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Abstract. The fast development of the Romania representative city – Bucharest was made up on the basis of some uneven urban politics; also it was underlined by the lack of the cohesion at microrurban level. All these are creating various problems with impact on the residential areas. In fact, the differentiated approach by the sector City Hall, Capital City Hall, actors involved in the urban process is allowing more and more the generation of segregative spaces of the city. The strong forces involved in those microrurban fractures are pressing on the image of the residential areas and they are diminishing rapidly the cohesion. The present approach on some aspects of nowadays Bucharest development is focusing on the segregation level in the residential space. Thus, the solutions for the urban problems of Bucharest are connected to the territorial cohesion European programmes. The segregation problems are analyzed through a deeper level, that of the spatial microstructures.

Rezumat. Segregare vs. coeziune la nivel microteritorial în București. Dezvoltarea accentuată a capitalei - București realizată în contextul lipsei de unitate a politicilor urbane și de absența coeziunii măsurilor la nivel microrurban conturează numeroase probleme. În fapt abordarea diferențiată la nivel de primărie de sector, primărie generală,actori implicați a permis formarea de păliere posibil segregative ale spațiului urban. Accentuarea acestor fracturi determină tot mai mult crearea de spații cu implicații negative în percepția socială și diminuarea factorilor catalizatori pentru zone rezidențiale în declin. Prin prezenta abordare încercăm să analizăm prin câteva repereteoretice, valențele segregative în spațiul rezidențial și cel conex. Rezolvarea problemelor urbane se poate realiza astfel în contextul de coeziune territorială, deoarece an ecația abordărilor segregative se omite importanța microstructurilor spațiale.
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INTRODUCTION

The Capital city of Bucharest has concentrated all through its evolution a multitude of advantages derived from its status, but also some inequities. Enhanced attractivity has brought in people accepting living conditions regardless of their quality, hoping situation would improve rapidly. Also, management of preferential investments directed towards developing certain areas of the city produced disfunctionalities of the territorial assembly and weakened the cohesion of various parts and components of the city.

The city was organized artificially at functional level and thus, the political factors from the communist regime has made up possible a city planning which was coherent as a whole, but it lacks the cohesion. At that moment planning next to another the residential areas with the industrial ones has appeared as a very good solution through which it was possible that Bucharest to rivalry with others European cities. Elements that make the system function as a whole have been neglected, specifically the connection between major
components and their respective subparts. By doing so, the relation between the inhabitant of the large urban estates and their needs has been gravely neglected. Transportation circuits have been operated in respects to central services and access to the working place. This means that people was considered only a working force and all their needs were planned to be implemented at a later stage, which in most cases never happened.

The spatial cohesion is negatively reflected by the microteritorial profile, though. That’s the interior of the large housing estates and the very interior of the urban center (see historical part of the Bucharest). Each of these subareas of the city has a 20 years old history of multiple problems.

The augmentation of numerous problems from Bucharest leads to gradual connection intensity decrease and to potentially segregational areas being traced. This process commences once the state regime is overthrown and the individual is granted greater liberty in organizing space, illicitly built and without clear functions (at least in the beginning) in the respective units of the city, constructions built sensenssly have produced ruptures in city transportation and negatively intensified population flows.

Still, judging from a holistic point of view, segregation appears there where zoning lacks continuity. Areas like Ferentari, the outskirts of Pantelimon, Colentina, Balta Alba, etc, located on the outskirts of the city had most to suffer from industrial space restructuring and the new planning.

If the segregation problem in particular is understood in terms of population, in geographical analysis we have to tend for those spatial disfunctionalities with consequences in territorial fragmentation. Countering this phenomenon, the UE programs have to facilitate every region to have access to the infrastructure in order to promote a social and economic cohesion, and spatial also. As cities in general, and especially the states capital city, represent territories, we must look at this matter in further detail.

1. SEGREGATION VS. COHESION

Space - the final frontier in respect to which the quality of our society hangs in the balance. The more is it subjective to further interventions it will evolve towards fragmentation and dissolution. When judged in relation to components situated on its both sides it gains unity and supports development. This is due to the fact that both sides retain their individuality and emphasis the connection in this specific contact zone. The two facets of the frontiers evolution are segregation and cohesion.

The importance of analyzing through means of usage of the concept of cohesion, both territorial as well of social becomes essential in research regarding planning and management of the entire urban space. On one side territorial cohesion provides with balancing the relations on both regional and national levels, reducing the disparities between Western and Central European cities, and at the same time, promoting referencing (of focal points) in the similar development policies. The social cohesion on the other hands determines the life quality and comparable space and the attenuation of problems generated by differential economic development. In dealing with a mobile population marked by globalizing tendencies whose dynamics exhibits ever more intense and various flows, the implementation of such social policies is a necessity in the intr-urban setting and moreover in the large urban estates.
Social cohesion approach is closely related to classics studies marking the theories of city organization, even though at that moment the respective authors didn’t use this specific terminology, the idea of improving urban life quality and the inhabitants integration (on equitable criteria) it was present.

Numerous authors (ecological authors especially) emphasize the importance of inhabitant income and building spatial diversity in the intra-urban space as decisive for social cohesion augmentation degree. Large urban estates heterogeneity amplify the cohesion degree, weakening those forces concentrating individualistic elements treated as false perception values (ethnicity, incomes).

Segregation with its multiple forms (social, residential, spatial, etc) has been present in Bucharest always. *Mahalalele* and their specific way of life disported from the rest. In the following period, the Capital organization corresponding with various planning models generated new segregation spaces through the concentration of economic activity in the city center. This error has been further expanded by the communist planning when imposed zonality was generated though the city function progressive separation. The ’50-’80 intervention purported a high organizational coherence degree, but lack the necessary means and the cohesion solutions. Presently, segregation elements are geographical marked by keeping those specific plans and further tracing of isolate areas. Isolation is a product of impoverished population concentration, lack of connectivity with the city poles, and areas reputation or by building exclusivist areas (nowadays residential projects) with segregation elitist characteristics. This upraise of income led to the possibility for certain social classes to search for new options in order to avoid problems by choosing the desired community and, implicitly, the space of residence. By doing so they tend to create clubs and realms of exclusive nature (Madanipour A., 1996).

Rejection of others appears inevitable. Inhabitants of these enclosed spaces would strive to achieve their own internal organization, and by doing so they would impose a new pole of power.

But not only the isolation of others by rejection of the whole units leads to spatial and social ruptures, but also the lack of a pole of power – reference on the community or society scale – which gives way not for borders, but, on the contrary for a limitless opening (the case of very large urban estates with lose their cohesion). Some places appear inclosed, but in reality they lack center and the limitations that centers could have determined. The decomposed place, disaggregated has the same inertion as the firmly bearer enclosed place (Constantinescu-Striian Annemarie, 1999). The lack of cohesive elements determines spatial planning of urban territory difficult to comprehend, promoting isolations tendencies by misunderstanding the whole as unit.

In this context, segregation appears as the nullifying or disturbance of the force that unites the two parts. The result is a far greater individualization of components. Thus, the system cohesion is diminished, and from the geographical point of view of the space foremost. The attractively force made up from the interaction with the important urban places from the nearby areas and the coordinating poles is fragmented by streets where traffic is to high, by a inadequate industrial restructuring areas, by the far distance to important location, and so on. The result is an opposition of the two concepts which have at their basis the same elements, but with a different meaning and characterized by the following patterns:
2. ANALYSIS OF THE COHESION /SEGREGATION AT THE MICROTERITORIAL LEVEL, IN BUCHAREST

2.1 Methodology

Using these patterns and in future analyses of the every part of one area we can try to quantify the territorial cohesion inside the city:

\[ Cp = Tf(ik) \ast (ln(N) - ln(ZfK) + 1) \]

- \( Cp \) – partial cohesion
- \( Tf(ik) \) – the frequency of the k element in one area i
- \( ZfK \) – the number of areas inside a space in which k can occur
- \( N \) – number of zones

By adding all partial cohesion of the city we can understand its cohesion at the European level. The difficult part is to have the same area specification as units in cities.

In our analysis we tried to see segregation and cohesion from a qualitative point of view. In respect to this approach we tried to see the urban form in an abstract way underlining the limits which define the areas and thus to see if there are segregation patterns at this level. Furthermore we made a plan which nullifies the small elements, emphasis only the possibility of the existence of some segregation limits. These models and others have shown that at some geometrical level there is not an ideal form. This means that the ideal form of planning, which is the hexagon doesn’t exist, so there is a very important disfunctionality at the spatial level of the city.

One important instrument of analysis was chorema – graphical representation of the geographical aspects. Using this instrument alongside the model proposed by Annemarie Strihan we analyzed three areas of Bucharest: Militari, Aviatiei and Baba Novac area (fig. 1).
2.2 Results

*Militari* area

*Militari large housing estate* is marked by a high degree of residential homogeneity and by a strong limitation in the southern part where the industrial area is. In this area the important marks are marginal - lake, green areas, economic centers, which can make possible a future transformation into an area with social problems. These tendencies are higher and higher in the western part of this area where the life quality is very low.
Aviației area. Unlike Militari area, the large housing estate of Aviației has enough openings to other areas, areas which can be renewed. The single problem of this area may appear from a nearby neighborhood, where the “gated community” phenomenon is more and more present. Aviației area is also too uniform from many points of view (especially the buildings) and may be useful a further intervention for making the past industrial area from nearby into a connected one. Very interesting from the residential point of view this area may lack some important points at economic level. The fact that economic activities are only reduced to the common ones diminishes the focal potential of this area.

Baba Novac area is marked out by the alternance of various elements. The potential of spatial cohesion from this area is high, because there is the advantage of linking easily with other areas. Due to the fact that functional elements are sustaining each other and also not being to concentrate in one specific place make from it an important developing space.

These neighborhoods are marked by high individuality and at some level, by a segregation potential. The field observations denote the continuation of the stagnation processes - important element in amplifying the segregation. Furthermore the new economic development in the respective areas isn’t so much related with them. These problems make necessary a new reorganization of the city and the rethinking of basis units of the city. From this point of view there is one model proposed by Radu Sageata which may resolve the the
functional cohesion inside the city. In the respective analysis he underlines the importance of the neighbourhoods’ centers as focal points.

CONCLUSIONS

The relation between segregation and spatial cohesion by the above models is showing (even partially) the major problems of the Bucharest. While the space is more and more considered as support and not as essential component of the living, we will see developing more of these disfunctionalities. By this analysis we notice once more the results of the past planning and the present indifference related to this. The numerous interventions at microspatial level from nowadays are making also problematic the renewal of the urban space and of the city as a whole.

At this time is important to find solutions of reshaping the administrative urban units and their connection accordingly to the territorial cohesion principles. We are in the favor of replanning the space on the multiple nuclei theory in order to diminish the arising of the areas with segregation potential.
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