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Figure 1. Manastir/Bitola workshop attendees, July 2018.
Introduction

The Municipal Development Plan (MDP) for Mitrovica is a spatial planning document for the 2009 – 2025+ period, which determines long-term goals for economic, social and spatial development. Whereas, the Urban Development Plan (UDP) for Mitrovica provides more specific objectives and implementation strategies, for the same period of time. These documents were drafted in year 2009 according to the Kosovo’s Law on Spatial Planning (No. 2003/14) and Law No. 03/L-106 for changing the Law on Spatial Planning (No. 2003/14).

However, these laws were repealed once the new Law on Spatial Planning (No. 04/L-174) got approved in 2013. The new law provides a new spatial planning system, which requires more detailed MDPs and introduces the Municipal Zoning Maps (a new concept and practice in Kosovo), among other things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Basic information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitrovica South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitrovica North</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, as a result of the decentralization and entry into force of the new Law on Local Self-Governance (No. 03/L-040) and the Law on Administrative Municipal Boundaries (No. 03/L-041) in 2008, the Municipality of Mitrovica was divided into two separate municipalities: Mitrovica South and Mitrovica North in year 2013.

While the current MDP addresses Mitrovica as one municipality (Mitrovica South and Mitrovica North today), the new respective MDPs complying with the new law (No. 04/L-174) need to be drafted for each municipality separately. As such, both municipalities started the process of drafting their new MDPs.

Aim of the Evaluation

The aim of this activity is to assess the implementation of the MDP 2009 – 2025+ (and following UDP and URPs) for the Municipality of Mitrovica in practice, compatibility among the planning documents and their compliance with the new Law on Spatial Planning (No. 04/L-174) in Kosovo. Outputs will serve as a baseline and lessons learned for drafting the new MDP and MZM for Mitrovica South.

Assessing Existing Planning Documents methodology:

1. Legal compliance (Legal requirements)
2. Compatibility among Planning Documents (from MDP to UDP to URPs)
3. Implementation assessment (Public and private Investments)

Findings (existing data) will serve in the process of collecting the missing data for drafting the new MDP (based on the new Law on Spatial Planning (No. 04/L-174) and will be structured and migrated to the municipal spatial planning database.³

Furthermore, the whole MDP assessment process, evaluation tools and this thorough report will serve as a guideline for assessing planning documents (MDPs) in other municipalities in Kosovo.

---

3. This database has been suggested by UN-Habitat as an additional component of Spatial Planning Application in Kosovo (SPAK) database, which only contains the proposals/suggestions part of the MDPs and MZMs.
Evaluation Process and Tools

MDP Evaluation Tools were first presented in the Programmatic Workshop at the end of the Inception Phase (Baseline Assessment) workshop in which the MDP Evaluation was determined by the MPT as one of the main priorities in the core implementation phase of the Inclusive Development Programme. Preparations for the MDP evaluation process started with a kick off workshop, organized for representatives of both the Municipality of Mitrovica South and the Municipality of Mitrovica North with the assistance of MESP and MLGA, in Manastir/Bitola, Macedonia. This workshop aimed at increasing inter-municipal cooperation and addressing related planning issues, such as the MDP Evaluation/Planning Law Assessment Framework, the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan and the Spatial Database. Besides sharing experiences among the two municipalities, this workshop also served for introducing the evaluation tools to the municipality and civil society representatives, as well as for testing those tools.

For Mitrovica South, the MDP’s evaluation process was done by the MPT and other substantive contributors, with the assistance and guidance of UN-Habitat and supported by MESP. The groups were responsible for analyzing the provided data in the existing MDP according to the evaluation tools, and updating and filling in the identified outdated and missing data that are required by the law (No. 04/L-174) for drafting the new MDP.

---

Figure 1. Manastir/Bitola workshop attendees, July 2018.

For Mitrovica South, the MDP’s evaluation process was done by the MPT and other substantive contributors, with the assistance and guidance of UN-Habitat and supported by MESP. The groups were responsible for analyzing the provided data in the existing MDP according to the evaluation tools, and updating and filling in the identified outdated and missing data that are required by the law (No. 04/L-174) for drafting the new MDP.

---

4 Refer to the MDP Evaluation Workshop Report for more information - https://mega.nz/#!XrjV0SZb!AkvpPhxWdlI4Qat_oEdDBfDKfKkk51SKMoVE4os05U
The involved departments within the Municipality of Mitrovica South include:

- Department of Planning and Urbanism
- Department of Environmental Protection
- Department of Geodesy, Cadaster and Property
- Department of Inspection
- Department of Finance and Economic Development
- Department of Public Services and Infrastructure
- Department of Education
- Department of Health
- Department of Culture, Youth and Sports
- Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
- Department of Protection and Rescue
- Department of Administration

For the purpose of the evaluation process, the municipality and civil society representatives were divided into four groups. Those groups were mixed, composed of municipality officials from different departments, and addressed four themes (one theme per group respectively):

1. Compliance with the spatial planning legal framework
2. Implementation of the MDP/UDP and URPs
3. Capital projects
4. Private projects

The evaluation tools for the Mitrovica’s MDP assessment were prepared by UN-Habitat, which are divided into three categories:

1. Compliance with the spatial planning legal framework
   a. Municipal data
   b. Structure of the textual part of MDP and UDP
   c. List and content of the cartographic part of MDP and UDP
2. Compliance/Implementation of MDP and UDP
   a. Compliance of the textual part of MDP/UDP with Urban Regulatory Plans (URPs)
   b. Compliance of the cartographic part (urban design) of MDP/UDP with Urban Regulatory Plans (URPs)
   c. Compliance of capital projects and service provision activities with MDP/UDP
   d. Compliance of private investments (housing and economic activities) with MDP/UDP
3. Sustainability assessment
   a. Assessment of social sustainability
   b. Assessment of economic sustainability
   c. Assessment of environmental sustainability
   d. Governance

This report presents the findings of the four thematic groups regarding the first two evaluation tools, as the third evaluation tool is still in the drafting process.
1. COMPLIANCE WITH THE SPATIAL PLANNING LEGAL FRAMEWORK
1. Compliance with the spatial planning legal framework

The first evaluation tool assesses the MDP’s compliance with the spatial planning legal framework through the provided municipal data, its structure (table of content) of the textual part, and its list and content of the cartographic part. The referred documents include the Law on Spatial Planning (No. 04/L-174) and its Administrative Instruction on Elements and Basic Requirements for Design, Implementation and Monitoring of Municipal Development Plan (No. 11/2015). While this MDP has been drafted under the old law, the evaluation is made with the new law so that data tables, information sources, etc. can serve for the drafting of the new MDP.

1.1. Municipal data

The first evaluation model of the first evaluation tool assesses the provision of municipal data in the MDP according to 13 specific thematic fields, as well as the year of available data, the following steps that need to be undertaken if data is missing or incomplete (i.e. updates or filling in), and the source of information where the data can be obtained for future use if it is lacking in the MDP.

The thematic fields include:

1. Cultural and Natural Heritage,
2. Demography,
3. Settlements,
4. Housing,
5. Informal Settlements,
6. Social Infrastructure and Public Services,
7. Economy,
8. Technical Infrastructure and Services,
9. Transport Infrastructure and Services,
10. Natural Disasters,
11. Environmental Pollution,
12. Land Use and Transformation, and

As assessed, the total data provision within the MDP of Mitrovica is 6.5%, which means that out of 1,295 specific required fields in the Evaluation Model 1.a (Annex 1) only 84 fields (6.5%) were provided while missing 93.5% (Chart 1). The type of information that is mostly provided include the name (i.e. name of architectural monuments, educational, healthcare, cultural and sports institutions), location (often only identified visually in the maps), area (i.e. elementary school buildings, water bodies, agricultural and forest land), and some other specific data (i.e. road length, bus lines and stops, number of economic enterprises, number of employed people, types of water and soil pollutants etc.).

Whereas, out of the 84 provided fields, 52 (61.9%) are available and 32 (38.1%) are partially available (Chart 2).

---

5 These thematic fields are required by the Administrative Instruction No. 11/2015, but have been redesigned for the purpose of the Mitrovica MDP’s evaluation exercise. The obtained information in the tables will be used in the Municipal Integrated Database as well.
Through this assessment it is noted that the most covered thematic fields in the MDP of Mitrovica include the Environmental Pollution (5 covered fields out of 12 in total = 41.7%), Economy (27/184 = 14.7%) and Land Use and Land Transformation (7/57 = 12.3%). Whereas, the thematic fields not providing the specific required data in the evaluation tool include the Demography, Settlements, Informal Settlements, Housing, and Natural Disasters.

Regarding the year of the data provided within the MDP, most of the data is from the 2004-2007 period, while the remaining 28 fields (33.33%) of the provided data are not referenced to a year at all. As the MDP of Mitrovica addresses the whole municipality of Mitrovica (before it was officially divided in the Mitrovica South and Mitrovica North) and was published in 2009 (almost 10 years ago), most of the available and partially available data needs to be updated when drafting the new MDP for Mitrovica South.

As per the source of information where the missing data can be found for each thematic field, please see below the List of Institutions Matrix (detailed informations are provided in Annex 2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAFRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainkos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEISW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCYS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QKMF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: List of institutions for the missing data (please refer to the list of acronyms)
1.1.1. Cultural and natural heritage

Cultural and natural heritage section gathers information regarding architectural heritage, archaeological heritage, cultural landscapes, specially protected zones, natural reserves, national parks, specially protected natural zones, natural parks, natural monuments, protected landscapes, and parks' architectural monuments. Each category assesses provided information regarding the (registration) number, name, area, location and legal status.

Out of these 11 categories, MDP includes more detailed information about architectural heritage (26.66%), followed by the natural reserves (20%), natural monuments (20%), and archaeological heritage (5%). Within the architectural heritage, there is information provided only about architectural monuments, including the name of the monument, location (city of Mitrovica or villages), legal status (i.e. inventoried or protected) and registration number (80% of the required information). The time when the monuments were built can also be found in the MDP. However, there is no information provided regarding their corresponding areas and the year of provided data in the MDP. Archaeological heritage (archaeological settlements) and natural heritage (old trees and water sources) are only identified visually in a joint map, hence, only their location is provided.

### Chart 4: Cultural and natural heritage data availability (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data availability</th>
<th>Provided information</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks architectural monuments</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Number, name, area, location and legal status (4/15)</td>
<td>26.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected landscapes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural monuments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specially protected natural zones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National parks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural reserves</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Archaeological settlements’ location (mapped) (1/20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specially protected zones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural landscapes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water sources location (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural heritage</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>Number, name, area, location and legal status (4/15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Architectural settlements’ location (mapped) (1/20)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural landscapes</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specially protected zones</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural reserves</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Water sources location (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 The first working group for MDP evaluation has identified 87 architectural monuments in Mitrovica South mentioned in the MDP, among them mosques, churches, tekkes, tomb houses (tyrbe), hamams (old Turkish baths), house towers (kulla), and other public buildings (a museum, two hotels, and a post office).

7 PZHK Mitrovica, 2009, 84-86

8 PZHK Mitrovica, 2009, 87
1.1.2. Demography

Demography section gathers information regarding populations’ demographic background (gender, age, ethnicity, religion, households, and birth and mortality rates by settlements), migration rate (internal and international), education level, and socio-economic status. Besides the total population number, which is also estimated (as the MDP was drafted prior to Kosovo’s population census in 2011), no other information regarding the specific required categories is provided. As such, none of the 20 required fields is provided.

1.1.3. Settlements

The current MDP does not provide a specific list of settlements’ (urban neighborhoods and villages) names, typology, population, area, and density. Therefore, none of the 6 required fields is provided.

1.1.4. Informal settlements

Regarding informal settlements, there are three identified informal settlements in Mitrovica, two of which located in Mitrovica South and one in Mitrovica North⁹. However, no information is available regarding their typology (urban or rural), property ownership (public or private), number of inhabitants, number of single family houses, access to road and technical infrastructure and public services, and regulatory instruments. As such, none of the 6 required fields is provided.

1.1.5. Housing

Furthermore, the MDP lacks information about the housing sector as well, including housing types (i.e. individual houses, row houses, collective houses), number of housing units, property ownership, housing characteristics (i.e. building year/period, area, floors, number of rooms), parking spots, access to infrastructure and services, social housing etc. Out of 75 fields for individual housing units and 75 others for collective housing, no information is provided.

1.1.6. Social infrastructure and public services

Social infrastructure and public services section includes information about healthcare, educational, cultural and youth, sports and recreation, social welfare, religious, and administrative institutions and public spaces (such as cemeteries, squares and parks). The first working group has identified the information about healthcare, educational and sports and recreation institutions in Mitrovica’s MDP. Out of 337 specific fields required in this section, only 29 are provided (8.6%).

⁹ PZHK Mitrovica, 2009, 95-96
1.1.6.1. Healthcare institutions

The MDP evaluation table categorizes healthcare institutions into primary and secondary institutions. In Mitrovica South there are 18 primary healthcare institutions. The primary healthcare institutions comprise one Main Family Health Center, seven Family Health Centers, and ten Family Health Ambulances. Eight (44.44%) out of the 18 healthcare institutions are located within the urban area. Information provided about the healthcare institutions in the MDP of Mitrovica is only available in terms of their location in maps. No information is provided regarding the institutions’ establishment year, built area and floors, parking spots for workers and visitors, green area, number of doctors, and number of served population.

The Institute for Public Health is located in Mitrovica South as well, whereas one secondary healthcare institution has also been identified in Mitrovica North.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Healthcare institutions data availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------- ----------------- ----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (4/44)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

10 The urban area defined in UDP of Mitrovica (2009) comprises urban neighborhoods Center, Suhadoll (i Epërm dhe i Poshtëm), Industrial Zone, Business Zone, Sitnica, Bair, Ura e Gjakut, Vaganicë, Fidanishte, Ilirida, Zhabar i Poshtëm, Zhabar i Epërm, Shipol and Shupkovc.

11 PZHK Mitrovica, 2009, 76-78

12 When the MDP of Mitrovica was drafted, secondary healthcare services were provided in the General Hospital located in the northern part of the city (Mitrovica North). However, since 2013 Mitrovica South has been served by the General Hospital Dr. Sami Haxhibeqiri, which is part of the Hospital and University Clinical Service of Kosovo in Prishtina.
1.1.6.2. Educational institutions

The identified educational institutions in Mitrovica South include one public preschool, 26 elementary schools (including two special schools), three high schools, and two faculties. Out of these 32 institutions, 18 (56.25%) are located in the urban area (including the preschool, all high schools and faculties), while the rest are in villages. Common provided information within the MDP for all educational categories includes the name of the educational institution, location and gravitational zone (mapped) and the year of the provided data. For primary/elementary schools there is added information about the built area and number of classrooms. However, there is no information provided regarding the year of establishment, buildings’ characteristics (number of floors, other supporting buildings, parking spaces), number of served population, number of registered female and male pupils/students per location, number of graduated and dropping students, and number of teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data availability</th>
<th>Provided information</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschools</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Name, location and gravitational zone (mapped) (3/26)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Name, location and gravitational zone (mapped), built area, number of classrooms (5/26)</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High schools</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Name, location and gravitational zone (mapped) (3/26)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Name, location and gravitational zone (mapped) (3/26)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (14/104)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>13.46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.6.3. Sports and recreation

Regarding sports and recreation, the first working group has identified three professional sports facilities, among them the old soccer stadium, the new Olympic soccer stadium, and the sports hall “Minatori”. All those facilities are located within the urban area.\(^{13}\) Besides the name and location of those sports facilities, no other information (i.e. facilities’ area, year of establishment, served population, number of officials, built area, parking spots and green spaces) is provided within the MDP of Mitrovica.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data availability</th>
<th>Provided information</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional sports</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Name and location (visually mapped) (2/22)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational sports</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/11)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (2/33)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6.06</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) PZHК Mitrovica, 2009, 137-138
1.1.6.4. Cultural, religious and administrative institutions

The MDP of Mitrovica provides brief information about the Center of Culture (and some cultural events/festivals), the Public Library, and religious buildings (mosques and churches), as well as their locations.\textsuperscript{14}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Cultural and religious institutions data availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.6.5. Social welfare institutions

Identified social and community welfare institutions in Mitrovica South include the Center for Social Welfare and a shelter for victims of domestic violence.\textsuperscript{15} Provided information for the Center for Social Welfare include its name, establishment year and location (presented within the map).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8. Social welfare institutions data availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social care for people in need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in need/ categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social care institutions for people with special needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community services institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (3/69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.6.6. Public spaces

The MDP includes some information regarding the open and green spaces along the Ibër, Sitnica and Lushtha rivers, the city park, a pedestrian walkway in Street “Agim Hajrizi”, two small squares (Mehë Uka and Adem Jashari),\textsuperscript{16} and cemeteries.\textsuperscript{17} Some of these features are presented visually in a map, but no information is provided regarding the year they were created, their green and total area, parking spaces, and the number of people using them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. Public spaces data availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (3/29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{14} PZHK Mitrovica, 2009, 79
\textsuperscript{15} PZHK Mitrovica, 2009, 79
\textsuperscript{16} PZHK Mitrovica, 2009, 136-138
\textsuperscript{17} PZHK Mitrovica, 2009, 81
1.1.7. Economy

The economy section includes information about the GDP, economic enterprises (in general), economic zones (i.e. industrial parks/zones, business incubators/parks, technology parks, free zones, and their employees), sectorial economic enterprises (i.e. agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining, quarries, manufacture, utility services, construction, trade, transportation, accommodation and food, information and communication, finance and insurance, real estates, scientific and professional etc.), commercial zones, touristic zones, agricultural enterprises and yield production trends (all for the last four years). Table 9 shows the identified data provided in the economy section within the MDP of Mitrovica, among which the most available data include the number of enterprises (private, public and in total), number of people employed in some of these enterprises, area of industrial parks, agricultural land and meadows and pastures. The whole percentage of provided data within this field is 14.7%.

Chart 6: Economic data availability (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data availability</th>
<th>Provided information</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/4)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic enterprises</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>No. of total, private and public enterprises, no. of employed persons in private and public sectors (6/14)</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic zones</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Industrial parks area (1/12)</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectorial economic enterprises</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>No. of economic enterprises (13/84)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial zones</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Location (in the map) (1/9)</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touristic zones</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/9)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural enterprises</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>No. of agricultural enterprises, area of private and public agricultural land, area of cultivated and non-cultivated land, area of meadows and pastures (6/18)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield production trends</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/34)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (27/184) 14.7

18 PZHK Mitrovica, 2009, 54-64
1.1.8. Technical infrastructure and services

This section gathers information regarding the water supply infrastructure (ground and underground water sources capacities, water usage capacity, water network, water treatment capacity, water supply and conservation capacity per settlement, age of reservoirs, number of households per settlement, number of public and commercial users per settlement, and prices per households, public and commercial users), sewage network (number of served units per operator and per settlement), and water supply primary and secondary network (tubes dimensions and age per location). The MDP of Mitrovica provides limited information regarding the water supply infrastructure as shown in Table 10. As the water supply network is regional, no data is provided in settlements level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data availability</th>
<th>Provided information</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water supply infrastructure</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Total water network, water treatment capacity (2/21)</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage network</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/4)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply primary network</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/11)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply secondary network</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/11)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (2/47)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.9. Transport infrastructure and services

The transport infrastructure and services section gathers information regarding the highways, national, regional and local roads, and their physical and spatial characteristics (roads width and length, paved area and materials, parking spots, bus stops, taxi stops, traffic management buildings, gas stations, car maintenance objects etc.), settlement roads (maximum speed, intensity, load, lane widths, pedestrian and cycling paths widths, bridges and tunnels widths and lengths etc.), main urban roads, secondary urban roads, linking roads, uncategorized roads, and road public transport (bus terminal area, bus stops and lines, taxi stations, parking spots, number of passengers, etc.). At the time when the MDP of Mitrovica was drafted, there was no database/cadaster of the roads network. As such, most of the data for specific road categories is not provided in the MDP.
1.1.10. Natural disasters

Natural disasters section provides information about the affected area by the main natural disasters categories (erosion, earthquakes, flooding, landslides and forest fires) in the municipal and national level. Out of 20 required categories in this section, none is provided in the MDP.

1.1.11. Environmental pollution

This section gathers data regarding the air, water, soil and acoustic pollution (pollutants and affected areas) in measured sites. Data provided in the MDP consists mainly the water, soil and air pollutants and some of the affected areas (mapped).
### Table 13. Environmental pollution data availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data availability</th>
<th>Provided information</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pollutants and measured sites</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Air, water and soil pollutants (3/4)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollutants and affected areas</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Water and soil pollutants and affected areas (in map) (2/8)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (5/12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1.1.12. Land use and transformation

The land use and transformation sector gathers data regarding the main land use categories’ area, including the surface water bodies, agricultural land area, forests, natural heritage, places of cultural heritage, settlements, informal settlements, housing, social and public infrastructure, economic zones, commercial zones, transport infrastructure, and technical infrastructure. Categories covered within the land use section in the MDP of Mitrovica include the surface water bodies, agricultural land, forests, settlements, industrial area, road infrastructure and total (technical) infrastructure. The area of agricultural land and settlements is fully provided, while the rest lack specific information.19

### Chart 10: Land use and transformation data availability (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data availability</th>
<th>Provided information</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface water bodies</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Total surface water bodies area (1/3)</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural land</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Agricultural land area (1/1)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Total forests area (1/3)</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural heritage</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/8)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places of cultural heritage</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 PZHK Mitrovica, 2009, 104
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlements</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Settlements area (1/1)</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal settlements</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/4)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/6)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and public infrastructure</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/9)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic zones</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Industrial area (factories) (1/5)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial zones</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/1)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport infrastructure</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Road infrastructure area (1/4)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical infrastructure</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Total infrastructure area (1/7)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (7/57)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.1.13. Administrative and financial capacities

This section gathers information about the administrative and financial capacities of the municipality. The administrative capacities include the number of municipal officials, their formal education and work experience. Whereas, the financial capacities include the planned budget of the municipality for the next four years, the spent budget (i.e. wages, supplies and services, subventions, and capital investments), municipal incomes (from property and vehicle registration taxes, building permits, commercial activities, etc.) and received donations during the last four years, as well as spending trends (in total and per sectors). Besides the total spent budget from the municipality, no other detailed information is provided in the MDP of Mitrovica.\(^{20}\)

![Chart 11: Administrative and financial capacities data availability (%)](chart)

#### Table 15. Administrative and financial capacities data availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data availability</th>
<th>Provided information</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative capacities</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>None (0/12)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial capacities</td>
<td>Partially available</td>
<td>Total spent budget (1/66)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (1/78)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{20}\) PZHK Mitrovica, 2009, 41
1.2. Structure of the textual part of MDP

The second evaluation model of the first evaluation tool assesses the structure (table of content) of the MDP’s textual part whether it includes the required sections set in the Administrative Instruction on Elements and Basic Requirements for Design, Implementation and Monitoring of Municipal Development Plan (No. 11/2015).

Those sections are:
- Introduction,
- Municipal Profile,
- Situation Assessment,
- Spatial Planning Framework, and
- Strategic Development Priorities and the Action Plan.

This evaluation model can be used for assessing all MDPs drafted after the new Law on Spatial Planning (No. 04/L-174) was enforced in 2013. As the MDP of Mitrovica was drafted in 2008/2009, it cannot be assessed whether it follows the required aforementioned structure. Even though this evaluation model is not applicable to this specific spatial planning document, the structure of MDP’s textual part was still assessed by the working group and it can be found in Annex 1. Information from this assessment is useful in determining the missing sections or those that need to be updated. As it is almost 10 years since the MDP was drafted, it is obvious that most of the data provided in the MDP will need to be updated.

1.3. List and content of the cartographic part of MDP and UDP

The third evaluation model of the first evaluation tool evaluates the list and content of the cartographic part of the existing MDP if they comply with the requirements in the Administrative Instruction No. 11/2015. The required maps include existing and planned spatial development map (including settlements with construction areas and protection measures), future land use map (i.e. agricultural, housing, commercial, technologic, industrial and mixed use) and sectorial development plans as follows:
- Spatial development map,
- Future land use map,
- Economic development plan map,
- Transport infrastructure plan map,
- Urban and rural transport plan map,
- Electrical and thermal energy plan map,
- Water supply and sewage map,
- Irrigation and drainage system map,
- Telecommunication and other similar installation plan map,
- Public and social facilities plan map,
- Sport facilities and areas plan map,
- Open public spaces and green areas plan map,
- Cemeteries management plan map,
- Protection of natural and cultural heritage plan map,
- Risk mitigation plan map, and
- Waste management and recycling plan map.
The MDP of Mitrovica does not have a List of Maps in the beginning of the document. The maps are integrated within the textual part, therefore, they have been assessed according to their content (Annex 1).

Out of 16 required aforementioned maps, the MDP of Mitrovica contains only five of them (31.25%), including the spatial development map, transport infrastructure plan map, urban and rural transport plan map, electrical and thermal energy map (partially), and water supply and sewage map. These maps need to be updated, whereas the missing 11 maps (68.75%) need to be drafted for the new MDP.
2. Compliance/Implementation of MDP, UDP and URPs
2. Compliance/Implementation of MDP, UDP and URPs

The second evaluation tool assesses the MDP’s (and UDP’s) compliance with URPs by assessing whether the building conditions and spatial/development concepts set in the approved Urban Regulatory Plans (URPs) comply with development conditions set in the MDP and UDP.

2.1. Coverage of urban area with Urban Regulatory Plans (URPs)

The urban area of Mitrovica South as defined in UDP (2009) was comprised of a total 20 quarters (neighborhoods). After the division of Mitrovica into two municipalities, six of them passed under the administration of Mitrovica North. Currently, Mitrovica South has 14 quarters (neighborhoods). Out of these 14, 6 of them have approved regulatory plans:

- Urban Regulatory Plan 'Qendra' 2010 - 2025+
- Urban Regulatory Plan 'Fidanishte' 2010 - 2025+
- Urban Regulatory Plan 'Illirida' 2010 - 2025+
- Urban Regulatory Plan 'Bairi' 2012 - 2025+
- Urban Regulatory Plan 'Ura e Gjakut' 2014
- Urban Regulatory Plan 'Sitnica' 2014

The urban area of Mitrovica South is approximately 1320.93ha (defined so in the decision to draft the new MDP) of which 402.09ha are covered with regulatory plans. Please refer to map 1 to see the coverage of urban areas with URPs.

2.1.1 Destination of spatial entireties by regulatory plans at municipal level - differences with UDP

Out of the 6 regulatory plans, the compatibility between UDP and URPs regarding the destination of the areas is high (please refer to the Map 2). The URP 'Qendra' in compliance with the UDP foresees the development of its 7 sub-groups with multifamily - collective and individual housing, public administration, business, greenery, public space, etc. The URP 'Fidanishte' is compatible with UDP except the subgroup F.C (please refer to the Map 2) which, while UDP envisages densification and access of the residential area in infrastructure, in URP is described as a Reserved Space (Institutional-Sports) Housing (now neighborhood built for the RAE community), as well as greenery along the river. The URP 'Illirida' is fully compatible with UDP. Both planning documents, see the area as a suitable area for housing, housing and commercial, institutions and parks. The URP 'Bairi' is compatible with UDP except the sub-groups B.A, B.I, B.L (please refer to the Map 2). While the UDP foresees the sub-group B.A as housing area with access to infrastructure, in the URP, the area consists of additional content such as elementary school and mosque. On the other hand sub-groups B.I and B.L are defined in UDP as a military zone (potential for crafts), in URP the area B.I is defined as a primary school area, kindergarten, healthcare center, crafts and the area B.L as a greenery area. Other area’s destinations are fully compatible. The URP 'Ura e Gjakut' is fully compatible with UDP. Both planning documents, see the area as suitable for collective and individual housing, housing and commercial, housing with high percentage of greenery, institutions and parks. The URP 'Sitnica' is compatible with UDP except for some of the sub-groups S.F, S.G, S.K (please refer to Map 2). While the UDP foresees the densification and access of the residential area in infrastructure, URP’s subgroup S.K is complemented with social buildings while the subgroup S.G foresees individual housing, meanwhile UDP has foreseen densification.
Harta 1: Mbuleshmiria e zonës urbane me plane regulluese

Zona Urbane e Mitrovice: 1320.93 hA

Grupet urbane me plane regulluese:
1. Qendra: 60.84 hA
2. Fidaniqere: 63.6 hA
3. Iliria: 56.15 hA
4. Bajr: 94.95 hA
5. Ura e Gjakut: 89.9 hA
6. Shtima: 36.85 hA

Mbuleshmiria e zones urbane me plane regulluese: 402.09 hA

Grupet urbane pa plane regulluese:
7. Zona e Bizneseve: ~735.5 hA
8. Zona Industriale: ~155.59 hA
9. Shupkove: 330 hA
10. Vagioni: 543 hA
11. Shipo: 155 hA
12. Zhabar e Qerrin: 264 hA
13. Zhabari i Poshtme: 292 hA
14. Sukadol: 127 hA

Mbuleshmiria e zones urbane pa plane regulluese: 1940 hA

LEGJENDA
Zonat urbane:
- Me plane regulluese
- Pa plane regulluese

Zonat urbane te Mitrovice Jugore agjes F2H-Line

20.8%
78.2%
2.1.2 Compliance of the textual and cartographic part of MDP/UDP with Urban Regulatory Plans (URPs)

This model of the second tool assesses the URPs compliance with the MDP and UDP in terms of development and building/construction conditions. The model is divided into the textual and graphical part. In the textual section, an explanation should be provided if there is no compliance at all or if there is compliance with specific decisions approved by the municipal assembly or public discussion. On the other hand, the cartographic part analysis groups and sub-groups within the URPs, their compliance with UDP provisions and the peculiar cases affected by the non-compliance and their impact. For further information, filled tables are provided in the annex 2 of this report.

The map 3 below, shows the compatibility between UDP and URPs, based on the building conditions, while the following maps 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 give detailed information for each URP. While completing the tables (please see Annex 2), the working group has met on 4 occasions in terms of compliance/non-compliance.

a. Building conditions are compatible between UDP and URPs - with the same conditions (72.75% of the urban area covered with URPs);

b. Building conditions are compatible between UDP and URPs - By decision of the Assembly to raise the coefficient or public discussion (16% of the urban area covered with URPs);

c. Building conditions are not compatible between UDP and URPs - with different conditions (4.5% of the urban area covered with URPs);

d. Building conditions are not compatible between UDP and URPs - with different conditions (even after the decision of the Assembly to raise the coefficient or public discussion) (6.75% of the urban area covered with URPs);

Urban Regulatory Plan ‘Qendra’ is 19% compatible with UDP with the same conditions; 64% compatible with UDP by the decision of the assembly to raise the coefficient and 17% not compatible with UDP even after the decision for raising the coefficient.

Urban Regulatory Plan ‘Fidanishte’, ‘Ura e Gajkut’ and ‘Sitnica’ are fully compatible with the UDP.

Urban Regulatory Plan ‘Ilirida’ is 82% compatible with UDP with the same conditions; and 18% not compatible with UDP.

Urban Regulatory Plan ‘Bairi’ is 90% compatible with UDP with the same conditions; and 10% not compatible with UDP even after the decision for raising the coefficient.

As a result of the increase of the coefficient with the decision of the Municipal Assembly for the city center (URP "Qendra" and part of the URP "Bairi"), the result on the ground showed a densification of the area beyond expectations and initial previsions. If we take illustrative examples as in Scheme 1, then we see that the effect of increasing the coefficient for 1 linearly has differently affected the building conditions.

As for the illustration when the building was 2 floors, with the coefficient from 1 to 2, it rose to 4 floors, or 100%, when the building was 8 floors, with the coefficient from 3 to 4, it increased to 10 floors, or 25% and so on.
Schematic illustration: The effect of increasing the coefficient for 1

Example 1: Coef. from 1 to 2 (100%) from 2 floor to 4 floors

Example 2: Coef. from 3 to 4 (25%) from 8 floor to 10 floors
Harta 4: Pajtueshmëria mes PZHK/PZHU dhe PRrU "Qendra", bazuar në kushtet e ndërtimit

**LEGJENDA**
- PO
- PO (Me vendim të Kuvendit apo diskutim publik)
- JO
- JO (Me vendim të Kuvendit apo diskutim publik)

**QENDRA**
- 17%
- 19%
- 64%

Zonat urbane te Mitrovices Jugore sipas PZHU-se
Harta 5: Pajtueshmëria mes PZHK/PZHU dhe PRrU 'Fidanishte', bazuar në kushtet e ndërtimit

LEGJENDA

- PO
- PO (Me vendim të Kuvendit apo diskutim publik)
- JO
- JO (Me vendim të Kuvendit apo diskutim publik)

FIDANISHTETE

Zonat urbane te Mitroviceq Jugore sipas PZHU-se

1. QENDRA
2. FIDANISHTETE 63.6 ha
3. ILIRIDA
4. BAIR
5. URA E GJAKUT
13. ZHABAR I POSHTEM
Harta 6: Pajtueshmëria mes PZH/K/PZHU dhe PRrU 'Ilirida', bazuar në kushtet e ndërtimit

LEGJENDA

- PO
- PO (Me vendim të Kuvendit apo diskutim publik)
- JO
- JO (Me vendim të Kuvendit apo diskutim publik)

ILIRIDA

- 18%
- 82%

Zonat urbane të Mitrovica Jugore sipas PZHU-se
Harta 7: Pajtueshmeria mes PZH/K/ZHU dhe PRrU 'Bair', bazuar në kushtet e ndërtimit

LEGJENDA

PO
PO (Me vendim të Kuvendit apo diskutim publik)
JO
JO (Me vendim të Kuvendit apo diskutim publik)

BAIRI

Zonal urbane te Mitrovices Jugore sipas PZHU-se
Harta 8: Pajtueshmeria mes PZHK/PZHU dhe PRrU 'Ura e Gjakut', bazuar në kushtet e ndërtimit

**LEGJENDA**
- PO
- PO (Me vendim tê Kuvendit apo diskutim publik)
- JO
- JO (Me vendim tê Kuvendit apo diskutim publik)

**URA E GJAKUT**

100%

Zonat urbane te Mitrovices Jugore sipas PZHU-se

1. ZHABAR I POSHTEM
5. URA E GJAKUT 89.9ha
11. Shipol
13. ZHABAR I POSHTEM
10. Vaganice

3. ILIRIDA
3. BAIR
Harta 9: Pajtueshmeria mes PZHK/PZHU dhe PRrU 'Sitrnica', bazuar në kushtet e ndërtimit

LEGJENDA

PO
PO (Me vendim të Kuvendit apo diskutim publik)
JO
JO (Me vendim të Kuvendit apo diskutim publik)

SITNICA

100%

Zonat urbane te Mitrovices Jugore sipas PZHU-se

1. QENDRA

7. ZONA E BIZNESEVE

6. SITNICA, 36.65 ha

8. ZONA INDUSTRIALE

9. SHUPKOVC
2.2 Compliance among MDP/UDP with Urban Regulatory Plans (URPs) - Design and function (spatial concepts)

2.2.1 Compliance among MDP/UDP with Urban Regulatory Plans (URPs) - Road Network

Within the MDP and UDP, the road network and mobility is considered as one of the priority areas for future treatment/development. Beyond the main roads (M2, M22.3) and national roads (R111, R129, R200) that represent the spinal axis of the transport system in the municipality, it is also proposed to build a local road network to facilitate the connection within the urban area of the city but also to connect the different villages of the municipality.

The UDP handles the road infrastructure and mobility in its sub-chapters, and the set priorities are:

a. Continuation of the Bypass in the south;
b. Building a local road network;
c. Parking places in the center;
d. Functionalization the urban bus system;
e. Improvement of railway network and access of craft workshops.

In these planning documents, railway infrastructure is described as a central level competence, but is considered of a strategic importance as the revitalization of the rail network would facilitate mobility in the city and directly affect the economic development of the municipality. As in other cities in Kosovo, in order for the city to be discharged from the traffic and congestion, it is proposed to build new parking places in the outskirts of the city and reach the center through public transport (not yet available in Mitrovica South).

Following the approval of the MDP and UDP in 2009, the municipality of Mitrovica has adopted urban regulatory plans for 6 neighborhoods of the city, starting with the Center, Ilirida and Fidanishte in 2010, Bairi in 2012, Ura e Gjakut and Sitnica in 2014. In each of these plans, however, special treatment has been given to road infrastructure. Map 10 shows the compliance and non-compliance between the UDP and the road network defined in the relevant URPs (as a whole), while Map 11 shows how the road infrastructure foreseen by the URPs was implemented on the ground up to the beginning of 2018.

Generally, the road infrastructure in urban areas is pretty much adapted to the one defined in the UDP. Map 10 focuses on the cases when certain road or profile tracks have changed in certain URPs, but generally did not escape the primary concept of the UDP. For example in the URP 'Fidanishte' since this proposes the construction of the RAE community neighborhood, the road network has been reorganized. However the connection between the crossroad at the 'Adem Jashari' stadium and the crossroad in the center of the city was still made possible. In the other case, the bypass track in the south of Bairi has changed track, but the connection with Shupkovc is the same. The rest of the road infrastructure fully agrees between the two documents.

On the other hand, if we compare the road infrastructure of the URPs and the existing road infrastructure (beginning of 2018) then it can be seen that some parts in the urban area escaped the concept foreseen in the relevant URPs. Map 11 focuses on these cases. For example, the case in Bairi, it can be seen that after the construction of houses, residents have built roads that lead directly to the entrance of their houses by not following the concept of dead end roads (cul de sac) foreseen in URP. The rest of the roads in Bairi is in harmony with the URP, comparison is made for those roads that have already been built as none of the URPs has been fully implemented up to today. In the Sitnica neighborhood the roads are somewhat in harmony, but there are other paved
roads, which are not foreseen in the plan, and it is clearly seen that these roads are connecting residential houses to local roads. Also in the eastern part of this neighborhood was constructed a new road infrastructure that connects the neighborhood with the business zone. In the Fidanishte neighborhood as explained above, a new road infrastructure alongside with the construction of the RAE community neighborhood was established. However, the foreseen connecting road between the RAE neighborhood and the Ibrir road that sends in Suhadoll is no longer feasible because of the construction of the swimming pool and the hotel at the location of the Iber River, which location tangents the RAE neighborhood. However, for this link there are alternative constructed roads.

Explanation: This report has evaluated the road infrastructure in terms of network in general, but not the design or profile (such as length, width, sidewalks, cycling paths, greenery, parking lots, etc.) These are also important components that determine the good functioning of traffic within the city center.

It is worth mentioning that the issue of mobility (road infrastructure, transport, walking, cycling) more specifically is being addressed by the municipality of Mitrovica South with the support of UN-Habitat through the drafting of the Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan.

2.2.2 Public and institutional space - Compatibility between the proposal and the existing situation

For the 6 neighborhoods with a regulatory plan, it has been easier to implement projects over the last 10 years. However, the city of Mitrovica was characterized by high development even in other parts, where regulatory plans were lacking. An example of this is the upper part of Lower Zhabar which is linked to the Iber River bed and is tangled with the neighborhood Fidanishte. The construction of the artificial lake, the presence of the Olympic Stadium 'Adem Jashari' at that location, the construction of the new Mitrovica University Campus as well as the undergoing construction of the 'Aqua Park' swimming pools and hotel have certainly affected the surrounding area but also prioritizing this area as very attractive for future development. Map 12 below illustrates how the URP proposal has been in relation to common public spaces (in particular greenery and river beds) compared to today's situation in 2018. Despite densification of the center area, one part of Bairi and surrounding areas, on the map it can be seen that the presence of greenery (free intermediate surface) in the urban area of the city is quite high.

Specifically, 'Ura e Gjakut' and 'Sitnica' are characterized by individual housing and high presence of greenery. In the illustrative example for the area of the artificial lake, considerable consistency can be seen between the foreseen and the implementation projects. But the project for the artificial lake is a particular project, since Lower Zhabar did not have a regulatory plan. Then, the 'Aqua Park' project as an extension of the artificial lake project has been extended into the area that operates with the URP 'Fidanishte' by changing the initial destination. The rapid development of this area should be monitored very carefully, and with the new law in force. After the drafting of the MDP and the MZM, detailed regulatory plans should be considered and the impact of the surrounding areas as well. For example, the positioning of the RAE community neighborhood in this area should be treated carefully so that the area and development are inclusive and serve all the citizens of the city without exception.
3. COMPLIANCE OF CAPITAL PROJECTS AND SERVICE PROVISION ACTIVITIES WITH MDP/UDP
3. Compliance of capital projects and service provision activities with MDP/UDP

The third evaluation model of this tool assesses whether the capital projects and activity plans comply with the MDP’s goals/objectives and activities. Furthermore, it gathers specific information for the Capital Investment Projects (CIPs) based on the investing department (sector), type of investment (infrastructure or service based), year and location. Such information will be geo-referenced and added to the Municipal Integrated Database.

The MDP of Mitrovica has eight general objectives, which include:

- Objective 1 (O1): Multiethnic city/cooperation

The basic issue in the field of multiculturalism and coexistence is that planning is coordinated and done in cooperation with both parts of the city.\(^{22}\)

- Objective 2 (O2): Regional economic center in northern Kosovo

Supporting and raising human capital is an important basis of economic prosperity. For this reason, as a main task is considered education and training of the workforce, a duty that must be fulfilled energetically.

"Treasury of Kosovo" offers us the economic potential of extracting the ore, the possibility of exploitation and processing of which should be examined more precisely. In the MDP, the areas/zones for this destination should be kept free.\(^{22}\)

- Objective 3 (O3): Social infrastructure (education and healthcare)

The expansion of educational facilities is urgent. Priority is given to buildings, which possess the least space for a student. It is imperative to plan school facilities including the definition of standards (at the state level).\(^{23}\)

- Objective 4 (O4): Technical infrastructure

The supply of drinking water must necessarily be solved in a regional context. A concept of expansion of the drinking water supply network should be developed, which will include those villages and sub-centers that can topographically be included. For areas that can not be included in the water supply network, a concept for supplying drinking water should be drafted (checking other drinking water sources). Power supply should necessarily be reviewed in regional and state context. With regard to the sewage network, a concept for its expansion and maintenance is needed.\(^{24}\)

- Objective 5 (O5): Traffic communications infrastructure

The highest priority is given to the inclusion of suburbs within the city of Mitrovica, in order for the rural population to have better access to the areas of consumption and health institutions and at the same time contribute to the reduction of village-city migration.\(^{25}\)

- Objective 6 (O6): Conditions for a healthy life and better environmental quality

During the remediation of waste sites, immediate measures should be taken to prevent other emissions of harmful elements.\(^{26}\)

\(^{21}\) Extract from the MDP (2009) on priority projects of the respective objectives, 217-224
\(^{22}\) Ibid 20
\(^{23}\) Ibid 20
\(^{24}\) Ibid 20
\(^{25}\) Ibid 20
\(^{26}\) Ibid 20
- Objective 7 (O7): Sustainable development of settlements

*MDP and UDP form the basis for drafting urban regulatory plans. It is therefore important for urban quarters, as well as for suburbs near the city, to draft urban regulatory plans as soon as possible.*

- Objective 8 (O8): Rural zones and agriculture

*Agriculture is an important economic pillar for rural areas. Agricultural products need potentially to grow, while agricultural products should be processed in accordance with market requirements. An intensification of irrigation in the area that includes Iber-Lepenc is significant.*

The thematic working group has checked the compatibility of projects with the objectives and activities listed in three ways:

1. If after the review of the list, the project does not match neither the objective nor the activity, they marked X on the respective table.

2. If, after reviewing the list, the project does not comply with the activity but complies with one of the objectives, they marked O and the respective target number in the respective table (for example O3 for the Objective 3)

3. If the project complies with one of the objectives and any of the activities (in some cases more than 1 activity, the group filled the box with a. Partially complies with yellow, b. Completely comply with green).

Please refer to Annex 5 for further information on each Department addressed in this report.

Whereas, CIPs implementing departments include:

- Department of Education,
- Department of Healthcare,
- Department of Public Services and Infrastructure,
- Department of Culture, Youth and Sports,
- Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, and
- Other departments, including:
  - Department of Planning and Urbanism,
  - Department of Environmental Protection,
  - Department of Geodesy, Cadaster and Property,
  - Department of Administration etc.

---

27 Ibid 20
28 Ibid 20
Explanation: This report does not include all 14 departments as there are in the municipality of Mitrovica South. The aim of this tool was to evaluate those capital investments or projects of relevant departments distributed across the entire territory of the municipality in order to assess their compliance with the objectives and purpose envisaged for development in the 2009 MDP. Findings will contribute also in the drafting of the new MDP, more precisely in the orientation of its development and defining the objectives and goals for the next decade. This exercise was carried out with data from the 10 above mentioned departments that provided the working group with their data from 2008 to 2017. However, the findings in this report are results of the work undertaken by the working group; eventual errors may be present. However this report is considered as a starting point for the work to be further developed.

During the period of 2008-2017, there were 871 total CIPs implemented across the aforementioned departments in the Municipality of Mitrovica. As seen in Chart 13, most of the projects were implemented by the Department of Public Service and Infrastructure (433 CIPs), whereas the least by Department of Culture, Youth and Sports (22 projects).

Chart 14 shows the yearly distribution of the implemented CIPs across the departments throughout the period of 2008-2017. Note that no data has been provided for years 2008, 2009 and 2011 for the Department of Culture, Youth and Sports, and years 2009 and 2011 for the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development.

Whereas, Chart 15 shows the CIPs breakdown into infrastructural and service-based projects, where it can be seen that all the departments have mainly implemented infrastructural projects.
Chart 14: CIPs across departments per year
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Chart 15: CIPs across departments per type/function
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Of all the projects analyzed within this report in the period 2008-2017, Objective 3 and Objective 5 have been mostly met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDP/UDP OBJECTIVES/STRATEGIES</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1- Multiethnic City / Cooperation</td>
<td>15 projects</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2- Regional Economic Center in northern Kosovo</td>
<td>10 projects</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3- Social Infrastructure (education and health)</td>
<td>219 projects</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4- Technical Infrastructure</td>
<td>89 projects</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O5- Traffic Infrastructure</td>
<td>449 projects</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O6- Healthy Living Conditions- Environment and Quality of Life</td>
<td>31 projects</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O7- Sustainable development of settlements</td>
<td>40 projects</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O8- Rural Areas and Agriculture</td>
<td>53 projects</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the objectives</td>
<td>29 projects</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16/17. Percentage of meeting the MDP/UDP objectives/strategies through capital projects and other investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Combinations</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O1 and O6</td>
<td>2 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1 and O7</td>
<td>1 project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1 and O5</td>
<td>10 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1 and O4</td>
<td>9 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1 and O3</td>
<td>4 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1 and O8</td>
<td>1 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2 and O7</td>
<td>6 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3 and O6</td>
<td>1 project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O4 and O6</td>
<td>2 projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 Department of Education

During the period of 2008-2017, the Department of Education has invested in 137 projects. As shown in Chart 16, most of the CIP projects (40 projects) were done in year 2012, while the least (1 project) in 2014.

Regarding the type of investments, the majority of the projects (134 of them) were infrastructural (i.e. new buildings or annexes, renovations, and provision of supplies) and the rest (3 projects) were service-based (i.e. establishing new centers or clubs).

Whereas, regarding the location, most of the projects (71 of them) were concentrated in the urban area of Mitrovica. The remaining investments are distributed across villages as shown in Chart 18 and Map 9. It should be noted that 14 projects do not mention a specific location.
Harta 14: Shpërndarja hapësinore e PIK dhe investimeve të tjera- Drejtoria e Arsimit
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The CIPs of the Department of Education fall into the **Objective 3 – Social infrastructure (education and healthcare)**, specifically addressing:

- Increasing school buildings capacities and improvement of their inventories (equipment),
- Building preschool buildings.

All the projects address the first sub-objective, as no new preschools or kindergartens were built during the period of 2008-2017. Out of 137 projects, 24 projects fully comply with one or two specific activities and six comply partially. The remaining projects comply with the Objective 3 in general, but not with specific activities.

### 3.2 Department of Healthcare

The Department of Healthcare has invested in totally 66 projects during the 2008-2017 period. Most of the projects have been done during the year 2011 (13 projects) and 2012 (12 projects).
Most of the invested projects (89.4% or 59 projects) are infrastructural (including healthcare building renovations, new annexes, yard and other facilities reparations, auto ambulances, and other related inventories), while the rest (10.6% or 7 projects) are service-based (i.e. information technology systems and buildings maintenance).

29 (43.9%) of the CIPs done by the Department of Healthcare are located within the Mitrovica’s urban area, while the remaining ones do not have a specific location provided.

Out of 66 projects, there are three projects fully compliant with one of the activities (including building and rebuilding new healthcare facilities) and 17 partially compliant with one of the activities (building FHC buildings) within the **Objective 3 – Social infrastructure (education and healthcare)**. One project is fully compliant with one of the activities (phone and internet network expansion) and five others are partially compliant with one of the activities (expansion and maintenance of drinking water network, septic holes for peripheral villages) within the **Objective 4 – Technical infrastructure**. All the CIPs comply with Objective 3 in general. Seven of them comply both with Objective 3 and 4 in general, and two others (maintenance of healthcare buildings) with Objective 3 and Objective 6.
3.3 Department of Public Services and Infrastructure

During the period of 2008-2017, the Department of Public Services and Infrastructure has implemented 433 projects. The year with most implemented projects is year 2017, with 79 projects (18.24% of total CIPs).

The majority of projects (427 projects or 98.61%) are infrastructural (i.e. road construction and pavement, water and sewage system improvements, street signage placement, public spaces improvements, public lighting instalment etc.), while the remaining six are service-based (drafting of capital investments projects).

Regarding the location, almost half of all the projects (48.73% or 211 projects) have been implemented in Mitrovica’s urban area, 31.63% (137 projects) in villages, 4.38% (19 projects) within two or more settlements, and 15.24% (66 projects) do not have a specific location provided.
All the projects are in general compliance with the **Objective 5 – Traffic communications infrastructure**, complying partially with the activity of roads treatment according to their related priorities, needs and feasibility.
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3.4 Department of Culture, Youth and Sports

The Department of Culture, Youth and Sports has invested in totally 20 projects during the period of 2010-2017. Most of the projects have been done in year 2012 (six projects) and 2013 (five projects). 21 of the projects are infrastructural (such as constructing sports terrains and stadiums, building community centers, functionalizing the city cinema, inventory for the city library etc.), while the remaining one is service-based (culture project for communities). 11 of the projects are located within the Mitrovica’s urban area, four across villages and five do not have a specific location.

12 of the projects comply with **Objective 3 – Social infrastructure (education and healthcare)** in general (but not specifically with any of its activities), three projects with both **Objective 1 – Multiethnic city/cooperation** and **Objective 3 – Social infrastructure (education and healthcare)** (but not specifically with any of their activities), and the remaining five do not comply with any of the objectives nor their activities. Within those that comply with Objective 3 in general, two are fully compliant with one or two activities, while two others are partially compliant with one of the activities. Whereas, all the three projects compliant with both Objective 1 and Objective 3 fully comply with one or two of their activities.
Harta 17: Shpërndarja hapësinore e PIK dhe investimeve të tjera- Drejtoria për Kulturë, Rini dhe Sport
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3.5 Department of Agriculture and Rural Development

During the period of 2008-2018, the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development has implemented 52 projects, 50 of which were infrastructural and two service-based. The projects were mainly spread across the following locations: Bajgorë, Bare, Batahir, Broboniq, Dedi, Kaçandoll, Kçiq i Madh, Koprivë, Koshtovë, Kovaçicë, Kutillovc, Lushtë, Maxherë, Mazhiq, Melenicë, Mitrovicë, Ofqar, Rahovë, Rashan, Rzhanë, Selac, Stantërg, Stranë, Svinjarë/Frashër, Tërstenë, Vaganicë, Vërbnicë/Vërrnicë, Vidishiq, Vidomiriq/Vidimriq, Vinarc i Ulët, Vllahi, Zabergjë, Zijaqë, Vinarc i Epërm, Kçiq i Vogël.

All the projects fall into **Objective 8 – Rural zones and agriculture.** Out of 52 projects, 27 projects comply fully with one (i.e. forestation, support for farmers with plants, machinery, green houses and other equipment) or two (i.e. support of aromatic medical plants and walnuts cultivators) of the activities of Objective 8, nine comply partially with one of the activities (i.e. support for bee keepers, restoration of buildings with touristic character, growth of walnut plantations), and 16 comply in general with the objective but not with any of its specific activities.
Zonat me 31 deri ne 60 projekte ne perioden 2008-2017
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Harta 18: Shpërndarja hapësinore e PIK dhe investimeve të tjera- Drejtoria e Bujqësisë dhe Zhvillimit Rural
3.6 Other departments

Other departments that have invested in capital projects include the Department of Planning and Urbanism, Department of Environmental Protection, Department of Geodesy, Cadaster and Property, Department of Administration etc. During the period of 2008-2017, those departments have implemented 161 projects in total, most of which are located within the urban area of Mitrovica. The highest number of implemented projects is 29, done in year 2010.

133 of the projects were infrastructural and 28 service-based. 137 of the projects are compliant with any of the objectives, while 24 do not comply neither with the objectives nor with their activities. Out of the 137 compliant projects, three comply with Objective 1, ten with the Objective 2, four with the Objective 3, 22 with the Objective 4, 16 with the Objective 5, 29 with the Objective 6, 40 with the Objective 7, and 1 with the Objective 8. 12 other projects comply with two objectives (two with O1 and O6, one with O1 and O7, six with O2 and O7, one with O3 and O6, and two with O4 and O6). For specific information refer to Annex 5.
3.7 Investments in Mitrovica North until 2012

The MDP of Mitrovica was published in year 2009, during which time the Municipality of Mitrovica was a united entity. The city was divided into Mitrovica South and Mitrovica North in 2013. From 2008-2012, there were 34 CIPs implemented in Mitrovica North, most of which were done in year 2011. Most of the projects (33 CIPs) were infrastructural (including damaged houses reconstruction, streets pavement, water system and public lighting improvements etc.), and one service-based (housing rent subsidies).

Out of 34 total projects, 33 are compliant with one or two objectives and at least one of their activities. Nine of the projects comply with Objective 1 – Multiethnic city/cooperation, ten with Objective 1 and Objective 5 – Traffic communications infrastructure, nine with Objective 1 and Objective 4 – Technical infrastructure, four with Objective 1 and Objective 3 – Social infrastructure (education and healthcare), and one with Objective 1 and Objective 8 – Rural zones and agriculture. Three of these projects are fully compliant with one of the respective objective’s activities, 20 are partially compliant.
Harta 19: Investimet në veri të Mitrovicës deri në vitin 2012
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4. COMPLIANCE OF PRIVATE INVESTMENTS (HOUSING AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES) WITH MDP/UDP
4. Compliance of private investments (housing and economic activities) with MDP/UDP

This evaluation model evaluates whether private housing and economic investments have been planned and implemented according to MDP and UDP suggested tables (i.e. infill, reconstruction, preservation etc.). It also gathers data regarding the new buildings’ code (legal or illegal building), built year, function and other related information (i.e. typology, number of stories, building index etc.).
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Harta 21: Shpërthyerja hapësinore e ndërtimeve me leje dhe pa leje në qendër të qytetit

LEGJENDA:
- Ndërtime me leje
- Ndërtime pa leje
4.1 Private developments with building permits

During the period of 2009-2018, a total of 194 building permits have been provided to private developers in the Municipality of Mitrovica South. Most of the building permits (34) were provided in year 2017, followed by year 2015 and 2016 (each with 29 building permits). Whereas, during the period of 2013-2018, ten building permits were refused/denied.

The majority of private developments (154 building permits or 78% of all private developments) were residential while the remaining ones (43 building permits, 22%) were economic activities. Among the residential developments, 92 building permits (47%) were individual housing developments, whereas 62 building permits (31%) were collective housing developments. Most of the residential developments (76%) included economic activities, besides 37 private projects (24%) which were residential only. As seen on the Map 17 most of these buildings are located in the urban area of Mitrovica, and some other few ones in the municipal villages, like Bare, Bajgore, Kovacice and Koshtove.

The majority of private developments (154 building permits or 78% of all private developments) were residential while the remaining ones (43 building permits, 22%) were economic activities. Among the residential developments, 92 building permits (47%) were individual housing developments, whereas 62 building permits (31%) were collective housing developments. Most of the residential developments (76%) included economic activities, besides 37 private projects (24%) which were residential only. As seen on the Map 17 most of these buildings are located in the urban area of Mitrovica, and some other few ones in the municipal villages, like Bare, Bajgore, Kovacice and Koshtove.
Zonat në të cilat shpërndahen ndërtimet me leje:
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Ndërtimet me leje në bazë të funksionit:

- **Ekonomike**: 22%
- **Banim**: 78%

Bazë të bazë të shkencës së termodinamikës:

- **Bazë individuale**: 47%
- **Bazë kolektive**: 31%

LEGJENDA:

- Ndërtimet me leje
- Ndërtimit pa leje
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Kodi i Objektit</th>
<th>Nr. i Parceles</th>
<th>Funksioni</th>
<th>Elazhitetit</th>
<th>Sip.bruto</th>
<th>Koordinatat hapesinore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>351-4062</td>
<td>2388/1, 2388/2, 2388/3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Banim/Afarizem</td>
<td>B+P+6+Nk</td>
<td>600.0m²</td>
<td>7488968.8700000000111759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-5573</td>
<td>2008/0, 2009/2, 2010/1, 2010/2, 2010/3, 2010/4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Banim/Afarizem</td>
<td>B+P+6</td>
<td>438.0m²</td>
<td>7489244.830000000074506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-5151</td>
<td>1353/1; 1354/2; 1354/10; 1355/1; 1355/2, 1355/1 &amp; 1356/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Banim/Afarizem</td>
<td>B+P+7-Nk</td>
<td>575.0m²</td>
<td>7487098.919999999925494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-5424</td>
<td>501/3; 501/1; 501/2; 501/4; 501/5 &amp; 501/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Banim/Afarizem(Aneks)</td>
<td>B+P+8</td>
<td>507.0m²</td>
<td>7486365.379999999888241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-7246</td>
<td>1461/0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Banim/Afarizem</td>
<td>B+P+6+Nk</td>
<td>290.0m²</td>
<td>7485937.5000000000000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-1401</td>
<td>610/2; 611/1; 611/2 &amp; 612</td>
<td></td>
<td>Banim/Afarizem</td>
<td>B+P+10</td>
<td>535.0m²</td>
<td>7489175.320000000298023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-4183</td>
<td>1629/2; 1630,1631</td>
<td></td>
<td>Banim/Afarizem</td>
<td>B+P+6-7</td>
<td>370.0m²</td>
<td>7485150.160000000049012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-4258</td>
<td>1986/20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Banim/Afarizem</td>
<td>P+3</td>
<td>34.5m²</td>
<td>7489335.70999999962747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Private developments without building permits

According to the MESP’s records, there have been 8,103 buildings constructed without permit in the Municipality of Mitrovica South from the beginning of 2000s until 2015 (the list may also include buildings without permit constructed during the 90ies). While evaluating the MDP of Mitrovica, Working Group 4 has identified further 16 constructions in 2016 and 19 in 2017 (not geo-referenced in the map, as the geoportal still uses the ortophoto of 2012). As soon as the geoportal site updates the map, the MPT will be able to also update the database with the right coordinates and the buildings without permits (2016, 2017, 2018) will be reflected in the map. Therefore, the total registered number of buildings constructed illegally from the period after the war until 2017 is 8,138.

The vast majority of the illegal private developments are residential-only developments (around 92%), followed by other developments (1.5%), commercial developments (1.3%), residential and commercial developments (mixed) (0.8%), and industrial developments (0.7%). 3.7% of all developments are uncategorized. As seen on the Map 19 most of these buildings are built in the urban area of Mitrovica, but also extended to municipal villages, especially along the border line between Kutillovc and Rahova.

![Chart 41: Type of illegal developments]
Harta 24: Shpërndarja hapësinore e ndërtimeve pa leje në komunën e Mitrovicës Jugore

Zonat në të cilat shpërndahen ndërtimet pa leje:

- Mitrovica (perfshirë gjithë zonen urbane)
- Magerrë
- Melënicë
- Vliksqiq
- Bari
- Beqëmë
- Dushiq
- Stantërg
- Rrahovë
- Tëna i parë
- Lisicë
- Reçë
- Kullillocc
- Rëshqan
- Koshtovë
- Kajiq (li madh dhe i vogel)
- Zelëlli
- Frashëri
- Vinari i Poshtëm
- Lushë
- Kopriviç
- Vidiqirë
- Termënë

Ndërtimet pa leje në baz të funksionimit:

- SANIM
- EKONOMIKE
- SANIM dhe EKONOMIKE
- INDUSTRIALE
- TFEKA
- TIE PAKATEGORIATUARA

LEGENDA:
- Ndërtimit në leje
- Ndërtimit pa leje
Conclusion

Main findings and Recommendations

1. Compliance with the spatial planning legal framework

Municipal Data, Structure of the textual part and list of maps of MDP

Main finding:

- After evaluating the document regarding the availability of data according to 13 specific thematic fields, if we compare them with the requirements in AI No. 11/2015, it appears that the overall data provision within the MDP of Mitrovica South is 6.5%, meaning that out of the 1,295 specific areas required, only 84 areas have been provided while 93.5% are missing. Even the available data are largely partially available and most of them date from 2004-2007 which means that they need to be updated or collected from the start when drafting the new MDP, MZM and other planning documents for Mitrovica South.

- For the available data in MDP there is a lack of verification of their accuracy, source of information, year of data. In general Management and Monitoring Protocols and Mechanisms for controlling the municipal data are missing.

- It should be noted that the municipalities including Mitrovica South do not possess human and financial capacities to collect all required data on their own. Even when they have support or consultancy, this process is equally difficult, as almost all of the required data has to be collected from the start and the financial implications are unaffordable from the municipal budget capacities.

- The content structure of the MDP and the list and contents of the mapping part of the MDP and UDP were also assessed in this process, if they include the sections defined in AI No. 11/2015 on the basic elements and requirements for the design, implementation and monitoring of the MDP. It should be emphasized that the MDP/UDP were drafted in 2008/2009 and cannot be assessed on the percentage of implementation of the above mentioned structure and the availability of required maps. However, the information from this assessment is an initial step towards creating the municipal spatial planning database (the municipality of Mitrovica South does not possess this database) and will be useful in defining missing data or the sections to be updated in the process of drafting the new document.

- The municipal working groups have identified missing data in the MDP, however available data at respective departments on that time.

Recommendations:

- Findings from the MDP/UDP assessment are the initial step in the missing data collection process. Cadaster is the starting point for the spatial data, since the DPU or other sectors do not possess a spatial database. The data required by the AI of the MDP is proposed to be reviewed and the list of required data to be prioritized in primary, secondary and tertiary data. So the municipality can start the process of collecting the most important data, and meanwhile collect other data as required by respective AIs.

- The Municipality should establish and operationalize the integrated municipal database (in accordance with SPAK/MESP requirements). This process requires: a. drafting the Management and Monitoring Protocols and Mechanisms so that the data are accurate,
verified and updated in the municipal database, b. Training of the Municipal staff (inter-sectorial) in database usage and management.

- Thematic fields and list of maps in MDP should be drafted based on the respective AIs. The data provided by the respective fields should have coherence, accuracy and elaboration within the document based on reliable and verified sources. Variable data should continue to be updated in the municipal database as well as central database. After each phase of data collection, the MPT should verify the compatibility of spatial and non-spatial data with data in their possession, before these data are migrated into the municipal database.

- The respective departments should cooperate with each other in the process of data collection. The consultant company for the drafting of the new MDP should be in close cooperation with the MPT and the municipal sectors during the drafting of the municipal profile, and the municipal departments should be the first source of the data. The drafting process of MDP should be followed with the principles of inclusiveness and co-operation including inter-municipal, inter-institutional and other stakeholders.

2. Compliance/Implementation of MDP, UDP and URPs

In the MDP’s (UDP’s) provisions for implementation, guidelines have been provided on issues related to the interpretation of the MDP during the drafting of regulatory plans and other plans. The MDP is a basic document that serves as a guide and controller of the entire development process of the city for the next two decades. It is also clearly determined that these plans must not be in conflict with the MDP’s provisions.

Planning Documents

Main findings:

- MDP and UDP of Mitrovica were both drafted in 2009 by the same companies. The objectives, goals and strategies set out in the MDP were further outlined in the UDP and in general these two documents are compatible. After, Mitrovica South drafted 6 URPs (Center, Fidanishte, Ilirida, Bair, Ura e Gjakut, Sitnica) for the urban area of the city. Despite the fact that in the MDP and UDP was highlighted the drafting of regulatory plans for Shupkovc, Shipol and others, these areas have continued to develop despite the lack of regulatory plans.

- In this evaluation was reviewed whether the building conditions and spatial/development concepts defined in the URPs, comply with the conditions set out in MDP and UDP. While other neighborhoods in the urban area did not have regulatory plans, some of them have had significant growth and development over the last few years. Regarding the destination of spatial entireties according to the 6 URPs, they are significantly compatible with the UDP, with some minor shifts in destination in urban sub-groups, such as Bairi, Fidanishte or Sitnica but without changing the initial concept.

- Differences between the UDP and the URPs were found on the determination of the building conditions, with particular emphasis on the center area and a part of the URP 'Bairi'. When compared the building conditions defined in the UDP and the building conditions of the surface covered by URPs, only 4.5% was the difference between the two documents (different conditions or non-compatibility). The municipal assembly’s decision to increase the building coefficient by 1 linearly in the center area changed this percentage. Changing

---
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the coefficient linearly has affected differently certain areas because in some cases conditions have changed for 100% while in other cases for 25%. The effect is better seen on the ground, where the center area is covered with high buildings, with very low percentage of green areas, lack of parking places and heavy traffic on the streets, as a result of increased number of residents as well.

- In Mitrovica South, the artificial lake project, the new area with swimming pools and recreational areas along the river, the botanical garden and the campus of the University of Mitrovica, have had an impact not only in the Fidanishte neighborhood, but in all neighborhoods with which Fidanishte is tangled.

**Recommendations:**

- In the midst of implementing the legal reform Mitrovica will undergo the process of drafting a more detailed MDP-strategic character, more specified MZM- operational character and detailed regulatory plans- spatial regulation character for areas of interest to the municipality. The findings of this report will serve to Mitrovica South in the process of drafting the new MDP (findings on the municipal data for the thematic fields, Practical Implementation of Objectives/Strategies) and MZM (findings on building conditions, urban development and the effects of these conditions in practice), while data on the new urban structure and development will serve to define the areas for which the municipality will draft detailed regulatory plans (findings on the impact of capital investments in the urban city space).

- Based on the vision, objectives and priority projects for the development of the city, the municipality should develop appropriate detailed plans for areas that will be affected by this development. Projects that do not meet the priorities set out in the MDP, ad-hoc projects in certain parts of the city should consider their impact not only in the neighborhood where they are implemented but also the entire surrounding area. Consequently the conditions previously set for the 'Ilirida' neighborhood; the 'Center' and the conditions to be determined for the 'Lower Zhabar' and other neighborhoods should take into account the developments in the nearby areas as this will in the future also change the residents’ requirements for the destination of their properties.

- When for different areas within a neighborhood different building conditions are set, the change of these conditions if done must have the specifications for each different case.

- The municipality should establish municipal mechanisms for implementing and monitoring the implementation of spatial plans. Department of Urbanism and Planning, Department of Finance, Department of Cadaster, Geodesy and Property, Department of Inspection would establish a management group for the functionalization of these mechanisms while other municipal sectors drafting projects such as Department of Public Services and Infrastructure, Department of Education, Department of Health etc., would be in the driving seat to implement these mechanisms.
3. Compliance of capital projects and service provision activities with MDP/UDP

Main findings:

- Of the eight objectives/strategies foreseen in the MDP/UDP of Mitrovica through capital projects and other investments, Objective 5 - Traffic Infrastructure with 48% and Objective 3 - Social Infrastructure (education and health) with 23.4% are mostly fulfilled. In the municipality there are many other investments that meet partially the objectives and other cases that do not meet any of the objectives or foreseen activities.
- Other MDP/UDP objectives/strategies have been fully or partially met by projects in other departments. Objective 1 - Multiethnic city/cooperation has been slightly met by investments in the north until 2012, since the city was after divided into two municipalities and the cooperation has been extinct.
- The projects and investments of all departments have been mainly focused on infrastructure, very few in services.
- The projects and investments of all departments have been mainly focused in the urban area of Mitrovica, and very few or none in the northern villages of the municipality (Rrzhane, Selac, Ofcar, Zabergje etc).
- The largest number of projects implemented in the municipality of Mitrovica South is from 2017, while the Department of Public Services and Infrastructure has implemented most of them.

Recommendations:

- In the new MDP as a strategic document, objectives for the development of the city should be clearly defined and turned into strategies and plan of activities (including budget implications) to then implement the projects that will meet these objectives. The implemented projects should be included in annual reports with the purpose of assessing the qualitative and quantitative aspects against the objectives/strategies. This will ease the process of managing the implementing planning documents.
- Since the city of Mitrovica has been divided into two municipalities in 2013, in the new MDP strategies should be provided on the possibility of cooperation with Mitrovica North, exchanges and joint plans and services (for addressing mobility and road infrastructure).
- In the objectives/strategies of the new strategic planning document, projects aimed at providing services beyond infrastructural projects should be considered further.
- Beyond the urban area of Mitrovica (which includes 14 city neighborhoods) development projects should be oriented in other areas of the municipality, including villages. In the new MDP, data should be collected on the exact number of residents in each settlement, the number of students, etc., so that investments are planned based on need. For example, in the village of Rrzhane where the number of inhabitants is not large, planning a school (in the absence of students) would be an unfounded investment.
- Municipal departments should deepen their co-operation on the municipal strategic projects. Because of budget constraints, municipality should draft projects which would attract various governmental and other grants, local and international investors. Public-Private Partnerships should be pushed forward.

4. Compliance of private investments (housing and economic activities) with MDP/UDP

Main findings:
From the list of constructions with permits and illegal constructions there is a high disproportion between them. While during 2009-2018, there are 194 construction permits issued in the municipality of Mitrovica South, on the other hand according to MESP’s list there are 8138 illegal constructions. However, for illegal constructions, the MESP’s list includes the period from 2000 to 2015 (with the possibility that on the list there are constructions dating before 2000s but which are unidentifiable as in this list is missing the year of construction for each of the buildings and the identification of those built before 2000, and after 2009 (after the approval of the MDP) has been impossible). Also during the geo-referencing process of these constructions, some of them do not have spatial compatibility.

Out of a total of 194 issued permits for private constructions over the period 2009-2018, 78% (47% collective housing, 31% individual housing) were issued for housing while 22% had an economic function. Most of these buildings are located in the urban area of Mitrovica South and some others in municipal villages such as Bare, Bajgore, Rahove, Tunel i Pare, Koprive, Kaqandoll, Vinarc i Poshtem, Broboniq and Koshtove.

Out of a total of 8138 illegal constructions over the period 2000-2015, the vast majority of them are residential (for housing) (about 92%), followed by other constructions (1.5%), commercial constructions (1.3%), residential and commercial constructions (mixed) (0.8 %) and industrial constructions (0.7%). 3.7% of constructions are unclassified. Most of these buildings are built in the urban area of Mitrovica, but extend to municipal villages, especially along the delineation between Kutllovc and Rahove.

While this report has in some cases confirmed the harmony between planning documents (as for illustration, the building conditions defined in the UDP are fully in harmony with the building conditions in the URP ‘Sitnica’) however the situation on the ground has taken another direction. All constructions in ‘Sitnica’ neighborhood have not been equipped with construction permits except two of them. It should also be added that Sitnica before the adoption of the MDP in 2009 was an informal settlement and precisely the lack of the construction year in the MESP’s database does not provide the opportunity to understand how many of these buildings were built after the approval of the MDP and how many of them after the adoption of the URP ‘Sitnica’ in 2014.

The municipality lacks a consolidated database for construction permits, which should be harmonized and managed by the close co-operation of the Department of Urbanism and Planning and the Department of Inspection. In the framework of this assessment, the working group comprised of officials from these two departments has consolidated the list of common data on constructions and initiated the database in QGIS, which database should be consolidated and updated further.

Recommendations:

All illegal constructions should be subject to legalization procedures. After the adoption of the new Law on legalization of illegal constructions, the municipality should be engaged in the mobilization of citizens in the legalization of their buildings. Legalized constructions must be included in the already established database. The municipality should invite all citizens who have built before 2000s and do not possess legalization papers of their constructions, to contact the municipality, in order for the municipality to identify these constructions and to proceed further with the legalization process based on the new law requirements.

All requirements for new construction permits should be based on the conditions set out in the applicable regulatory plans until the municipality drafts the Municipal Zoning Map. Cases
when for certain areas there is no regulatory plan, the constructors must be provided with the respective permit and conditions issued by the Urbanism Department/Sector for Legalization.

- Based on the findings of this report, whether in the case of constructions possessing permission or in the case of not possessing, most of them have residential function (78% with permission, 92% without permission) and mainly permeate the urban area of the city. This should be taken into account in the process of drafting new planning documents as the provision of housing conditions in the urban area of the city may affect the village-city migration, which in this case is in contravention with one of the 2009 MDP objectives.
- The Department of Urbanism and Planning must deepen the cooperation with the Department of Inspection and unify the mechanisms in addressing illegal constructions. The database already established by the working group during the MDP Evaluation process must continue to be further updated based on the respective AIs deriving from the New Law on Illegal Constructions.

### Next steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Next steps/Activities</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collection of missing data to be based on the Findings from the MDP/UDP Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Consultant Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Cadastre, starting point for the spatial data, since the DPU or other sectors do not possess a spatial database.</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Drafting of Protocols and Management and Monitoring Mechanisms, so that the data are accurate, verified and up-to-date in the municipal database.</td>
<td>MPT, Consultant Company, UN-Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Close cooperation between MPT, Consultant Company, UN-Habitat and other inter-municipal, inter-institutional stakeholders in the process of drafting the new MDP.</td>
<td>MPT, Consultant Company, UN-Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The list of Data required by the AI on MDP is proposed to be reviewed and prioritize the data in primary, secondary and tertiary data.</td>
<td>MESP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Establish and operationalize the Spatial Planning Database (in accordance with SPAK/MESP).</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Establish the municipal working group (inter-sectorial) for the municipal database</td>
<td>Municipality, UN-Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Training of municipal staff (inter-sectorial) in database usage and management.</td>
<td>Municipality, MESP, UN-Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Developing the structure of the integrated municipal database, respectively the list of graphical data and attributes; Development of datasets;</td>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Collection and migration of data (According to the MDP evaluation report)</td>
<td>Consultant Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To establish municipal mechanisms for implementing and monitoring the implementation of spatial plans. DPU, DF, DCGP, DI to form a management group for the functionalization of these mechanisms while other municipal sectors drafting projects such as DPSI, DE, DH etc., should implement these mechanisms.</td>
<td>Municipality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The objectives set out in the MDP should include **budget implications** to then implement in practice the projects that would meet these objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The objectives set out in the MDP should include <strong>budget implications</strong> to then implement in practice the projects that would meet these objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Drafting the format for <strong>annual reports</strong> to manage the process of implementing planning documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Municipal departments should <strong>deepen the cooperation</strong> on municipal strategic projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Municipality, Consultant Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Drafting the format for <strong>annual reports</strong> to manage the process of implementing planning documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Municipality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Municipal departments should <strong>deepen the cooperation</strong> on municipal strategic projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Explanation:** The above listed activities are the initial steps in the launch of the MDP drafting process. Furthermore, the drafting process and the detailed respective tasks of the MPT, the consulting company and UN-Habitat are as defined in the MDP drafting programme.