

DEVELOPMENT OF NEW ECONOMIC POLES IN METROPOLITAN AREAS: BELGRADE EXAMPLE

Slavka Zeković, Nenad Spasić, Tamara Maričić

INTRODUCTION

New European paradigms of sustainable economic activity development (based on the Lisbon agenda) have had a profound effect on the creation of new phases and development policies in Serbia, such as spatial-planning and urban policy. The economic and social development policy founded on new knowledge, innovation and entrepreneurship (the development of small and medium-sized enterprises, spin-off companies etc., as „regional catalysts“ of development), environmental protection and principles of sustainability, represents the new paradigm of spatial development. Harmonisation of strategic aims, policies and instruments is an essential factor for the competitiveness of industry and individual regions.

For an effective planning of sustainable industrial development and spatial organization in urban areas in Serbia in the following period, it is necessary to incorporate European strategic frameworks, approaches and spatial planning practises. In the process of economic and social transition in Serbia, coordination to the conditions of EU competitiveness, the development of small and medium-sized enterprises in the industrial sector, services and other business activities, as well as urban policy, is a complex economic and spatial planning challenge. Under the pressure of global processes in economic development, the transition of the socio-economic system into a market-oriented economy in Serbia, among other things, has influenced the creation of new economic poles (spatial-economic clusters) in urban areas, changes in spatial organization of cities, the appearance of new locational-spatial forms of industries,

services and various business activities, urban development etc. In the present stage of transition and development, it is necessary to begin with the adaptation of development, spatial and economic policy in accordance with the rules and demands for joining the EU. The present process of transition and development took place until the end of 2006, without a ratified strategy of development, i.e. until the adoption of „Serbia's Strategy of Industrial Development by 2012“. Unfortunately, this strategy does not deal with the questions about the effects of development processes and the process of globalisation on the creation of new economic poles/spatial clusters within urban/metropolitan areas in Serbia. Therefore, this work is trying to demonstrate the need for the research of new economic poles in urban areas, the need for mechanisms of agglomerating activities in spatial/economic clusters, the typology and parameters of new economic poles, and the harmonisation of sustainable spatial and urban development in Serbia, based on the example of the Belgrade metropolitan area.

PARADIGM OF SUSTAINIBILITY AND VISION OF TERRITORIAL AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The latest discussions concerning potential spatial development are not possible without taking into consideration the visions of socio-economic development. However, in economic theory the ideas of certain schools about the vision of economic development have always been divided between free market and/or state regulation. Apart from this difference in opinions, according to Heilbroner R., Milberg W. (1997), a certain crisis of visionry is

evident in modern economic thought. In a way, the utopian vision of society and economic growth in a soc.-realistic planning system in the development of post-communist areas has been opposed to political pluralism and market-oriented economy. Hodgson G.M.(1999), finds that an evolving economy and the development of economy occurs inside the context of long-term perspectives, high uncertainty, with an accent on resources, enterprise potentials and institutional evolution arrangements. Hodgson G. M. (2000), also, points out that the utopian paradigm of the central/planning system is replaced by another – a paradigm of market individualism, and that these two should be replaced by „market cognitivism“ and by „a learning economy“. If we consider the idea that defining a vision is a pre-condition of general progress in spatial organization, the same can be considered as a target point and an essential place in the concept of future development. Two key global tendencies have influenced the socio-economic and spatial changes – the globalization of economy and the transformation of postcommunist economic systems and state into a market economy, political pluralism and the strenghtening of institutional frameworks. The concept of sustainable development, as a challenge in harmonizing economic, social, political, environmental and spatial dimensions could serve as a suitable frame for“depreciation of influences“ of globalization processes and socio-economic transitions on all levels of planning. Due to the influences of the latter processes, spatial organization of cities and settlements, regardless of big regional differences, is characterised by a 'Planetary“ sindrom of standardizing lifestyles and

organization of work for people, together with a characteristic homogenization of urban structures and processes (the so-called European monotopy, -Jensen O.B., Richardson T., 2004).

From the viewpoint of the proclaimed new competitiveness policy of European area, a dominant role of economy is noticeable, one that is based on knowledge, innovation and entrepreneurship, or the so-called „learning economy“, in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. In accordance with the changes in knowledge, innovations, indications of new potentials and ideas, a question can be raised about different options concerning future spatial development. Essentially, it concerns the choice between various uncertain futures of spatial development and the „certain“ future of planning.

According to Jakšić M. (2004), the challenge of the 21st century is not in establishing a fixed and final *utopia*, but in creating an *ev-topia*. In other words, instead of *u-topia* (a Greek word meaning an „imaginary/non-existing“ place) – the creation of an *ev-topia* (a place that evolves, develops), meaning a system of stimulating and applying knowledge and adjusting skills to the conditions, uncertainties and aims of the surroundings. As the mechanisms of perception and acquiring knowledge have a social character, social relations are based on territory, so is the development of economy based on knowledge together with mechanisms of spatial planning policies.

Starting from the complexity of spatial development and the aspirations for a certain unification of spatial-planning policies and standards within the European area (on a national and supranational level), parallelly with the mentioned system of *ev-topia*, according to Jensen O.B., Richardson T. (2004), on territory exists an even more pronounced phenomenon of *European mono-topia* (in the sense of unification of places, spatial structures, processes of expanding new economic poles in city peripheral areas etc). In order to overcome the reverse effects of spatial mono-topia, changes are necessary in the understanding of universally effective ways and mechanisms of

planning an industrial balance in a defined area, in accepting local conditions, locally „coloured“ structure systems and the particularities of a local/regional area. The development should be suitable for the actual conditions of area, i.e. it should depend on stimulating and limiting circumstances, but also on an institutional frame as well. However, the connection between these elements is determined by the political and social power in interaction with a market-oriented economy, the strong influence of the process of globalisation, and the creation of new economic poles in the city suburbs.

According to Harvey, J. (1996), the main dialectic insights useful for linking the discourse of general development with that of spatial development are founded on:

- a) endeavours to „map the area“ as a precondition for structuring any kind of knowledge;
- b) mapping the area, which implies a certain kind of power, as a crucial mode and tool in the political battle and decision-making;
- c) on social relations that need spatial frames;
- d) on practical experiences of spatial change, in which all knowledge is included;
- e) institutions that have been made territorial, mainly for controlling sustainable development, surveillance of territory, issue of authority over land, resources, etc.
- f) on innovation (of thought, desires and imagination) as a fruitful source for reshaping a territory and activities, in accordance with different discourses, social relations, power relations, institutional structure and practice.

Principles of sustainable development should be added to these (CEMAT, 2000).

TREND OF EXPANDING ACTIVITIES AND NEW ECONOMIC POLES IN CITY AREAS

Questions concerning the mode of organization and management of development on a regional level and level of metropolitan areas are being raised throughout the EU. Mathias J. (2003), points out the manner in which political actors

in peripheral regions of EU are trying to create and implement the strategy of regional development in the context of regional decision-making, by way of EU institutions and national governments, in respect of the globalisation process. At the same time, a „new regionalism“ is evident, together with two main models in European integration – neofunctionalism and liberal intergovernmentalism. Amin A., and Massey D. (2003) point out to the radical decentralization and relocation of national political institutions and global economies into less developed regions. Apart from this general European trend of curtailing regional differences, establishing new „economic poles of development“ in metropolitan peripheries is also significant in planning spatial development. According to Burdach J. (2006), it is a matter of a new discourse in peripheral growth (metropolitan). Simultaneously, a trend of faster industrial/economic growth of the EU peripheral region can be observed with the integration of new member-states. In other words, a presence of a new discourse of double peripheral growth is evident – a growth of peripheral metropolitan areas and a growth of EU peripheral regions. New economic poles in metropolitan areas are a result of a high participation of the public sector (especially in providing heavy infrastructure, support in curtailing spatial unbalance, etc), but also in attracting foreign and local investments. State intervention, schema of regional planning and local actors have a significant role in their development as well. State intervention in the public sector has an entrepreneurial character, which can be noticed in various forms of public and private partnerships. According to the EU Competitiveness Program 2007-2013, in the target year (2013) for competitiveness growth, economic growth and employment, a budget of 16,3 billion euros/per year or 33% of EU budget is predicted. The initiated process of relocation, expansion and transfer of know-how, and direct foreign investment into Eastern Europe has influenced the dynamic of growth of GDP in this part of Europe, and of the entire EU. With the expansion of EU, it is supposed that the average GDP per capita for the 15 member-states in EU will be around 10% less, especially because of the growth rate dynamic of GDP of new member-states (according to

Kovačević R., 2004, in the period 2000–2004 growth rate of GDP of these countries was 3,2%, while the rate of BDP of the 15 member-states was 1,8%).

New economic polarities in urban/metropolitan peripheries

In some large cities of Europe, and Serbia as well, (ex. Belgrade, Novi Sad), new economic poles – new economic, commercial, industrial, entrepreneurial zones that have been created by planning or spontaneously in the suburbia (along motorways, main roads) have a priority in the development and spatial organization planning of the area. The reasons for such a trend are manifold – low price of land, available sites, proximity of residential areas, favourable conditions on site etc. The expansion of work/factory zones in big cities is contradictory to the idea of a sustainable compact city, above all, because of an increase in transportation, greater energy consumption, greater costs of infrastructure, negative effects on the environment, ruin of agricultural land and similar. In this way, the tendency of deurbanization has transformed into suburbanization, because the density of population in peripheral metropolitan areas has rapidly grown, as well as the number of flats, the growth of economic activity, costs of infrastructure, ecology etc. In other words, new centres of production and consumption influence the transformation of suburbia (as mainly residential, socially homogenous zones, with lower density in an urban periphery) into post-suburbia (which expresses the transformational process in multi-functional locations). Many different concepts have been concerned with this phenomenon of the transformation of suburbia into post-suburbia, describing it as a „new centrality“ outside of the central place, i.e. the creation of a new centre outside the downtown city area. The term „new economic pole“ implies various kinds of new dynamic centres with a functional specialization in the metropolitan periphery. The main spatial forms of new economic poles in peripheral urban areas (suburbia) are industrial parks, technological parks, industrial complexes, shopping malls, business-commercial centres, logistics centres, business centres etc.

According to Burdack, J.(2006), the concept of classic spatial models of cities (standardized „rings“ and sectors) is being more and more transformed into polycentric forms, created by grouping or networking different kinds of locations for different purposes. A tendency of the breaking up of urban structures into different series of specialized and fragmented localities, by way of clusters of activities dispersed inside a populated structure. In that way, more and more an image of a „functional archipelago“ is created in an urban (periphery) fabric, unlike earlier approaches. (for example, in earlier GUP in Belgrade in 1970's, the concept of an „archipelago in a sea of green“ was promoted). The cumulative effects of developing new poles lead to a new concept of growth of urban/metropolitan periphery as well. Initial nucleuses of this development are often shopping centres, business-commercial centres et sl., which is a consequence of the transition of an industrial into a post-industrial society, i.e. the transfer of agglomerative advantages of cities onto regional/peripheral surroundings. Based on the experiences of European cities, new economic poles have 5.000–10.000 workers.

Mechanisms of agglomerating in new economic poles

In studies and explanations of the development of functions/activities of spatial cluster in a defined territorial entity ,Agglomerating mechanisms play an important role. For example, new industrial zones and production complexes show various mechanisms of spatial/economic clusters on town and regional levels. According to Burdack J. (2006), three types of mechanisms stand out and they lead to different spatial clusters of activities:

- 1) spatial branching based on incoherent agglomeration;
- 2) spatial branching as an industrial complex (coherent agglomeration) and
- 3) spatial branching based on social networking (coherent agglomeration).

First type of spatial clusters is based on the grouping of functions because of the factor of proximity (to the centre). These clusters

usually lead to the reduction of transportation and communication costs, to the reduction of employment costs when hiring local work force, the reduction of costs for using local resources, special services and infrastructure, as well as the advantages of the proximity of the local market. In this formation of branching activities, an absence of special gains is evident because of the presence of other actors. The key factor of agglomeration are the real estate costs. Burdack, J. (2006), calls these clusters some sort of „open membership“, in which usually are concentrated business facilities and offices, in which there is mixed use of land, with residential functions, and with main corridors are linked to the central parts of the city or region.

The other type of spatial clusters, like the industrial complex, is based on well-known input-output links among the enterprises in the zone, which mainly have a commercial character. The locational behaviour of enterprises in the complex is directed towards the reduction of costs in the transactions between companies (intercompany cooperation). These industrial spatial clusters are more stable than a simple and incoherent grouping of enterprises. In the industrial spatial cluster there often is one dominant enterprise that „determines“ the principle conditions for locating the other companies around itself, by way of a kind of hierarchy of relations. These zones are often far away territorially from other built locations, but are always connected by motorways and main roads with their surroundings. Examples of this form of industrial clusters can be seen in many big towns in Serbia – ex. the zone location in the area of motorways and Belgrade airport, in Pecinci, Šimanovci, Indjija, Novi Sad etc.

Examples of spatial clusters based on social networks are local zones/areas, which are favoured by directing social capital, knowledge, networking. These functions of branching, based on social organization of institutions, are often linked to the „Californian school“ of regional economy, whose followers are Scott A. Storper, Saxenian (Scott A, 1988). Research of locational factors of agglomerating high-tech industry are very extensive, and demonstrate the differences in attitudes of

theoreticians of planning (Markusen A., Hall P., 1986., Scott, Storper, 1987., Scott A.J., 1997). reject Markusen's theory of unique high-tech industry locational factors, while stressing the factors of highly-skilled personnel and the economy of agglomeration/clustering. Saxenian, A. (1993) supports the views that agglomeration of high technology stimulates synergetic factors, and has many spatial and infrastructural attributes. Examples of this kind of concentration of activities into clusters are high-tech zones (ex. technology parks, industrial parks, high tech corridors, business incubators et sl.).

With the evolution of knowledge and awareness of the greater roles territory and environment play, as limiting factors in planning industrial development, there have been some „contradicting“ attitudes in the treatment of locational and environmental aspects of investment moves. According to traditional economic theories, industrial development is primarily determined by capital investment and employment rate, without the role of technical progress and location. However, neoclassic theory of proportional factors (which includes technical progress), indicates the special importance of *locational economies* as a result of expansion of industrial space, and the role of *agglomeration economies – urban economies* in the planning of industrial development.

Typology of new economic poles in urban/metropolitan peripheries

In the typology of new economic growth poles in the urban/metropolitan periphery, the agglomerative mechanisms of functionally-related clusters of companies (functional clusters) and „unrelated“ clusters are very important, as well as functional specialization of poles. On the other hand, there is a generally accepted classification of new economic poles into „dynamic“ and „stagnant“. The first are related to, for example, shopping malls, airport zones of development, technology parks, zones of business-commercial activities in an urban periphery, and the other („stagnant“) are usually relics of the soc.-realistic era (classic industrial, work zones, military complexes et sl.).

In European cities, new economic polarities are a result of locational dynamics and reevaluation of the existing spatial organization under the effect of activity of multinational companies and the development of structure on knowledge-based economy (with strictly global relations). According to Dovenyi Z., Kovacs Z. (2006), the post-communist development of eastern-European cities shows a hybrid layout with relics of spatial structures of the socialist era, a phenomenon of structure transformation and new suburban/posturban spatial layout of clusters. The majority of totally developed new economic poles have a clear sectoral orientation. New economic poles are comprehended as a great area of concentration of economic activity, comprised of many „spots“, points, branching, and have a specific spatial configuration. They are initial nucleuses of new employment growth in city peripheries, and the first early signal of a polycentric structure of a territory. Spatial economy of periphery urban area is not homogenous. Although, until recently, traditional city peripheries were identified as a mixture of industrial spaces, family homes, traffic corridors and greenery, today they have a more distinct sensitivity to market signals and initiatives in relation to the central city zones. In this space, drawn by the growth of population with a higher education, especially by way of a new infrastructure for research-development institutions, many new high-tech activities of production take place services. There activities of transportation services are developed, logistics, production and wholesale (warehouses, storehouses etc.) shopping malls and various services.

EFFECTS OF NEW TRENDS OF DEVELOPMENT OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES ON SPATIAL ORGANIZATION OF BELGRADE METROPOLITAN AREA

The process of post-suburbanization is a consequence of activity of commercial powers and it takes place in all metropolitan peripheries, including Belgrade. Significant foreign investments and the development of 86.000 enterprises (of which around 1/3 are in Belgrade), illustrate a more significant role of market mechanisms of allocated new

economic content in the metropolitan area. According to *Serbia's Strategy for Joining the EU*, (2005) a development of industrial parks is predicted, which would later grow into clusters, with the provision of necessary heavy infrastructure, possibility of fast construction of business and industrial facilities, fiscal incentives and qualified labour. *The National Investment Plan of RS* predicts the construction of 49 industrial zones in towns of Serbia. According to data of *Serbian investment climate assessment* (2004), only in the area of Belgrade, in a „new wave“ of construction 20.000 ha of urban land (farmland) has been found to be under construction in the peripheral area. A housing deficit in Belgrade, numerous refugees and dislocated persons, have caused a significant residential pressure onto the suburbs, and uncultivated farmland of Belgrade agglomeration (ex. Zemun corridor, belt of motorways to Surčin, Batajnica, Novi Sad, Avala direction, Borča, Ovča, Pančevo direction etc.) as well as the birth of new small enterprises, and the concentration of economic activity in the mentioned spaces. Metropolitan periphery outside the borders of the city of Belgrade is becoming more attractive for settlements (ex. The zones along the motorway Belgrade–Novi Sad, Belgrade–Zagreb, Belgrade–Niš, Ibar direction, Avala direction, Zrenjanin direction etc.) due to easy access to the corridors, nature etc. In addition, a concentration of economic activity is evident along the motorway from Belgrade to Batajnica, Novi Sad, airport “Nikola Tesla”, Dobanovci, Zemun, Pančevo road etc. A great concentration of economic activity has occurred outside the Belgrade agglomeration, on the motorway zones _ ex. large industrial zones in Šimanovci, Pećinci, Krnješevcima etc. At motorway exits (corridor X) big shopping centres have been built like „Metro“, „Tempo“, „Idea“, „Rodić“, „Mercur“, „Mercator“, „Veropulos“, etc. Municipalities that have better traffic and communication links with their surroundings, and with the central zone of Belgrade, and have an efficient entrepreneurial local authority and administration, are advantaged in attracting new content. In the Belgrade agglomeration, those are municipalities Pećinci, Surčin, Stara Pazova, Indjija and others.

At the start of transition we can equally find both the existing functional territories/areas and areas of economic growth with new functional specializations. A significant part of urban spaces is occupied by industrial and transportational functions and facilities, often they are very negative. Recently, with privatisation, the process of reactivating abandoned industrial locations (brownfields) in eastern-european cities, including Belgrade is gradually being opened. In cities with a market economy, the industry holds 4-10% (Paris 5.2%, London 4.7%) of the entire developed space (Bertaud A., 2006), while industrial locations in eastern-european cities occupy 15,1-43,8% (Prag 13,4%, Varšava 15,1%, Sofija 27,1%, Ljubljana 27,4%, Moscow 31,6%, St. Petersburg 43,8%. In Belgrade, it is approximately 18%. However, the general opinion is that due to the price of construction, parking problems et sl., the new dominant trend is construction in new industrial facilities, on free locations in the urban periphery (greenfields).

Clustery deconcentration of business activity leads to a new relation and movement from the centre of city to the outskirts. The effects of development and concentration of industrial activity and living in the suburbia (post-suburbia), without control of the over-construction phenomenon or urban lots, environmental effects and pollution et sl., have an ever-growing, partly explosive character. Post-socialistic „boom“ of the metropolitan periphery is not imminent to only eastern-european and Balkan countries, but to developed metropolitan areas of Western Europe too. The development is shifting from the central compact city nucleus to the inner and outer city peripheries. One of the principle reasons for the socio-economic and spatial transformation of urban areas is the process of tertialization, i.e. the development of services. The main instigator of these processes are usually foreign investments into the services sector (most often it is the banking sector, insurance, shopping malls, sales and exhibit halls, hotels, storehouses and trade etc). The role of city authorities, municipalities and local investors in this process is relatively small, usually they have a service function in providing suitable conditions on locations.

The formation of new economic poles as a result of a general tendency for an international shift of production and services from the city centre to the periphery. In other words, the market mechanisms and factors of international proportions, activate the pressure of direct foreign investments into metropolitan/urban peripheries, above all, because of the agglomeration economies, reduction of various costs, acceptable and favourable locational economies in periphery city zones etc. This process has negative repercussions both in spatial-environmental, and in the institutional domain as well. Based on theoretical opinions, experiences from many areas, it seems that the process has a devastating effect on the regional and local institutions, as well as on the local investors, by imposing on them the rules of behaviour, standards, movements and direction of capital. Inside an urban-spatial context, it can be directly observed in the profound changes (quite often in the caving in as well) of the existing spatial organization of a city, city zonings, propositions, rules and regulation standards for using the building land et sl. So, direct foreign investment is the pivot of the development of new economic poles in urban areas (banking, shopping malls, high-tech and business activities, industrial parks, logistics centres and transportation etc). This process has a foothold in the theoretical concept of liberal economy, especially the so-called Smith's „invisible hands“ of the market. In other words, the processes of illegal construction and expansion of cities are only a consequence of bad legal solutions in the field of planning and building of spaces, poverty of citizens, social and other problems, but they are directly fuelled and/or initiated by market mechanisms. The process of suburbanization is „artificially“ initiated by economic and social policies as well, but also by inadequate measures of urban policy and policy of urban land (ex. untransformed system of managing the building land, undeveloped instruments of taxing building land and real estate, tax rates, the fee for land development and usage, local taxes, subventions, concessions, etc.).

In accordance with economic restructuring (tendency towards tertialization) in a spatial urban/metropolitan structure, a stagnation and „disappearance“ of classic industrial zones, complexes, enterprises is evident. A functional

conversion of these zones is evident, fuelled on one side by the process of privatization of state enterprises in these zones, and on the other side, by the pressure of direct foreign investment. The process of transformation of these „ossified“ industrial localities is often complicated, slow, expensive and uncertain, that is why the activities of construction and development of new zones/economic polarities (greenfield investments) in an urban matrix are much more important and large-scale.

The process of globalization and the activity of the „invisible hand“ on the market, among other things, is the product of profound spatial, structural, urban and socio-economic changes on all levels. On the territory of Serbia, due to the activity of transitional changes these processes have been significantly boosted. However, they flow spontaneously, randomly and often without adequate planning and management or institutional control. In the period between 1990-2000, due to the many political economic and social happenings in Serbia, „grey“ economy was especially promoted, with an explosion of illegal construction and an uncontrolled expansion of cities.

The aim of urban planning policy and the concept of branching-clustery deconcentration activities is to prevent the negative consequences of the doom scenario and entropy of urban territories (conversion of the „boom“ development scenario into the so-called „doom scenario“), based on the principles of sustainable development. Considering the fact that the development of new economic polarities in urban peripheries mainly is not linked to regional and national politics, the concept of polycentric urban structure could alleviate the negative effects of the mentioned tendencies. The development of potential implications of new polarities onto the regional environment and development, the manner of coexistence of growth and stagnation areas and/or depression, the disappearance of traditional industrial production, expansion of services, explosive growth of suburbia, is the subject of planning policy of metropolitan area.

Possible development of new economic poles in metropolitan area of Belgrade

The current developing tendencies in the Belgrade metropolitan reflect the growing socio-economic differences through a special „functional archipelago“. In accordance with the experiences of the European metropolitan peripheries, the possible scenarios for the future expansion of new economic polarities in the metropolitan area of Belgrade:

- an actual existence of area growth, mainly along important traffic corridors nearby the city centre, will continue in the future as well. Today this process is visible along the motorways Belgrade-Novisad, Belgrade-Zagreb, next to the airports „Nikola Tesla“ (the so –called „aerovill“ – Herfert G. 2006.) the Ibar major road et sl.;
- the development of new industrial structures (modern production complexes – industrial parks, technology parks entrepreneurial zones, complexes) mainly by government aid, the arrival of multinational companies, the support of EU et sl. Apart from technological complexes, the new polarities are the shopping malls, distribution-transportation centres, business centres and others.
- the prediction that the residential zone of suburbanization will expand in the future onto the green zones and will demonstrate the adverse side of suburbanization;
- the process of reurbanization in the Belgrade agglomeration is present sporadically, by way of rehabilitation of the existing industrial zones;
- the development of new industrial/business spatial forms of the new economic poles of development in the rural area, with the possible development of a big theme park. The construction of Waterland on the periphery of New Belgrade, the planned construction of Aqualand nearby Dobanovci, along the motorway Belgrade-Zagreb, like specific economic poles. Some European cities within the new poles of development have waterland parks and other zones of recreation and entertainment – „funurbia“, „tropical islands“ etc.
- and apart from the problems and impossibilities of an accurate prognosis for directing the dynamics and developing

processes, it is predicted that the centre of socio-economic trends in the following decade in the belgrade metropolitan will move to te periphery. In accordance with such expectations, and the functional borders in the metropolitan area can be significantly expanded.

CONCLUSIVE REMARKS

The development of economic activities within the new economic poles-spatial-economic clusters in urban areas can be assessed as a consequence of the process of globalization. New economic poles could be some kind of conglomerate of old spatial structures and the development of new locational-spatial and development models in the urban fabric, under the influence of market and the globalization process of economic activity and investment. In this process are evident: the existence of growth area, mainly along important traffic corridors nearby the heart of the city; development of new spatial/locational forms of modern economic complexes (industrial park, technology park, high-tech corridors, complexes), mainly with government aid, foreign investment of multinational companies, et sl.; the effect of large changes onto spatial organizations of metropolitan areas; possible destructive activity onto the institutional framework of the local community, but also turning the local institutions towards „entrepreneurial management“; over-construction of building locations; the effect on the price fluctuation of real estate in certain parts of metropolitan spaces; population mobility from the centre to the peiphery (in residential and work functions); endangering the quality of environment and others.

It is estimated that the absence of harmonization of European development policies, industries, spatial development, environment in future territorial development of economic activity in cities and regions of Serbia could have consequences in :

- a) the further process of restructuring and the growth of competitiveness of local economy and territories, within the new phase;
- b) the practice of planning spatial development of economic activity, especially of industry and services (in the approach, methods, spatial

planning policies, means of planning and solutions implementation);

c) environmental protection, because of the falling behind in the implementation of the principles of sustainability on levels of different spatial entities and corporative level.

References

- Amin A., Massey D., Thrift N. (2003) ,Decentring the Nation:Radical Approach to Regional Inequality, London:Catalyst
- Bertaud A. (2006) ,The Spatial Structures of Central and Eastern European cities, u ,*The Urban Mosaic of Post-Socialist Europe, Space, Institutions and Policy*, Verlag, Springer
- Burdach J.(2006) ,New economic poles in European metropolitan peripheries: Introductory remarks on theory and empirical evidence, *European Spatial reseach and policy*, Vol.13 No 2
- Competitiveness and Innovation framework Programme 2007-2013, European Parliament and the Council, 1639/2006/EC, 24.october 2006, OJ L 310/15,09.11.2006*
- Dovenyi Z., Kovacs Z.(2006) ,Budapest-The Post-socialist Metropolitan Periphery between 'Catching up' and Individual Development Path, *ESRP*, vol.13, No2
- CEMAT (2000) ,Guiding principles for sustainable spatial development of the European continent, Adopted at the 12th Session of the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning on 7-8 September 2000, Hannover, Strasbourg, Council of Europe*
- Harvey J.(1996) ,Urban Land Economics, 4th ed., London, Macmillan
- Heilbroner R., Milberg W. (1997) , *The crisis of vision in modern economic thought*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Herfert G.(2006) ,Berlin:The Metropolian Periphery between boom and shrinkage, *ESRP*, Vol.13, No2
- Hodgson G.M.(2000) ,*Economics and Utopia*, Routledge, London, New York
- Hodgson G. M. (1999) ,*Evolution and Institutions:On Evolutionary Economics and the Evaluation of Economics*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Jaksic M. (2004) ,Vision, institions and economic development, *Ekonomski anali* br.163, Economics faculty, Belgrade
- Jensen O.B., Richardson T. (2004) ,*Making European Space*, Routledge, London, New York
- Kovacević R. (2004) ,Impact of the EU on the old members, *Ekonomski anali*, br.163 Economics faculty, Belgrade
- Mathias J.(2003) ,*Regional interest in Europe, Wales and Saxony as Modern Region*, Frank Cass Publishers, London
- Markusen A., Hall P. (1986) ,*Silicon landscapes*, Allen and Unvin, Boston
- Scott A.J., Storper M.(1987) ,*Industrial Change and Territorial organization*, Allen and Unvin, Boston
- Saxenian A.(1993) ,The genesis of Sillicon Walley, *Built Environment*, No 9
- Scott A.J. (1997) ,*Limits of Globalisation*, Routledge, London
- Scott A.(1988) ,*New Industrial Spaces, Flexible Production Organisation and Regional Development in North America and Western Europe*, London, Pion
- Serbia Investment Climate Assessment*, Finance and Private Sector Development Unit (ECSPF), (2004), Europe and Central Asia, World Bank
- Strategy of the Serbia's entry into the EU*, (2005), Government of the Republic Serbia, Belgrade