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This time we'll start at the end. **Flexibility** is a key word of recent years. Crisis always shows the way. The latest trends clearly demonstrate that "hard" planning based on "hard data" is an unstable and therefore vulnerable discipline. The only answer to the present fragmented way of life is to "be flexible". Flexibility leads to stability. This might seem to result in a gradual loss of traditional values, but the opposite is true - we've just found ourselves in the laborious process of finding them again. From the viewpoint of municipal development it is clear that the traditional values of urban structure, its universality, simple and clear distinction between unbuildable land (natural landscape) and buildable land (city), between the public (public spaces) and private (buildings) provides the desired stability. And because this stable structure is able - without serious difficulty - to absorb completely different content - activities, or functions as they used to say, it is also capable of (flexible) adaption. It is a paradox that this very ability can be lost only as a result of human intervention. Tendency to define completely unnecessary regulations - prohibitions that reduce the natural flexibility sometimes down to zero value. The fate of such an urban structure is a gradual but inevitable decline. The most striking example is the application of regulations that prohibit the return of housing into our city centres, regulations that prohibit (flexible) changes of utilisation of individual buildings, regulations that complete total disintegration of the city that was going on for almost the entire twentieth century.

The 20th century was an extravagant one, which is why the **Priorities** today do not lie in establishing what to do first, but rather in deciding what can wait, or what not to do at all. When setting current priorities it is necessary to reflect the situation first and possibly review what the result is of the procedures applied so far, manifested in the approved plans and goals. The originally well-intended
principles of sustainable development, city of short distances etc. have become mere rhetoric exercise that can provide rationale for almost any plan, regardless of its real impact. Thus the means become the end, while the real target disappears, or is lost somewhere beyond the horizon. Priorities get their meaning only with being aware of and able to define one's objectives. Is our objective residential, i.e. city welcoming everybody, offering enough opportunities for various activities, processes and ways of life, resulting in a truly sustainable "city for living"? Or is our objective to create a single-purpose, separated blocks, without the possibility to modify their purpose, for which conditions were made based on the 20th century doctrine sure of the necessity of quantitative growth and dictate of predestination at the expense of the quality of everyday life in the neighbourhood? Our goal can be a distant one, a bold one. Our task is to define such priorities that will direct us towards our goal.

So what is in fact the Potential of Prague? Speaking of cities, the potential is often seen as a complex of investment opportunities, offer of development and transformation zones. But this is too narrow a viewpoint. Potential of a city resembles that of a human being. It is an aggregate of known and hidden abilities and willingness to find them and use them. It is necessary to admit our deficiency, and to stop wasting time and energy on something that is not natural for us. But we have to go constantly after the things where we are remarkable. Only then each of us, just like the city itself, can fulfil our potential.

This is not (and will not) necessarily mean maximum use of all given opportunities, but optimum use of those possibilities whose utilisation will result in an improved quality of the city life. Meaning full range of the quality of life.

Therefore this section deals mainly with translation of the obsolete and rigid 20th century planning language into a modern and simpler language of the current heterogeneous and complex society. We are looking for an order within chaos, because we want to fill the order with chaos freely afterwards [Paradigm and golden rule].

We are in the teens of the twenty-first century. At all times cities were founded, changed and abandoned. We have no traditional city states that were established thousand years ago. Their legacy of spatial arrangements and community
functions (people) was utilised by townships throughout history. Cities were the opposite poles of natural landscape, and as such were clearly separated from it. Thus the way of life separated as well. Towns and cities offered a different order of things, different society and lifestyle. The city way of life has remained unchanged for centuries. Cities have lately experienced dramatic population growth. More than a half of global population lives in cities, and it seems we haven't seen the climax yet. This means the cities have to absorb the ever increasing numbers. And they often solve the problem by expanding across their former borders. Especially in the 20th century the cities were very eagerly spreading into the countryside, with decrease of population density within, which was accompanied by a number of side effects. Today the world realizes the need for remedy and change of direction. It is clear that the last century's strategies have been exhausted. It is necessary to look for new approaches to developing our cities.

But the situation in the Central Europe with its deeply rooted red tape management tradition is developing slowly. And Prague is no exception. The idea of extensive (linear) development as planned earlier still persists, despite the fact it has not corresponded to the status and needs of current society.

To avoid the looming crisis it is essential to change direction. We are at the stage of city transformation. There is no other data source than studying the situation and revealing the development that resulted in it. If we are aware of the steps taken in the past to create the present, we can become active creators of the future.

We assume the presented topic will lead to re-assessment of the concept of work with the city in the 21st century.
Lessons learned from city disintegration

When developing the plan, current European city with all of its key phenomena was analyzed: landscape, size, image and quality of life, third dimension - height as an information of cultural and economic potential, and identifying priorities leading to meaningful future. We think it is useful to mention the lesson learned from arranging development and transformation zones right at the beginning, from processing the natural phenomena, public spaces and image of Prague in general. Many places in Prague are so diverse it makes definition of their character a real challenge. Similarly many spaces at the borderline of built-up and unbuilt areas have no clear designation, namely spatial one. When speaking about the borderland between the city and the landscape we use the term periphery. We don’t replace it with politically more correct terms like suburb. This is perhaps because we see not only the centre of problems, but also key opportunity for a change of attitude, as non-compromising vocabulary often leads to an unambiguous answer. And we need a clear answer to create a good and straightforward plan.

From the springboard of definition of typical urban structures we continued towards the description and names of smaller units - localities, from which core can be made of what can be reasonably planned, and initiate the development of centrifugal post-modern society. The character of localities is included in [► City boundaries and localities].

There is one topic, which has always been a taboo in conservative circles, related to the city’s potential and development discourse: third dimension of the city as a whole. This means its altitude image, described in [► Third dimension of the city]. All that completed not within the safety of theoretical musings, but on the example of the only real metropolis we have in the Czech Republic: Prague.

(...) In the current European context there are no visible needs or ambitions to create new cities. The existing cities and their suburbs have been going through unprecedented changes due to regulations. Instead of intensive utilisation of the limited space the cities are spreading extensively, washing out everything they cannot absorb with legislation. However, the inner city is no finished, definitive structure, but an ever-changing organism that needs new impulses from within to keep on living. Compact city does not mean creation of new borders, but opening up to the possibility of building within already built-in spaces. (...)
Lessons learned from other European cities

"New" urbanism and the new paradigm
When looking at the European cities and their planning it is clear that deviation from functional planning and expansion began already in the 1980s, and ways were sought how to make the best use of inner spaces. Czech urban planning responds to this, albeit very slowly. Although the Development Policy of the Czech Republic mentions principles of compact city creation and administration, the practical application and implementation is far from consistent, and is not manifested in actual planning documents. It's been proved that in the Western Europe with its established civil society the "restrictive spatial planning" was abandoned much earlier, and "new" (contemporary) urbanists were given green light. The level of success of the new urbanists is derived from the very interest in the urban composition at the expense of functional arrangement of space, symbolized by the coloured spots on maps, generating disintegration of the city through haphazard urban structures.\(^1\)

Therefore it is necessary to take into account the ever-changing modern society, where stability has to be found in the level of flexibility that allows improvisation and innovation, and is an inspiration in itself. This is the only way to discover the hidden potential.

Compact city
There are currently numerous studies, researches and papers dealing with the situation of cities, global population growth and societal demands in the 21st century. It is apparent that the old attitudes just won't do. This is why the topic of city planning and development is becoming one of the agendas for international institutions and organizations. Let's mention for instance OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development). Even this institution, more often than not mentioned only in relation to social-economic issues and analyses, focuses on the situation of metropolitan regions and urban development. From national and international levels it currently researches the level of cities. Its various analyses and studies claim that e.g. the policy of compact city creation is present to varying degree in a number of countries (as different as Australia, France or South Korea can be). OECD recommends several specific strategies to be adopted by cities in this respect. One of the main recommendations is to set clear - explicitly defined compact city objectives. Re-use of derelict zones is also stressed, as well as higher concentration of activities (literally from housing to high-end office space). "Intensification" of the existing urban environments has been mentioned as an efficient strategy. Of course it is necessary to support lively, high-quality and colourful city, and at the same time to clearly compensate for the possible negative phenomena connected to the higher concentration of activities and processes in the city. Support for top-quality concourses is just another recommendation given by OECD. The analysis provides detailed description of the benefits of compact city for sustainable development, including the positive effects on the environment - with wider focus than purely on the ecological aspects that are obviously incorporated.\(^2\)

\(^1\) Paraphrase according to Rein Geurtsen: History of European urbanism from Dutch perspective, 2009.
\(^2\) Paraphrase according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Compact city policy : Comparative evaluation, Green growth study, 2012.
Changed course

When defining the individually existing parts of urban structure, when describing and naming localities, when developing the matrix of public spaces and setting the admissible height levels other questions are raised. Questions gradually generating answers that will show the way how to stimulate the city. In particular if we find that most of the city area is taken by the periphery.

We continuously asked the following questions when preparing the methodology:

- Can the periphery be transformed into suburb and suburb into city?
- What do we have to start doing and stop doing in order to make the periphery a fully-fledged part of the city?
- How to define periphery as a necessary quality?
- How to prevent creeping transformation of the city into one big periphery with an open-air museum in the centre?
- What should be a city like in the twenty-first century?
- What development strategy should one choose?

The answers have provided a number of hints, and most likely will provide new ones in the future... And they can be rather surprising for many. Character of given city quarter (locality) cannot be changed by waving a magic wand. Where characters of certain areas are built on different attributes, these cannot be changed without fundamental modifications. This is most visible when defining public space. Free regulation line simply cannot be made into a closed line, even when applying disproportionate means. Border made by a fence does not equal border made by facade. Therefore the answer to the first question is no. There is no easy shift "one level up". Quality must be searched for in all the structures individually, and not mechanically. Even the loose structure of modern city has its undisputed values, albeit they differ from those in a "classical" city. Where possible efforts should be preferred aimed at development of an existing strength to total transformation with uncertain outcome. Answers to the other questions vary, and they basically depend on the last two questions. Having considered all possible alternatives and studied similar questions in various sources we formulated the following findings.

Contemporary city needs first of all clear and visible contrasts and higher density of activities. At the same times tendencies of "sustainable development" prevail, depending mostly on preservation of free landscape on one hand, and on economically optimal structure on the other hand. These tendencies have been defined repeatedly, also during the Architecture Biennale in Venice - the quotation is from 2006: „Going up, not out!“

3
The media conscious character of the new century requires adequate methods of self-realization and promotion of every entity. Perfect purity is not the most admired feature anymore. The liveliest areas are the densest ones. They are worth the visit. There it makes sense to see and be seen. „The phenomenon of a city and its lifestyle as we know it - that is currently the most precious and simultaneously the most endangered treasure.“

This is why all territorial development activities should strive to go back to the point where intuition meets statistics and the so-called scientific discourse. Both can be formulated in slogans:

Contrast + Density = Potential
which is in fact the same as

Going up, not out!

The strategy sums up the necessary change of direction, from expansion into surrounding landscape and creation of endless horizon of low sparse solitaires, seen mostly from a means of transport, towards accelerated development in the centre and namely in its immediate neighbourhood.

Turning from the support of non-contrast infinite sprawl that devours the landscape towards lively and colourful city as a distinct island in a free countryside.

---

3 Pavel Hnilička: More declarations like “Going up, not out!” could be found, for instance Munich City has been declaring the following slogan since 1980s: “Urban, compact, green”, and within Europe it is used as an example to follow with the best ratio of those moving in to the expanded city area. And true to the word – it has thickened the structure and “gone inside” since the 1930s.

City still needs clear spatial borders, even though it may seem that lightness of movement of people, material and information can eliminate the borders. “City can be normally developed only if it stays within its walls. Only then there will be proportion between real need and profligacy.”

City will exist as long as it is anchored by solid border within the landscape, while the landscape really starts on the city’s edge. To give up on this contrast means to give up on the existence of both: landscape and city.

The principle of contrast lies in setting main borders. Now borders can have a number of forms, but their result will be the possibility to unambiguously define buildable areas from unbuildable areas. This basic contrast has two aspects - internal and external. The principle of external contrast leads to preservation of the city as a cultural phenomenon within natural landscape, fundamentally stimulating increase of inner quality. The internal contrast will outline fullness and emptiness (public space borders). Where individual terms cannot be told apart there can be only gradual loss of both.

The external contrast is of key importance for initiation of the city's potential, while the internal contrast is of key importance for the city's composition.

City needs certain level of intensive development to exist and to give a frame to the innumerable human activities and an image to the city itself. It is necessary to allow the development to thicken and grow upwards according to natural needs and historical context. All city life activities should take place within, not unnecessarily around. There are more motivations for such arrangement, and can be summarized as follows: It is economically attractive, environmentally friendly and last but not least socially cohesive.

The principle of density lies in increasing the diversity and number of qualities inside the city. Increasing the density has two closely related forms: more diversified activities and thicker structure. Thickening of activities corresponds to elimination of zoning limits within the city structure. Using the present planning vocabulary one could speak of "overlays and mergers of functional areas", in particular towards the city centre. The same is sometimes helplessly expressed by the anti-term "areas with varied utilisation - mixed". Thickening of the structure is a natural property of cities as living organisms. It helps the organism to be more resistant to various fluctuations. While free regulation line is acceptable on the city's edges, it must be continuous in the centre.

Thus minimum limits should be set in the city centre instead of maximum limits. Density also means for example new definition of the very questionable height limits. However, denser structure does not in itself result in higher qualities of urban life without parallel thickening of major live activities.
City comprises a number of natural "flaws". Spaces that in a way "outlived themselves" and are open to radical transformation, as well as many areas that have remained empty for some reason, even though they should be developed. Plan should support permanent renewal of urban wholeness within the intended composition defined by the plan. The main purpose of the plan should be to look for such places on the basis of contrast and density.

The principle of potential lies in setting up the combination of all plan parameters into minimum regulation so that maximum utilisation of all possibilities is pursued. The key is namely removal of pointless ideological and technocratic limitations. Specifically it is necessary to define contrast and density in the centre's neighbourhood in order not only to preserve the values, but also develop and advance them. Unfortunately the initiation so far has been basically focused on mere extensive growth. This leads to expanding periphery that moves towards the centre as well due to regulations. The cure to ailments of the periphery can be found most of all in the centre. Instead of the persistent rejection of increased density and diversity in the city centre that resulted in meeting similar needs in the periphery it is necessary to release the potential close to the centre.

Discovering the dormant potential should result in a definition of methods of recycling and revitalizing the city as a whole.

Recycling (process of introducing the old structures into a new cycle) differs from reconstruction (where something that already existed is rebuilt) and rehabilitation (where derelict building is improved). Urban recycling means the beginning of a new cultural physical, economic and social cycle in the city. Recycling means to accept the fact that something has reached the end of its life cycle and new cycle has to begin, based on the current situation. Recycling culture, the 21st century phenomenon, is different from rehabilitation culture typical for the late 20th century, whose aim was to improve something of value in its own time, to be after a period of neglect restored to the original condition. The recycling allows to build upon the existing foundations (does not require creation or import of new products), changing them into a material coherent in itself. History and culture of a place is the basic platform on which a new cycle begins. Urban recycling does not impact only on the physical aspects, but also on the behaviour of inhabitants, new approach of the administration and development of new economy. Recycling equals innovation.

Definition of transformation and development areas

One of the important tasks for the Metropolitan Plan is to define what shall be unambiguous, so that the flexibility described in the opening chapters has a foundation to rest on. This means namely to find and define clear (corresponding to the reality and needs of the city) borderline between the built-up area and unbuilt area, and of course between the buildable area and unbuildable area. To proceed further, it is necessary first to define key terms - stabilized, transformation and development area. Built-up and unbuilt areas (urban and landscape areas and their structures) can be divided according to the expected level of changes (stability) as follows:

A  stabilized, with the assumption of preservation of the current character, and with the possibility to partially modify and change while preserving the character,

B  transformation, with the assumption of larger modifications, or change of the existing character,

C  development, with the assumption of major change of character by establishing new urban and landscape structure.

For more details of the individual terms and description of the frequently mentioned documents see [Glossary].

The prerequisite of a meaningful and beneficial specification of development and transformation localities or their parts is an assessment of development processes following the Master Plan of the Capital City of Prague from 1999, and the Concept of the Master Plan of the Capital City of Prague from 2009. The topic of existing and proposed localities is elaborated in more detail in [City boundaries and localities]. Thus it is important to prepare a source document that will enable an evaluation of the existing potential of areas designated for development both within the city and outside, allow to identify areas with development and transformation potential, and to point out the areas without major development potential, whose utilisation would reduce the viability of the entire urban organism. The decision whether an area is a transformation or a development one is based on its location as compared to the borderline of built-up area (according to the procedure defined by Act No. 183/2006 Coll.) [Topography, landscape and parks].
In general, the areas inside the built-up area borderline are designated as transformation areas. The areas outside the built-up area borderline are designated as development areas.

The importance of development areas can be easily imagined in localities and areas within the urban structure. Landscape structure is different from the urban one, therefore development in the natural landscape means a completely different process than that inside urban localities. In the specific case of development areas (parts) that are unbuildable and located according to the present definitions within built-up area, the development will mean exclusively an improvement of the status of landscape, natural and recreational values.

To provide relevant evaluation of potential of individual areas it is necessary to describe the given areas by their character and location, by the prevailing current and proposed land use.

From the viewpoint of prevailing method of land use and overall load the urban areas (buildable) will be evaluated and described. According to the approved specifications of the Metropolitan Plan these are urban production, urban residential and urban recreational areas. In these areas (localities or their parts) construction activities are expected, as well as change of their character (of both arrangement and utilisation) - a change that usually has an effect on the load.

On the contrary natural landscape, recreational landscape and production landscape areas will not be evaluated, because these are basically unbuildable areas. For more on the unbuildable transformation and development areas see [Topography, landscape and parks].

In this material definition and basic evaluation is provided of the transformation and development areas that are and will be further assessed by the Office of Strategy and Development of IPR. To complete the evaluations described in this material it was necessary to translate the existing utilisation terminology of the original planning documents to the Metropolitan Plan language, therefore the following sections deal with the process of definition, naming and grouping of transformation and development areas to larger territorial units to be further evaluated.

---

**Fig. 3: Scheme of transformation area**
Specification procedure

**Resources**
When specifying the transformation and the development areas, Office of the Metropolitan plan had two groups of resources: Initial descriptions of the character of municipal precincts prepared by municipal districts in 2013, and the "inheritance" of previous planning documents. The areas described in both resources were equally analyzed. The planned extensive growth of the city outside into the landscape that has been incorporated in the planning documents in the long term is currently in sharp contrast with the possibilities the city and its inhabitants have available. That is why at this stage of Metropolitan Plan preparation we decided to deal with the "inherited" areas first. Only after solution is found to the situation it will be possible to discuss other transformation and development areas mentioned by some municipal districts in their initial assumptions. All the development and transformation areas were thus specified only on the basis of analytical and planning documents elaborated so far.

**Transformation areas**
were created by gradual amalgamation of following layers:

1. Large development areas from Plan '99* are key localities for future development of the city. In these areas it is necessary - prior to permitting new development - to review the overall concept by means of a more detailed planning documentation (regulatory plan) or study.

2. Reconstruction areas according to the analytical documents from 2012 are areas whose original functions gradually and inevitably disappear, or have been already lost.

3. Transformation and development areas from Plan '99 are areas or corridors marked as such in IPR sources.

4. Territorial reserves from Plan '99 are areas or corridor specified for the purpose of review of future utilisation. Their utilisation so far shall not be modified in a way that would prohibit or complicate the reviewed future use.

5. Transformation and development areas from Concept 2009 are areas or corridors marked as such in IPR sources.

6. Territorial reserves from Concept 2009 are usually larger areas or corridors of higher than local importance, reviewed for possible future use.

7. Transformation and development areas from Concept 2009 2nd variant - areas or corridors marked as such in IPR sources.

8. Areas without use according to surveys for analyses performed in 2014 are areas or corridors defined in field survey from 2013.

**Development areas**
created by amalgamation of the following layers (hierarchically arranged):

1. **Proposed areas from Plan '99** are areas or corridors with proposed functional use in Plan '99.
2. **Territorial reserves from Plan '99** (definition see above)
3. **Proposed areas from Concept 2009** are areas or corridors with proposed functional use including the areas proposed for realization at the stage incorporated in the basic draft of Concept 2009.
4. **Territorial reserves from Concept 2009** (definition see above)
5. **Proposed areas from Concept 2009** are areas or corridors with proposed functional use including the areas proposed for realization at the stage incorporated in the variant draft of Concept 2009 - 2nd variant.

**Revision of areas from Concept 2009**

As the Concept 2009 was developed in two variants, some solutions were defined as optional. Following the public hearing on the Concept in late 2009 the author in cooperation with appointed member of the municipal assembly prepared draft instructions for new master plan, including the proposed decision on final variant. For this purpose so-called source material was prepared for Draft decision on the selection of final variant. This source material includes recommended variant on the basis of assessment of the impact on sustainable development, recommendations of the project designer with regards to comments by authorities concerned during the public hearing, resulting recommendation and rationale. The source material for Draft decision on the selection of final variant was completed in February 2012, and subsequently handed over to the principal: Department of Development Planning of Prague City Hall (today Building and Land Use Planning Department).

Considering the above-mentioned facts the Office of the Metropolitan Plan finds this document sufficient, and the variant areas from Concept 2009 were reviewed on its basis. This means only the resulting variant was included in the present evaluation.

**Specification of transformation and development areas**

The process of specification of transformation and development areas was analogical, with tiny differences described on the following pages.

In general, as the first step buildable areas were collected (from the sources mentioned above). Line elements of transport and technical infrastructure were removed from the developable areas. This is because the Metropolitan Plan sees them differently from other spatial elements. The transport line elements are parts of public space or landscape, and the technical infrastructure line elements are utilities "serving" the city. The location itself is seldom made of these elements

*To simplify the language the frequently mentioned documents in this material will be referred to as follows:

— **Plan '99** = Master Plan of the Capital City of Prague from 1999
— **Concept 2009** = Master Plan of the Capital City of Prague - 1st variant from 2009
— **Concept 2009** = Master Plan of the Capital City of Prague - 2nd variant from 2009
— **ÚAP 2012** = analytical documents for the Capital City of Prague – update 2012
— **ÚAP 2014** = analytical documents for the Capital City of Prague – update 2012
Another common step for both types of areas was classification and revision. The Metropolitan Plan is the first plan to lead the developed area borderline along the boundaries of individual plots of land – for more see [► City boundaries and localities]. Small areas resulting from the difference between the developed area borderline defined by the Metropolitan Plan and the previous planning documents whose size does not allow full-value transformation or development and achievement of the proposed land use were thus omitted. On the other hand line transport elements, public spaces and greenery elements were incorporated that would otherwise divide compact areas into smaller non-logical units. This was a deliberate process aimed at showing the size of areas influenced by future development and transformation.

TRANSFORMATION AREAS

Transformation areas were defined on the basis of developable lands identified in the above-mentioned documents, located inside the built-up area. No hierarchy was defined in the planning documents for the transformation areas; they were summarily identified as "unstable" areas (with expected larger modifications or changes of the current character) - opposite of stabilized areas.

Apart from the procedure described above one of the steps taken was sorting and review of the transformation areas according to the present situation.

TRANSFORMATION AREAS (3,880 ha)
The layout illustrates built-up area in the Capital City of Prague defined by the Office of the Metropolitan Plan as of 16 November 2013. The red vertical hatching marks "unstable" areas specified only on the basis of analytical and planning documents elaborated so far.
**DEVELOPMENT AREAS**

Development areas were defined on the basis of buildable lands identified in the above-mentioned documents, located outside the built-up areas. One of fundamental differences of working with development areas is preservation of the information on the source. The information should serve as a tool helping the work with development areas, in particular the discussion on their preservation or reduction and subsequent creation of proposed locations.

Apart from omitting the areas resulting from different definitions of built-up area borderline the areas already used as planned were not included into our evaluation. On the contrary small parts of unbuildable functional areas were included that remained between the defined built-up areas and buildable zones. In these cases the development areas are linked to the built-in area borderline.

---

**DEVELOPMENT AREAS (3,780 ha)**

The layout illustrates built-up area in the Capital City of Prague defined by the Office of the Metropolitan Plan as of 16 November 2013. The red horizontal hatching marks development areas specified only on the basis of analytical and planning documents elaborated so far. The development areas are shown by individual sources. Statistics:

- Proposed development areas from Plan 99 = 2,150 ha (57 % of the total)
- Reserve development areas from Plan 99 = 1,100 ha (29 % of the total)
- Proposed development areas from Concept 2009 = 410 ha (11 % of the total)
- Reserve development areas from Concept 2009 = 80 ha (2 % of the total)
- Proposed development areas from 2nd variant of Concept 2009 = 40 ha (1 % of the total)
Definition of load

As the last step all the development and transformation areas were assigned loads according to the proposed use in the source documentation. The so-called functional use of areas was transferred into the load system in the Metropolitan Plan. This transfer is illustrated by the diagrams on the next page. Functional areas from the valid master plan marked as VN - not disturbing production and services and the functional areas from Concept 2009 marked as SMV - general mixed or SMN mixed non-production represent special cases. Utilisation of these zones is often between the production and residential load. The areas were provisionally assigned higher load, i.e. production. The loads there should be discussed and perceived in a wider context of the territory.

For larger transformation areas consisting of functional zones with different loads the prevailing load was selected. Only in cases where areas with different loads could influence the boundaries of proposed locations the areas were divided, and each part assigned respective load.

Areas from Concept 2009 were processed analogically.
The PRODUCTION load was applied mostly to the following areas: transport infrastructure areas - communications (DK), transport infrastructure areas except the communications (DP), production areas (PR), technical infrastructure areas (TI), mixed areas - not disturbing production and services (SM), mixed areas - general mix (SM), agricultural and plant growing areas - agricultural land (PZ).
The RESIDENTIAL load was applied mostly to the following areas: housing areas (OB), public amenities (VV), mixed areas except the not disturbing production and services, generally mixed areas and sport compounds, multifunction arenas (SM).
The areas with following codes were transferred to RECREATIONAL load: sport areas (SP), recreational areas (RP), park zones (ZP), non-forest areas except meadows and pastures (ZN), mixed areas - sport compounds, multifunction arenas (SM).
The areas with following codes were transferred to LANDSCAPE load: forest areas (ZL), agricultural and plant growing areas - except agricultural land (PZ), non-forest areas (ZN).
Evaluation and classification of transformation and development areas

Prague has 3,880 hectares of transformation areas and 3,780 hectares of development areas – all this just in Plan '99, Concept 2009 and UAP. No other areas have been included in these figures, as they are viewed by the Office of the Metropolitan Plan as unstable.

It means we need to start asking whether Prague really needs and wants all those areas, and possibly which are more useful and beneficial for the capital. That is why we performed sorting and assessment of all the areas, which should help us to make qualified decisions on these zones.

When preparing this section the Office of the Metropolitan Plan cooperated with the Office of Strategy and Development and the Office of Infrastructure. Following joint meetings comprehensive system of evaluation criteria was established.

Total of 30 criteria were defined so as to include all sections of the plan into the evaluation. Due to the large number of developments and transformations and the quantity of criteria the evaluation is ongoing. However, to be able to ask questions related to the next steps and approach to the inherited development and transformation zones, this material includes at least example of the evaluation system. The complex system of criteria is represented here by only 6 items, and the number of areas evaluated was limited by their size. Only those areas are presented whose size exceeds 30 ha. Yet IPD will continue detailed evaluation using all 30 criteria for all the development and transformation areas.

**SIX SELECTED EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

- City
- Share of public ownership (expressed as percentage of the capital city's, municipal districts' and state's ownership to other owners).
- Development potential
- Landscape
- Availability of capacity transport infrastructure
- Availability of capacity technical infrastructure

*explanations and evaluation of the criteria are in the text below.*
Grouping of transformation and development areas

For the purpose of evaluation of development and transformation areas these were grouped into larger territorial units. The areas were grouped especially by spatial connections and contexts, and according to the planned future character and use. As regards the largest areas staging of future construction works was also considered.

The development areas enhancing the city's territory were grouped namely according to their links to adjacent built-up areas. Areas surrounding smaller settlements in the landscape were then grouped by cadastral identification with individual settlements. These development areas were indexed by letter "m".

The basic criterion for grouping of transformation areas was their location in localities with similar character. Where the transformation area overlapped into more localities, or on the contrary took just part of the areas within one locality, the spatial context was considered, as well as the planned future character and load. Large areas with the expected lowest (recreational) load were not included in the transformation areas.

This procedure defined 34 development and 19 transformation areas, whose size equals or exceeds 30 ha. These are important "unstable" areas in Prague with high potential. By percentage these transformation areas take 33 % of all transformation areas, and development areas take 70 % of all development areas. Thus there are 1,290 ha of important transformation areas in developed parts of Prague, hardly to be filled at present, and outside the built-up area Plan '99 and Concept 2009 have already identified 2,640 ha of important development areas.

FIG. 6
Transformation (T) and development (R) areas in numbers
Transformation Areas

T 01 Bohdalec ........................................... 204 ha
T 02 Vysočany ........................................... 163 ha
T 03 Smíchovské nádraží ................................ 106 ha
T 04 Bubny-Holešovice ................................ 78 ha
T 05 Letňany I ............................................. 77 ha
T 06 Přední Počernice ..................................... 72 ha
T 07 Výzkumný ústav Běchovice ....................... 67 ha
T 08 Uhříněves ............................................... 59 ha
T 09 Rohanský ostrov-Palmovka ....................... 59 ha
T 10 Stodůlky ................................................ 54 ha
T 11 Jinonice ................................................ 54 ha
T 12 Nákladové nádraží Žižkov ......................... 49 ha
T 13 Letňany II .............................................. 45 ha
T 14 Zličín II ............................................... 39 ha
T 15 Zličín I ................................................ 34 ha
T 16 Belárie .................................................. 34 ha
T 17 Ruzyně I ............................................... 32 ha
T 18 Hostivař ............................................... 30 ha
T 19 Ruzyně II .............................................. 30 ha

Development Areas

R 01 Východní Město II .................................... 214 ha
R 02 Jihozápadní Město II ................................ 173 ha
R 03 Východní Město I ...................................... 168 ha
R 04 Jihozápadní Město I ................................... 164 ha
R 05 Horní Počernice ........................................ 155 ha
R 06 Barrandov-Slivenec ................................ 152 ha
R 07 Letiště Václava Havla .............................. 149 ha
R 08 Lipence .................................................. 140 ha
R 09 Uhříněves I ............................................ 102 ha
R 10 Dolní Počernice ...................................... 90 ha
R 11 Letiště Kbely / Letňany ............................. 83 ha
R 12 Březiněves ............................................. 76 ha
R 13 Ďáblice .................................................. 68 ha
R 14 Jahodnice ............................................... 64 ha
R 15 Klánovice ............................................... 56 ha
R 16 Benice ................................................... 55 ha
R 17 Běchovice .............................................. 54 ha
R 18 Újezd u Prahy ........................................... 54 ha
R 19 Divčí Hradiště ......................................... 51 ha
R 20 Kolovraty ............................................... 49 ha
R 21 Dolní Chabry .......................................... 44 ha
R 22 Pitkovice ............................................... 44 ha
R 23 Nebušice ............................................... 42 ha
R 24 Újezd nad Lesy ......................................... 42 ha
R 25 Horní Počernice produkce ......................... 41 ha
R 26 Cholupice .............................................. 41 ha
R 27 Písnice ................................................... 39 ha
R 28 Černý Most ............................................. 36 ha
R 29 Křeslice ................................................ 35 ha
R 30 Výzkumný ústav Běchovice ....................... 35 ha
R 31 Čakovice ................................................. 33 ha
R 32 Miškovice ............................................... 32 ha
R 33 U Letňanského lesoparku ......................... 32 ha
R 34 Šebrov .................................................... 30 ha

Larger territorial units grouped of transformation areas
Larger territorial units grouped of development areas
Transformation areas
Transformation areas
Evaluation diagram

**City**
This criterion assesses the character and quality of the place. Its opposite pole is the transport, representing structural level together with the landscape. It is evaluated on scale of 1 to 6, where 6 represents area enhancing the city and decisive for its composition.

**Development Potential**
Together with the City criterion it describes an image of the area and its development. It is evaluated on scale of 1 to 6, where 6 is given to the areas with the highest average coefficient of floor area.

**Availability of capacity technical infrastructure**
Together with the "Availability of capacity transport infrastructure" makes "legs" of the diagram. Where the legs are strong, the area has a good development potential. On the scale 1 to 6 the highest number of points is given to the areas with the best availability, where no further investments are necessary.
**Landscape**
The landscape criterion is an opposite pole of technical infrastructure. The criterion is evaluated on scale of 1 to 6, where 6 means an area not overlapping into metropolitan parks or green belt.

**Share of Public Ownership**
A given related to the plan. Together with the development potential these two represent the strategic and planning level. The criterion is evaluated on scale of 1 to 6, where 6 is given to the areas with the highest share of public ownership.

**Availability of Capacity Transport Infrastructure**
Together with the "Availability of capacity technical infrastructure" represents the infrastructural level. On the scale 1 to 6 the highest number of points is given to the areas with the best availability of capacity transport, where no further investments are necessary.

**FIG. 7: HOW TO READ DIAGRAMS**

- City of good quality, but in need of investments in its infrastructure
- Infrastructural readiness, but colliding with the landscape, or failing to bring the desired quality
- Area of high quality and potential and possibility to “be controlled” by the city


- **R01** Východní Město II
- **R02** Jihozápadní Město II
- **R04** Jihozápadní Město I
- **R05** Horní Počernice
- **R06** Barrandov-Slivenec
- **R07** Letiště Václava Havla
- **R08** Lipence
- **R09** Uhříněves I
- **R10m** Dolní Počernice
- **R11** Letiště Kbely / Letňany
- **R12m** Březiněves
- **R13m** Ďáblice
- **R14** Jahodnice
- **R15m** Klánovice
- **R16m** Benice
- **R17m** Běchovice
- **R18m** Běchovice
- **R19** Dívčí Hrady
- **R21m** Dolní Chabry
- **R20m** Kolovraty
- **R22m** Pitkovice
- **R23m** Nebušice
- **R25** Horní Počernice produkce
- **R26m** Cholupice
- **R27m** Písnice
- **R28** Černý Most
- **R29m** Křeslice
- **R30** Výzkumný ústav Běchovice
- **R31m** Čakovice
- **R32m** Miškovice
- **R33** U letňanského lesoparku
- **R24m** Újezd nad Lesy

- **T01** Bohdalec
- **T02** Vysočany
- **T04** Bubny-Holešovice
- **T05** Letňany I
- **T06** Paběnice
- **T07** Výzkumný ústav Běchovice
- **T08** Uhříněves
- **T09** Rohanský ostrov-Palmovka
- **T10** Stodůlky
- **T11** Jinonice
- **T12** Nákladové nádraží Žižkov
- **T13** Letňany II
- **T14** Zličín II
- **T15** Zličín I
- **T16** Belárie
- **T17** Ruzyně I
- **T18** Hostivař
- **T19** Ruzyně II
- **T20m** Kolovraty
- **T21m** Dolní Chabry
- **T22m** Pitkovice
- **T23m** Nebušice
- **T24m** Újezd nad Lesy
- **T25** Horní Počernice produkce
- **T26m** Cholupice
- **T27m** Písnice
- **T28** Černý Most
- **T29m** Křeslice
- **T30** Výzkumný ústav Běchovice
- **T31m** Čakovice
- **T32m** Miškovice
- **T33** U letňanského lesoparku
- **T34m** Šeberov
- **T35** Ruzyně II
- **T36** Hostivař
- **T37** Hostivař
FIG. 8: EVALUATION DIAGRAMS OF TRANSFORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT AREAS
Description of criteria and evaluation

**City**

When evaluating a city we mostly deal with the structure, morphology, character and quality of the environment. The criterion "City" assesses quality related to the entire city and the place itself, aiming at the architecture - how the city is built.

The evaluation is created to include the following three topical issues: importance of area within the city's composition, relation of the planned development to morphology and typology, and connection to transport systems.

The importance of area in city's composition expresses the expected benefit for the city's composition, or on the contrary which areas destroy the composition. The connections of planned development include suitability of the planned typology, and the level of utilisation (according to the proposed solutions in applicable documents) regarding the position within the city and the surrounding developments. The connection to transport systems evaluates the possible links to public transport systems, or communication network in a small scale with regards to the present conditions. Not every area, even with available transport systems nearby, is automatically accessible and passable towards the connection point.

**Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Evaluation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unsuitable for the city (destroying its composition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not beneficial for the city (does not improve its composition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neutral (not important for the composition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Making the city complete (can complete its composition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Supporting the city (conveniently completes its composition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strengthens the city (is decisive for its composition)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation**

It is clear that defined transformation areas achieve better results from the viewpoint of quality. But even among them there are areas whose contribution to the quality and architecture of the city is weaker (Výzkumný ústav Běchovice, Hostivař, Barrandov-Slivenec, Benice, Dívčí Hrady, Pitkovice).

On the other hand some areas prove to be of key importance for the city's composition, layout and utilisation (Ruzyně I, Smíchov railway station, Bubny-Holešovice, Rohanský ostrov-Palmovka, Jinonice, Zličín I, Kbely/Letňany Airport, Václav Havel Airport).

Of the total 34 evaluated development areas the score 1 to 3 is recorded in 13 cases that represent 47% of the total size of all development areas larger than 30 ha. 21 areas evenly distributed around the capital's territory received good scores.

Of the total 19 evaluated transformation areas the score 1 to 3 is recorded in just 2 cases that represent 8% of the total size of all transformation areas larger than 30 ha.

---

**Poznámka**

Při návrhu budou stanoveny jiné návrhové hodnoty, nyní hodnotíme území podle ukazatelů z platných dokumentací, zejména Plánu '99.
**Share of public ownership**

This criterion assesses the share of public ownership, i.e. aggregate value of ownership of the capital city of Prague, of municipal districts, state and its organisations, or regional properties.

This analysis was carried out from data sources of the Spatial Information Section. The resulting shares were subsequently evaluated on scale of 1 to 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>SHARE OF PUBLIC OWNERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 – 15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15 – 30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30 – 50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50 – 70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>70 – 100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation: The share of public ownership in 34 identified development areas (size exceeding 30 ha) achieved 27.8%. Considering only the areas exclusively owned by the capital city, their share is 15.6% (after adding the ownership and co-ownership of the municipal districts there is only minimum change - 15.9%).

The values of public property share (all forms) are very differentiated among individual development areas. The most common - almost one third group is the development areas where the public ownership share is between 5 and 15%. In four development areas (of total 34) this share is lower than 5% and in 7 areas the share is more than half. Lands within the development area Výzkumný ústav Běchovice are even owned exclusively by the public sector - of this the capital city of Prague about 90% (do not confuse with the transformation area Výzkumný ústav Běchovice, where the public sector owns less than ten per cent). The second highest share of public ownership is recorded in the strategically important development zone of Václav Havel Airport, where the public sector owns 72% of the area (even though the capital city including its municipal districts owns less than 1%).

Representation of public ownership in the development areas is comparable to the transformation areas. In total for all the transformation areas the share of public ownership is 34.1%, being higher by about 6%. However, expressed differently the average score based on the scale of 1 to 6 was 3.1% with the development areas, and one tenth of per cent higher with the transformation areas. Considering only the category of hundred per cent ownership by the capital city the difference of average score would be slightly higher with the development areas (2.3 to 2.0%).
Development potential defines maximum possible level of space consumption. Because at the moment we assess only the areas included in Plan 99 and Concept 2009, the space consumption potential is also calculated according to coefficients from the documents.

It was established for development areas from average coefficient of floor area (hereinafter KPP), based on relevant data in Plan 99 and Concept 2009. In the event of some area without coefficient the figure was used corresponding to the character of the planned development. Subsequently KPP was re-calculated to average KPP for the entire area, i.e. including the unbuildable areas within the territory.

For transformation areas the procedure was different, because KPP according to relevant sources was only for 57% of the areas. That is why KPP from Concept 2009 was used for all the areas. Both the coefficients were then compared, and where they did not differ considerably the higher one was used. Where they differed the position of the area was considered, as well as coefficient of adjacent areas and planned character of development according to the relevant documentation. Subsequently KPP was re-calculated to average KPP for the entire area. The evaluation scale was set from the highest value KPP 3.2 defined in Plan '99, which received the highest score of 6 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>SPACE CONSUMPTION POTENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5 – 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0 – 1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5 – 1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0 – 2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 – 3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation: The space consumption potential evaluation showed that the transformation areas from the viewpoint of maximum possible development manifest higher potential than the development areas. This is also shown in the comparison of average KPP, which is 0.98% with the transformation areas and only 0.54% with the development areas. And yet 58% of the transformation areas have KPP lower than 1.0. It is evident that in the transformation areas average KPP is very low considering their position and character, not corresponding to the neighbouring localities. The highest space consumption potential is in the areas of Bubny-Holešovice, Rohanský ostrov-Palmovka and Ruzyně I. The lowest space consumption potential is in the development areas of smaller settlements, such as Klánovice, Lipence or Křeslice, where it is less than 30%.
The "Landscape" criterion considers the influence of planned developments and transformations on the existing and planned landscape concept. At that moment we evaluated to what extent the development and transformation areas affect green belt and metropolitan parks (definitions of green belt and metropolitan parks see [Topography, landscape and parks]). This criterion will also be represented by ÚSES (territorial system of ecological stability) in the plan. According to the share of areas colliding with the boundaries and parks (hereinafter landscape) the areas were given scores of 1 to 6. 6 points means the area does not collide with landscape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80 – 100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60 – 79 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40 – 59 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 – 39 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 – 19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 – 4 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation: On the basis of completed evaluation it can be claimed that the transformation areas have more positive effect on landscape value protection than the development areas. 19 transformation areas (95% of the area of selected transformation areas) do not collide with green belt or metropolitan parks. On the contrary there are only 12 development areas in the first category (46% of selected development zones area). As regards more detailed evaluation of development areas, apart from the aforementioned 12 areas 9 other areas collide with landscape by less than half of their area. On contrary 13 zones representing 49% from the selected development areas collide with landscape by more than half of their area. 10 of them (29% from the selected development areas) collide with landscape by more than 81% of their area. The most serious collisions between landscape and development were recorded with Dívčí Hrady, Čakovice, U Letňany forest park, Šeberov, Jahodnice and Východní Město I.
**Availability of capacity transport infrastructure**

The defined development and transformation areas from the viewpoint of transport availability were divided in 6 categories by connection to subway, higher level communication network, trams, suburban rail transport and their combinations. For detailed description of the categories and evaluation table see [Movement of people and goods].

**Evaluation:**

As regards capacity railway transport coverage, specifically within 800 m from subway station entrance or 600 m from tram/suburban railway stop, the following can be stated: From 19 large transformation reas larger than 30 ha 17 have available capacity railway public transport, 12 have capacity railway public transport availability higher than 50 %, and of those 12 one half (i.e. 6 areas) have full coverage 100: Bubny-Holešovice, Smíchov railway station, Vysočany, Rohanský island - Palmovka, Jinonice and Belárie. From 34 large development zones larger than 30 ha only 12 have available capacity railway public transport, and mere 3 have capacity railway public transport availability higher than 50 %: Kbely / Letňany Airport, Jihozápadní Město I and Dívčí Hrady.

Of the area 1,286 ha of 19 large transformation areas over 30 ha there are currently about 65% served by capacity railway public transport, i.e. some 840 ha, while approx. 440 ha is not covered.

Of the area 2,643 ha of 34 large development areas over 30 ha there are currently about 12% served by capacity railway public transport, i.e. some 320 ha, while approx. 2,320 ha is not covered.

**Availability of capacity technical infrastructure**

This criterion assesses how the development and transformation areas are covered by technical infrastructure networks. Individual areas were evaluated with regards to water supply, sewerage, central heating, natural gas, electric power and connection to electronic communications in 4 basic categories. The result was weighted average that was subsequently divided in levels of 1 to 6 so that the results can be compared. For detailed description and evaluation table see [Movement of Utilities].

**Evaluation:**

The evaluation of technical infrastructure availability shows that none of the assessed areas made it into category 6. It is not so simple in zones larger than 30 ha. Another clear result: transformation areas are less demanding as regards technical infrastructure services than the development areas. Concerning the transformation areas the most problematic situation of drinking water supply is in the southeastern city quarters, namely in Uhříněves. The situation with development areas is varied, none of them was classified in two top categories 5 and 6. 10 areas were evaluated as easier serviceable (category 4), which equals about 30%.
The scheme shows development and transformation areas larger than 30 ha and their evaluation in a radar chart.

[ base map: Technical map of Prague – buildings / IPR, 2013 ]

Red: Transformation and development areas ≥ 30 ha
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE %</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>PUB. OWNERSHIP %</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>TRANSP.</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>DEVELOP. POTENTIAL KPP</th>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T 01</td>
<td>Bohdaleně</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 02</td>
<td>Vysočany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,01</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 03</td>
<td>Smíchovské nádraží</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 04</td>
<td>Bubny-Holešovice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,51</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 05</td>
<td>Letňany I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 06</td>
<td>Paběnice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,46</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 07</td>
<td>Výzkumný ústav Běchovice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,64</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 08</td>
<td>Uhříněves</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 09</td>
<td>Rohanský ostrov-Palmovka</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 10</td>
<td>Stodůlky</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,91</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 11</td>
<td>Jinonice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,51</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 12</td>
<td>Nákladové nádraží Žižkov</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 13</td>
<td>Letňany II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 14</td>
<td>Zličín II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 15</td>
<td>Zličín I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 16</td>
<td>Belárie</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 17</td>
<td>Ruzyně I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 18</td>
<td>Hostivař</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 19</td>
<td>Ruzyně II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of Development Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT AREAS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE EVALUATION</th>
<th>PUB. OWNERSHIP EVALUATION</th>
<th>TRANSP.</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>DEVELOP. POTENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R 01</td>
<td>Východní Město II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 02</td>
<td>Jihozápadní Město II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 03</td>
<td>Východní Město I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 04</td>
<td>Jihozápadní Město I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 05</td>
<td>Horní Počernice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 06</td>
<td>Barrandov-Slivenec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 07</td>
<td>Letiště Václava Havla</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 08</td>
<td>Lipence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 09</td>
<td>Uhříněves I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 10</td>
<td>m Dolní Počernice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 11</td>
<td>m Letiště Kbely / Letňany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 12</td>
<td>m Březiněves</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 13</td>
<td>m Dáblíce</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 14</td>
<td>m Jahodnice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 15</td>
<td>m Klánovice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 16</td>
<td>m Benice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 17</td>
<td>m Běchovice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 18</td>
<td>m Újezd u Prahy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 19</td>
<td>m Dívčí Hrady</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 20</td>
<td>m Kolovraty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 21</td>
<td>m Dolní Chabry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 22</td>
<td>m Pitkovice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 23</td>
<td>m Nebušice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 24</td>
<td>m Újezd nad Lesy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 25</td>
<td>m Horní Počernice produkce</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 26</td>
<td>m Cholupice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 27</td>
<td>m Pišnice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 28</td>
<td>m Černý Most</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 29</td>
<td>m Křeslice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 30</td>
<td>m Výzkumný ústav Běchovice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 31</td>
<td>m Čakovice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 32</td>
<td>m Miškovice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 33</td>
<td>m U Letňanského lesoparku</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 34</td>
<td>m Šebeřov</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As our civilization grew we have replaced the basic evolution axiom - what does not evolve starts to decompose or die - with the idea of what does not develop is doomed. We have replaced the natural evolution that always means qualitative movement forward, but also may have inherent tendency to reduce quantity, or even apparent stillness related to building up structures not visible under the surface, with development based solely on increasing quantitative indicators. We have fallen for the illusion that extensive development is "good", leading us and the entire civilization in the "right" direction.

Using the value systems that provide the basis of our civilization we are sure that everything will be "good" if we do thing "right". This deeply rooted belief in good end (salvation) does not enable us to do real evaluation of the consequences of some "good" ideas and decisions conceived in the past.

The sooner we realize we have no claim for a happy end and that we ourselves create the future with the decisions we are making now, the bigger our chance to change the adverse developments. Enough examples have been provided of the results of extensive development policies - we can see them all around.

We have presented the development and transformation areas taken from plans made very recently. Their abundance is quite striking, even more so considering the stagnating population and low level of internal and external migration. We are facing the challenge of realistic evaluation of how big development our city truly needs, and whether it is desirable to continue the extensive expansion. The presented evaluation shall open a debate. It is necessary to keep asking what is the potential of development for the city and its inhabitants. It is necessary to think about where to direct the scarce resources and energies, and whether to create immense burden for future generations in the costs of maintenance of inefficiently spread-out city.
To be aware of our responsibility for the future we are creating by our decisions is an important aspect of understanding the context of development and transformation areas. Awareness of the need for having a plan where the fundamental decisions are embedded. Therefore the Metropolitan Plan cannot be finished before the questions asked in the introduction are answered, and before decisions are made on the future direction of the city.

Prague and its inhabitants have a unique opportunity to evaluate the last quarter-century development and think hard on which side of the scales they will place their weight, and where to direct the city's development in the next decades. This material intentionally never mentions what should be done. Yet it clearly specifies what to take into account, and that without clear decision there is no hope of change of the present direction.
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What is the potential of Prague in the twenty-first century? What is the potential of a city in crisis? Potential at a time of limited resources lies in concentration, aiming and focus. In setting the priorities that will apply in the long term. Priorities do not lie in establishing what to do first, but rather in deciding what can wait, or what not to do at all. When setting current priorities it is necessary to reflect the situation first and possibly review what is the result of the procedures applied so far, manifested in the approved plans and goals. Flexibility is a key word of recent years. Crisis always shows the way. The latest trends clearly demonstrate that “hard” planning based on “hard data” is an unstable and therefore vulnerable discipline. The only answer to the present fragmented way of life is to “be flexible”. Flexibility leads to stability.