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ABSTRACT:

For several years, local governments have been tackling new challenges related to the regeneration of their cities, within the physical sphere (in relation with the physical rehabilitation of their spaces), as well as in the economic and social spheres. This task is developed within the framework of these initiatives in accordance with what has been called the Integrated Urban Development Model, understanding the Integrated nature of this approach not only in terms of the spheres of public policy involved, but also in relation to their management. In this paper, this management is analysed in terms of the development of mechanisms for New Local Governance and New Public Management. Through the application of cluster analysis, this paper analyses the degree to which Spanish municipalities implement their urban regeneration policies by putting the Integrated Urban Development Model into practice, paying close attention to the development of mechanisms for New Local Governance from a multilevel perspective, as well as the development of mechanisms for New Public Management.
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Introduction

The growth of cities is one of the most significant events in contemporary societies. This growth means that cities are facing the major challenge of finding solutions for the majority of problems that affect today’s societies, as well as prioritising needs that emerge as a consequence of demographic changes, and those pertaining to urban sustainability. Cities have become drivers for economic and social growth on a global scale (Florida, 2008). Therefore, one of the biggest challenges facing contemporary societies in terms of achieving social cohesion, quality of life, and job creation, lies in the promotion of urban development.

Over the years, there has been renewed interest in the phenomenon of urban areas in crisis, yielding a certain consensus related to two core ideas. Firstly, transformation processes as an effect of globalisation have intensified urban socio-spatial inequalities and have transformed their nature (Fainstein, Gordon & Harloe, 1992; Musterd & Ostendorf, 1998; Marcuse & Van Kempen, 2000). Secondly, given the emerging realities of urban socio-spatial segregation, new approaches and instruments of public policy are needed to tackle this problem (García, 2008; Geddes & Benington, 2002; Hutchinson, 2000; Couch, Fraser & Percy, 2003).

Against this background, and within different institutional (European Commission, 2009) and academic spheres (Sassen, 2006), it has been highlighted that, in order to tackle this challenge of urban development, one of the most important instrumental lines can be provided by interventions in neighbourhoods and urban areas that are in crisis, since socioeconomic differences yield socio-spatial evidence that translates into significant differences between neighbourhoods (Mendez, 2010; Mendez and Rodríguez, 2007).

In recent years, a large number of cities have promoted public intervention programmes in areas of social, economic, and urban deterioration. These programmes, known as urban regeneration initiatives, introduce scaled actions characterised by their response to different demands and various functions. Hence, the new way of tackling intervention in the urban space is not limited just to the transformation of their physical space, but also includes what could be termed a social, economic, and cultural dimension (Bianchini & Parkinson, 1993). Furthermore, the new way of approaching the problems faced by neighbourhoods in decline or crisis is not only linked to the content of actions, but also the way in which such initiatives are managed, particularly in relation to the establishment of networks of collaboration between government and other public agents and civil society\(^1\), as well as the incorporation of effective and efficient mechanisms for managing these initiatives (Farinós, 2008).

In this context, various initiatives have been launched in recent years within administrative and governmental spheres. These include initiatives that have emerged from the European Union, specifically its areas of policy aimed at regional development. In the specific case of Spain, within the National Strategic Reference Framework (hereinafter NSRF)\(^2\), local and urban development forms the backbone of the ERDF programme 2007-2013, following EU guidelines with regard to cohesion policy. Within this framework, and for the period 2007-2013, the URBANA programme and Integrated Local and Urban Development Programmes have been developed by the Spanish Ministry for the Economy and Ministry in charge of urban affairs, applying
measures to be funded with Structural Funds for the 2007-2013 period. This initiative has emerged with a view to ensuring continuity in the experience acquired through the development of the EU URBAN Initiative and the Urban Pilot Projects since 1994. The aim is to launch innovative urban regeneration strategies that, through an integrated approach that takes social, economic, and environmental aspects into consideration, foster sustainable urban development in accordance with the principles and strategic orientations of EU policy. In EU policy, Community initiatives are an instrument of intervention aimed at priority sectors within member states, in order to strengthen its economic and social cohesion. These initiatives are based on four principles: mainstreaming through information exchange and dissemination of good practice, innovation from new solutions approach, bottom-up approach and promote social change (De Gregorio and Kocewicz, 2005).

This article aims to analyse the urban regeneration initiatives developed within the framework of the URBANA programme in Spain, in the period 2007-2013. Specifically, the following research questions are posed: What are the characteristics of urban regeneration policies within the framework of the URBANA initiative 2007-2013 in Spain? To what extent do they respond to the so-called Integrated Urban Development Model? Can we find differences in the Integrated Urban Development Model based on the characteristics of the municipality?

In order to respond to the research questions raised, the article is structured as follows: The first section analyses the urban dimension of European policy up to the concept of the Integrated Urban Development Model. The second section presents the general analytical framework and its operationalisation in specific measures, as well as a description of the sources of information used for data analysis. The third section presents the empirical results, and the final section examines the conclusions reached.

The urban dimension of European policy. Towards an Integrated Urban Development Model.

An urban policy can be defined as a series of measures aimed at cities developed by different levels of government: European, national, regional, or local. On the basis of this definition of urban policy, all levels of government can promote these policies, since higher levels of government also promote actions that are not specifically aimed at cities, but which have a major impact on them. Hence, national and regional governments set in motion political and financial instruments that establish social, economic, and political conditions on the basis of which cities design their own policies. In this respect, apart from the influence of national governments, European cities are increasingly affected by supra-national policies (ERICUR, 2004).

The urban dimension of EU policy has been increasing. The starting point, in 1975, was the creation of the European Regional Development Fund, with the aim of achieving the economic integration of the poorest regions. This fund represented the start of a regional European policy, although during these years there was not yet an urban dimension to European policy.

In the late 1980s and early 90s, it became clear that cities are spaces where the majority of problems and opportunities in a region are concentrated. In light of the Cheshire
report (1988), it has been observed that many European cities have entered a period of
decline. In 1991, this report led to the drafting of a proposal to modify the Treaty to
give the Commission formal authority in the matter of urban policies, although the
member states did not approve it. However, it led to certain modifications being made
to the Regional Development Funds, as well as the emergence of specific programmes.
As of that moment, specific instruments began to be created to intervene in cities within
the framework of Regional Policy.

Urban Pilot Projects (UPP), created within the framework of the Regional Development
Funds, represent an initial attempt to create a specific urban dimension within Regional
Policy. Although, various documents were drafted in the EU during the 1990s reflecting
the existence of an urban dimension in its policies\(^4\), none of them achieved institutional
status in the form of specific competencies with regard to urban policies.

However, experience and the lessons learned from the first stage of the urban pilot
projects led to the adoption of a programme aimed specifically at cities: the URBAN
initiative, focusing on regeneration and urban cohesion actions. With the arrival of the
new century, the budget allocated to Structural Funds increased, and cities began to be
considered drivers for regional growth. This is shown by specific instruments such as
URBAN II and URBACT. Under these programmes there are some strategies consistent
with the guidelines contained in the European urban policies. These include: developing
and implementing innovative strategies to achieve physical, economic and social
rehabilitation; exchange of knowledge and experiences among cities of the European
Union, and integration of good practices. Ultimately, it is about creating a catalyst
capable of initiating a change in disadvantaged urban areas and fostering cooperation
between the private and public sectors, and collaboration between different levels of
government (De Gregorio and Kocewicz, 2007).

The approval of the “Lisbon Agenda” in the year 2000 aimed to achieve a new global
framework for action within the context of the global economy, and implied major
changes in EU urban policy. The Lisbon Agenda highlighted the privileged role held by
cities in inter-territorial competitiveness. The implementation of this Agenda also
foresaw that each State would design its own National Strategic Reference Framework
(NSRF), which should include priorities related with sustainable urban development.
Furthermore, in the case of actions that affect sustainable urban development, the NSRF
can support the development of participatory, integrated, and sustainable strategies to
tackle the high concentration of economic, environmental, and social problems affecting
urban areas (Rodríguez, 2010).

The period 2007-2013 has marked the consolidation of the urban dimension of
European policy. This can be seen in the documents of the Directorate General for
Regional Policy such as “Fostering the urban dimension: Analysis of the Operational
Programmes co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund (2007-2013)”,
from November 2008, “The urban dimension in Community policies for the period
2007-2013”, or the statement issued by the Committee of the Regions about the role of
urban regeneration in the future of urban development in Europe, passed in 2010.
Furthermore, various documents have emerged from informal meetings of ministers in
relation to urban development, in particular the “Lille Action Programme” in 2000;
“Urban Acquis”, in 2004; the “Bristol Accord” in 2005; and the “Territorial Agenda of
the EU. Towards a more competitive and sustainable Europe of diverse regions”\(^5\).
Together with the urban dimension of policies in these different documents, a methodology was beginning to be developed for the development of these policies: the Integrated Urban Development Model. This is reflected in statements such as the one drawn up by the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) regarding the need to apply an integrated approach to urban regeneration (EESC 760/2010), passed on 26th May 2010. Documents were also drawn up as a result of informal meetings of ministers regarding the matter of urban development. Of particular note is the “Leipzig Charter on Sustainable European Cities”, held on the 24th and 25th May 2007 in Leipzig, the “Marseille Declaration” from the 25th November 2008, and finally, the “Toledo Declaration”, drafted as a result of an informal meeting of ministers regarding the issue of urban development, on the 22nd June 2010.

As stated in “Toledo Declaration”, integrated urban regeneration is developed from a planned process that must transcend the partial spheres and approaches used frequently until now, in order to tackle the city as a functional whole, and its parts as components of an urban organism, with a view to fully developing and balancing the complexity and diversity of social, productive, and urban structures, whilst at the same time promoting environmental efficiency.

Hence, in this most recent period (2007-2013), programmes and actions have adopted an urban dimension to a greater extent. Given the results of the URBAN initiative, the Commission is trying to raise the profile of urban affairs in the agenda, with more integrated holistic actions, an emphasis that is clear from the objectives proposed within the framework of the Structural Funds.

In accordance with the process to include urban issues in the European political agenda, it seems logical to think about the possible impact of this inclusion on the reality of the member States. The literature shows the existence of an impact of European transfers and policies, both explicitly through urban actions (URBAN), and indirectly (for example, in the objectives described within the framework of the Structural and Cohesion Funds). However, this influence is not manifested in the same way in the different member states, since it is stronger among countries that have received cohesion funds, such as Portugal, Greece, Ireland, or Spain (ERICUR, 2004).

As pointed out by Nel.o (ERICUR, 2004), in the case of Spain, the impact of European policies in cities has been considerable. The URBANA programmes or cohesion funds have, to a certain extent, helped to resolve some of the traditional management problems, related to their fragmentation and lack of economic resources. In this respect, as Nel.o states, these programmes have provided cities not only with finance but also with governance opportunities and management tools.

Hence, the added value of programmes such as URBANA would reside not only in their budget, but particularly in terms of their methodology. Specifically, the integrated nature of policies promoted is considered an innovation in the way of doing politics. In addition to an integrated and long-term strategy, there are strong principles of collaboration and partnership, along with mechanisms of citizen participation at the very heart of such initiatives.

Bearing in mind the model proposed within the framework of these European initiatives, as well as their impact, according to the literature, urban regeneration
policies have become extremely important in the development agendas of European cities, not only because of the role they play in cities that are facing crisis, but also because of their application of what is being referred to here as the Integrated Urban Development Model, which, in short, could be characterised by three fundamental principles (Zamora & Merinero, 2012):

- The integrated approach to urban development is related to the definition and solution of problems, taking their economic, cultural, social, environmental, and physical dimensions into account all together. It entails, firstly, having a vision of all the questions and matters as a whole, and then adopting an integrated perspective in order to implement solutions.

- The articulation of networks of intra-governmental agents. This is simply the previously mentioned territorial governance, in other words, the capacity to define and implement actions on the basis of the collaboration and cooperation of different public and private agents who might be affected by problems and their foreseeable solutions. This collaboration between agents implies internal coordination (between different government departments), vertical or multilevel cooperation (between different types of government), and external collaboration (with agents of civil society). But it is also necessary to apply the New Public Management formula that guarantees the correct involvement and incorporation of different areas of government that drive urban regeneration programmes.

- And intra-urban equilibrium, in other words, the importance acquired by the fact that different neighbourhoods and areas in a city do have very differentiated standards of socioeconomic development and quality of life. To do this, it is necessary to pay particularly close attention to deteriorated neighbourhoods in order to reduce inequalities and to promote processes of socio-spatial cohesion (Borja, 1998; 2003).

Ultimately, as pointed out by Aparicio and di Nanni (2011), the integrated approach or Integrated Urban Development Model would be defined as the achievement of an optimum cooperation network between agents, as well as the conditions required to implement actions that allow for the effective creation of synergies between them.

In this regard, when it comes to analysing public policy, the Integrated Urban Development Model would encompass two dimensions (Van Berkel, 2006; Navarro & Rodríguez, 2010): a substantive dimension, related to the content of actions; and a procedural dimension, related to the way in which they are managed, focusing particularly on the relationship between agents.
Analytical framework and operationalisation of concepts.

Analysis of urban regeneration initiatives, in Spain and other countries, has attended to their substantive dimension (Blanco, 2005; Bradford, 2004; Bonet-Martí, Martí-Costa, Parés, 2011), focusing on regeneration case studies attached to specific areas of certain cities. Few analyses have studied the procedural dimension of these initiatives, and even fewer attempts have been made to analyse urban regeneration initiatives extensively, beyond specific case studies.

This research endeavours to analyse the two dimensions, with a view to analysing the characteristics of the urban regeneration initiatives developed in Spain within the framework of the URBANA 2007-2013 European initiative, as well as the degree to which they respond to the Integrated Urban Development Model. In addition, given that one of the research questions looks at studying the differences of the Integrated Urban Development Model according to the characteristics of the municipality, this work encompasses the institutional framework in which the initiative is developed, as well as the socioeconomic characteristics of the municipality.

Table 1. Analysis of urban regeneration policies. Proposed operationalization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>SUB-DIMENSION</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specificity</td>
<td>Existence of a specific normative framework in the municipality, province or Autonomous Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>Contextual factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Size of the municipality</td>
<td>Number of inhabitants in the municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>Industrial activity index, Commercial activity index, Economic activity index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED URBAN DEVELOPMENT MODEL</td>
<td>PROCEDURAL</td>
<td>Horizontal governance</td>
<td>Areas coordinated within the execution of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Civil society entities coordinated within the execution of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-level governance</td>
<td>Public administrations coordinated within the execution of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>Measurement standards in the performance of actions (creation of indicators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of diagnosis prior to the execution of the programme (SWOT, study of needs...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of a technical project prior to the execution of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of actions related to urban regeneration in the Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Transparency in budget design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline in the use of resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Citizen as client (e.g., existence of a service charter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Territorial</td>
<td>Benefit only for the area targeted by the intervention/area and rest of city/or city as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Possible areas of intervention / Areas developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Analysis of urban regeneration policies. Proposed operationalization.
The context of the initiative. From the institutional framework to the characteristics of the municipality.

In line with research conducted from the institutionalist perspective, in general terms (Weaver & Rockman, 1993) and specifically for urban regeneration policies, it is necessary to take account of the institutional design in each case (McCarthy, 2008). In this respect, the extent to which European guidelines have a direct effect on initiatives is already known, in terms of their content and the way in which they are managed (Marshall, 2004; Atkinson & Rossignolo, 2009, Nel.o, 2004). In this paper, it is maintained that the existence of a regional or local normative framework could also introduce specific dynamics into the conception and execution of urban regeneration actions. In Spain, according to the distribution of powers between regions and cities, there are different regulations depending on the territory. This makes it difficult to analyse urban regeneration as a uniform policy for the Spanish case, since the specific rules of each region or municipality may create a proper context for the development of the initiatives, as well as the possibility of cooperation between different levels of government to implement it.

Furthermore, this work takes aspects related to the characteristics of the municipality into account, since variability in the type of initiatives developed would have to be taken into consideration, bearing in mind the nature of the municipality itself. As municipalities become bigger, concentrating a larger number of inhabitants, they also have a local administration with a greater capacity to take on responsibilities, which should lead to a greater capacity to include a large number of local policy areas in urban regeneration initiatives, which will be referred to in this paper as greater political scope.

A smaller municipal size, on the contrary, could be linked to a larger-scale intervention within the municipal territory, owing to logical questions of size. Hence, as the size of the municipality increases, it would be logical to find actions that are more closely circumscribed to specific areas as opposed to the city as a whole, which in the context of this work will be referred to as smaller territorial scope.

In turn, the larger the municipality, the bigger the business and associative framework, in general. From this perspective, it could be assumed that larger municipalities have more opportunities (potential partners) for the establishment of networks of governance with the private sector. In smaller municipalities, on the other hand, these processes would develop with other levels of government, since the administrations would have lesser capacity to provide services themselves, as well as fewer potential partners in local society.

In accordance with these hypotheses, municipal size should be related with greater development of the Integrated Urban Development Model, at least in relation to the development of mechanisms of governance and variability in the areas of public policy involved.

Looking at the economic profile of the municipality, the starting situation in the municipality, will be decisive in understanding the type of actions prioritised, either in terms of economic development, social wellbeing, or both at the same time. The wealth and market position of the municipality could explain differences in the Integrated Urban Development Model. Hence, as stated in the pertinent literature, a greater level
of economic development could lead to a larger network of economic agents and, therefore, a greater number of potential partners for the development of urban regeneration initiatives (Joassart Marcelli & Musso, 2005), in addition to a greater number of economic resources to promote these actions.

The procedural dimension. Management models of urban regeneration initiatives.

As regards the procedural dimension, Blanco (2005) makes reference to a series of dimensions or basic lines of urban regeneration projects in Europe. These are: territorial focus; multidimensional agendas; strategic approach; local leadership; and plural networks. Ultimately, Blanco is referring to two fundamental dimensions: on the one hand, the development of mechanisms of governance; and on the other, the development of mechanisms of New Public Management, which aim to achieve more effective and efficient functioning, in harmony with the demands of citizens.

Some attempts in the literature, for example Marshall (2004), and Nel.o (2004) in the case of Spain, highlight how the development of European Union guidelines for urban policy is reflected in the development of mechanisms of New Governance, not only at the level of the Nation State, but also through local agents and institutions, both in terms of their patterns of functioning and in the relationship between them and higher levels of government. Based on this same logic, given that the municipalities included in the analysis of this article develop urban regeneration initiatives with funding from URBANA programmes, it is considered relevant to ascertain the degree to which these initiatives include mechanisms of New Governance, as set out in the pertinent literature.

Furthermore, as stated by González (2011), EU urban strategy focuses on fostering an integrated approach to urban development within the framework of governance, with a view to generalising relational and transversal cultures between all the agents involved in urban development. Also, cities are advised to implement integrated planning processes to “reflect on” and “manage” progress, which should incorporate a diagnosis of the city, define objectives that will make up the city’s strategy, coordinate with other sector plans, harness funds accessed by agents from the public and private sectors, and, finally, foster the involvement of other levels of government in the project, as well as other social and economic agents. Similarly, the document Promoting Sustainable Development in Europe. Achievements and opportunities (2009) establishes lines of action through which a specific methodology is defined (an integrated approach) that implies new forms of governance (including the role of citizens) and management (on the basis of mechanisms of New Public Management).

Both dimensions (Governance and New Public Management) would be considered within the procedural dimension of urban regeneration initiatives in this paper.
The substantive dimension: Models of intervention in the territory.

By analysing the substantive dimension, the aim is to study urban regeneration initiatives through three specific dimensions.

Firstly, the scope of actions, looking, on the one hand, at the physical scope of the territory, considering the degree to which initiatives are circumscribed to specific areas or the city as a whole. As reflected by the literature in relation to urban actions, territory is an essential element to take into consideration, since actions must be adapted to the characteristics of the target territory.

Secondly, analysis of scope includes the study of actions according to the type of goal pursued for the municipality, considering the degree to which actions strive for economic development, the improvement of infrastructures, the social integration of its citizens (Atkinson, 1999) or all of them together, giving rise to a greater or lesser degree of political scope for interventions.

As shown in Table 1, for each of the concepts outlined above, when analysing the municipal profile and the Integrated Urban Development Model, the aim has been to transform them into specific measures, which will be described below.

As for the municipal profile, the institutional framework has been measured through the existence of a specific normative reference, beyond the framework regulated by the URBANA initiative itself. Therefore, this indicator includes the existence of other regulations or legislation, which could be local, provincial, or regional in nature. Looking at the characteristics of the municipality, municipal size has been measured using the number of inhabitants, and the level of economic development has been calculated from the mean values for three specific indices.

As regards the procedural dimension, the article analyses the existence of networks of collaboration with other agents. The Integrated Urban Development Model incorporates the existence of mechanisms of collaboration not only with agents from the municipality itself, but also with other levels of government. Therefore, the paper incorporates three indicators of governance: Horizontal, Partnership, and Multi-Level. Each of the indicators is calculated by adding together all the agents with whom collaboration is established out of the total number of agents that exist. Thus, the intensity of collaboration is a rate that takes into account the total actors that can potentially collaborate, rather than a simple sum of actors in the network, adopting a 0 – 100 scale.

In relation to the development of mechanisms of New Public Management, the questionnaire asked about a series of mechanisms of innovation within local administration. These reforms include the search for greater efficiency and transparency in the use of public resources through measures to evaluate the performance of organizations (Peters and Pierre, 2000). These management procedures, traditionally used within business organizations, are, for example, to give greater capacity of decision to leaders and managers; increase discipline in the use of resources; or consider citizenship as a customer rather than passive user of goods and services (Olias of Lima, 2001).
Using factor analysis, the indicators were grouped into three groups, referring to the development of mechanisms aimed at promoting efficacy, efficiency, and citizen participation in decision-making. Data were standardised on a 0-100 scale, in the same way as the indicators of governance, with a view to conducting an analysis using both dimensions at the same time.

Finally, in relation to the content of policies, the substantive dimension is analysed using, on the one hand, indicators of political scope, measured through the number of areas of public policy involved out of the total number of areas set out in point 1.3 of the Terms and Conditions of URBANA programmes.

On the other hand, for the measurement of territorial scope, the questionnaire asked the participants to rate the territorial scope of their initiative on a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 referring to actions centred on specific areas of the municipality, and 10 referring to the city as a whole. In order to facilitate analysis of the procedural and substantive dimensions, the indicators of scope were also standardised on a scale from 0 to 100. In order to obtain the information required to conduct the analyses, primary sources were used, through the administering of a questionnaire to municipal agents involved in the management and execution of urban regeneration initiatives. Furthermore, the information required to analyse data related to the socioeconomic context of the municipality was obtained through secondary sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Sources of information analysed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary sources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities with more than 50,000 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities with between 20,000 and 50,000 inhabitants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (Universe) 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (Sample) 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate 84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error 0.0619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of confidence 93.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period during which fieldwork was conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2010 - Nov 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Characteristics and implementation of the Integrated Urban Development Model: analysis of empirical data.**

**Institutional and sociodemographic profile of the municipalities analysed.**

As regards the characteristics of the municipalities included in the sample, 54.9% are relatively large in size, with an average of 276,238 inhabitants, and 45.1% of them are smaller in size, with an average of 34,882 inhabitants.

Regarding their institutional profile, the majority of the municipalities do not have their own normative reference to govern urban regeneration in the municipality, beyond the...
framework that regulates the URBANA subsidy programme, issued by the Ministry in charge of Urban Affairs, to which all the municipalities included in the sample have signed up\textsuperscript{10}. Within the 43.7\% that claims to have their own normative reference, this pertains to legislation issued by the Autonomous Region (31.67\%) and Local Legislation (30\%).

Looking at municipal size, it is clear that the existence of specific legislation and regulations is more commonly found among the larger sized municipalities. Furthermore, whereas in smaller municipalities, their specific normative frameworks are local in nature, in larger municipalities they tend to be regional.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
Existence of specific normative references & All municipalities & Medium municipalities & Large municipalities \\
\hline
NO & 54.4 & 67.7 & 43.2 \\
\hline
YES & 43.7 & 32.3 & 56.8 \\
\hline
Regional normative frameworks & 31.67 & 27 & 31.37 \\
\hline
Specific local urban normative references for specific areas & 13.33 & 27.27 & 11.76 \\
\hline
Local Land Development Plans & 30 & 45.45 & 25.49 \\
\hline
Other & 25 & - & 31.37 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Existence of other specific normative references by municipality size}
\end{table}

Looking at the level of economic development, the largest municipalities achieve the highest scores in all the indicators, displaying, therefore, greater socioeconomic development.

Ultimately, the municipalities that develop urban regeneration initiatives in Spain, specifically those included in the sample analysed, are characterised as being medium sized or relatively large towns and cities in which, fundamentally, these initiatives are governed by a common normative framework for all of them, which exists at a national level, although to a lesser extent, they will also be governed by other normative references, such as frameworks issued by the Autonomous Region, or the municipality itself, such as Local Land Development Plans or specific normative references for specific areas. Furthermore, these municipalities will have a relatively low level of economic development, which is higher among larger municipalities.

\textit{Procedural dimension of urban regeneration initiatives.}

This section will analyse the procedural dimension of urban regeneration initiatives in Spain. This analysis will focus, firstly, on the development of strategies for New Local Governance, through the establishment of collaboration networks between the administrative units of the city council (horizontal governance), with other levels of government (multi-level governance), and with agents from local civil society, such as companies and citizen entities (partnership).
Secondly, analysis of the procedural dimension will examine the way in which initiatives are managed within local administration, looking at the development of mechanisms of New Public Management. Specifically, the development of three dimensions will be analysed, namely: efficacy, efficiency, and meeting citizen demands. These dimensions where obtained from a cluster analysis of the items related to innovation in the administration.

Regarding the development of mechanisms of New Local Governance, descriptive analyses show the existence of particularly high levels of coordination between municipal areas or departments, with lower levels between different administrations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Mechanisms of governance. Intensity: synthetic indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic indicators of the intensity of governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-level governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: authors’ own.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the development of mechanisms of New Public Management, in the management of urban regeneration initiatives, municipalities develop actions aimed fundamentally at improving efficacy, in other words, resolving problems through the implementation of technical mechanisms. Secondly, a high level of development is observed for actions aimed at guaranteeing efficiency in the use of resources by setting up controls on spending. To a lesser extent, mechanisms are implemented aimed at facilitating access to citizen opinion of the management of actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. New Public Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean for the total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: indicators created on the basis of factor analysis. Varimax Rotation. Source: authors’ own.

**Substantive dimension of urban regeneration initiatives. Policy content**

The analysis of the substantive dimension was conducted in order to study urban regeneration initiatives through two specific dimensions: territorial scope and political scope.

Looking at physical territorial scope, the analyses show that the majority of interventions are circumscribed to a medium scope, in other words, to actions that go beyond a specific area, but which do not encompass the city as a whole. In light of the
results, it could be said that urban regeneration initiatives do not generally aim to tackle the city as a whole, but rather they constitute fragmented and partial approaches, with the exception of a small percentage, 12.78% of the total of the sample, where the actions would affect the city as a whole. In short, we could say that only a small part of the municipalities adopt initiatives in line with the proposals of the URBANA programme, related to the territorial scope of the intervention.

As for political scope, in other words, the degree to which the initiatives developed encompass several areas of public policy, the actions have an index of 29.27, on a scale from 0 to 100. This shows a medium to low level of development, indicating that, although it is a principle raised within the framework of initiatives through the URBANA programme, there is not yet a broad scope in terms of the diversity of public policy areas involved.

Table 6. Territorial and political scope of the actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean political scope</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29.27</td>
<td>13.32959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean territorial scope</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52.16</td>
<td>23.07792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors’ own.

The crossing of dimensions. Towards an Integrated Urban Development Model.

Although traditionally the procedural and substantive dimensions of urban regeneration policies have been analysed separately, some contributions in the literature have looked at analysing various models of urban regeneration according to the mechanisms of governance set up through these initiatives. In this regard, Pierre (1999) maintains that different institutional forms of governance grounded in different systems of values, norms, beliefs, and practices, produce different choices of public policy and different results. Specifically, regarding the analysis of urban regeneration policies, articles such as those published by Bonet-Martí, Martí-Costa and Parés (2011) as well as the work of Blanco (2009), and Brendan and Shine (2001) find a relationship between the mechanisms of governance and the political scope of initiatives, stating that more participatory models tend in turn to be those developed in broader regeneration policies that are more oriented towards the social and community development of the municipality.

The crossing of the two dimensions highlights that, in line with the pertinent literature, projects with a greater scope, not only political but also territorial, would also be accompanied by the development of greater mechanisms of governance and new public management; in other words, greater implementation of the Integrated Urban Development Model.

Table 7. Synthetic indicators. Towards a model of urban regeneration public policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political scope</th>
<th>Territorial scope</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Mean Governance</th>
<th>Mean NPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated in terms of areas of local policy</td>
<td>For the city as a whole</td>
<td>.364***</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strictly area or neighbourhood</td>
<td>Mean (0-100)</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>55.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (0-100)</td>
<td><strong>Source: authors’ own.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *** indicates statistical significance at the 0.001 level.*
Together with the analysis of means, a cluster analysis was performed with a view to ascertaining the degree to which Spanish municipalities cluster in terms of the dimensions considered. For this purpose, a factor analysis was conducted previously in order to understand the way in which the variables analysed group together and the dimensions to which they give rise.

A principal components analysis of the variables examined here yields two dimensions. The first dimension is made up of New Local Governance (Horizontal Governance, Partnership and Multi-level Governance) and Political Scope. And the second dimension groups together the variables that make up New Public Management (Efficacy, Efficiency and Legitimacy). The rotated components matrix is show below, followed by the resulting graph of the types of municipalities.

### Table 8. Rotated components matrix\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political scope</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-level governance</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>-.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal governance</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method of extraction: Principal components analysis.
Method of rotation: Normalisation with Kaiser Varimax.
\(a\) Rotation converged in 3 iterations.
Graph 1. Typology of municipalities
Source: authors’ own.

Cluster analysis yielded a typology of municipalities according to the dimensions obtained previously: Implementation of New Governance and Political Scope tools on the one hand, and implementation of New Public Management tools on the other. Having drawn up this typology, the last question raised is: what are the characteristics of the municipalities included in each model? Below are the profiles of the municipalities affiliated to each type category on the basis of the variables considered in this article: municipal size, economic development index, and existence of their own normative framework.

**Type 1: Low level of Public Management/Low level of Governance and Political Scope.** The municipalities included in this model are small in terms of their population size. In turn, this group has the lowest presence of specific normative references with regard to urban regeneration in the municipality (only 34.8% stated that they had their own normative reference for this area). These municipalities also have relative low economic indices. An example of such municipalities would be Priego de Córdoba. It is a small town of around 40,000 inhabitants of inland Andalucia. The project consists almost exclusively of conditioning streets and roads to connect two parts of the city. This simple and physical performance depends only on the initiative and will of the City council. This could explain that large doses of innovation are not needed (they are very simple actions in their definition and implementation), and also low governance since the action does not depend on internal or multilevel coordination, or even the involvement of social actors to carry it out.
Type 2: Low level of Public Management/High level of Governance and Political Scope. These municipalities are characterised by being small in terms of population size. As for the presence of specific normative references in the territory, the municipalities in this model are more likely to have their own normative references (66.67%). This group has the lowest economic indices of the four models. An example would be Palma del Río. It is a small town of around 35,000 inhabitants of inland Andalucia. The project is complex in its configuration as it seeks to incorporate urban dynamics in physical, cultural and economic city neighbourhood located near the Genil river. The project involves not very complex actions to execute for a small municipality, and this could be the reason why new public management in implementation is low. However, it carries a high level of governance because the actions require coordination between various departments of the municipality, with other levels of government and civil society that are incorporated into the project design.

Type 3: High level of Public Management/High level of Governance and Political Scope. These municipalities are generally larger in size (280,455 inhabitants). Just over half (55.6%) of the municipalities included in this group have their own normative references, making it the group with the second highest presence of normative references governing urban regeneration in the territory. Finally, this group has the highest economic indices of the four models. The case of Lucena could illustrate this typology of municipalities. The project consists in generating a process of pedestrian streets in the historic centre, boosting business promotion for trade and tourism. The project includes the construction of an auditorium, which may require local government to implement innovative ways of managing the complexity of the equipment to create, as well as for the development of programmes for business promotion. As regards the high level of governance this would be related to the existence of an extensive network of highly active social groups in the city centre who have actively participated in the design and implementation of pedestrian projects; internal coordination necessary for complex projects that affect many municipal areas as was the revitalization programme; and multilevel coordination and funding for the design of complex actions, such as the renovation of a historic building and the construction of an auditorium.

Type 4: High level of Public Management/Low level of Governance and Political Scope. These are large municipalities, and yet they are in last place in terms of the existence of normative references within the municipality (41.7%). As for economic indices, this model occupies second place with the highest indices. Loja would be a good example of this group of municipalities. The project tries to integrate a socially degraded area within the dynamic urban neighbourhood. The actions are mostly physical, but also creating public use facilities, which would be forced to use novel forms of management. Regarding the low governance, it must be said that this project is managed by an agency created by the council and, therefore, equipped with all the necessary powers, thus there is no need for internal and external coordination.
Ultimately, analysis of the municipalities included in this typology reveals differences in terms of the sociodemographic profile. Whereas municipalities with low levels of development with regard to New Public Management, New Local Governance and Political Scope are characterised as being medium in size, having a lower level of development in terms of their own normative references for urban regeneration, and low economic development, the municipalities that are characterised as being the opposite (high development of mechanisms of New Public Management, New Local Governance, and Political scope), which would enter into the Integrated Urban Development Model, are large in terms of the number of inhabitants, have a broad presence of their own normative references for regulating urban regeneration initiatives, as well as a high level of economic development. Table 9 below provides a summary of the information analysed above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of municipality</th>
<th>Municipal size</th>
<th>Normative reference</th>
<th>Economic development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low New Public Management Low Governance and Political Scope</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low New Public Management High Governance and Political Scope</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low New Public Management Low Governance and Political Scope</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High New Public Management High Governance and Political Scope</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9. Models of urban regeneration in Spain**

In short, in light of the results obtained, population size should facilitate the implementation of the Integrated Urban Development Model. The greater the concentration of inhabitants in a municipality, the more likely it is to have a local administration with a greater capacity to assume responsibilities (more economic resources, human resources, etc)\(^1\), which could lead to a greater capacity to include a larger number of local policy areas in urban regeneration initiatives, in other words, to give them greater political scope, as well as the greater capacity to implement mechanisms of innovation for management within local administration. Furthermore, a larger municipal size would facilitate opportunities for contact with a greater number of agents to collaborate on urban regeneration initiatives, giving rise to more opportunities for the development of mechanisms of governance.

The existence of a specific normative framework for urban regeneration would facilitate the implementation mechanisms included in the procedural and substantive dimensions, so it could be stated that regional, provincial, or local normative frameworks would reinforce the guidelines or lines of action set out within the framework of the URBANÁ programme in terms of the Integrated Urban Development Model, since their presence is related to increased intensity in the procedural and substantive dimensions.
Finally, in light of the results, economic development should facilitate the Integrated Urban Development Model, possibly because greater economic development would imply the existence of greater dynamism and the presence of economic agents on the ground to collaborate on such initiatives, and also because greater economic development implies having more resources for the implementation of more diverse initiatives (with greater political scope), as well as more innovative mechanisms for management within local administration.
Conclusions: the Integrated Urban Development Model in Spain through urban regeneration initiatives.

This paper set out to analyse different urban regeneration policies in Spain, developed within the context of the URBANA initiative 2007-2013. Using a questionnaire administered to municipal agents, the aim was to ascertain the existence of different models of urban regeneration, taking the Integrated Urban Development Model as a reference, analysed in terms of public policy through two specific dimensions: the content of policies, in other words, their substantive dimension; and the way in which they are managed, in other words, their procedural dimension.

The analyses conducted point to the conclusion that within the framework of the URBANA Initiative 2007-2013, a model of intervention is developed in cities characterised by an Integrated holistic approach, which implies not only a way of approaching initiatives in terms of the areas of public policy and territories involved, but also tends towards the application of a specific management model, characterised by collaboration with other agents, as well as the implementation of diverse mechanisms of internal management within the administration.

In the procedural dimension, regarding the development of mechanisms of New Local Governance, descriptive analyses show the existence of particularly high levels of coordination between municipal areas or departments, with lower levels between different administrations. Looking at the development of mechanisms of New Public Management, in the management of urban regeneration initiatives, municipalities develop actions aimed fundamentally at improving efficacy. Secondly, a high level of development is observed for actions aimed at guaranteeing efficiency. To a lesser extent, mechanisms are implemented aimed at facilitating access to citizen opinion of the management of actions.

Looking at the substantive dimension, the analyses show that urban regeneration initiatives do not generally aim to tackle the city as a whole, but rather they constitute fragmented and partial approaches. As for political scope, it shows that, although it is a principle raised within the framework of initiatives through the URBANA programme, there is not yet a broad scope in terms of the diversity of public policy areas involved.

This would corroborate some of the proposals included in this paper regarding the capacity of European policy to influence not only the implementation of certain policies, but also the methodology applied in them, related to the territorial cooperation between administrations and actors involved in the initiatives, as a mainstream in the URBANA programme (Nel.o, 2004; Zamora & Merinero, 2012; Marshall, 2004; Atkinson & Rossignolo, 2009, González, 2011, De Gregorio and Kocewicz, 2005).

Given the results of this research, such an influence would not be unified for all municipalities in the country, but rather the development of the Integrated Urban Development Model would vary depending on the profile of the municipalities. This paper has focused on municipal size, the existence of specific regulations regarding urban regeneration in operation in the municipality, as well as the level of economic development, showing that, effectively, the Integrated Urban Development Model would adopt a higher or lower level of application according to the institutional, social, and economic profile of the municipalities. Specifically, municipal size would help the
Integrated Urban Development Model, facilitating a greater capacity for action within the local administration in terms of developing policies and opportunities to contact a greater number of potential partners with a view to establishing mechanisms of collaboration, as set out at the start of this article and in line with the proposals of Boyne (1998), Ferris (1989), Navarro and Ramírez (2005), or Huete (2010).

The existence of a normative framework regarding urban regeneration would incentivise the implementation of mechanisms included in the procedural and substantive dimensions, so it could be affirmed that these regulations would be helping to strengthen guidelines regarding the Integrated Urban Development Model, proposed within the framework of the URBANA programme 2007-2013.

Finally, economic development would facilitate the Integrated Urban Development Model, possibly because it would imply the existence of greater dynamism and the presence of economic agents on the ground to collaborate on these initiatives, as suggested at the start of this article, in accordance with the references consulted (Joassart, Marcelli & Musso, 2005); also because greater economic development would imply having greater resources to implement more diverse initiatives (with greater political scope), as well as more innovative mechanisms of management within local administration. In this regard, this research would confirm the statements made by Atkinson and Rossignolo (2009), who signalled that aspects related to the characteristics of the territory where this initiative is developed are also important.

In this sense, the analysis shows that conclusions cannot confirm the existence of an Integrated Urban Development Model in Spain, but under the guidelines established in the URBAN programme, a number of favourable conditions are created for it. Not only in relation to the content of the initiatives in the areas of public policy involved and the territorial scope, but also in incorporating innovative management strategies and the search for collaborative agreements with actors in the territory, whether public or private. But undoubtedly, the characteristics of the municipalities play a crucial role in understanding the extent and manner in which the Integrated Urban Development Model adopted in each of the municipalities.

Further research would be needed regarding the capacity of the municipality, according to its profile, to act as a catalyst for European policy guidelines regarding the Integrated Urban Development Model, with other local variables being included in the analysis, such as, the political composition of government or the local administration management model in each case.

As regards the URBANA programme itself, the implementation of the Integrated Urban Development Model should be analysed in future work, comparing Spain with other countries, with a view to ascertaining the degree to which this model is found in other national and institutional contexts. Also, within Spain, other urban regeneration initiatives should be analysed, not necessarily developed within the framework of the URBANA programme European initiatives, since this could lead to a certain bias in the results. Given the characteristics of the URBANA programme itself, it could shape certain characteristics within the actions carried out, in terms of their scope and the development of management mechanisms, since both aspects are strongly present in the spirit and make-up of this programme.
Notes

1 About the establishment of partnerships between actors at the local level in Spain, available Huete and Navarro. (2010), related to collaboration for the provision of services in different public policy areas. NSRF 2007-2013 is a financial and conceptual framework, and a structured set of principles and rules of action that frame urban actions. It establishes provisions and actions aimed at regional and territorial cohesion policy set out for Spain in terms of the ERDF, the ESF, and the Cohesion Fund.


European Commission Regulation (CE) No.1828/2006, of the 8th December 2006, and its subsequent modifications establishing the development rules of Council Regulation (CE) No.1083/2006, as well as Regulation (CE) No.1080/2006 mentioned previously, establish the possibility that an Intermediate Body could carry out one or more of the tasks of a management or certification authority, having formally registered the pertinent agreements in writing, wherein the provisions of the aforementioned Regulation pertaining to said authorities would become applicable to said Body (art. 12).


4 Although the influence of the EU in the form adopted by these initiatives is clear-cut, Atkinson and Rossignolo (2009) point out that aspects related with the characteristics of the territory where said initiatives are developed are also important: “Cities may, when applying for EU funding or in their local plans, conform with the language of the Acquis Urbain but their actions are frequently determined by more local (and national) traditions, issues/objectives and political and organisational cultures (i.e. forms of path-dependency) that actually may run counter to the spirit of the Acquis Urbain.”

6 “Market position” is understood to refer to the municipality’s level of socioeconomic development, and with it the capacity to attract economic development. This definition has been taken from Kantor and Savitch (1997; 2005).


10 Specifically, this aspect was worded as follows: “In addition to the legal framework that regulates Regional Operational Programmes funded by the ERDF, are there any other normative references that govern urban regeneration in your municipality, province, or autonomous region? If so, please provide details”.

REFERENCES

• European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) (2010) on “the need to apply an inte- grated approach to urban regeneration”(EESC. 760/2010), approved on May 26, 2010.
• Committee of the Regions (2010) on "The role of urban regeneration in the future of urban development in Europe", adopted at its plenary session on 9 and 10 June 2010.
• Kantor P. & Savitch, H.V. (1997) The political economy of urban regimes. A

- Ministers responsible for Territorial Cohesion (2004) urban acquis (Urban Acquis), approved by the informal Council of Ministers on urban policies, held in Rotterdam from November 30, 2004.
- Ministers responsible for urban development of States members of the EU (2007) "Territorial Agenda of the EU - Towards a More Competitive and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions”
lo Blanch.
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