

CENTRAL SETTLEMENTS IN SLOVENIA IN 2016

CENTRALNA NASELJA V SLOVENIJI LETA 2016

Janez Nared, David Bole, Mateja Breg Valjavec, Rok Ciglič,
Maruša Goluža, Jani Kozina, Nika Razpotnik Visković, Peter Repolusk,
Petra Rus, Jernej Tiran, Majda Černič Istenič



MARJAN GARBAJS

Because of their compact layout and functional connection,
Radovljica and Lesce function as a settlement cluster.
Radovljica in Lesce zaradi strnjene lege in funkcijske povezanosti
delujeta kot eno – stično naselje.

Central settlements in Slovenia in 2016

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/AGS.4606>

UDC: 911.37(497.4)»2016«

COBISS: 1.01

ABSTRACT: This article presents central settlements in Slovenia and their main characteristics in 2016. We defined central settlements based on services of general interest and the population of an individual settlement, and developed the analysis further by using competitiveness indicators. We defined 360 central settlements at six levels of centrality, among which the significance of Ljubljana as a national center of international importance and the significance of intermunicipal, local, and rural centers are increasing. The significance of certain regional centers at the second and third levels of centrality is decreasing. The level of services of general interest supplied to Slovenian territory is relatively appropriate, but it should be improved by promoting competitiveness, especially in centers of national and regional importance.

KEY WORDS: geography, settlement system, central settlements, services of general interest, cohesion, competitiveness, polycentrism, settlement clusters, conurbations, Slovenia

The article was submitted for publication on 31th May, 2016.

ADDRESSES:

Janez Nared, Ph.D.

Anton Melik Geographical Institute

Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts

Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

E-mail: janez.nared@zrc-sazu.si

David Bole, Ph.D.

Anton Melik Geographical Institute

Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts

Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

E-mail: david.bole@zrc-sazu.si

Mateja Breg Valjavec, Ph.D.

Anton Melik Geographical Institute

Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts

Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

E-mail: mateja.breg@zrc-sazu.si

Rok Ciglič, Ph.D.

Anton Melik Geographical Institute

Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts

Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

E-mail: rok.ciglic@zrc-sazu.si

Maruša Goluža

Anton Melik Geographical Institute

Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts

Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

E-mail: marusa.goluza@zrc-sazu.si

Jani Kozina, Ph.D.

Anton Melik Geographical Institute
Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
E-mail: jani.kozina@zrc-sazu.si

Nika Razpotnik Viskovič, Ph.D.

Anton Melik Geographical Institute
Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
E-mail: nika.razpotnik@zrc-sazu.si

Peter Repolusk

Anton Melik Geographical Institute
Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
E-mail: peter.repolusk@zrc-sazu.si

Petra Rus

Anton Melik Geographical Institute
Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
E-mail: petra.rus@zrc-sazu.si

Jernej Tiran, Ph.D.

Anton Melik Geographical Institute
Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
E-mail: jernej.tiran@zrc-sazu.si

Majda Černič Istenič, Ph.D.

Sociomedical Institute
Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
E-mail: majdaci@zrc-sazu.si

1 Introduction

Central settlements have been studied since von Thünen's (1842) work on the topic, but the concept was established only with Christaller's (1933) central place theory. In it, central settlements are defined as »major and minor political, cultural, economic, and transport centers that arose as an expression of the political, cultural, and economic operation of human society and that must therefore be considered the basic elements in the functional construction of social life« (Vrišer 1967, 143). Christaller understood them as the centers of regions that shape and define the region through their area of influence. Because of constant mutual influence, regions and their centers are constantly adapting to changing conditions, which also changes the system of central settlements. In the system of central settlements, an important role is played by central functions, such as commerce, crafts, transport, education, healthcare, administration, and cultural institutions. If the surrounding functional area is small, the settlement has only basic, frequently used central functions that are available to users in the vicinity of their residences, but, as settlements' level of centrality increases, these functions become increasingly diverse (Vrišer 1967).

Central settlements in Slovenia have been studied since the 1960s (Vrišer 1967; Kokole 1971; Pak, Batagelj and Hrvatin 1987; Vrišer 1988; Cigale 2002; Strategija ... 2004; Drozg 2005; Benkovič Krašovec 2006; Zavodnik Lamovšek, Drobne and Žaucer 2008; Rus, Razpotnik Visković and Nared 2013). They are characterized by constant changes in their definition, in part due to changing methodology, but more due to spatial and social changes (Nared, Bole and Ciglič 2016). Different authors have used various functions and various numbers of levels of centrality, and the manner in which they obtained their data has also varied (surveys and institutionalized data sources; Table 1).

As these studies showed, the structure of central settlements at higher levels is relatively stable, but greater changes are visible in central settlements at lower levels, especially because of spatial and social changes in past decades: local government reform, centralization, digitization and increased internet use, construction of the freeway network and increasing mobility, suburbanization and post-suburbanization, demographic changes, tertiarization of the economy, privatization of public services, and the economic crisis (Bole et al. 2012; Rus, Razpotnik Visković and Nared 2013; Nared, Bole and Ciglič 2016). The otherwise scant modern studies of central settlements have added new aspects to the original examination of supply with services. At the forefront are discussions of the ratio between cohesion and competitiveness (Meijers 2008), and examinations of functional regions (Karlsson and Olsson 2006; Zavodnik Lamovšek 2011) and functional polycentrism (Green 2007). Meijers (2007) believes that it is necessary to further develop central place theory because towns are not only connected vertically, but also horizontally through sharing functions (i.e., conurbations) and functional specializations. Such »networking« is typical of the global economy, especially for growing service sectors such as finance, IT, the creative industry, and so on (Sassen 1991; Castells 1996).

This article examines the network of central settlements in Slovenia in 2016 from the perspective of supply with services of general interest (i.e., the functional aspect). The functional aspect of defining central settlements, which can be understood as an analysis of ensuring the cohesiveness of the entire national territory, is further developed with selected elements of competitiveness or, specifically, an analysis of the distribution of researchers, patents, and the largest export companies. This article is based on the project The Polycentric Network of Centers and Accessibility of the Population to Services of General Interest and General Economic Interest (Nared et al. 2016), which was financed by the Slovenian Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning as part of revamping Slovenia's current spatial strategy.

2 Methods

We based our analysis of central settlements on services of general interest, which government bodies define as such and for which special public service obligations apply (ESPON Evidence Brief 2013; Noguera-Tur and Martínez 2014). Following examples from abroad (Meijers 2007), we limited the broader selection of services to four main functions: public administration, education, healthcare, and the judiciary. This narrower selection of services of general interest made it possible to define central settlements relatively transparently. With the addition of new functions, the definition of central settlements would be less transparent because the various functions appear in the same settlements and the addition of new functions

Table 1: A comparison of the criteria and findings of three selected studies (Kokole 1971; Vršer 1988; Giale 2002 (Rus 2013)).

	Kokole (1971)	Vršer (1988)	Giale (2002)
<i>Collecting data on central activities</i>	Qualitative approach: directories, telephone books, lists of institutions, survey; quantitative approach: active population in the town-serving sector	Qualitative approach: directories, telephone books, lists of institutions, Register of Companies and Associations, Register of Private Entrepreneurs, census; quantitative approach: ratio between population and number of employed (jobs) in tertiary and quaternary activities by local communities (with towns treated as a whole)	Qualitative approach: Slovenian telephone book, information on post office branches, information on health centers, information on primary schools, survey
<i>Determining the scope of the area of influence</i>	Surveying primary schools	Surveying local communities / community offices	Surveying primary schools: determining where residents satisfy different needs for different services
<i>Number of levels of centrality</i>	Nine: Kokole does not name levels of centrality, but only defines the level	Seven (five): local centers, rural or industrial centers, communal or municipal centers, district centers, area centers, provincial centers, centers of Yugoslav republics	Three: macro-regional centers, meso-regional centers, micro-regional centers
<i>Classifying central settlements by hierarchical level of centrality</i>	Classification of indicators based on frequency of occurrence	Classification of indicators based on frequency of occurrence	Supply with functions / service activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities present in 150 to five hundred settlements; • Activities present in more than fifty and fewer than one hundred settlements; • Activities present in fewer than twenty settlements

would not offer significantly different results. We designed a database of centers' supply with services of general interest; in addition to georeference data this also included metadata necessary for constantly updating the database. It includes 703 settlements with at least one of four main functions. The database is based on the Slovenian Business Resister (AJPES) and databases at ministries and agencies.

Proceeding from definitions of central settlements to date, proposals from a focus group, and a workshop with stakeholders (Policentrično omrežje ... 2015), we defined six levels of centrality (Table 2). On the one hand, the level of centrality was defined based on the population in a particular settlement and, on the other hand, individual functions were ascribed the corresponding level of centrality. Assessment of the overall level of centrality was made using a combined index of level of centrality (l_{cen}). The index equally weighted the average level of centrality from the four functions $\left(\frac{\sum_1^4 f_i}{4}\right)$ and the level of centrality based on population (l_{pop})

$$l_{cen} = \frac{\frac{\sum_1^4 f_i}{4} + l_{pop}}{2} \quad (1)$$

Table 2: Level of centrality for settlements and criteria for individual levels.

Level of centrality	Population	Expected functions
1. National center of international importance	$\geq 100,001$	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public university University medical center Higher court
2. Center of national importance	20,001–100,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> College, university faculty, or academy Large general hospital
3. Center of regional importance	10,001–20,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> District court Junior college Hospital High school
4. Center of inter-municipal importance	3,001–10,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health center Local government office Local court
5. Center of local importance	1,501–3,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full primary school Health station Municipal headquarters
6. Center of rural importance	501–1,500	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Branch primary school

In classifying the settlements into individual levels of centrality, we defined the following classification limits (Table 3).

Table 3: Classification limits for defining levels of centrality.

Level of centrality	Centrality index value
1. National center of international importance	≤ 1.50
2. Center of national importance	1.51–2.50
3. Center of regional importance	2.51–3.50
4. Center of inter-municipal importance	3.51–4.50
5. Center of local importance	4.51–5.50
6. Center of rural importance	≥ 5.51
6a. Center of rural importance with fewer than 500 people	Fewer than 500 people and at least two functions

Figure 1: Settlement clusters (Nared, Bole and Ciglič 2016). ►

Because of dispersed settlement, in Slovenia there are a large number of well-supplied settlements with a population below five hundred, which was initially defined as the lower population limit in a central settlement. We therefore added a new category of central settlements with a population below five hundred but that had to contain at least two of the four functions examined.

We also determined that several administrative settlements are located close to one another but that the functions are uniformly distributed between them, which means that an individual settlement is not necessarily sufficiently large or supplied, but, if it is combined with another, then the combined settlement may satisfy the criteria of both size and supply. These types of settlements are called settlement clusters (such settlements are underlined in the text). We defined them as a set of morphologically connected settlements that, despite their administrative division into several settlements, operate as a functionally connected whole. Such settlements had to satisfy two criteria: the majority (> 50%) of their population had to live in areas of high density of numbered housing (> 1.5 house numbers per hectare in a diameter of 800 m) and areas of high density had to be continuously connected with at least one such area in another settlement. In this manner we defined fifty-six areas, further verified them through visual inspection of aerial photos and review of the presence of the four functions, and thus expanded the list of central settlements with an additional twenty-nine settlement clusters (Figure 1). Using settlement clusters, we were better able to assess the level of supply, especially in areas of compact settlement, and the sharing of functions between individual settlements; for example, Nova Gorica–Šempeter–Vrtojba, Piran–Lucija, and so on (Nared, Bole and Ciglič 2016).

For analyzing the network of central settlements from the perspective of competitiveness, we studied three indicators: exports in millions of euros per company headquarters in 2015 (SLOEXPORT 2016), number of researchers per workplace (SICRIS 2016), and number of patents per place of patent holder between 1991 and 2016 (Patenti 2016). The last two indicators are often a component of measuring global competitiveness indicators (Global Competitive ... 2016) and global creativity indexes (Global Creativity ... 2016), and so they are also appropriate for this analysis of competitiveness. The statistical correlation between settlement size, supply with services of general interest, and competitiveness was calculated using Spearman's correlation coefficient (ρ).


3 Results

Using the methodology presented, we defined 360 central settlements in Slovenia (Figure 2) with a total population of 1,318,051, which is just under 9.2% of the country's settlements and 64% of its population. Two settlements are national centers of international importance (Ljubljana and Maribor), five are centers of national importance (Celje, Nova Gorica, Koper, Novo mesto, and Kranj), twelve are centers of regional importance (Domžale–Kamnik, Ptuj, Velenje, Jesenice, Murska Sobota, Trbovlje, Piran, Slovenj Gradec, Izola, Škofja Loka, Brežice, and Krško), thirty-eight are centers of inter-municipal importance, fifty-five are centers of local importance, and 248 are centers of rural importance, among which we also classified forty-nine centers with a population under five hundred but at least two main functions; in the text, settlement clusters are underlined.

From the perspective of the central functions and size of a settlement, Ljubljana is far in the lead. As the country's second-largest city, Maribor also preserves an important role. Among the other regional centers, the second level of centrality is achieved by five settlements (Celje, Nova Gorica, Koper, Novo mesto, and Kranj), and the third level by four (or five) (Murska Sobota, Trbovlje, Slovenj Gradec, and the conurbation of Krško–Brežice). The weakest among the regional centers is Postojna, which is ranked at the level of inter-municipal centers. With regard to the size of the settlement and its economic strength, Velenje is undersupplied with functions, which is largely a consequence of its location between two nearby regional centers: Celje and Slovenj Gradec.

Ljubljana has great administrative and economic influence, and is becoming an important metropolitan center. The economic significance of settlements at the second and third levels of centrality is weakening, but increased influence can be noted at the level of municipal centers, which may be ascribed to local

Figure 2: Central settlements in Slovenia, 2016. ►



government reform and the »localization« of regional policy; decisions on regional projects are made by mayors, who favor local projects.

The creation of many new municipalities had a major impact on the number of central settlements at the sixth level, especially those that do not achieve the threshold of five hundred residents. In line with the size structure of Slovenian municipalities, these settlements predominate in eastern Slovenia.

With regard to settlement clusters, it is especially relevant to mention Domžale–Kamnik and Nova Gorica. The settlement cluster of Domžale–Kamnik is only a morphologically connected settlement without shared functions because both of the main settlements are centers of inter-municipal importance. In contrast, the morphological connection of Nova Gorica and the settlements of Šempeter pri Gorici, Kromberk, Pristava, Rožna Dolina, Solkan, and Vrtojba is further enhanced by shared functions, especially between Šempeter pri Gorici and Nova Gorica.

It is also interesting to compare the level of centrality from the perspective of settlement size and how well a settlement is supplied with individual functions. Large settlements are generally better supplied with functions than smaller ones. If the level of centrality by function exceeds the level of centrality by population, the settlement is oversupplied and, in the opposite case, it is undersupplied (Figure 3).

Oversupply is especially characteristic of settlements in less urbanized parts of the country, which can be explained by the conscious uniform provision of functions across the entire territory of the country as a result of the policy of polycentric urban development from the 1960s onward. Here it has to be taken into account that, in adapting the functions to the size of the settlement, more sparsely settled areas faced a relatively poor supply of functions.

Undersupply is especially characteristic of settlements near major towns, which is a consequence of suburbanization, which has been prominent especially in the last forty years (Ravbar 1997; 2005). Because residents moved to the outskirts of towns, the populations of these settlements have grown greatly, but the supply of functions has not adapted sufficiently quickly to this.

Among the central settlements, only twenty-three contain the seat of a major export company (more than 0.5% of Slovenian exports). In this regard, Ljubljana, Novo mesto, and Velenje stand out, which together account for over 50% of all Slovenian exports. Among the major central settlements, Maribor (Level 1), Murska Sobota, Slovenj Gradec, Trbovlje, Brežice, and Izola (Level 3) have no headquarters of a major export company at all. With regard to level of centrality, relatively weak positions are also held by Celje, Kranj, and Nova Gorica (Level 2) and Domžale–Kamnik, Ptuj, and Krško (Level 3). Conversely, there are many export companies in Škofja Loka (Level 3) and certain central settlements at lower levels, such as Slovenska Bistrica and Idrija (Level 4), Mežica and Zreče (Level 5), and Nazarje and Spodnja Idrija (Level 6).


In 2016, Slovenian research organizations employed 10,100 researchers on a full-time, additional-time, or part-time basis, which is equivalent to 8,988 full-time researchers. Their distribution among the sixty-nine central settlements is somewhat more dispersed than that of export-oriented companies, but among them stands out Ljubljana (69%), followed at a great distance by Maribor (12%), and the remaining centers have significantly fewer researchers. More than one percent of researchers are also found in Koper, Novo mesto, Celje, and Rodica.

In the period from 1991 to 2016, around 5,800 patents were issued in Slovenia. Their distribution among central settlements was more dispersed than that of researchers and export-oriented companies because patents may also be registered by natural persons. Nonetheless, among the 228 central settlements Ljubljana once again strongly stands out with 31% of all Slovenian patents, followed at a great distance by Maribor (7%), Velenje, Kranj, and Novo mesto (3% each), and Celje (2%), whereas the remaining settlements had less than two percent of patents issued.

The competitiveness of central settlements is moderately statistically correlated with their size and supply with functions (Table 4). The not very robust correlations primarily result from the great strength of Ljubljana, the relatively low competitiveness of Maribor, Level 2 settlements, and most Level 3 settlements, and the relatively high competitiveness of certain settlements at lower levels of centrality.

Figure 3: Difference between level of centrality by function and level of centrality by population of the settlement. ►

Figure 4: Competitiveness of central settlements in Slovenia in terms of export companies, researchers, and patents. ► p. 18






Table 4: Statistical correlation between the competitiveness of central settlements and their size and supply of services (Spearman's correlation coefficient).

	Exports (€ million) (23 settlements)	Number of researchers (69 settlements)	Number of patents (228 settlements)
Settlement level by education	0.399	0.651	0.489
Settlement level by healthcare	<i>0.511</i>	0.480	0.511
Settlement level by public administration	0.644	<i>0.271</i>	0.478
Settlement level by judiciary	<i>0.509</i>	0.514	0.470
Average level by education, healthcare, public administration, and judiciary	<i>0.475</i>	0.544	0.539
Settlement level by population	0.572	0.531	0.601
Average level by education, healthcare, public administration, judiciary, and population	<i>0.524</i>	0.557	0.592

Italic text: correlation significant at $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed).

Boldface text: correlation significant at $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

4 Discussion

Regional policy and promoting the development of a polycentric system of settlement played an important role in shaping the settlement system in the past (Drozg 2005; Nared 2007). In addition to the abstract orientation of spatial development towards a polycentric settlement system, this was especially contributed to by both major reforms of local government: the introduction of the communal system in the 1960s, and the establishment of new municipalities in the 1990s (Drozg 2005; Rus, Razpotnik Visković and Nared 2013). This also explains the good supply to settlements at the fourth, fifth, and sixth levels of centrality. On the other hand, the role of Ljubljana is strengthening (Bole 2004; 2011; Nared 2007; Ravbar 2007; 2009; 2011; Ravbar, Bole and Nared 2005), which has especially been apparent after the most recent economic crisis, when Ljubljana has offered employment to an increasing number of people from the surrounding area (Bole et al. 2012; Rus, Razpotnik Visković and Nared 2013). However, one must be cautious in explaining the role of Ljubljana because data on commuting, based on which the influence of centers was analyzed (Nared et al. 2016), is connected with information about jobs. This can lead to errors because the job location is often cited as the company headquarters (e.g., in the official information at AJPES, the legal records office), and not at its branch locations distributed throughout Slovenia (e.g., Mercator grocery stores, Petrol gas stations, or the Slovenian Armed Forces).

In the past decades, the role of individual regional centers has been weakening, especially that of Postojna, Kranj (Rus, Razpotnik Visković and Nared 2013), and Murska Sobota, which on the one hand points to the leveling of development within regions, and on the other hand to the increasing divide between Ljubljana and other settlements.

The current situation has been strongly influenced by the polycentric arrangement of functions in the past, which points to the path-dependent development of the settlement system (Martin and Sunley 2006; Bristow and Healy 2014). This is especially reflected in the divide between the level of centrality based on settlement size and the level of centrality based on functions in the settlement, where it can be observed that functions only slowly adapt to demographic changes. A similar conclusion can also be drawn from the distribution of researchers, who are concentrated in the two main university centers, whereas patents, which also ought to reflect the activity of the academic sphere to a certain degree, are distributed among considerably more settlements. At the same time, the results point to the influence of past ideologies on spatial planning because polycentrism was also a goal of social planning under communism. Vrišer (1978) thus mentions the development of a polycentric system in line with the organization of systems of »basic organizations of associated labor,« »self-management,« and similar concepts of that era.

Despite a different methodology used, our findings agree with those in a study carried out in Norway, in which Dale and Sjøholt (2007) used a definition of central settlements based on commercial and non-commercial functions within walking distance to determine that specialized services and market-oriented functions are especially concentrated in settlements with a high level of centrality, where competitiveness thus comes to the fore. On the other hand, places with a low level of centrality lose market services and

retain only basic functions such as schools and general stores. There, ensuring the basic cohesion of national territory is at the forefront.

In general, it is difficult to compare our study with modern investigations by researchers in other countries, who have focused more on the role of competitiveness and the functional organization of polycentric systems than uniform provision of functions. They have especially highlighted the networking and economic specialization of settlements and regions (Parr 2004), physical polycentrism, which is measured through commuting or employment in particular centers, political-administrative polycentrism, which is a result of the administrative division of territory, functional polycentrism, which arises due to the specialization of towns within the urban system, and regional-identity polycentrism, which is a result of historical, symbolic, and sociocultural processes (Kloosterman and Musterd 2001).

Defining central settlements based on services of general interest captures the aspect of competitiveness only from the perspective of establishing a supportive environment, and therefore it is appropriate for defining and directing the spatial organization of the country, but is less appropriate for directing economic development. Namely, defining the level of centrality is closely connected with the policy of polycentric development, which is one of the basic goals of spatial development in Europe and for which the so-called European Spatial Development Perspective (Evropske prostorske razvojne perspektive 2000) emphasizes three goals of spatial development in the European Union:

- Economic and social cohesion;
- Conservation of natural resources and cultural heritage; and
- More balanced competitiveness of European territory.

It is through polycentric development that countries ought to achieve these goals. Slovenia is following the guidelines established, whereby attention is focused on ensuring basic coverage of the country's territory with services of general interest and social cohesion, but Slovenia is less consistent in ensuring more balanced territorial competitiveness.

5 Conclusion

This article used selected services of general interest (public administration, education, healthcare, and the judiciary) to determine which settlements comprised the network of central settlements in Slovenia in 2016 and what are their chief characteristics.

Based on our own methodology, we defined six levels of central settlements and matched the corresponding settlements to them:

1. National centers of international importance (two settlements; in this case, Maribor is a settlement cluster, which means that together with certain other settlements forms a group of morphologically connected settlements that, despite their administrative division into several settlements, operate as a functionally connected whole; in the text, settlement clusters are underlined): Ljubljana and Maribor;
2. Centers of national importance (5): Celje, Nova Gorica, Koper, Novo mesto, and Kranj;
3. Centers of regional importance (12): Domžale-Kamnik, Ptuj, Velenje, Jesenice, Murska Sobota, Trbovlje, Piran, Slovenj Gradec, Izola, Škofja Loka, Brežice, and Krško;
4. Centers of inter-municipal importance (38);
5. Centers of local importance (55); and
6. Centers of rural importance (248).

The 360 central settlements were importantly influenced by historical development; among other things, especially by both local government reforms, which in many ways defined the development of the polycentric settlement system in Slovenia, especially from the perspective of cohesion at the level of centers of inter-municipal, local, and rural importance. Among other factors, we highlight strong centralization, which is a consequence of the concentration of essential national institutions in the capital city. Economic development also follows this, which is evidenced by Ljubljana's dominant share of export companies, researchers, and patents.

From the perspective of uniform spatial coverage, the supply of Slovenian territory with services of general interest is relatively satisfactory, but this should be improved with elements that promote competitiveness. In these efforts, attention should especially be directed toward centers of national and regional importance.

6 Literature

- Benkovič Krašovec, M. 2006: Vloga centralnih naselij prve in druge stopnje pri razvoju slovenskega podeželja. Doktorska disertacija, Filozofska fakulteta Univerze v Ljubljani, Ljubljana.
- Bole, D. 2004: Daily mobility of workers in Slovenia. *Acta Geographica Slovenica* 44-1. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/AGS44102>
- Bole, D. 2011: Changes in Employee Commuting: A Comparative Analysis of Employee Commuting to Major Slovenian Employment Centers from 2000 to 2009. *Acta geographica Slovenica* 51-1. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/AGS51104>
- Bole, D., Gabrovec, M., Nared, J., Razpotnik Visković, N. 2012: Integrated planning of public passenger transport between the city and the region: the case of Ljubljana. *Acta geographica Slovenica* 52-1. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/AGS52106>
- Bristow, G., Healy, A. 2014: Regional resilience: an agency perspective. *Regional studies* 48-5. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2013.854879>
- Castells, M. 1996: *The Rise of the Network Society*. Malden.
- Christaller, W. 1933: *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland*. Jena.
- Cigale, D. 2002: Centralna naselja v Sloveniji in njihova vplivna območja v letu 1999. *Geografski vestnik* 74-1.
- Dale, B. E., Sjøholt, P. 2007: The changing structure of the central place system in Trøndelag, Norway, over the past 40 years – viewed in the light of old and recent theories and trends. *Geografiska Annaler, Series B, Human Geography* 89-1. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0467.2007.00257.x>
- Drozg, V. 2005: Koncepti policentrične ureditve Slovenije. *Dela* 24.
- ESPON Evidence Brief, 2013. Internet: https://www.espon.eu/main/Menu_Publications/Menu_EvidenceBriefs/EEB4_Services-General-Interest.html (8. 3. 2016).
- Evropske prostorske razvojne perspektive, 2000. Ljubljana.
- Global Competitive Index, 2016. Internet: <http://reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness-report-2015-2016/competitiveness-rankings/> (1. 3. 2016).
- Global Creativity Index, 2016. Internet: <http://reports.weforum.org/global-competitiveness-report-2015-2016/competitiveness-rankings/> (1. 3. 2016).
- Green, N. 2007: Functional polycentricity: a formal definition in terms of social network analysis. *Urban Studies* 44-11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980701518941>
- Karlsson, C., Olsson, M. 2006: The identification of functional regions: theory, methods, and applications. *Annales of Regional Sciences* 40-1. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00168-005-0019-5>
- Kloosterman, R. C., Musterd, S. 2001: The polycentric urban region: Towards a research agenda. *Urban Studies* 38-4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980120035259>
- Kokole, V. 1971: Centralni kraji v SR Sloveniji, problemi njihovega omrežja in njihovih gravitacijskih območij. *Geografski zbornik* 12.
- Martin, R., Sunley, P. 2006: Path dependence and regional economic evolution. *Journal of Economic Geography* 6-4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbl012>
- Meijers, E. 2007: From central place to network model: theory and evidence of a paradigm change. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 98-2. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9663.2007.00394.x>
- Meijers, E. 2008: Measuring polycentricity and its promises. *European Planning Studies* 16-9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654310802401805>
- Nared, J. 2007: Prostorski vplivi slovenske regionalne politike. *Geografija Slovenije* 16. Ljubljana.
- Nared, J., Bole, D., Ciglič, R. 2016: Določanje stičnih naselij za vrednotenje opremljenosti naselij s storitvami splošnega in splošnega gospodarskega pomena. *Prostorski podatki. GIS v Sloveniji* 13. Ljubljana.
- Nared, J., Bole, D., Breg Valjavec, M., Ciglič, R., Črnič Istenič, M., Goluža, M., Kozina, J., Lapuh, L., Razpotnik Visković, N., Repolusk, P., Rus, P., Tiran, J. 2016: Policentrično omrežje središč in dostopnost prebivalstva do storitev splošnega in splošnega gospodarskega pomena. *Končno poročilo*. Ljubljana.
- Noguera-Tur, J., Martínez, A. F. 2014: Accessibility and provision of services of general interest in rural areas of the European Union: an analysis of the Eurobarometer. *Boletín de la Asociación de Geógrafos Españoles* 64.
- Pak, M., Batagelj, M., Hrvatin, M. 1987: Problematika centralnih naselij na Notranjskem. *Notranjska, zbornik* 14. Zborovanja slovenskih geografov. Postojna.

- Parr, J. 2004: The polycentric urban region: A closer inspection. *Regional Studies* 38-3. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/003434042000211114>
- Patenti, 2016. Internet: <http://www2.uil-sipo.si/> (15. 1. 2016).
- Policentrično omrežje središč in dostopnost prebivalstva do storitev splošnega in splošnega gospodarskega pomena: zapisnik 1. javnega posveta. Geografski inštitut Antona Melika ZRC SAZU. Ljubljana 2015. Internet: http://giam.zrc-sazu.si/sites/default/files/priponka_3_centralna_naselja_1_-_posvet_zapisnik.pdf (21. 6. 2016).
- Ravbar, M. 1997: Slovene cities and suburbs in transformation. *Geografski zbornik* 37.
- Ravbar, M. 2005: »Urban sprawl«: popačena slika (sub)urbanizacije v Sloveniji? *Geografski vestnik* 77-1.
- Ravbar, M. 2007: Geografija človeških virov v Sloveniji – pomen ustvarjalnih socialnih skupin za regionalni razvoj. *Geografski vestnik* 79-2.
- Ravbar, M. 2009: Economic geographical assessment of investments – a development factor in regional development. *Acta geographica Slovenica* 49-1. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/AGS49105>
- Ravbar, M. 2011: Creative social groups in Slovenia: contribution to geographic studying of human resources. *Acta geographica Slovenica* 51-2. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/AGS51204>
- Ravbar, M., Bole, D., Nared, J. 2005: A creative milieu and the role of geography in studying the competitiveness of cities: the case of Ljubljana. *Acta Geographica Slovenica* 45-2. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/AGS45201>
- Rus, P. 2013: Centralnost naselij z vidika dosedanjih študij. Seminarska naloga pri predmetu Filozofija in epistemologija raziskovanja. Univerza na Primorskem, Fakulteta za management. Koper.
- Rus, P., Razpotnik Visković, N., Nared, J. 2013: Upravljanje območij z vidika sprememb funkcijskih zaledij centralnih krajev: primer Gorenjske. *Gorenjska v obdobju globalizacije*. Bled.
- Sassen, S. 1991: *The global city*. Princeton.
- SICRIS, 2016. Internet: <http://www.sicris.si/public/jqm/cris.aspx?lang=slv&opdescr=home&opt=1> (15. 1. 2016).
- SLOEXPORT, 2016. Internet: <http://www.sloexport.si> (1. 3. 2016).
- Strategija prostorskega razvoja Slovenije. 2004. Internet: http://www.mop.gov.si/fileadmin/mop.gov.si/pageuploads/publikacije/sprs_slo.pdf (24. 3. 2016).
- von Thünen, J. H. 1842: *Der isolirte Staat in in Beziehung auf Landwirtschaft und Nationalökonomie*. Jena.
- Vrišer, I. 1967: O centralnih naseljih. *Geografski vestnik* 39.
- Vrišer, I. 1978: Slovensko urbano omrežje in policentrični razvoj. *Zbornik II. Slovensko-slovaškega geografskega simpozija*. Maribor.
- Vrišer, I. 1988: Centralna naselja v SR Sloveniji leta 1987. *Geografski zbornik* 28.
- Zavodnik Lamovšek, A. (ur.) 2011: *Funkcionalne regije – izziv prihodnjega razvoja Slovenije*. Ljubljana.
- Zavodnik Lamovšek, A., Drobne, S., Žaucer, T. 2008: Majhna in srednje velika mesta kot ogrođje policentričnega urbanega razvoja. *Geodetski vestnik* 52-2.

Centralna naselja v Sloveniji leta 2016

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/AGS.4606>

UDK: 911.37(497.4)»2016«

COBISS: 1.01

IZVLEČEK: Namen prispevka je predstaviti centralna naselja v Sloveniji in njihove poglavitne značilnosti leta 2016. Centralna naselja smo opredelili na podlagi storitev splošnega pomena in števila prebivalcev v posameznem naselju ter analizo nadgradili s kazalniki konkurenčnosti. Na šestih stopnjah centralnosti smo opredelili 360 centralnih naselij, med katerimi narašča pomen Ljubljane kot nacionalnega središča mednarodnega pomena ter središč medobčinskega, lokalnega in vicinalnega pomena. Manjša se pomen nekaterih regionalnih središč na drugi in tretji stopnji centralnosti. Opremljenost slovenskega ozemlja s storitvami splošnega pomena je razmeroma ustrezna, a bi jo bilo treba nadgraditi s spodbujanjem konkurenčnosti, zlasti v središčih nacionalnega in regionalnega pomena.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: geografija, sistem poselitve, centralna naselja, storitve splošnega pomena, kohezivnost, konkurenčnost, policentrizem, stična naselja, somestja, Slovenija

Uredništvo je prejelo prispevek 31. maja 2016.

NASLOVI:

dr. Janez Nared

Geografski inštitut Antona Melika

Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti

Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija

E-pošta: janez.nared@zrc-sazu.si

dr. David Bole

Geografski inštitut Antona Melika

Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti

Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija

E-pošta: david.bole@zrc-sazu.si

dr. Mateja Breg Valjavec

Geografski inštitut Antona Melika

Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti

Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija

E-pošta: mateja.breg@zrc-sazu.si

dr. Rok Ciglič

Geografski inštitut Antona Melika

Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti

Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija

E-pošta: rok.ciglic@zrc-sazu.si

Maruša Goluža

Geografski inštitut Antona Melika

Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti

Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija

E-pošta: marusa.goluza@zrc-sazu.si

dr. Jani Kozina

Geografski inštitut Antona Melika
Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija
E-pošta: jani.kozina@zrc-sazu.si

dr. Nika Razpotnik Visković

Geografski inštitut Antona Melika
Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija
E-pošta: nika.razpotnik@zrc-sazu.si

Peter Repolusk

Geografski inštitut Antona Melika
Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija
E-pošta: peter.repolusk@zrc-sazu.si

Petra Rus

Geografski inštitut Antona Melika
Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija
E-pošta: petra.rus@zrc-sazu.si

dr. Jernej Tiran

Geografski inštitut Antona Melika
Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija
E-pošta: jernej.tiran@zrc-sazu.si

dr. Majda Černič Istenič

Družbenomedicinski inštitut
Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija
E-pošta: majdaci@zrc-sazu.si

1 Uvod

Centralna naselja so predmet strokovne razprave že vse od von Thüenovega dela (von Thünen 1842), a so se uveljavila šele s Christallerjevo (1933) teorijo centralnih naselij. V njej so centralna naselja opredeljena kot »večja in manjša politična, kulturna, gospodarska in prometna središča, ki so nastala kot izraz političnega, kulturnega in gospodarskega delovanja človeške družbe in jih zato moramo smatrati kot temeljni element v funkcijski zgradbi družbenega življenja« (Vrišer 1967, 143). Christaller jih pojmuje kot središča regij, ki prek svojih vplivnih območij regijo oblikujejo in opredeljujejo. Regije in njihova središča se zaradi nenehnega sovplivanja stalno prilagajajo spreminjajočim se razmeram, s čimer se spreminja tudi sistem centralnih naselij. Pri sistemu centralnih naselij imajo pomembno vlogo centralne funkcije, kot so trgovina, obrt, promet, šolstvo, zdravstvo, upravne in kulturne ustanove. Če je zaledje majhno, ima naselje le temeljne, pogosto uporabljane centralne funkcije, ki so uporabnikom na voljo v bližini bivališča, z naraščanjem stopnje centralnosti naselja pa so funkcije vse bolj raznovrstne (Vrišer 1967).

Centralna naselja v Sloveniji preučujemo že od 60-ih let preteklega stoletja (Vrišer 1967; Kokole 1971; Pak, Batagelj in Hrvatini 1987; Vrišer 1988; Cigale 2002; Strategija ... 2004; Drozg 2005; Benkovič Krašovec 2006; Zavodnik Lamovšek, Drobne in Žaucer 2008; Rus, Razpotnik Visković in Nared 2013). Značilne so stalne spremembe v njihovem opredeljevanju, deloma zaradi spremenjene metodologije, še bolj pa zaradi prostorskih in družbenih sprememb (Nared, Bole in Ciglič 2016). Avtorji so uporabljali različne funkcije in različno število stopenj centralnosti, različno je bilo tudi pridobivanje podatkov (ankete, institucionalizirani viri podatkov; preglednica 1).

Kot so pokazale omenjene študije, je struktura centralnih naselij na višjih stopnjah razmeroma stabilna, večje spremembe pa so vidne v centralnih naseljih nižjih stopenj, zlasti zaradi prostorskih in družbenih sprememb v preteklih desetletjih: reforme lokalne samouprave, centralizacije, digitalizacije in povečane rabe interneta, izgradnje avtocestnega križa in naraščajoče mobilnosti, suburbanizacije in postsuburbanizacije, demografskih sprememb, terciarizacije gospodarstva in privatizacije javnih služb ter gospodarske krize (Bole s sodelavci 2012; Rus, Razpotnik Visković in Nared 2013; Nared, Bole in Ciglič 2016).

Sicer redke sodobne raziskave centralnih naselij so izhodiščno preučevanje opremljenosti s storitvami nadgradile z novimi vidiki. V ospredju so razprave o razmerju med kohezivnostjo in konkurenčnostjo (Meijers 2008), razprave o funkcijskih regijah (Karlsson in Olsson 2006; Zavodnik Lamovšek 2011) in funkcijskem policentризmu (Green 2007). Meijers (2007) meni, da je treba teorijo centralnih naselij nadgraditi, saj se mesta ne povezujejo le navpično, temveč tudi vodoravno prek delitve funkcij (somesstja) in funkcijske specializacije. Takšno »mrežno« povezovanje je značilnost globalnega gospodarstva, zlasti rastočih storitvenih sektorjev, kot so finance, informatika, ustvarjalna industrija in podobno (Sassen 1991; Castells 1996).

Namen prispevka je preučiti omrežje centralnih naselij v Sloveniji leta 2016 z vidika opremljenosti naselij s storitvami splošnega pomena (funkcijski vidik). Funkcijski vidik opredeljevanja centralnih naselij, ki ga lahko razumemo kot analizo zagotavljanja kohezivnosti celotnega državnega ozemlja, smo nadgradili z izbranimi elementi konkurenčnosti, natančneje z analizo razporeditve raziskovalcev, patentov in največjih izvoznih podjetij. Prispevek je nastal na podlagi projekta *Policentrično omrežje središč in dostopnost prebivalstva do storitev splošnega in splošnega gospodarskega pomena* (Nared s sodelavci 2016), ki ga je financiralo Ministrstvo Republike Slovenije za okolje in prostor v okviru prenove veljavne prostorske strategije Slovenije.

2 Metode

Pri analizi omrežja centralnih naselij smo se oprli na storitve splošnega pomena, ki jih državni organi opredelijo kot storitve v splošnem interesu in se zanje uporabljajo posebne obveznosti javne službe (ESPON Evidence Brief 2013; Noguera-Tur in Martínez 2014). Širši nabor storitev smo po tujih zgledih (Meijers 2007) omejili na štiri pglavitne funkcije, in sicer javno upravo, šolstvo, zdravstvo in sodstvo. Ožji nabor storitev splošnega pomena je omogočil razmeroma pregledno opredelitev centralnih naselij. Ob dodajanju novih funkcij bi bilo določanje centralnih naselij manj pregledno, ker se različne funkcije pojavljajo v istih naseljih, pa dodajanje novih funkcij ne bi prineslo bistveno drugačnih rezultatov. Izoblikovali smo podatkovno zbirko opremljenosti središč s storitvami splošnega pomena, ki poleg georeferenciranih podatkov vsebuje tudi meta podatke, potrebne za sprotno posodabljanje podatkovne zbirke. V njej smo zajeli 703 naselja

Preglednica 1: Primerjava meril in rezultatov treh izbranih študij (Kokole 1971; Vršer 1988; Cigale 2002) (Rus 2013).

	Kokole 1971	Vršer 1988	Cigale 2002
<i>zbiranje podatkov o centralnih dejavnostih</i>	kvantitativni pristop: adresarji, telefonski imeniki, seznamni ustanov, anketa; kvantitativni pristop: aktivno prebivalstvo v mestovornem sektorju	kvantitativni pristop: adresarji, telefonski imeniki, seznamni ustanov, Register delovnih organizacij in samoupravnih skupnosti, Register zasebnih podjetnikov, popis prebivalstva; kvantitativni pristop: odnos med prebivalstvom in številom zaposlenih (delovnimi mesti) v terciarnih in kvartarnih dejavnostih po krajevnih skupnostih (mesta obravnavana kot celota)	kvantitativni pristop: telefonski imenik Slovenije, podatki o poštnih poslovalnicah, podatki o zdravstvenih domovih, podatki o osnovnih šolah, anketa
<i>ugotavljanje obsega vplivnih območij</i>	anketiranje osnovnih šol	anketiranje krajevnih skupnosti/krajevnih uradov	anketiranje osnovnih šol – ugotavljanje, kje prebivalci zadovoljujejo različne potrebe po različnih storitvah
<i>število stopenj centralnosti</i>	9 Kokole stopenj centralnosti ne poimenuje, temveč določi le stopnjo	7 (5) lokalna ali krajevna središča; ruralna ali industrijska središča; komunalna ali občinska središča; distriktna ali okrožna središča; kantonalna ali okrajna središča; provincijska ali pokrajinska središča; republiška središča	3 makroregionalna središča; mezoregionalna središča; mikroregionalna središča
<i>razvrščanje centralnih naselij v hierarhično stopnjo centralnosti</i>	razvrstitev indikatorjev glede na pogostost pojavljanja	razvrstitev indikatorjev glede na pogostost pojavljanja	opremljenost s funkcijami/storitvenimi dejavnostmi: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dejavnosti, ki so zastopane v od 150 do 500 naselijih; • dejavnosti, ki so zastopane v več kot 50 in manj kot 100 naselijih; • dejavnosti, ki so zastopane v manj kot 20 naselijih

z vsaj eno od štirih poglavitnih funkcij. Podatkovna zbirka temelji na Poslovnem registru Slovenije (AJPES) ter zbirkah ministrstev in agencij.

Izhajajoč iz dosedanjih opredelitev centralnih naselij, predlogov fokusne skupine in delavnice z zainteresirano javnostjo (Policentrično omrežje ... 2015) smo opredelili šest stopenj centralnosti (preglednica 2). Stopnjo centralnosti smo na eni strani določili na podlagi števila prebivalcev v posameznem naselju, na drugi strani pa smo posamezni funkciji pripisali, kateri stopnji centralnosti ustreza. Vrednotenje skupne stopnje centralnosti smo opravili s sestavljenim indeksom stopnje centralnosti (st_{cen}). V indeksu smo enakovredno

upoštevali povprečno stopnjo centralnosti, izhajajoč iz štirih funkcij $\left(\frac{\sum_1^4 f!}{4}\right)$, in stopnjo centralnosti z vidika števila prebivalcev (st_{pop}).

$$st_{cen} = \frac{\frac{\sum_1^4 f}{4} + st_{pop}}{2} \quad (1)$$

Preglednica 2: Stopnja centralnosti naselij in merila za posamezno stopnjo.

stopnja centralnosti	število prebivalcev	pričakovane funkcije
1. nacionalno središče mednarodnega pomena	100.001 in več	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sedež javne univerze • univerzitetni klinični center • višje sodišče
2. središče nacionalnega pomena	od 20.001 do 100.000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sedež visoke šole, fakultete ali akademije • večja splošna bolnišnica
3. središče regionalnega pomena	od 10.001 do 20.000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • okrožno sodišče • sedež višje šole • bolnišnica • sedež srednje šole
4. središče medobčinskega pomena	od 3001 do 10.000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • zdravstveni dom • upravna enota • okrajno sodišče
5. središče lokalnega pomena	od 1501 do 3000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • popolna osnovna šola • zdravstvena postaja • sedež občine
6. središče vicinalnega pomena	od 501 do 1500	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • podružnica osnovne šole

Pri razvrščanju naselij v posamezno stopnjo centralnosti smo določili naslednje meje razredov (preglednica 3).

Preglednica 3: Meje razredov pri opredeljevanju stopenj centralnosti.

stopnja centralnosti	vrednost indeksa centralnosti
1. nacionalno središče mednarodnega pomena	do 1,50
2. središče nacionalnega pomena	od 1,51 do 2,50
3. središče regionalnega pomena	od 2,51 do 3,50
4. središče medobčinskega pomena	od 3,51 do 4,50
5. središče lokalnega pomena	od 4,51 do 5,50
6. središče vicinalnega pomena	nad 5,51
6a. središče vicinalnega pomena z manj kot 500 prebivalci	število prebivalcev pod 500 in vsaj dve funkciji

Zaradi razpršene poselitve je v Sloveniji veliko številoma dobro opremljenih naselij z manj kot 500 prebivalci, kar smo sprva opredelili kot spodnje število prebivalcev v centralnem naselju. Zato smo dodali novo kategorijo centralnih naselij z manj kot 500 prebivalci, ki pa so morala imeti vsaj dve od obravnavanih štirih funkcij.

Ugotovili smo tudi, da več administrativnih naselij leži tesno eno ob drugem, funkcije pa so enakomerno porazdeljene med njimi, kar pomeni, da posamezno naselje ni nujno dovolj veliko ali opremljeno, če pa jih združimo, združeno naselje zadosti tako merilu velikosti kot opremljenosti. Tovrstna naselja smo poimenovali stična naselja (v besedilu so ta naselja podčrtana). Opredelili smo jih kot skupek morfološko povezanih naselij, ki kljub administrativni razčlenjenosti na več naselij delujejo kot funkcijsko povezana celota. Takšna naselja so morala zadostiti dvema kriterijema: da imajo večino (> 50 %) svojih prebivalcev na območjih večje zgotovitve hišnih številke (> 1,5 hišne številke/ha v polmeru 800 metrov), in da so območja večjih zgotovitev nujno neprekinjeno povezana z vsaj še enim tovrstnim območjem drugega naselja. Tako smo določili 56 območij, jih preverili še z vizualnim ogledom letalskih posnetkov in pregledom zastopnosti štirih funkcij ter tako seznam centralnih naselij razširili za dodatnih 29 stičnih naselij (slika 1). S stičnimi naselji smo lahko bolje ocenili raven opremljenosti zlasti na območjih strnjene poselitve in delitve funkcij med posameznimi naselji, na primer Nova Gorica–Šempeter–Vrtojba, Piran–Lucija ... (Nared, Bole in Ciglič 2016).

Slika 1: Stična naselja (Nared, Bole in Ciglič 2016).

Glej angleški del prispevka.

Za analizo omrežja centralnih naselij z vidika konkurenčnosti smo preučili tri kazalnike: izvoz v milijonih evrov po sedežu podjetij leta 2015 (SLOEXPORT 2016), število raziskovalcev po kraju dela (SICRIS 2016) in število patentov po kraju imetnika v obdobju 1991–2016 (Patenti 2016). Zadnja dva kazalnika sta pogosto sestavni del meritev globalnega kazalnika konkurenčnosti (Global Competitive ... 2016) in globalnega kazalnika ustvarjalnosti (Global Creativity ... 2016), zato sta primerna tudi za našo analizo konkurenčnosti. Statistično povezanost velikosti naselij, njihove opremljenosti s storitvami splošnega pomena in konkurenčnosti smo izračunali s pomočjo Spearmanovega korelacijskega koeficienta (ρ).

3 Rezultati

Na podlagi predstavljene metodologije smo v Sloveniji opredelili 360 centralnih naselij (slika 2), v katerih živi 1.318.051 prebivalec, kar je slabih 9,2 % naselij in 64 % prebivalcev. Dve naselji sta nacionalni središči mednarodnega pomena (Ljubljana, Maribor), pet je središč nacionalnega pomena (Celje, Nova Gorica, Koper, Novo mesto, Kranj), 12 središč regionalnega pomena (Domžale-Kamnik, Ptuj, Velenje, Iesence, Murska Sobota, Trbovlje, Piran, Slovenj Gradec, Izola, Škofja Loka, Brežice, Krško), 38 središč medobčinskega pomena, 55 središč lokalnega pomena, in 248 središč vicinalnega pomena, med katere smo uvrstili tudi 49 središč z manj kot 500 prebivalci, a z vsaj dvema poglobljenima funkcijama; v besedilu so stična naselja podčrtana.

Slika 2: Centralna naselja v Sloveniji 2016.

Glej angleški del prispevka.

Z vidika centralnih funkcij in velikosti naselja je močno v ospredju Ljubljana. Pomembno vlogo kot drugo največje mesto ohranja Maribor. Med ostalimi regionalnimi središči drugo stopnjo centralnosti dosega pet naselij (Celje, Nova Gorica, Koper, Novo mesto, Kranj), tretjo stopnjo pa štiri (pet) (Murska Sobota, Trbovlje, Slovenj Gradec, somestje Krško-Brežice). Najšibkejša med regionalnimi središči je Postojna, ki se uvršča na raven medobčinskih središč. Z vidika velikosti naselja in njegove gospodarske moči je s funkcijami podopremljeno Velenje, kar je v veliki meri posledica njegove lege med bližnjima regionalnima središčema, Celjem in Slovenj Gradcem.

Ljubljana ima velik upravni in gospodarski vpliv in postaja pomembno metropolitansko središče. Gospodarski pomen naselij na drugi in tretji stopnji centralnosti slabi, povečan vpliv pa znova zaznamo na ravni občinskih središč. Slednje lahko pripišemo reformi lokalne samouprave in »lokalizaciji« regionalne politike; o regionalnih projektih odločajo župani, ki dajejo prednost lokalnim projektom.

Nastanek številnih novih občin je močno vplival na število centralnih naselij šeste stopnje, zlasti tistih, ki ne dosegajo meje 500 prebivalcev. Skladno z velikostno sestavo slovenskih občin ta naselja prevladujejo v vzhodni Sloveniji.

Z vidika stičnih naselij je smiselno opozoriti zlasti na Domžale-Kamnik in Novo Gorico. Stično naselje Domžale-Kamnik je le morfološko povezano naselje brez delitve funkcij, saj sta obe glavni naselji središči medobčinskega pomena. Nasprotno pa je morfološka povezanost Nove Gorice in naselij Šempeter pri Gorici, Kromberk, Pristava, Rožna Dolina, Solkan in Vrtojba nadgrajena z delitvijo funkcij, zlasti med Šempetrom pri Gorici in Novo Gorico.

Zanimiva je tudi primerjava stopnje centralnosti z vidika velikosti naselja in z vidika opremljenosti naselja s posameznimi funkcijami. Večja naselja so praviloma bolje opremljena s funkcijami kot manjša. Če raven centralnosti po funkcijah presega raven centralnosti po številu prebivalcev, je naselje nadopremljeno, v nasprotnem primeru pa podopremljeno (slika 3).

Slika 3: Razlika med stopnjo centralnosti po funkcijah in stopnjo centralnosti glede na število prebivalcev v naselju. Glej angleški del prispevka.

Nadpovprečno opremljena so zlasti naselja na manj urbaniziranih predelih države, kar si lahko razlagamo z zavestnim enakomernim zagotavljanjem funkcij po celotnem državnem ozemlju kot posledico politike policentričnega urbanega razvoja od 60-ih let preteklega stoletja dalje. Pri tem je treba upoštevati, da bi se ob prilagajanju funkcij velikosti naselja redkeje poseljena območja soočala z razmeroma slabo opremljenostjo.

Podopremljena so zlasti središča v bližini večjih mest, kar je posledica suburbanizacije, ki je bila izrazita zlasti v zadnjih 40-ih letih (Ravbar 1997 in 2005). Zaradi selitev prebivalcev na obrobje mest se je v teh naseljih močno povečalo število prebivalcev, oskrba s funkcijami pa se temu ni dovolj hitro prilagajala.

Med centralnimi naselji je samo v 23-ih sedež večjega izvoznega podjetja (več od 0,5 % slovenskega izvoza). V tem oziru nadpovprečno izstopajo Ljubljana, Novo mesto in Velenje, ki skupaj ustvarijo več kot 50 % vsega slovenskega izvoza. Od večjih centralnih naselij Maribor (1. stopnja), Murska Sobota, Slovenj Gradec, Trbovlje, Brežice in Izola (3. stopnja) sploh nimajo sedeža večjega izvoznega podjetja. Glede na stopnjo centralnosti so razmeroma šibki tudi Celje, Kranj in Nova Gorica (2. stopnja) ter Domžale-Kamnik, Ptuj in Krško (3. stopnja). Obratno je veliko izvoznih podjetij v Škofji Loki (3. stopnja) in nekaterih centralnih naseljih nižjih stopenj, kot so Slovenska Bistrica in Idrija (4. stopnja), Mežica in Zreče (5. stopnja) ter Nazarje in Spodnja Idrija (6. stopnja).

V slovenskih raziskovalnih organizacijah je leta 2016 za polni, dodatni in skrajšan delovni čas zaposlenih 10.100 raziskovalcev, kar ustreza 8988 polno zaposlenim raziskovalcem. Njihova razporeditev med 69 centralnimi naselji je sicer nekoliko bolj razpršena od izvozno usmerjenih podjetij, vendar med njimi izrazito izstopa Ljubljana (69 %), kateri z velikim zaostankom sledi Maribor (12 %), ostala središča pa imajo bistveno manj raziskovalcev. Več kot en odstotek slovenskih raziskovalcev je še v naseljih Koper, Novo mesto, Celje in Rodica.

V obdobju 1991–2016 je bilo v Sloveniji podeljenih okoli 5800 patentov. Njihova razporeditev med centralnimi naselji je bolj razpršena od raziskovalcev in izvozno usmerjenih podjetij, saj so lahko patentni

Preglednica 4: Statistična povezanost kazalnikov konkurenčnosti centralnih naselij z njihovo velikostjo in opremljenostjo s storitvami (Spearmanov koeficient korelacije).

	izvoz (v milijonih evrov) (N naselij = 23)	število raziskovalcev (N naselij = 69)	število patentov (N naselij = 228)
stopnja naselja glede na šolstvo	0,399	0,651	0,489
stopnja naselja glede na zdravstvo	0,511	0,480	0,511
stopnja naselja glede na javno upravo	0,644	0,271	0,478
stopnja naselja glede na sodstvo	0,509	0,514	0,470
povprečna stopnja glede na šolstvo, zdravstvo, javno upravo in sodstvo	0,475	0,544	0,539
stopnja naselja glede na število prebivalcev	0,572	0,531	0,601
povprečna stopnja glede na šolstvo, zdravstvo, javno upravo in sodstvo ter število prebivalcev	0,524	0,557	0,592

ležeče oblikovano besedilo: povezanost je značilna pri stopnji tveganja $p < 0,05$ (dvostranska).

krepko oblikovano besedilo: povezanost je značilna pri stopnji tveganja $p < 0,01$ (dvostranska).

prijavitelji tudi fizične osebe. Kljub temu med 228 centralnimi naselji ponovno močno izstopa Ljubljana z 31 % vseh slovenskih patentov, ki ji z velikim zaostankom sledijo Maribor (7 %), Velenje, Kranj in Novo mesto (vsak po 3 %) ter Celje (2 %), medtem ko imajo ostala naselja manj kot dva odstotka podeljenih patentov.

Slika 4: Konkurenčnost centralnih naselij v Sloveniji z vidika izvoznih podjetij, raziskovalcev in patentov. Glej angleški del prispevka.

Konkurenčnost centralnih naselij je zmerno statistično povezana z njihovo velikostjo in opremljenostjo s funkcijami (preglednica 4). Ne največji povezanosti botrujejo predvsem velika moč Ljubljane, relativno nižja konkurenčnost Maribora, naselij 2. stopnje in večine naselij 3. stopnje ter relativno višja konkurenčnost nekaterih naselij nižjih stopenj centralnosti.

4 Razprava

Regionalna politika in spodbujanje razvoja policentričnega sistema poselitve sta imela v preteklosti pomembno vlogo pri oblikovanju naselbinskega sistema (Drozg 2005; Nared 2007). K temu sta poleg deklarativne usmerjenosti prostorskega razvoja v policentrični sistem poselitve prispevali zlasti obe pomembnejši reformi lokalne samouprave: uvedba komunalnega sistema v 60-ih in ustanovitev novih občin v 90-ih letih preteklega stoletja (Drozg 2005; Rus, Razpotnik Visković in Nared 2013). S tem lahko pojasnimo tudi dobro opremljenost naselij 4., 5. in 6. stopnje centralnosti. Na drugi strani se krepi vloga Ljubljane (Bole 2004 in 2011; Nared 2007; Ravbar 2007, 2009 in 2011; Ravbar, Bole in Nared 2005), kar je posebej opazno po zadnji gospodarski krizi, ko nudi Ljubljana zaposlitev vse širšemu zaledju delavcev (Bole s sodelavci 2012; Rus, Razpotnik Visković in Nared 2013). Vendar pa moramo biti pri razlagi vloge Ljubljane previdni, saj so podatki o dnevni mobilnosti, na podlagi katere smo preverjali vpliv središč (Nared s sodelavci 2016), vezani na podatke o delovnih mestih, kjer pogosto prihaja do napak, saj je kot lokacija dela večkrat naveden sedež podjetja (npr. v uradnih podatkih AJPEŠ-a), ne pa njegove izpostave, razmeščene drugje po Sloveniji (na primer Mercator, Petrol, Slovenska vojska).

V zadnjih desetletjih slabi vloga posameznih regionalnih središč, zlasti Postojne, Kranja (Rus, Razpotnik Visković in Nared 2013) in Murske Sobote, kar na eni strani nakazuje na izenačevanje razvoja znotraj regij, na drugi pa večanje razkoraka med Ljubljano in drugimi naselji.

Na sedanje stanje je močno vplivala policentrična razmestitev funkcij v preteklosti, kar nakazuje na zgodovinsko pogojeni razvoj naselbinskega sistema (angleško *path-dependent*; Martin in Sunley 2006; Bristow in Healy 2014). To zlasti odseva v razkoraku med stopnjo centralnosti glede na velikost naselja in stopnjo centralnosti glede na funkcije v naselju, kjer je zaznati, da se funkcije le počasi prilagajajo demografskim spremembam. Do podobnega sklepa lahko pridemo tudi pri razmestitvi raziskovalcev, ki so osredotočeni v dveh poglobitnih univerzitetnih središčih, medtem ko so patenti, ki bi morali biti v določeni meri tudi odraz dejavnosti akademske sfere, razporejeni po precej več naseljih. Rezultati obenem kažejo na vpliv preteklih ideologij na prostorsko načrtovanje, saj je bil policentrizem tudi cilj družbenega planiranja v socializmu. Vrišer (1978) tako omenja razvoj policentričnega sistema skladno z organiziranostjo sistemov temeljnih organizacij združenega dela, samoupravljanja in podobno.

Navkljub različni metodologiji se naše ugotovitve ujemajo s tistimi v raziskavi, opravljeni na Norveškem, kjer sta Dale in Sjøholt (2007) na podlagi opredelitve centralnih naselij s pomočjo gospodarskih in negospodarskih funkcij v peš dostopnosti ugotovila, da se specializirane storitve in tržno usmerjene funkcije zgoščujejo zlasti v naseljih z višjo stopnjo centralnosti, kjer torej v ospredje stopa konkurenčnost. Na drugi strani kraji z nižjo stopnjo centralnosti izgubljajo tržne storitve in ohranjajo le temeljne funkcije, kot so šole in trgovine z mešanim blagom. Tam je v ospredju zagotavljanje osnovne kohezivnosti državnega ozemlja.

Sicer pa je naša raziskava težje primerljiva s sodobnimi poskusi tujih raziskovalcev, ki se bolj kot na enakomerno zagotavljanje funkcij osredotočajo na vlogo konkurenčnosti in funkcijsko organizacijo policentričnih sistemov. V ospredju so predvsem mrežno povezovanje in gospodarska specializacija naselij in regij (Parr 2004), fizični policentrizem, ki se meri z dnevno mobilnostjo ali zaposlenostjo v določenih središčih, politično-upravni policentrizem, ki je posledica upravne razdelitve ozemlja, funkcionalni policentrizem, ki nastane zaradi specializacije mest znotraj urbanega sistema, ter regionalno-identitetni

policentrizem, ki je posledica zgodovinskih, simbolnih in družbeno-kulturnih procesov (Kloosterman in Musterd 2001).

Določanje centralnih naselij na podlagi storitev splošnega pomena zajame vidik konkurenčnosti zgolj z vidika vzpostavljanja podpornega okolja, zato je primerno za opredeljevanje in usmerjanje prostorske organizacije države, manj primerno pa za usmerjanje gospodarskega razvoja. Opredeljevanje stopnje centralnosti je namreč tesno povezano s politiko policentričnega razvoja, enim od temeljnih ciljev prostorskega razvoja v Evropi, pri čemer so Evropske prostorske razvojne perspektive (2000) poudarile tri cilje prostorskega razvoja Evrope:

- gospodarska in socialna kohezija,
- ohranjanje naravnih virov in kulturne dediščine ter
- teritorialno bolj uravnotežena konkurenčnost.

Te cilje naj bi države dosegle prav s policentričnim razvojem. Slovenija sledi zastavljenim usmeritvam, pri čemer sta v ospredju zagotavljanje osnovne pokritosti ozemlja s storitvami splošnega pomena in socialna kohezija, manj dosledna pa je Slovenija pri zagotavljanju teritorialno bolj uravnotežene konkurenčnosti.

5 Sklep

Namen prispevka je bil na podlagi izbranih storitev splošnega pomena (javna uprava, šolstvo, zdravstvo in sodstvo) ugotoviti, katera naselja sestavljajo omrežje centralnih naselij v Sloveniji leta 2016 in katere so njegove poglavitne značilnosti.

Na podlagi lastne metodologije smo opredelili šest stopenj centralnih naselij in jim določili ustrežajoča naselja:

1. nacionalna središča mednarodnega pomena (2 naselji; Maribor je v tem primeru stično naselje, kar pomeni, da skupaj s še nekaterimi naselji tvori skupek morfološko povezanih naselij, ki kljub administrativni razčlenjenosti na več naselij delujejo kot funkcijsko povezana celota; v besedilu so stična naselja podčrtana): Ljubljana, Maribor;
2. središča nacionalnega pomena (5): Celje, Nova Gorica, Koper, Novo mesto, Kranj;
3. središča regionalnega pomena (12): Domžale-Kamnik, Ptuj, Velenje, Iesenice, Murska Sobota, Trbovlje, Piran, Slovenj Gradec, Izola, Škofja Loka, Brežice, Krško;
4. središča medobčinskega pomena (38);
5. središča lokalnega pomena (55);
6. središča vicinalnega pomena (248).

Na skupaj 360 centralnih naselij je pomembno vplival zgodovinski razvoj, med drugim zlasti obe reformi lokalne samouprave, ki sta v marsičem določili razvoj policentričnega sistema poselitve v Sloveniji, še posebej z vidika kohezivnosti na ravni središč medobčinskega, lokalnega in vicinalnega pomena. Med drugimi dejavniki izpostavljammo močno centralizacijo, ki je posledica osredotočenosti bistvenih državnih institucij v glavnem mestu. Temu sledi tudi gospodarski razvoj, na kar kaže prevladujoči delež Ljubljane v izvoznih podjetjih, raziskovalcih in patentih.

Preskrba slovenskega ozemlja z obravnavanimi storitvami splošnega pomena je z vidika enakomerne prostorske pokritosti razmeroma ustrezna, a bi jo bilo treba nadgraditi z elementi spodbujanja konkurenčnosti, pri čemer naj se pozornost nameni zlasti središčem nacionalnega in središčem regionalnega pomena.

6 Literatura

Glej angleški del prispevka.