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UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT, CITY GOVERNANCE, AND URBAN CHANGE—UNPACKING THE GLOBAL-LOCAL Nexus IN DUBLIN’S INNER CITY
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INTRODUCTION

The city can be read as the nexus of global change and daily life—a site of contestation in the flux of economic imperatives, urban policymaking, and local needs and values. Just as importantly, the key general processes at work—economic restructuring, flows of capital through the built environment, and the like—have proceeded most unevenly, as reflected in local problems of job loss, displacement, poverty, and a whole range of attendant urban struggles and social tensions. In particular, the processes of uneven development and globalization in the city have generated new and complex patterns of growth and inequality, raising important analytical and policy challenges. For example, recent years have seen the realignment of the state and the evolution of new forms of urban governance under conditions of flexible production, international competition, mobile investment, the restructuring of global commodity chains, and emergent consumption trends and lifestyle changes. All of these issues are evident across different regions worldwide and at different points on the global urban hierarchy (from so-called world cities to “ordinary” cities), and thus remain the subject of important theoretical and political debates. Specifically, we are faced with conceptual and empirical questions about the processes and rearticulations of this current period of flux, as well as practical questions about how societies and states should most effectively deal with the resultant social tensions and economic challenges.

Dublin City, Ireland, offers an important and instructive case study of these complex global-local processes owing both to its position geographically and to its recent efforts...
4. NOTE ON SOURCES AND METHODS

In the main, this chapter is based on primary data (interview material, documents, participant observation) from various research studies that the authors have undertaken since the late 1990s, as well as a number of ongoing action-oriented projects. This work revolves around a common, broad theme—about the changing relationships between capital, the state, and the great room in the city, in particular the socio-economic and political impacts of economic development processes and public policies on disadvantaged communities and the emergence of bottom-up responses and resistances. While set within the established parameters of academic discourse, some of the more recent research has also involved active engagement in community-based programmes and oppositional movements to neoliberal urban policies, reflective of a move toward societality toward local and activist engagement and the emergence of bottom-up responses and resistances. As such, the research engages with the changing relationship between the local and the translocal and the emergence of new social movements. Over time, the research has explored the social, economic, and political impacts of economic development processes and public policies on disadvantaged communities and the emergence of bottom-up responses and resistances. The research has been based on a wide range of qualitative and quantitative methods, including interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and participatory action research. The findings of the research have been used to inform policy and practice at the local, national, and international levels.
Of particular importance for this research is how these formulations can be applied to urban analysis. At a general level, the movement of capital through the built environment in search of surplus value (through investment in industrial production, services, or real estate) is a key element of both the urban economy and the urban environment. This tendency toward equalization is "fixed" by the highly differentiated outcomes across a variable physical and social landscape. For instance, the general processes of investment and disinvestment that form the generative basis for urban social change can be interpreted as the result of the balance of power and levels of different individual interests (city boosters, local development capital, marginalized, and amenity provision (Harvey 1989b). Thus, a central question for the analysis of urban change and globalism relates to the balance of priorities, strategies, and patterns of investment (Harvey 1989a). This is one core force behind recent patterns of stop-go development patterns, growth, and decay can be recognized in every city, but the forces at play vary significantly. The special and dynamic nature of inner-city urban governance and the role of planning within this institutional setting have been explored by a number of commentators (e.g., Brindley et al. 1996; Newman and Thornley 1997). Key concerns include the disinvestment and urban governance regimes variously emphasize economic priorities such as urban renewal, fiscal incentives, microarea planning, and flagship projects (Peck and Tickell 1994; Levering 1995; Wilks-Heeg 1996; Edwards 1997).

The main dimensions of the theoretical discussion are summarized diagrammatically in figure 4.1. One analytical challenge is to engage with the operation of a number of global processes, principally, capital accumulation (the apparently endless drive to make money out of money, and the related imperative to seek out more profitable forms of production, and patterns of investment (Harvey 1989a). This is one core force behind the patterns of economic restructuring that have imposed at every scale, is equally necessary, however, to explore the interpenetration of such processes with different individual biographies and different local and regional needs. In this regard, particular attention has been paid in the recent literature to the role of the state—and more particularly, capital accumulation in search of surplus value (through investment in industrial production, services, or real estate) is a key element of both the urban economy and the urban environment. This tendency toward equalization is "fixed" by the highly differentiated outcomes across a variable physical and social landscape. For instance, the general processes of investment and disinvestment that form the generative basis for urban social change can be interpreted as the result of the balance of power and levels of different individual interests (city boosters, local development capital, marginalized, and amenity provision (Harvey 1989b). Thus, a central question for the analysis of urban change and globalism relates to the balance of priorities, strategies, and patterns of investment (Harvey 1989a). This is one core force behind recent patterns of stop-go development patterns, growth, and decay can be recognized in every city, but the forces at play vary significantly. The special and dynamic nature of inner-city urban governance and the role of planning within this institutional setting have been explored by a number of commentators (e.g., Brindley et al. 1996; Newman and Thornley 1997). Key concerns include the disinvestment and urban governance regimes variously emphasize economic priorities such as urban renewal, fiscal incentives, microarea planning, and flagship projects (Peck and Tickell 1994; Levering 1995; Wilks-Heeg 1996; Edwards 1997).

The main dimensions of the theoretical discussion are summarized diagrammatically in figure 4.1. One analytical challenge is to engage with the operation of a number of global processes, principally, capital accumulation (the apparently endless drive to make money out of money, and the related imperative to seek out more profitable forms of production, and patterns of investment (Harvey 1989a). This is one core force behind the patterns of economic restructuring that have imposed at every scale, is equally necessary, however, to explore the interpenetration of such processes with different individual biographies and different local and regional needs. In this regard, particular attention has been paid in the recent literature to the role of the state—and more particularly, capital accumulation in search of surplus value (through investment in industrial production, services, or real estate) is a key element of both the urban economy and the urban environment. This tendency toward equalization is "fixed" by the highly differentiated outcomes across a variable physical and social landscape. For instance, the general processes of investment and disinvestment that form the generative basis for urban social change can be interpreted as the result of the balance of power and levels of different individual interests (city boosters, local development capital, marginalized, and amenity provision (Harvey 1989b). Thus, a central question for the analysis of urban change and globalism relates to the balance of priorities, strategies, and patterns of investment (Harvey 1989a). This is one core force behind recent patterns of stop-go development patterns, growth, and decay can be recognized in every city, but the forces at play vary significantly. The special and dynamic nature of inner-city urban governance and the role of planning within this institutional setting have been explored by a number of commentators (e.g., Brindley et al. 1996; Newman and Thornley 1997). Key concerns include the disinvestment and urban governance regimes variously emphasize economic priorities such as urban renewal, fiscal incentives, microarea planning, and flagship projects (Peck and Tickell 1994; Levering 1995; Wilks-Heeg 1996; Edwards 1997).

The main dimensions of the theoretical discussion are summarized diagrammatically in figure 4.1. One analytical challenge is to engage with the operation of a number of global processes, principally, capital accumulation (the apparently endless drive to make money out of money, and the related imperative to seek out more profitable forms of production, and patterns of investment (Harvey 1989a). This is one core force behind the patterns of economic restructuring that have imposed at every scale, is equally necessary, however, to explore the interpenetration of such processes with different individual biographies and different local and regional needs. In this regard, particular attention has been paid in the recent literature to the role of the state—and more particularly, capital accumulation in search of surplus value (through investment in industrial production, services, or real estate) is a key element of both the urban economy and the urban environment. This tendency toward equalization is "fixed" by the highly differentiated outcomes across a variable physical and social landscape. For instance, the general processes of investment and disinvestment that form the generative basis for urban social change can be interpreted as the result of the balance of power and levels of different individual interests (city boosters, local development capital, marginalized, and amenity provision (Harvey 1989b). Thus, a central question for the analysis of urban change and globalism relates to the balance of priorities, strategies, and patterns of investment (Harvey 1989a). This is one core force behind recent patterns of stop-go development patterns, growth, and decay can be recognized in every city, but the forces at play vary significantly. The special and dynamic nature of inner-city urban governance and the role of planning within this institutional setting have been explored by a number of commentators (e.g., Brindley et al. 1996; Newman and Thornley 1997). Key concerns include the disinvestment and urban governance regimes variously emphasize economic priorities such as urban renewal, fiscal incentives, microarea planning, and flagship projects (Peck and Tickell 1994; Levering 1995; Wilks-Heeg 1996; Edwards 1997).

The main dimensions of the theoretical discussion are summarized diagrammatically in figure 4.1. One analytical challenge is to engage with the operation of a number of global processes, principally, capital accumulation (the apparently endless drive to make money out of money, and the related imperative to seek out more profitable forms of production, and patterns of investment (Harvey 1989a). This is one core force behind the patterns of economic restructuring that have imposed at every scale, is equally necessary, however, to explore the interpenetration of such processes with different individual biographies and different local and regional needs. In this regard, particular attention has been paid in the recent literature to the role of the state—and more particularly, capital accumulation in search of surplus value (through investment in industrial production, services, or real estate) is a key element of both the urban economy and the urban environment. This tendency toward equalization is "fixed" by the highly differentiated outcomes across a variable physical and social landscape. For instance, the general processes of investment and disinvestment that form the generative basis for urban social change can be interpreted as the result of the balance of power and levels of different individual interests (city boosters, local development capital, marginalized, and amenity provision (Harvey 1989b). Thus, a central question for the analysis of urban change and globalism relates to the balance of priorities, strategies, and patterns of investment (Harvey 1989a). This is one core force behind recent patterns of stop-go development patterns, growth, and decay can be recognized in every city, but the forces at play vary significantly. The special and dynamic nature of inner-city urban governance and the role of planning within this institutional setting have been explored by a number of commentators (e.g., Brindley et al. 1996; Newman and Thornley 1997). Key concerns include the disinvestment and urban governance regimes variously emphasize economic priorities such as urban renewal, fiscal incentives, microarea planning, and flagship projects (Peck and Tickell 1994; Levering 1995; Wilks-Heeg 1996; Edwards 1997).
The face of it, these plans were a significant targets (MacLaran and Williams 2003). On Kirby 2002; Punch 2004).

Kirby's work examined the urban regeneration strategies of plc approaches to urban regeneration, which, it was argued, were reactive and had to anticipate development needs. Consequently, the new urban renewal policies sought to bypass the traditional planning process through the introduction of fiscal incentives and the establishment of special-purpose planning and development bodies, which would operate outside the local authority structures. The net effect of such measures was to introduce significant risk reduction for private sector development interests, ensure a greater certainty in obtaining permission to develop, and fast-track bureaucratic procedures. The main consequent has been large-scale property development, the physical renewal of the inner city, and significant transformations in social geography. Since these schemes began in the mid-1980s, almost 12,000 new apartments have been built in the inner city, representing a massive physical but also social and economic transformation in inner Dublin (Bartley and MacLaran 2004).

After a decade of tax-led development from 1986 onward, this market-led approach was strongly criticized because of the absence of any local community input into policies and the consequent negative social impacts, particularly for poorer city residents (Department of the Environment 1990). Indeed, this intense development has led to rapid land price increases, stimulating speculation in property, and to a local crisis of homes, housing and the displacement of valuable low-grade community functions. Moreover, such an approach also substantially lowered the level of local democracy or political accountabilty. The result, as McCurk (1994, 1995, 2000) demonstrates, was the effective undermining of the local authorities and the erosion of their powers and legitimacy. Indeed, evidence from McCurk's research demonstrates that planners themselves became increasingly facilitative of development interests and began to assume a more entrepreneurial attitude to development proposals. While this approach certainly delivered some very substantial results in terms of extensive residential and commercial investment, official 'visions' were critical of this market-led approach to planning as it was almost entirely property-led and either ignored or side-lined the need for socioeconomic renewal of local communities (Department of the Environment 1990).

As a reaction to this criticism, central government instituted, in 1998, collaborative or integrated approaches to urban regeneration, which, it was argued, would address community demands and thus generate local benefits and planning gain (McCurk and MacLaran 2001). Five Integrated Area Plans (IAPs) were formulated for inner-city locations, which had a strong community emphasis with, in some cases, specific community-gain targets (MacLaran and Williams 2005). On the face of it, these plans were a significant...
The more recent work of McGurk and MacLaran (2001) and Barry and Treadwell Shine (2003) is generally positive with regard to the potential of integrated planning and the possibility of community gain accruing. However, they also argue that local integrated planning can be manipulated as part of a neoliberal agenda and practice. In this regard, Barry and Treadwell Shine (2003) argue that the Dublin City Council has in fact become an enthusiastic advocate of neoliberal entrepreneurial approaches, to such an extent that it is seen as being more enthusiastically pro-business than the Dublin Docklands Development Authority (one of the special-purpose agencies responsible or the redevelopment of the docklands area). McGurk (2000) has claimed that the entrepreneurial approach to planning, which necessitated fluid relations among a variety of stakeholders, might allow the local authority room to grow positive social outcomes by taking a more central role in the new governance regimes, wherein previously they had been excluded. However, while it seems that the local authority has become a stronger player in the new paradigm of urban governance, it is by no means clear that it has used this new mechanism of action in pursuit of social inclusion aims. Rather, as the remainder of this chapter seeks to demonstrate, the local authority seems to have embraced a neoliberal development agenda, which looks likely to encourage the transformation of working-class and industrial parts of the city into overwhelmingly private enclaves, displacing an indigenous population with a long historic connection to the city in the process.

**Impacts of Entrepreneurial Governance:**

The Liberties-Coombe area is a classic example of such inner-city locales within the broader structure and processes of capitalist globalization. The community sector of the southwest inner city has a tradition of drawing up local plans that are sensitive to the needs of inner-city residents and neighborhoods. These bottom-up community-based plans include the "Back to the Streets" initiative developed by the South Inner City Community Development Association in the early 1990s and the "Area Action Plan" devised by the South West Inner City Network (SWICN, 1999), an umbrella network involving over 50 local community groups. Fierljeap (1999) provided much of the basis for the 1998 Liberties-Coombe IAP. This IAP was initiated by Dublin Corporation (the local authority changed its name to Dublin City Council in 2002) and developed in close consultation with the SWICN, local representatives, local businesses, schools, and voluntary and statutory agencies. The IAP seeks to achieve sustainable urban regeneration through a three-pronged approach of economic, social, and physical renewal, and its stated vision is to "reinstate the dignity of the Liberties-Coombe as a living working locality fully participating in Dublin's entry into the next millennium" (Dublin Corporation, 1998, p. 7). The objectives and renewal strategies contained in the IAP seek to attract significant investment to underpin this renewed (through the development of new industry locally), encourage the provision of a range of housing types and a variety of housing tenures, and improve educational and recreational facilities and the quality and appearance of the built environment (through a mixed land use policy, infill development, reinforcement of the coherence of the landscape, and the restoration of the civic character of a number of key urban spaces).

In line with the formal commitments to "integration and equity," the structures for implementation required the establishment of a cross-sector steering group "to guide the implementation" of the IAP (Dublin Corporation 1998). The steering group was subsequently changed to a monitoring committee in 1999. The monitoring committee originally comprised nine members—those from the local authority, three from community organizations (representing over 90 groups), one business representative, one trade-union representative, and one representative of architectural, historical, and community interests. A fourth community representative was subsequently added to the monitoring committee in 2001. A multidisciplinary project team and a project manager were responsible for the IAP's implementation and administration in consultation with the committee. To date, a key issue for the committee and for the community sector in particular has been the securing of community gain.

In order to qualify for tax incentives on designated sites, each development must contribute "community gain" to the IAP area. The Liberties-Coombe IAP stated that "a development levy of 15 per cent of the site value would be attached to key development sites (exceeding 350 sq. m. in gross floor area) designated for tax relief" (Dublin Corporation 1998, p. 108). To date, a total of 100 sites have been designated for tax incentives in the plan area. Types of community gain include the allocation of a percentage of residential development for social and/or affordable housing, a financial contribution based on a percentage of the current site value, and provision of facilities/apparatuses within the physical

**Peripheral residential development rather than inner-city regeneration, and public and private disinvestment, along with road-widening schemes, created considerable urban blight. Such conditions around the typical environments for problem drug use, and a heroin crisis, which took hold in the early 1980s, has further devastated many neighborhoods (Porch 2005).**

Nevertheless, the area has seen considerable levels of vibrant grassroots organization and opposition to the contradictions and negative local impacts of economic change and urban policy priorities and to the "place" of such inner-city locales within the broader structure and processes of capitalist globalization. The community sector of the southwest inner city has a tradition of drawing up local plans that are sensitive to the needs of inner-city residents and neighborhoods. These bottom-up community-based plans include the "Back to the Streets" initiative developed by the South Inner City Community Development Association in the early 1990s and the "Area Action Plan" devised by the South West Inner City Network (SWICN, 1999), an umbrella network involving over 50 local community groups. Fierljeap (1999) provided much of the basis for the 1998 Liberties-Coombe IAP. This IAP was initiated by Dublin Corporation (the local authority changed its name to Dublin City Council in 2002) and developed in close consultation with the SWICN, local representatives, local businesses, schools, and voluntary and statutory agencies. The IAP seeks to achieve sustainable urban regeneration through a three-pronged approach of economic, social, and physical renewal, and its stated vision is to "reinstate the dignity of the Liberties-Coombe as a living working locality fully participating in Dublin's entry into the next millennium" (Dublin Corporation 1998, p. 7). The objectives and renewal strategies contained in the IAP seek to attract significant investment to underpin this renewed (through the development of new industry locally), encourage the provision of a range of housing types and a variety of housing tenures, and improve educational and recreational facilities and the quality and appearance of the built environment (through a mixed land use policy, infill development, reinforcement of the coherence of the landscape, and the restoration of the civic character of a number of key urban spaces).

In line with the formal commitments to "integration and equity," the structures for implementation required the establishment of a cross-sector steering group "to guide the implementation" of the IAP (Dublin Corporation 1998). The steering group was subsequently changed to a monitoring committee in 1999. The monitoring committee originally comprised nine members—those from the local authority, three from community organizations (representing over 90 groups), one business representative, one trade-union representative, and one representative of architectural, historical, and community interests. A fourth community representative was subsequently added to the monitoring committee in 2001. A multidisciplinary project team and a project manager were responsible for the IAP's implementation and administration in consultation with the committee. To date, a key issue for the committee and for the community sector in particular has been the securing of community gain.

In order to qualify for tax incentives on designated sites, each development must contribute "community gain" to the IAP area. The Liberties-Coombe IAP stated that "a development levy of 15 per cent of the site value would be attached to key development sites (exceeding 350 sq. m. in gross floor area) designated for tax relief" (Dublin Corporation 1998, p. 108). To date, a total of 100 sites have been designated for tax incentives in the plan area. Types of community gain include the allocation of a percentage of residential development for social and/or affordable housing, a financial contribution based on a percentage of the current site value, and provision of facilities/apparatuses within the physical

peripheral residential development rather than inner-city regeneration, and public and private disinvestment, along with road-widening schemes, created considerable urban blight. Such conditions around the typical environments for problem drug use, and a heroin crisis, which took hold in the early 1980s, has further devastated many neighborhoods (Porch 2005).**
The lack of progress in achieving the social and community aims has generated considerable conflict between the state and the community, leading to the resignation of two of the leading local representatives from the monitoring committee in November and December 2002. At the time of writing, the remaining two community representatives are refusing to sign off on the IAP's Annual Report, as dissatisfaction and frustration with the manner in which the regeneration is being implemented—and with the failures of the monitoring mechanisms to address these issues—continue to grow. Repeated appeals have been made to the city manager, the minister for the environment and local government, and to the European Commission to review and rectify the implementation structure and mechanisms. In his letter of resignation, a community representative illustrates the level of local frustration and discontent with the manner in which the plan is being implemented:

Little did I, as a community member, realise that the IAP would be implemented in a manner which would encourage wholesale prejudice to market interests over the legitimate social and economic rights of the resident community. Let me reiterate that...the maximum benefit of the urban renewal of a heretofore 'unfashionably' deprived area would accrue not to the deprived inhabitants of such areas but to the representatives of private capital who are moving in and exploiting the level and social and economic objectives outlined in the IAP has been and continues to be a source of considerable frustration among community representatives on the monitoring committee and has served to undermine the implementation of the plan as agreed in 1998.

Another serious source of contention surrounds the recent granting of planning permissions for mixed-use developments on a number of sites. The design of the developments frequently runs counter to the Urban Design Framework for the Liberties-Coombe IAP and, in some cases, to the recommendations of planning appeal inspectors. This seemingly contradictory outcome of microarea planning is explained by a senior planner in the DCC who, in describing the readiness of the operational activities of the local authority, suggests that "the potential of the entrepreneurial approach to enable planners to implement the social dimensions of planning schemes is compromised by a pro-development local authority corporate vision at the managerial level" (interview quoted in McGuirk and MacLaran 2001). This contradiction is manifested in the confusion surrounding the precedence of conflicting guidelines and plans, with the IAP guidelines, the Dublin City Development Plan (Dublin Corporation 1999), and central government's Residential Density Guidelines (Government of Ireland 1999) causing particular discord for a more detailed discussion, see Iudel et al. 2004).

Criticism has also been directed at the implementation and monitoring mechanisms established by the local authority. Community and local elected representatives have pointed to a lack of clarity surrounding the agenda, with a blurring and confusion of roles and issues to be negotiated by the monitoring committee and the project team. No detailed guidelines or terms of reference have been devised as to the role and decision-making power of the various groups involved in the implementation of the plan. The SWCN (2002) suggested that the "precise provisions and power vested in community representation should be formulated, if such representation is to extend beyond token." Other inadequacies with the implementation and monitoring mechanisms of the IAP identified by the SWCN, include the weak links between the monitoring committee and the project team, the failure to "inform" and to "resource" the community representatives, and the insufficient frequency and duration of meetings of the monitoring committee. One community representative highlighted the broad frustrations in doubling his experience of the monitoring committee as "the only group that have I ever been a part of that I felt excluded from" (personal interview).
directions of this uneven development of the contemporary city. The most important aspect of this is the movement of capital through the built environment, driven by the accumulation imperative (the global market force at work). This chapter has shown how urban policies have been revisited away from social priorities and toward the "enabling" of this economic process. The effect has been to displace and disempower working-class life places in the city, initially through the loss of the older industrial base as the city's role in the global division of labor changed, laterly through the recommodification of nonmarket spaces for bourgeois consumption. In short, the local state is now largely involved in preparing and selling the city for capital. As a result, the inner city and indigenous working-class communities are under severe pressure from powerful economic forces and the increasingly neoliberal priorities of urban policymakers, which are translating into a revitalized strategy of land and class clearance.

In short, Dublin has essentially been a laboratory for a raft of experimental policy experiments since the mid-1990s, as well as in urban areas that have been substantially reshaped through the uneven flows of capital and the shifting priorities and practices of urban governance. It provides some critical insights regarding the tensions consequent upon these processes of uneven development and urban intervention, which seem to have impacted cities almost universally (albeit in different ways and to various extents). Importantly, the shortcoming of the social agenda within the Libertas-Compatible IAP have already generated growing discontent and emerging opposition, and the progress of community movements and resistance of this kind will be instructive for urban analysis but (more importantly) potentially decisive for the possibility of exploring and implementing genuinely socially inclusive policies that might ensure a more egalitarian and sustainable city future.

The research presented here provides some important insights from an "ordinary" smaller city undergoing rapid social and economic transformation, in part under the influence of an "urban governance regime more aimed at economic than social priorities." Arguably, such tendencies can be seen as a reflection of a broader developmental model pursued by the Irish state that has put "asymmetrical emphasis on issues of competitiveness, openness to foreign investment, and the search for new roles in the global division of labor (as older indigenous industrial sectors have folded into decline)." It is "clearly apparent how a policy emphasis on place promotion, tax incentives, and the transformation of urban locales could serve as dominant urban interventions in such a context. Moreover, as a capital and dominant city, the experiments carried out in Dublin have perhaps been pursued with particular gusto, almost as flagship projects, while the city remains particularly susceptible to intense cycles of private and public sector disinvestment, urban decay, social disengagement and (sexual) reorganization, and cataclysmic physical and social change.

In short, Dublin has essentially been a laboratory for a raft of experimental policy experiments since the mid-1990s, as well as in urban areas that have been substantially reshaped through the uneven flows of capital and the shifting priorities and practices of urban governance. It provides some critical insights regarding the tensions consequent upon these processes of uneven development and urban intervention, which seem to have impacted cities almost universally (albeit in different ways and to various extents). Importantly, the shortcomings of the social agenda within the Libertas-Compatible IAP have already generated growing discontent and emerging opposition, and the progress of community movements and resistance of this kind will be instructive for urban analysis but (more importantly) potentially decisive for the possibility of exploring and implementing genuinely socially inclusive policies that might ensure a more egalitarian and sustainable city future.

Urban Governance in Developing Countries: Experiences and Challenges

Richard E. Stren

Introduction

To begin to comprehend the massive changes taking place in cities of the developing world, we need to start with some large demographic numbers. As the world moves inexorably toward the day when the majority of humankind will be living in urban areas (which will be some time during 2007, we are told by the United Nations), the largest and most breathtaking population increases are taking place in the developing world: in Latin America, in Africa, and in Asia. Indeed, during 2000-2030, almost all the projected aggregate growth of the world's total population will be absorbed by cities of the less developed regions (United Nations 2004).

The aggregate figures on global urbanization set out in Chapter 1 hint at a more complex, regional story. Between the years 2000 and 2030, Africa's urban population is projected to grow at an average annual rate of about 7.1 million (a compound annual average rate of growth of 4.39 percent); Asia at 31.2 million (an average annual growth rate of 2.22 percent), and Latin America and the Caribbean at an average annual rate of 7 million (a compound annual average growth rate of 1.02 percent) (United Nations 2004). And in these regions, it is generally the poorest countries where urbanization is proceeding most rapidly. In Ethiopia, for example, a country with a per capita average income of $391 in 2000 (World Bank 2003), the rate of urban growth from 2000 to 2005 is estimated at 4.5 percent per year. And in Asia, Cambodia, with a per capita average income of $310 in 2005, has a projected urban growth rate during the 2000-2005 period of 5.59 percent per year. Against typical European annual urban growth rates of 0.74 percent for France, 0.38 percent for the United Kingdom, and 0.52 percent for Spain, these growth rates are immense-between 18 and 20 times higher than in Europe.