterthwaite and Tacoli, 2003:12). This network of small, medium-size and larger urban centres is perceived to allow clusters of services, facilities and infrastructure that cannot be economically located in small villages and hamlets to serve a widely dispersed population from an accessible central place (Rondinelli, 1985). Small towns are perceived to play a positive role in such network by offering more service supply points with a variety of services, agricultural inputs and consumer goods to the rural areas (Tacoli, 1998).

On the other hand, a distinctive character and quality of small towns in many areas is under pressure from: population change, economic

restructuring, and insensitive development. Some or all of these factors may change the historic, economic, social, and environmental role of small towns.

Experiences from around the world show that there exist three different levels of decision-making that have a significant impact on the role of small urban centres in economic growth (Satterthwaite and Tacoli, 2003:2). The first is the role of local government, which is best placed to identify local needs and prioritise them in order to define the future action. Local decision-making can help regulating the use of natural resources by rural and urban residents and enterprises, which otherwise can become a major source of conflict. However, while decentralisation has a great potential in terms of both efficiency and responsibility, there may be costs and limitations with regard to revenue, capacity and legitimacy. The second level is the national context, where by far the most important constraint can come from the lack of 'fit' between national macro-economic and sectoral policies and local development strategies. The problem arises because the spatial dimension of national growth strategies is often ignored as well as the issues such as: equitable distribution of and access to land; regionally balanced growth strategies including satisfactory provision of infrastructure and basic services (education, health, water and sanitation); revenue support to local government, etc. The third level is the international or global context. In almost all world nations, the liberalisation of trade and production has reshaped traditional links between rural and urban areas, where the existence of small urban centres may be seriously threatened. However, if foreign investments support local production, they empower the role of small urban centres for the economic base of their proper region.

SETTLEMENT CLASSIFICATION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF SMALL TOWNS IN CENTRAL SERBIA

One of the key problems encountered when addressing urban settlements is the definition of towns, i.e. distinction between urban and other types of settlements. In theory and in practice, there are several criteria that may be applied in distinguishing urban from "non-

urban" settlements: statistical, administrative, functional, sociological, economic, historical, demographic, etc. When observed internationally, a town status and its scope are usually defined by using individual or combination of the following characteristics: settlement size (number of inhabitants), urban way of living, minimum centrality, compactness of a settlement, territorial enclosure, etc. (Vresk, 1980). However, the population size and urban way of living are usually considered as the key features, according to which a town status of a settlement has been defined in the majority of countries (Stevanović, 2004).

In virtually all nations, official definitions ensure that urban centres include all settlements with 30,000 or more inhabitants; however the minimum size of a small town may vary from one country to another. No accurate international comparisons can be made of the proportion of nations's population living in small towns defined by their population size because each nation has its own criteria for determining when a settlement is large enough to be classified as urban (or to have the administrative status, density or concentration of nonagricultural employment to be classified as urban) (Satterthwaite, Tacoli, 2003:8). For example, some nations use population thresholds of between 200 and 1,000 inhabitants to define urban centres (e.g. most Scandinavian countries). On the other side of extreme, countries like Japan use the minimum size of 30,000 inhabitants to define a town. Therefore, what in one nation would be hundreds of small towns would be hundreds of rural settlements in another. Yet, in most countries the lowest settlement size for a town is 2,000 people, and this criterion is usually accompanied by the percentage of population employed in nonagricultural activities (usually 2/3-4/5 of employed persons, sometimes considering only male work force), or it is required that a settlement has some typical urban features (Milićević, 1994).

In Serbia, the Census statistics in the period 1948-2002 used either of the two criteria for differentiation of settlements: administrative (a settlement is proclaimed as town according to law regulations) and demographic-statistical one (urban settlements should have at least 2,000 inhabitants and 90% of nonagricultural

inhabitants, where this percentage may be lower with the increase of a settlement's population size, e.g. settlements with 15,000 and more inhabitants are considered as towns if they have at least 30% of nonagricultural inhabitants). This latter criterion was proposed by M. Macura in the mid-1950s and was applied for determining urban settlements in 1953, 1961 and 1971 Censuses. On the other hand, the administrative criterion which is used by the latest Census (2002) as well as by the 1948, 1981 and 1991 Censuses, allows local (municipal) governments to proclaim the settlement as urban, and is endorsed by publishing the declaration in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia. Such administrative criterion has some serious flows because it doesn't give differentiated picture of urban settlements in Serbia. Namely, this criterion encompasses urban settlements that vary in size from several hundreds to more than a million inhabitants.

Without any intention to broaden up the discussion on the most apt criteria for classification of towns in Serbia, in this paper we have proposed the following conditional classification of urban settlements:

- Small towns (population up to 20,000)
- Medium towns (population between 20,000 and 100,000)
- Cities (population over 100,000)

Also, in this paper we have limited our observations to the settlements of Central Serbia, i.e. Vojvodina has been omitted from the research, as well as Kosovo and Metohija for which there is a lack of official data.

Apart from urban types, official settlement classification in Serbia also recognises so-called 'other settlements'. Those are non-urban settlements, and according to demographic-statistical criterion are used to be labelled as rural and mixed type of settlements, latter being of transitional type between urban and rural settlements. A category of mixed type of settlements ceased to exist applying the administrative criterion for settlement differentiation (starting from 1981). Namely, all settlements that are not urban have been put in the category of 'other settlements'. In Central Serbia most numerous are in fact other settlements, but they encompass a total of 2,392,408

inhabitants, accounting 43.8% of the total population in this part of the country (2002 Census data).

As it can be observed from the Table 1, according to 2002 Census data, small towns are the most numerous urban settlements in Central Serbia (76% of all urban settlements belong to this category). However, their population intake is the smallest among all three types of urban settlements, due to the fact that some small towns have just a few hundred inhabitants.

There has been a noticeable change in number of small towns in the period 1948-2002, however with the application of administrative criterion for determining urban settlements, the number of small towns stabilised on 89 in 2002, with the increase of just 4 new small towns in Central Serbia since 1981.

According to the conditional classification of small towns in Central Serbia based on their population size in 2002, five groups of small towns can be identified:

- Small towns of 15,000 – 20,000 people: Prijepolje, Velika Plana, Vlasotince, Aleksinac, Trstenik, Negotin, Knjaževac, Priboj, Loznica (9 in total);
- Small towns of 10,000 – 15,000 people: Lebane, Majdanpek, Nova Varoš, Surdulica, Bujanovac, Ivanjica, Sjenica, Požega, Kuršumlija, Surčin (10 in total);
- Small towns of 5,000 – 10,000 people: Čičevac, Umka, Topola, Blace, Veliko Gradište, Vranjska Banja, Ub, Banja Koviljača, Aleksandrovac, Raška, Arilje, Dimitrovgrad, Lapovo, Sevojno, Svrlijig, Petrovac, Dobanovci, Grocka, Vladičin Han, Sokobanja, Bela Palanka, Tutin, Kladovo, Kostolac, Svilajnac, Bajina Bašta, Vrnjačka Banja (27 in total);
- Small towns of 2,000 – 5,000 people: Guča, Zlatibor, Resavica, Grdelica, Ovča, Bosilegrad, Mataruška Banja, Rača, Ribnica, Medveđa, Pinosava, Ljig, Donji Milanovac, Vučje, Beli Potok, Lajkovac, Boljevac, Ostružnica, Kosjerić, Lučani, Despotovac, Niška Banja, Kučevo, Babušnica, Veliki Crljeni, Brus, Mali Zvornik, Krupanj (28 in total); and
- Small towns of less than 2,000 people: Kuršumlijska Banja, Divčibare, Belanovica, Rucka, Pečani, Belo Polje, Sijarinska Banja, Brza Palanka, Jošanička Banja, Bogovina,

Table 1: Urban classification in Central Serbia in 2002

Types of urban settlements	Number of urban settlements	% in total number of urban settlements	Population	% in urban population intake
Small towns	89	76.1	590,869	19.2
Medium towns	25	21.4	1,042,993	33.9
Cities	3	2.5	1,439,739	46.9
Total	117	100	3,073,601	100

Aleksinački Rudnik, Baljevac, Mionica, Sopot, Rudovci (15 in total).

Small towns represent a rather heterogeneous group, in terms of their developmental, socio-economic, demographic, functional, and spatial-physical characteristics. This group includes towns which, regarding their size, function, and location, represent potential sub-regional centres or new medium towns (Negotin, Knjaževac, Priboj, Loznica), as well as small municipal centres which exert no influence outside the borders of their commune, and small urban settlements which function as centres of communities of villages. The group also includes various settlements with one dominant function, such as spas (Vrnjačka Banja, Sokobanja, Banja Koviljača, Vranjska Banja, Niška Banja, etc.), tourist settlements (Zlatibor, Guča, Divčibare), and industrial and mining towns (Majdanpek, Kostolac, Sevojno, Veliki Crljeni, Resavica, Aleksinački Rudnik). Therefore, it is not easy to offer a general definition to this category of urban settlements.

When trying to formulate definition applicable in the urban context of Central Serbia, small towns can be regarded as settlements with less than 20,000 people (according to the 2002 Census) and rating as urban settlements according to the criteria of the statistical service; they have the function (the role) of communal centres or that of supplementary communal centres; they are in direct contact with their rural surroundings, and they represent or would represent the most immediate centres of urbanisation (“vitalisation”) of rural areas.

DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL TOWNS IN COMPARISON TO OTHER URBAN SETTLEMENTS IN CENTRAL SERBIA

Urban population of Central Serbia has noted a remarkable growth in the period 1948-2002. This can be substantiated by the fact that in 1948 there was slightly over 20% of urban residents, and with continual growth of their ratio in total population of Central Serbia, in 2002 they reached the figure of 56%.

When observing the urban population growth according to three different types of urban settlements (small towns, medium towns and cities), it can be noticed that in the period 1948-1971 such increase was mainly due to the growing population of small towns. In this period, small town population grew 2.7 times, whilst for medium towns and cities it grew 2.5 and 2.1 times respectively. This indicates that until 1971, small towns used to be in the first line of absorption of rural-urban migrations in Central Serbia. Some previously conducted research showed that in the 1970s small towns exhibited the fastest rate of growth of GNP, as well as very high employment rate, which indicated a fast economic growth and rapid changes in the socio-economic structure of the population (Spasić, 1984a; Spasić, 1984b; Malobabić, Spasić, 1997).

However, in 1981 the primacy in urban population growth rate was taken over by medium towns, whereas cities increased their population at slower rate than any of the other two urban settlement types.

As it can be observed from the Table 2, the growth of urban population in small and medium towns of Central Serbia was stable and almost equalised in the last two inter-census decades (1981-2002). On the other hand, it is

interesting to notice that the cities of the same territory were at the same time lagging behind in terms of population growth, and for the first time in the period 1991-2002, they marked a population loss. This situation is mainly due to the fact that the negative natural growth appeared in cities (including Belgrade), so basically only small and medium towns provided natural replacement of their populations. Having in mind that small and medium towns are becoming the bearers of population reproduction, some may view them as the poles of future demographic revitalisation of Central Serbia (Stojanović and Vojković, 2005).

When examining small towns of Central Serbia in particular, one should take in consideration that not all of them have had a population growth in the last inter-census period. The small towns with negative demographic trend are usually those with less than 10,000 inhabitants (19), however there is a few with more than 15,000 people that started losing their population (e.g. Priboj, Knjaževac, Trstenik, Velika Plana and Prijepolje).

Small towns of Central Serbia are not a homogeneous group, so it is rather difficult to make any inferences that would equally apply to all of them. There are obvious differences between small towns which are almost as developed as medium ones and those which are not even centres of communes; there are equally obvious differences between mono-functional settlements (mining towns, spas) and those with the tendency to develop more diversified functions. When considering the influence of small towns on their rural surroundings, the ones with a higher degree of economic and social development have a more marked influence on their immediate surroundings and vice versa.

Small towns that function as centres of communes and that are not in the zones of influence of larger towns have a more complex role to play. At the same time, it is difficult for them to serve as centres of development for rural surroundings. These towns are often the centres of communes which are economically underdeveloped, with inadequate infrastructure, limited natural resources, etc. The relationship between a small town – centre of commune and its rural surroundings is of some interest.

As a rule, the majority of all employed persons within a commune live in the town. This clearly undesirable fact is due to a tendency to quickly emancipate the old provincial settlement into an urban centre, so that all available resources (which were often rather modest) have been invested into the centre of the commune. Social and communal facilities and services are also concentrated in the towns, and the same applies to all the quality of living features.

Although small towns used to have the fastest growth rates of both population and GNP, their development is still well behind that of the larger towns in Central Serbia. This is partly due to the fact that larger towns have higher productivity because of better structure of labour force, presence of economy branches with very high accumulation, and so forth. In addition to this, the quality of life in small towns may show the weak points in comparison to medium towns and cities, so that many rural migrants go straight to the larger urban centres, and this may explain population decreases in certain small towns and their communes.

THE POTENTIAL ROLE OF SMALL TOWNS IN REGIONAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The commonly stated spatial aims of regional planning policies assume that the country's small towns joined by medium town centres contribute to regional and rural development in four main ways:

- By acting as centres of demand/markets for agricultural products from their surrounding rural region, either for local consumers or as links to broader markets. Access to markets is a prerequisite to increasing rural agricultural incomes, and the proximity of local small towns to production areas is assumed to be a key factor in their potential role.
- By acting as centres for production and distribution of goods and services to their rural hinterland. Such concentration is assumed to reduce costs and improve access of rural population to a variety of services (health, education, administration, leisure).
- By becoming centres for the growth and consolidation of nonagricultural activities and

employment through the development of small and medium-size enterprises or through the relocation of branches of large enterprises.

- By attracting rural migrants from the surrounding region offering them job prospects and perhaps decreasing migration pressures on some large urban centres.

The empirical evidence available shows great variations in the extent to which small towns fulfil these roles. Much of this relates to the specific context in which these towns develop, to the quality of transport and communications links, and to the structural conditions prevailing at the local, national and international levels.

Rural producers' physical access to the markets in small towns and the extent of these towns' connection to wider network of urban centres have a key influence on development of small towns. The location of small towns is therefore critical. In many cases, small towns that are located on road axes or along railways and rivers, have better links with wider market networks.

Growth centre theory places a great emphasis on small and medium towns in the distribution of services and goods, where their size is perceived to play a key role in the types of services they provide. Hence, investments in medium towns are assumed to spread to and stimulate small towns, which, in turn, provide a limited range of lower-order services and goods to the rural region. However, empirical evidence does not confirm that the size of town necessarily relates to its economic role within its surrounding region.

Availability of employment, especially in trade, services and manufacturing is an essential precondition for rural migrants to move to small towns within their region. Indeed, the growth of many small towns is linked to their retention capacity for the local rural population. In addition to this, many rural residents prefer to commute into town rather than move, as this helps retain a foothold in agricultural production. Where distances between rural settlements and local small towns are not too great, investment in transport facilities that respond to the rural population needs are likely to benefit them by increasing their options, and

may to some extent reduce pressure on small and medium towns – and by extension on larger towns and cities.

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF SOME OF THE POLICIES PROPOSED FOR SMALL TOWNS

Policy measures for small towns often have a multiplicity of economic, social and political objectives, either explicit or inherent to the wider national strategy. According to Hardoy and Satterthwaite (1986), these policies can be put in five broad categories:

- Policies for development of small towns in more 'backward' and generally more rural regions;
- Policies for development of small towns specifically aimed at supporting rural and agricultural development;
- Policies to develop small towns in more urbanised and generally more industrialised regions, to reduce concentrations of population and investment in the larger urban centres in these regions;
- Policies to slow migration flows or to address the major cause of such migration, e.g. the concentration in larger urban centres; and
- Policies to strengthen local or regional government, including improving public service provision there.

Policies to strengthen the role of small towns have commonly been labelled as 'growth centre' or 'growth pole' policies. Yet, growth centres usually provided much less stimulus to their surrounding regions than expected: this was due to inadequate recognition of factors specific to each centre and to the imprecise diagnosis of existing circumstances in the centres and their regions, resulting in the top-down implementation of policies formulated at the central level.

Policies aimed to help rural and agricultural development with support of small towns were also with doubtful success. The assumption that the location of services in variety of 'central places' would benefit agriculture was often not confirmed in reality.

Policies aiming to develop small towns in more urbanised and generally more indus-

trialised regions are likely to focus along transport corridors. One important element of such policies is to offer incentives to large companies to relocate.

Policies attempting to slow down migration to larger towns and cities by retaining (or attracting) migrants in small towns also have mixed results. The reasons behind the choice of destination for migrants are primarily, but not exclusively of economic nature. They include issues such as: employment, migrants' social acceptability and, to some extent, access to affordable accommodation. These policy measures also encompass improvements in the quality of life in small towns (urban services, communal infrastructure, schools, child-care centres, medical services, cultural activities, etc.).

Although policies for small towns often have an element of strengthening local and regional government, sometimes a real decentralisation is missing. In some cases, the development of local governments and certain public services in centres of communes is seen as the way for such centres to gain the 'urban' status, regardless of their population size and economic base.

The growth, or the stagnation and declination of small towns, and the nature of their economic relations with their rural regions, are often strongly influenced by macro-economic strategies or sectoral priorities that make no explicit reference to spatial dimensions.

The distribution of urban population (and of industrial and service employment) within the urban system from the largest to the smallest urban centre is obviously influenced by distribution of power, resources and capacities within the local government structure. Thus policies intended to support small towns, need to ensure that they are not being undermined by the 'non-spatial' priorities of higher levels of government.

CONCLUSION

Small towns are in the immediate contact with their rural surroundings, enabling them to strongly influence the development of rural areas. Accordingly, in the future, small towns could become miniature centres of "vitali-

sation" and urbanisation of rural areas. That would be the most efficient way to gradually relieve the pressure of rural population on urban centres. In Central Serbia, such a role of small towns ought to be researched in the process of spatial and urban planning of towns and their gravitation zones, especially with reference to developmental, transportation, and other functional connections between the town and its surroundings.

It is not likely that small towns of Central Serbia will be able to play their role in controlling the excessive rural-urban migration unless sufficient and synchronised attention is given to improvements in their quality of life elements. In addition to improvements in the collective and individual standards of living, this also implies the following: increased employment opportunities in small towns as well as in rural centres; improved transportation links and other forms of communication; better communal services; health and social care; environmental protection, etc.

Many of the "urban comforts" and attractions possessed by larger urban centres cannot be found in small towns. On the other hand, they do have other comparative advantages (contact with natural and rural environment, lower costs of living, etc.), which combined with gradual planned improvements in their urban facilities, may generate more attractiveness to life in a small town.

The future for small towns in Central Serbia does not involve turning back the clock but it should be flexible enough to understand how market forces and social trends can be harnessed.

By following some of the key recommendations, planning for small towns should be underpinned by three elements:

- Examining and, if necessary, redefining their key functions;
- Identifying, safeguarding and reinforcing sense of place and local assets; and
- Involving local communities and business organisations in decision making.

Table 2. - Population change in Cities, Medium, and Small Towns of Central Serbia in the period 1981-2002

	Population			Index of change		
	1981	1991	2002*	1991/81	2002/91	2002/48
Cities	1,378,308	1,491,150	1,439,739	108.2	99.2	306.7
Medium towns	900,676	1,027,376	1,042,993	114.1	103.5	410.7
Small towns	513,350	590,928	590,869	115.1	102.5	348.4
Aleksandrovac	5,177	6,354	6,476	122.7	106.1	683.0
Aleksinac	15,734	17,030	17,171	108.2	102.7	304.7
Aleksinački Rudnik	1,927	1,645	1,467	85.4	90.1	137.9
Arilje	4,982	6,074	6,744	121.9	111.9	868.2
Babušnica	2,906	4,270	4,575	146.9	107.5	762.2
Bajina Bašta	6,284	8,555	9,543	136.1	113.1	803.0
Baljevac	1,707	1,614	1,636	94.5	101.6	148.4
Banja Koviljača	5,478	5,516	6,340	100.7	119.4	294.2
Bela Palanka	7,502	8,347	8,626	111.3	103.9	307.9
Belanovica	336	260	266	77.4	102.7	64.5
Beli Potok	3,150	3,069	3,417	97.4	113.9	202.2
Belo Polje	480	568	545	118.3	97.1	383.8
Blace	4,409	5,228	5,465	118.6	107.0	308.7
Bogovina	1,810	1,611	1,348	89.0	85.5	78.0
Boljevac	3,289	3,926	3,784	119.4	99.2	382.5
Bosilegrad	2,029	2,440	2,702	120.3	110.8	222.5
Brus	3,406	4,558	4,653	133.8	102.9	618.3
Brza Palanka	1,699	1,557	1,076	91.6	91.0	104.7
Bujanovac	11,789	17,050	12,011	144.6	72.2	460.0
Ćićevac	5,520	5,398	5,094	97.8	95.8	120.6
Despotovac	3,268	4,170	4,363	127.6	113.4	329.1
Dimitrovgrad	7,055	7,276	6,968	103.1	96.8	239.1
Divčibare	172	130	235	75.6	180.8	602.6
Dobanovci	7,592	7,966	8,128	104.9	105.4	215.8
Donji Milanovac	2,996	3,338	3,132	111.4	95.9	147.5
Grdelica	2,204	2,431	2,383	110.3	99.9	294.5
Grocka	6,394	7,642	8,338	119.5	112.2	294.9
Guča	1,852	2,026	2,022	109.4	100.6	342.6
Ivanjica	8,765	11,093	12,350	126.6	112.2	820.3
Jošanička Banja	1,366	1,296	1,154	94.9	97.2	116.8
Kladovo	8,325	9,626	9,142	115.6	98.0	456.2
Knjaževac	16,665	19,705	19,351	118.2	99.1	410.1
Kosjerić	2,988	3,794	4,116	127.0	109.6	752.7
Kostolac	9,274	10,365	9,313	111.8	93.2	326.9
Krupanj	3,779	4,795	4,912	126.9	104.1	593.4
Kučevo	5,051	4,846	4,506	95.9	101.2	166.9
Kuršumlija	10,550	12,525	13,639	118.7	110.2	581.4
Kuršumlijska Banja	198	185	151	93.4	81.6	36.4

* 2002 Census data are not absolutely comparable with data from the previous Censuses because of the change in methodology. Before 2002, the official statistics of Serbia recorded population with permanent residency in the place where the Census was conducted. However, in 2002, following the UN statistics recommendation, the Serbian Statistics adopted the principle of the present (*de facto*) population, which means that it recorded only the population that was present in the place of residency when the Census was conducted.

	Population			Index of change		
	1981	1991	2002*	1991/81	2002/91	2002/48
Lajkovac	3,188	3,428	3,443	107.5	101.6	234.6
Lapovo	8,837	8,655	7,422	97.9	94.7	115.2
Lebane	7,966	9,528	10,004	119.6	106.2	520.4
Loznica	17,790	18,845	19,863	105.9	107.2	633.0
Lučani	3,310	4,130	4,309	124.8	104.7	958.9
Ljig	2,632	2,754	2,979	104.6	110.6	319.5
Majdanpek	9,489	11,760	10,071	123.9	85.9	539.3
Mali Zvornik	3,786	4,321	4,736	114.1	111.8	655.5
Mataruška Banja	2,132	2,262	2,732	106.1	124.1	597.7
Medveđa	2,488	3,057	2,810	122.9	93.6	172.4
Mionica	1,438	1,679	1,723	116.8	106.1	312.7
Negotin	15,311	17,355	17,758	113.3	105.3	314.4
Niška Banja	3,854	4,179	4,437	108.4	108.7	495.3
Nova Varoš	8,565	10,424	10,335	121.7	99.3	587.4
Ostružnica	4,060	3,787	3,929	93.3	108.1	177.0
Ovča	2,530	2,444	2,567	96.6	111.0	134.1
Pečani	467	632	493	135.3	81.8	150.3
Petrovac	7,383	7,728	7,851	104.7	110.4	202.7
Pinosava	2,837	2,700	2,839	95.2	107.3	167.5
Požega	10,410	12,552	13,206	120.6	106.3	593.2
Priboj	18,295	22,137	19,564	121.0	89.1	1420.2
Prijepolje	14,543	15,634	15,031	107.5	96.8	577.5
Rača	2,305	2,729	2,744	118.4	104.0	289.2
Raška	5,639	6,437	6,619	114.2	103.3	445.5
Resavica	2,716	2,693	2,365	99.2	91.7	553.9
Ribnica	2,345	2,712	2,779	115.6	104.9	165.3
Rucka	278	317	310	114.0	109.5	97.1
Rudovci	1,883	1,804	1,787	95.8	99.7	161.8
Sevojno	4,655	6,501	7,445	139.6	114.8	406.2
Sijarinska Banja	582	530	568	91.1	114.7	607.7
Sjenica	11,136	14,445	13,161	129.7	93.6	411.2
Sokobanja	7,204	8,439	8,407	117.1	101.5	259.0
Sopot	1,581	1,720	1,752	108.8	102.9	316.8
Surčin	12,575	12,264	14,292	97.5	120.6	420.1
Surdulica	9,538	11,357	10,914	119.1	97.7	403.5
Svilajnac	9,340	9,622	9,395	103.0	109.7	208.0
Svrlijig	5,728	7,421	7,705	129.5	105.6	613.8
Topola	3,482	4,592	5,422	131.9	120.3	574.7
Trstenik	13,239	18,441	17,180	139.3	94.9	542.7
Tutin	6,233	8,840	9,111	141.8	104.6	1842.2
Ub	4,819	5,797	6,018	120.3	109.2	354.7
Umka	5,618	5,005	5,292	89.1	109.2	264.8
Velika Plana	16,175	17,197	16,210	106.3	98.7	236.7
Veliki Crljeni	4,252	4,668	4,580	109.8	101.6	211.9
Veliko Gradište	4,977	5,973	5,658	120.0	103.9	228.4
Vladičin Han	6,207	7,835	8,338	126.2	107.3	675.8
Vlasotince	12,166	14,552	16,212	119.6	112.2	332.9
Vranjska Banja	5,004	5,779	5,882	115.5	103.3	300.4

	Population			Index of change		
	1981	1991	2002*	1991/81	2002/91	2002/48
Vrnjačka Banja	9,699	9,812	9,877	101.2	103.2	436.2
Vučje	3,318	3,492	3,258	105.2	94.4	186.9
Zlatibor	1,237	1,684	2,344	136.1	140.5	2073.9

References

- 1) Hardoy, J.E. and Satterthwaite, D. (1986) Government policies and small and intermediate urban centres. In: JE Hardoy and D. Satterthwaite (eds) *Small and Intermediate Urban Centres: Their Role in National and Regional Development in the Third World*. London and Westview Press (USA): Hodder and Stoughton.
- 2) Malobabić, R., Spasić, N. (1997) Uloga malih gradova i seoskih centara u sprovođenju politike ravnomernijeg regionalnog razvoja, u monografiji: *Prostorno planiranje, regionalni razvoj i zaštita životne sredine III*. Beograd: IAUS.
- 3) Milićević, G. (1994) Analiza mogućnosti unifikacije kriterijuma za razlikovanje gradskih od negradskih naselja, *Stanovništvo*, No. 3-4/1-2.
- 4) RZS (2004) *Popis stanovništva 2002*. Knj. 9, Beograd: Republički zavod za statistiku.
- 5) Rondinelli, D. (1985) *Applied Methods of Regional Analysis: the Spatial Dimensions of Development Policy*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- 6) Satterthwaite, D., Tacoli, C. (2003) The urban part of rural development: the role of small and intermediate urban centres in rural and regional development and poverty reduction. Working Paper 9, published by International Institute for Environment and Development.
- 7) Spasić, N. (1984a) *Mali gradovi Srbije*. Posebna izdanja IAUS, Beograd:IAUS.
- 8) Spasić, N. (1984b) Small towns of Serbia-Knjaževac. Congress: International Society of City and Regional Planners: *Implementation of Planning in small towns – Agents of Action*. Braga-Portugal.
- 9) Stevanović, R. (2004) Gradska naselja Republike Srbije u popisima stanovništva od 1948. do 2002. godine. *Stanovništvo*, No. 1-4, pp.109-126.
- 10) Stojanović, B., Vojković, G. (2005) Urbane aglomeracije na glavnim razvojnim osovinama kao polovi demografske revitalizacije Srbije. *Stanovništvo*, No. 1-4, pp.61-79.
- 11) Tacoli, C. (1998) Rural-urban interactions: a guide to the literature. *Environment and Urbanization*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 147-166.
- 12) Vresk, M. (1980) *Osnove urbane geografije*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.