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**Fig. 1 “Old” Business zone Lucija (Portorož, RS), fragmented land ownership structure (up); Attempt of spatial reserves calculation based on the existing development plan and the actual state on the ground (down).**

**Reserves within the Lucija Development Plan (DP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Structure dim.</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Floors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern part</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central part</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern part</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.2 x 20</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>G+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.8 x 20</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>G+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.6 x 20</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>G+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.0 x 20</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>G+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0 x 20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>B+G+L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0 x 12</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>B+G+L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.5 x 9</td>
<td>364.5</td>
<td>B+G+L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.0 x 9</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>B+G+L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total gross undeveloped area within 41 structures (in compliance with the applicable DP):** 30,275.56 m²
The focus of the study was business zones in Slovenian and Croatian Istria. The existing situation is characterised by a non-transparent situation as to the number, extent, and range of development areas. In the study, we used the comparative method to determine the existing situation and potential solutions for a more efficient role of zones in the concept of spatial development of Istria as a whole. We found that improvements in the fields of programmatic typology, data updating, and the management and marketing system were necessary.
INTRODUCTION

The Republic of Slovenia [RS] and the Republic of Croatia [RC], as new European Union [EU] member states, want to improve their national and regional competitiveness under the current socio-economic context. In this context, the attractiveness of the business environment is one of the crucial priorities of economic and spatial development strategies. Spatial planning and design can contribute to this by directly shaping its development potential through creation of spatial conditions for the siting and placement of economic activities in an environment. By changing the national government framework after 1991, spatial planning and design changed both in Slovenia and Croatia. The previous concept of social and spatial development, characterised by the planned socialist economy, was replaced by a sustainable development doctrine, following the example of western European countries. With the creation of free market and the production of new spatial and development documents, the regulation of integrating economic activities in the physical space changed both administratively and structurally. The existing industrial, small business, and similar zones, under privatisation, have mostly undergone ownership transformation, while a wide range of small industry activities was introduced. This trend was also evident in Slovenian and Croatian Istria, which covers a small part of the Istrian Peninsula, saw intensive urbanisation in the first decades after World War II. In this period, with the development of conurbation Koper-Isola-Piran, large industrial zones were planned, which included the metal and mechanical industry, food and the raw materials processing industry and logistics (Tomos, Cimos, Droga, Luka Koper, etc.). Politically stimulated economy and spatial planning provided jobs for an integrated development concept of the South Primorska region. Similarly to the Slovenian Primorska region, a similar situation, but to a greater degree, was found in Croatian Istria until 1991. Industrial development, which started as early as the 18th century, was intensive up until the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. During the post-war urbanisation (after 1950) the development of the coastal zone was re-intensified (Pula – shipbuilding, Umag – cement works, Rovinj – tobacco factory, etc.) – as well as that of its inland territory (Pazin – textile industry) where, in comparison to the Slovenian transport hinterland, the transport network is more densely branched out. With the declaration of independence in 1991, land use became legitimately established in the spatial plans of municipalities/towns in both countries, including the major development reserves.

Period until 1991 – The Slovenian coastal region, which covers a small part of the Istrian Peninsula, saw intensive urbanisation in the first decades after World War II. In this period, with the development of conurbation Koper-Isola-Piran, large industrial zones were planned, which included the metal and mechanical industry, food and the raw materials processing industry and logistics (Tomos, Cimos, Droga, Luka Koper, etc.). Politically stimulated economy and spatial planning provided jobs for an integrated development concept of the South Primorska region. Similarly to the Slovenian Primorska region, a similar situation, but to a greater degree, was found in Croatian Istria until 1991. Industrial development, which started as early as the 18th century, was intensive up until the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. During the post-war urbanisation (after 1950) the development of the coastal zone was re-intensified (Pula – shipbuilding, Umag – cement works, Rovinj – tobacco factory, etc.) – as well as that of its inland territory (Pazin – textile industry) where, in comparison to the Slovenian transport hinterland, the transport network is more densely branched out. With the declaration of independence in 1991, land use became legitimately established in the spatial plans of municipalities/towns in both countries, including the major development reserves.

Period after 1991 – development of a network of business zones – After 1991 only
some zones managed to preserve their mono-
cultural focus, while many zones changed
their intended purpose due to privatisation,
restructuring and bankruptcies.22 The pro-
duction in some zones partially or completely
ceased, in abandoned buildings or on reha-
bilitated land the activities of trade and stor-
geage were most commonly introduced.23 In
the second half of the 1990s, due to the "uncon-
trollable economic development", both coun-
tries started to promote the development of
their economies. Despite the many incen-
tives, only few investments (domestic or for-
eign) were implemented. In RS, one of the
main obstacles was land availability, project
documentation production, and the acqui-
sition of the permits necessary; thus RS used
financial resources to boost the development
of business zones. RC took the same meas-
ures.24 The construction of a countrywide
business zone network started in 2004 with
the adoption of the national "programme of
business zone development".25 In this pro-
cess, the role of the "former" zones was
somewhat neglected, which despite their
problems (ownership, availability, obsolete
infrastructure, etc.) represent a specific de-
velopment potential.26

Locational factors and the theory of business
zone planning — In both theory and practice,
the planning of business zones is carried out
on the basis of various starting points and ob-
jectives. Site-specific factors, which are in
principle of economic and spatial character,
are of fundamental importance in determin-
ing the placing of a business zone. Their se-
lection is based on location theories trying to
explain the spatial distribution of specific spa-
tial phenomena and facts. The development
of this theoretical approach dates back to the
19th century when Von Thünen (1826) con-
structed the location rent theory; later Weber
(1909) introduced the location analysis. The
central-place theory was introduced by Chris-
taller (1933) and Lösch (1940); Isard (1956),
the founder of regional science, and Hender-
son (1974), who developed the urban systems
theory27, also played important roles. The lo-
cation of an "economic activity" can be ana-
lysed from a partial perspective (i.e. site-spe-
cific — microeconomic approach) or from the
perspective of the economy as a whole (i.e.
macroeconomic approach).28

The location theory underwent various phas-
es. At the beginning, transport costs played a
determining role, which gradually decreased
with the construction of new infrastructures.
This led to a more efficient labour migration
(commuting) and the decrease in labour
costs, so secondary location factors became
important in site selection, particularly the
proximity of markets and suppliers. Over the
past twenty years, tertiary location factors
have become important, such as government
policies, institutional framework, knowledge
centres, information and communication in-
frastructure, quality and mentality of labour
force, environmental aspects, representa-
tive business locations, and quality of living
environment.29

A detailed examination of industrial location
factors was prepared by Badri (2007), who
identified the following factors: transportation
infrastructure, labour force structure, ac-
cessibility of markets, site characteristics
(size, cost, space for future expansion, man-
gement), utilities, government attitude, tax
structure, climate, and appropriate commu-
nity (research and educational institutions,
primary and secondary schools, hospitals, li-
braries, shops, hotels, banks, recreational
facilities). A very similar set of the factors af-
flecting location decisions was prepared by
MacCarthy and Atthirawong (2003), who par-
cularly emphasized accessibility to suppli-
ers, the market, and competition. Location
factors change over time and are not the
same for all activities, while their significance
is greatly affected by the development of
technology and globalisation.30 Also in the
planning of zones "sometimes in practice" other factors are also considered, such as:
interest of real property investments, oppor-
tunity to produce new design and planning
documents (definition of potential locations
in advance), implementation of local busi-
ness incentives, etc., which are hard to justify
theoretically.

The problem and a hypothesis — Nowadays,
spatial capacities and conditions for the
placement of economic activities in Istria are
highly diverse. In the Slovenian part, these

15 The establishment of new zones in the Slovenian coastal region (contrary to the rest of Slovenia) was mostly restricted by spatial possibilities [KAVAS, KOMAN, 2015]
16 http://put-up-istre.eu/
17 KRATI PAVLOVEC, 1999
18 VRISER, 1978
19 Particularly in the second half of the 19th century in settlements along the railway line and in coastal towns, particularly Rovinj and the war port of Pula.
20 Ferencic, 2005
21 This is a remnant of socialism, spatial heritage of the industrialisation development model which is, to this day, logically transferred to the new generation of spatial plans [BALAZIC, 2006].
22 Gabrijelcic, et al., 2016
23 On the other hand, in the coastal zone some indus-
tries stayed in their traditional locations (e.g., small fish
processing facilities, cement works in Umag, quarries in
Novigrad).
24 Zimmermann, Martinec, 2016
25 Cini, Varga, 2009
26 Loncar, 2008
27 Krugman, 1998: 9
28 Kusar, 2008: 38
29 Assink, Groenendijk, 2009: 3
30 Cok, 2004
are zones that result from previous plans\textsuperscript{31}, while in Croatia a network of various types of zones has been developed, i.e. a blend of old and new zones.\textsuperscript{32} In the Slovenian part, there is a deficit\textsuperscript{33} in the number of locations and the scope of the available areas\textsuperscript{34}, while in Croatia there is a large surplus.\textsuperscript{35} In both cases, the situation regarding the spatial plan production and the supply market of “development business areas and buildings” is non-transparent.\textsuperscript{36} Even though, from a land area perspective, the zones are precisely determined in spatial plans, their “usability and availability” are difficult to define.\textsuperscript{37} In this framework, the following research questions are important:

1. What are the form and scope of zones in Slovenian and Croatian Istria and what are their common characteristics and differences?
2. Are the zones, in their current form, an efficient instrument for steering and encouraging spatial and economic development?

Based on this, the following hypothesis was developed: There are many zones and they are extensive; however in their current “spatial, typological, and administrative form” they are not an efficient enough planning instrument for regulating spatial and economic development.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**MATERIJALI I METODE**

Methodology – The study was directed at assessing the existing situation and designing the guidelines for increasing the efficiency of zones as a regulatory instrument. It was implemented in three phases. In the first phase we used the descriptive method for data collection and analysis. In the second phase we used a comparison method which allowed for a systematic comparison of textual, tabular, and graphical data of both countries. In the third phase, conclusions were drawn and the guidelines to amend the existing situation were proposed.

– In the first phase we defined the potential sources for data collection. These were the following: professional municipal services (spatial plans and expert studies), archives, web, and libraries. The materials and other information were obtained based on two assumed criteria:

1. Spatial criterion: area of Istria (separately RC: 41 local self-governance units – JLSs)\textsuperscript{38} and RS: 4 coastal municipalities;
2. Programmatic criterion: area of industrial, business, small business and other types of zones which allow for spatial placement of economic activities in the physical space.

– In the second phase we analysed the interim results and defined seven key areas allowing for (inter-state) comparison of the existing situation:

1. legal framework for planning and design of existing and new business zones (descriptive comparison of the provisions in RS and RC documents);
2. typological definitions of zones (descriptive designation of the individual zones in RS and RC documents);
3. development incentives and financing instruments encouraging the development of business zones (descriptive comparison of financing programmes);
4. locations and capacities: existing and envisaged new zones (visual comparison of graphical sheets of zoned land use in a scale of 1:5,000 and 1:25,000 and the comparison of numerical data. The zones were analysed on the basis of 11 basic spatial and economic parameters for determination of development potential);
5. reliability and ownership;
6. marketing and promotion;
7. advantages and disadvantages.

– In the third phase, conclusions were drawn and the guidelines to amend the existing situation were proposed.

**RESULTS**

**REZULTATI**

Development material and data – The wide range of the material obtained was selected and classified into the following groups: 1. strategic spatial development documents\textsuperscript{39}, 2. spatial development plans – regional level\textsuperscript{40}, 3. spatial development plans – local level\textsuperscript{41}, 4. expert studies for drafting of plans\textsuperscript{42}, 5. web applications, 6. other references (professional material for planning and design of existing and new business zones (descriptive comparison of the provisions in RS and RC documents)).

\textsuperscript{31} KAVAS, KOMAN, 2015
\textsuperscript{32} *** 2002a; *** 2013d
\textsuperscript{33} CERIN, 2015
\textsuperscript{34} PLAZAR MLAKAR, ET AL., 2007; COK, ET AL., 2007; KAVAS, KOMAN, 2015
\textsuperscript{35} *** 2014
\textsuperscript{36} Based on the findings of expert studies and overviews of business zones in relevant web portals, http://web-hosting-wmd.hr/poslovne-zone/; http://zone.mingorp.hr; http://www.ida.hr/index.php?id=28; http://www.invest-slovenia.org
\textsuperscript{37} The zones should have a more significant role in steering economic and spatial development [KOMAN, ET AL., 2012]. In the regulatory sense, they are an element [KOMAN, KAVAS, 2008] of the business environment (state, regions, municipalities) as they promote the setting up of businesses (access to land, municipal, transport, and other infrastructure, procedures and permits connected to the start of operation, etc.), in this context the different demographic potential [KAVAS, ET AL., 2013] and employment trends in the Slovenian and Croatian parts of Istria as well as tourism as the central business activity must be taken into consideration.
\textsuperscript{38} JLSs – local self-governance units; within the Istarska županija area we analysed 41 JLSs.
In the next step, the data were categorised, according to content, into five groups: data on zone locations, size, ownership, infrastructure, manner of financing, and marketing.

We found that the "technical data" (zone location and size) are consistently provided for in existing spatial documents, while other "content and development data" (availability, equipment, marketing, etc.) are far less available (i.e. absent for most zones). They are partially covered in professional bases for preparing the new generation of plans (RS: for municipal spatial plans (OPNs), RC: for county plans), while some are available online.

**Scope of Comparison**

**Obuhvat usporedbe**

- Legal framework for planning and design of existing and new business zones – By comparing the individual parts of spatial acts we found the following:
  - The two countries have comparable spatial legislation, national and local planning levels, and planning documents (strategic and implementing).
  - Contrary to RC, RS currently still lacks the "regional planning level" as the optimal spatial framework for strategic planning of the network of various types of zones.
  - Currently, not all municipalities in Slovenian Istria have spatial plans in place (OPNs), but rather many times amended plans from 1985 are used, which preserve the long-established zoned land use. These plans lack an adequately defined zone typology and data updating system.

40 RS: *** 2006a, *** 2006b, *** 2013e; RC: *** 1969, *** 2002b, *** 2015a
42 RS: evidence base for municipal OPNs of Koper, Izola, and Piran; RC: *** 2013a, *** 2013b, *** 2014
43 In this paper, neither agricultural land nor areas of mineral resources, which also represent an economic activity, are taken into consideration.
44 Through the: *** 2013d – 15 strategic zones obtained the status of priority zones based on the existing spatial planning documents, previous infrastructure, and available labour force in the area. In the mean time, due to increased entrepreneurial activities and needs, the number of zones increased to 34. These zones take up an area of 1,200 ha, but over 290 million HRK should be invested in their equipment and completion. So far, 168 million HRK has been invested in the implementation of this programme in Istarska zupanija [Vajdić, 2014].

– In the Croatian part of Istria in the period 2003-2015 spatial development plans were adopted for all JLSs (10 towns and 31 municipalities). The planning and design of zones in JLS follow the goals of the County Plan (outside settlements), while inside the areas their own development strategies are implemented.

- **Typological zone definitions** – In RS’s and RC’s spatial plans, zones appear in various forms and under various names (Table I). In principle, there are two options available:
  1. zones in traditional locations (the plans before 1991), which preserve their planning names (areas zoned for industry, small businesses, storage, logistics, and mixed use);
  2. new zones that express their "business character" in their name (the same planning definition of zoned land use applies).

Even though zoned land use is provided for in the plans of both countries, in practice there are great discrepancies between zone names and their programmes (particularly in old zones, e.g. zone of municipal industries Kopar, where nowadays commercial and business services prevail).

- **Development incentives – programmes and financial instruments encouraging the development of business zones** – RS and RC both see an important development potential in their business zones. Thus, RS decided to financially support the establishment of new zones from the following resources: PHARE funds, Direct Regional Incentives (until 2004), the Single Programming Document of the RS 2004-2006 (construction of 21 zones), and the Operational Programme of Strengthening Regional Development Potentials 2007-2013: Coastal municipalities did not make a full use of the available financial resources, with the exception of co-financing of the Small-Business and Development Zone of Srmin.

RC started to finance this project more intensively by adopting the national Business Zone Development Programme in 2004. Later the Programme Promoting Small and Medium Entrepreneurship 2008–2012 was adopted, and in 2013, the Improvement of Business Infrastructure Act was adopted. In line with the state programme, Istarska zupanija started constructing business zones as early as 2002, when the Long-term Programme for Promotion and Development of Business Zones in Istarska zupanija was adopted. 105 zones in an area of 1,544 ha were provided for in spatial plans. There were no public investments in 58 zones (21 active and 37 non-active ones), while 35 zones were developed from the existing infrastructure.**

Due to the lack of analyses and evaluations it is difficult to assess the success and effec-
The Slovenian part of Istria: parameters of existing zones (a total of 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zones in Slovenian Istria – basic parameters for development potential determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial parameters</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of zone</th>
<th>Period of construction</th>
<th>Spatial document</th>
<th>Size ha</th>
<th>Reserved land ha</th>
<th>Level of municipal services</th>
<th>Possibility of expansion</th>
<th>Direct Transport link (up to 2 km)</th>
<th>Price EUR/m²</th>
<th>Joint management and marketing</th>
<th>Enterprises in zone</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Zone of municipal industry</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. TOMOS</td>
<td>Old (+ new development)</td>
<td>PUP, (partially ZN)</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ob Šmarno</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>ZN ob Šmarno</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cimos</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Small-business zone Šalara</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vinakoper</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Small-business and development zone Srmin</td>
<td>Old + new</td>
<td>PUP, OPPN</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Construction zone Srmin</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>ZN</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>Entire zone: 19.5</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Luka</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Industrial zone Iplas</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Business zone Izola Delamaris</td>
<td>Old + new</td>
<td>PUP</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Industrial zone Izola</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>Various ZNs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>150-280</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Industrial zone CMI-vzhod Izola</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>OPPN</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Small-business zone Lucija</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>ZN</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>144-200</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All zones in total: 234.7 ha 58.2 ha

AC – motorway, HC – expressway, R1 – regional road, G1 – main road

The success of establishment/operation of zones in both countries is also affected by unfavourable business conditions, since on the IMD Competitiveness Yearbook for 2016 Slovenia was ranked 43rd (improving from the 49th place in 2015), and Croatia was in the 58th place (the 58th place in 2015) among the 61 countries included in the ranking [IMD, 2016].

- Locations and capacities: existing planning areas, reserves, and predicted new zones – By analysing and comparing the existing applicable spatial documents and the documents in preparation, we defined, for the whole Istria, the basic parameters of the existing and envisaged business zones. The parameters (for determining development potential) are summarised according to the "Criteria for Categorising Business Zones in Preparation of Strategic Spatial Documents" [PhD dissertation, Cok, 2004].

In the analytical sense, the zones in the Croatian part of Istria can be divided into (a) those provided by the County Plan (with a defined zone status), and (b) all other “industrial, etc., areas, zones” inside settlements, as provided for by spatial plans of JLSs. Due to the lack of data (unavailability, absence, distinct diversity between zoned and actual land use, etc.) this group is not covered in our analysis. In this context our focus was on the County Plan (the current County Spatial Plan (2002), draft of a new plan (public unveiling in 2015), and audit report) which actually define the “zones” as completed spatial entities with a known programmatic direction, and for the Slovenian part, on the existing spatial plans of three coastal municipalities (Koper, Izola, Piran). The detailed analysis for the Croatian part addressed 34 priority locations (out of 91 envisaged, presenting a blend of new and old zones), while for the Slovenian part we addressed all 14 locations (of mostly old zones), which the municipal...
spatial plans (with different names) define as business zones (Fig. 2). In defining spatial reserves (RS and RC) in the individual zones, this parameter could not be reliably defined in many cases due to the absence, non-availability, and diversity of data. We found the following:

- Slovenian part of Istria: All zones (except for one) were planned already before 1991 (Table II). The transport accessibility of all zones is good; their infrastructure is also good, and not in conflict with the narrow and wider environment, with the exception of the Iplas industrial zone. Most zones are completely developed, and all are located in the coastal zone (up to 3 km from the water line). By considering any of the set of location criteria to define the zones according to their meaning in RS (e.g. Cok, 2004) we find that by the criterion of size (zones of national (100 ha), regional (30-50 ha) and local significance (5-30 ha)) there are only 2 zones of regional significance in the area of Slovenian Istria and no zones of national significance. Other zones have local character.

- Croatian part of Istria: The zones are distributed both in the coastal zone and the interior. Industry, as a result of previous plans, is located directly along the coastal line, while new zones are mostly not located in the narrow coastal zone. According to spatial development plans of JLS, in 2013 there were 52 entrepreneurial zones with approx. 6,400 employed persons, while 53 zones were not in operation yet (with an area of 668 ha). Because of this the number of zones was reduced to 91 locations in the new spatial plan of Istarska županija. Of this, zones larger than 4 ha cover 2,242 ha (existing and planned, but built in only 26%) and zones smaller than 4 ha cover 325 ha, or 2,567 ha in total. Besides, spatial regulation plans of JLSs of towns and municipalities can plan additional zones and livestock farms, while the total allowed area of business zones (completed, under construction, or completely empty areas) in all (41) JLSs can cover a maximum area of 2,852 ha. Analysis of the existing documents of spatial development of JLSs reveals that the areas planned for the industry and services were over-dimensional or that they were planned before the last great economic, demographic, and social crisis.49 Table III shows 34 priority zones in Croatia Istria.

In view of the above, we found that the current draft of the new spatial plan of Istarska županija provides for a maximum of 91 business zones with a maximum area of 2,567 ha, while in the Slovenian part of Istria there are 14 business zones with an area of 234.7 ha.

- Availability and ownership – Due to the lack of data, the definition of spatial and ownership situation in the existing zones represents a major analytical problem. For the Slovenian part of Istria, expert studies for OPNs were done for all zones, which showed that the spatial reserves within the existing zones are minimum (or completely lacking), and that the "potential of land availability" is, in fact, difficult to define (Fig. 1). Active (old) zones (in RS and RC) are faced with complex ownership situations, non-digitalised maps, and vague regulatory conditions (areas covered by area specific building code (PUP), based on which it is difficult to define the extent of the potential new construction (quota in m2). The situation is more transparent in locations that recently saw the adoption of municipal detailed spatial plans (OPPNs) providing for a rational plot division. This is mostly the case with new zones in the Croatian part of Istria.

47 In this framework we also addressed the existing spatial development plans of the key JLSs which cover these zones.
48 We found that no zones existed in the fourth coastal municipality, i.e. Ankaran.
49 This was also found in the report: *** 2014 which provides 14 recommendations for increasing the efficiency of zone development.
### Zones in Croatian Istria – basic parameters for development potential determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Name of zone</th>
<th>Period of construction</th>
<th>Spatial document Type/Yes</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Reserved land ha</th>
<th>Level of municipal services Yes/No/Partly</th>
<th>Possibility of expansion Yes/No</th>
<th>Direct Transport link (up to 2 km) to AC, HC, R1, G1</th>
<th>Price EUR/m² Not available (n/a)</th>
<th>Joint management and marketing Yes/No</th>
<th>Enterprises in zone Yes/No/Partly</th>
<th>Implementation Completed/In Progress/Stagnation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Town of Vodnjan</td>
<td>Galizana</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>AC, R1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Town of Labin</td>
<td>Vinez</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Town of Novigrad</td>
<td>Vidal</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Municipality of Žminj</td>
<td>Žminj</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>AC, R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Municipality of Kastelir Labinci</td>
<td>Labinci</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Town of Pazin</td>
<td>Ciburi</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>AC, R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Municipality of Svetvincenat</td>
<td>Bibići</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Town of Buzet</td>
<td>Mažinjca</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Municipality of Lupoglav</td>
<td>Lupoglav</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Municipality of Višnjan</td>
<td>Milanezi</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>AC, R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Town of Buzet</td>
<td>Mala Huba 1 and 2</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Town of Rovinj</td>
<td>Gripele Spine</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Town of Buje</td>
<td>Buje</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Town of Poreč</td>
<td>Bući - Zbandaj</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Town of Umag</td>
<td>Ungarija</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Municipality of Tinjan</td>
<td>Butori</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Municipality of Vrsar</td>
<td>Neon</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Municipality of Varazdin</td>
<td>Barban</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Town of Vodnjan</td>
<td>Tison</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>378.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>AC, R1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Municipality of Labin</td>
<td>Aerodrom Pula</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>AC, R1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Municipality of Rama</td>
<td>Rama</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Municipality of Pisan</td>
<td>Potpani</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Municipality of Kite</td>
<td>Strpe</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>AC, R1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Municipality of Sv. Nedelja</td>
<td>Nedescina</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Municipality of Bale</td>
<td>Monkastel</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Municipality of Sv. Petar sa Sumi</td>
<td>Skripe Bijeli</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Town of Poreč</td>
<td>Kukci</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Town of Poreč</td>
<td>Baderna</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Town of Poreč</td>
<td>Facinka</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23.73</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Town of Buje</td>
<td>Mazurija</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Town of Rovinj</td>
<td>Rovinsko selo</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Municipality of Funtana</td>
<td>Funtana</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Town of Pazin</td>
<td>Podberam</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Municipality of Sv. Nedelja</td>
<td>Dubrava</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 34 priority zones: 1,300 ha

AC – motorway, HC – expressway, R1 – regional road, G1 – main road
The problems that aggravate the definition of "reserves and availability" relate to absence and non-availability of information on:
- current sale/purchase procedures of land and/or structures within a zone (ownership interests);
- already issued building permits and intent to build (role of administrative units);
- available municipal infrastructure on land and condition thereof (obsolete, new, in need of remediation, etc.);
- municipal spatial development visions concerning the zone as a whole and the intention to change implementing spatial planning documents (PIAs) (role of municipalities, change of zoned land use or building conditions);
- intention for (short-term or long-term) removal of a certain entrepreneur from the zone.

The following quota of available land can be defined based on the data available:
- in the Slovenian part we identified approx. 81 ha of undeveloped land within 14 zones;
- in the Croatian part we identified 210 ha of land available for sale (source: Audit Report) to which zones that are not yet built must be added.

In both cases, due to the aforementioned reasons, it is difficult to consider this quota as an actual development reserve.

• **Promotion in marketing** – Within the analysis, we compared audit reports and web portals. We found that the business zones in Slovenian Istria lack both appropriate management and marketing. The only organisation that "markets" the zones is the Public Agency of the Republic of Slovenia for promotion of entrepreneurship, internationalisation, foreign investment, and technology (SPIRIT Slovenija), whose database contains 5 zones from the Slovenian Istria, but the information is highly deficient. Unlike some other areas, the Regional Development Agency (RCR Koper) is not active in the field of marketing business zones, while the activity of municipalities is also limited.

Marketing and promotion are limited in Croatia, too, as the Ministry of Economy, which promotes foreign investment in Croatia, does not mention business zones\(^5^0\); some zones are marketed by the Investments and Competition Agency (two from Istarska županija). Promotion and marketing activities are limited to the county level (IDA)\(^5^1\); however, this approach is limited and incomplete.\(^5^2\)

---

### Table IV Zones in Slovenian and Croatian Istria: analysis of advantages and disadvantages of the existing situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>RS Advantages</th>
<th>RC Advantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Old/new</td>
<td>• Prevalence of old zones.</td>
<td>• New zones prevail; the County Plan provides for many zones that can be activated when the need arises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spatial document</td>
<td>• All zones have PIAs in place; the amendments of the existing documents can implement modern and rational urban planning and architectural solutions</td>
<td>• As these are mostly new developments (new PIAs) modern and rational urban and architectural solutions can be achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Size</td>
<td>• No advantages identified</td>
<td>• Some zones are large, and allow for major investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reserved land</td>
<td>• No advantages identified</td>
<td>• Due to the low degree of zone realisation there are major reserves both in plans and in space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Level of municipal services</td>
<td>• Most zones are built on developed land</td>
<td>• Many zones are well equipped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Possibility of expansion</td>
<td>• No advantages identified</td>
<td>• The expansion allows for long-term operation even with the possible growth of companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Transport</td>
<td>• All locations are accessible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Price</td>
<td>• No advantages identified</td>
<td>• More favourable prices than in Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Management</td>
<td>• No advantages identified</td>
<td>• No advantages identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Enterprises in zone</td>
<td>• Most zones are active (except for one)</td>
<td>• No advantages identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Implementation</td>
<td>• No advantages identified</td>
<td>• They allow for a fast occupation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^5^0\) [http://www.mingo.hr/page/kategorija/investicije](http://www.mingo.hr/page/kategorija/investicije)

\(^5^1\) [http://www.ida.hr/index.php?id=28](http://www.ida.hr/index.php?id=28)

\(^5^2\) Non-operational www.Istriainvest.com, activities at LinkedIn, YouTube, Facebook
of the local self-governance units manage to actively market their own zones.

- **Development advantages and disadvantages** — Based on the systematisation, analysis, and comparison of all data we identified the advantages and disadvantages of the existing situation (Table IV). The zones in RS and RC vary substantially in size and territorial dispersion, which is the key advantage of the situation in RC. Despite the extensive planning areas, in practice these zones are not recognised as an actual development capacity. In RS, the key advantage is their already established integration with the local environment and infrastructure, while the level of availability and the high price of land is the biggest shortcoming (Fig. 3, 4).

**DISCUSSION**

**DISKUSIJA**

The zones in Istria are, in some cases only, an efficient instrument for steering spatial and economic development. These are the locations that from the spatial perspective allow for a fast, simple, and competitive establishment of business of a specific enterprise. At the same time, they are recognised on the market and in spatial documents as the adequate spatial capacity with a specific reserve for the introduction of new, and expansion of the existing, companies. In the Slovenian part only one zone falls into this category, while for the Croatian part, at least 34 zones have been identified as potentially efficient locations, i.e. priority zones.

In this study we found that the locations and the scope of the individual zones are derived from: (a) former socialist plans and (b) (very) ambitiously set new development strategies. The key disadvantage aggravating the "role of zones" as a regulatory instrument is that old zones deal with "saturation and problems related to ownership and municipal infrastructure", while with new ones, there is a lack of reliable data on availability and development needs. We found that the key difference between the zones in the Slovenian and Croatian parts of Istria is mostly in their scope (number and size: RC still has major capacities, while RS has minimum capacities); therefore the current situation in implementation of development strategies in RS and RC varies a lot. A common characteristic of all zones is the obvious lack of various data and the absence of an efficient system of their promotion and marketing.

In line with this, the first part of the hypothesis set at the beginning that the zones "in their current form are not an efficient enough spatial planning instrument for steering spatial and economic development" can be fully confirmed. The hypothesis is only partially confirmed for the Croatian part, as the existing capacities of spatial policy (despite the lack of data on specific zones) allow for steering of economy in various locations. The second part of the hypothesis, i.e. that zones "are not an efficient instrument for steering economic development", cannot be either fully confirmed nor fully rejected due to the lack of data on the connection between the location of enterprises and the "institute of zones" as development locations (for both countries).

Our position is that the planning of locations and the production of PIAs are, nevertheless, only some of the necessary conditions (beside appropriate typological direction, land prices, organised ownership, municipal services, labour force, etc.) to start the actual economic development of a zone. In this sense it may justifiably be brought into question whether there is a sufficient business interest and demographic potential to fill such a large number of planned zones. Internal competition exists between regions/countries, where due to the prices of land (Slovenian Istria) and labour force (Croatian Istria), the regions are among the most competitive regions in the context of the state, particularly in terms of production activities, for both domestic and foreign investors.

For the zones to become more efficient, the following elements should be also included in the planning and design system in Istria (in both countries):

1. Efficient monitoring and system for data updating ((a) status of land/structure availability: phase of operation, sale and expansion reserves; (b) short-term company tendencies: further business, expansion, migration etc.).
2. The single typology of zones (expressing the content and scope) and the strategy for

---

53 Croatia already has the regional scale of planning in place, Slovenia does not.
54 This guidance concerns the updating of the national legislation in both countries.
construction of the zone network in terms of programmes and timetables, which should be integrated in the wider regional scale.53

3. Zone promotion and marketing system (the current SPIRIT/IDA lacks the necessary data and there are no permanent zone promotion activities in connection to regional/local development actors).

4. Zone management and administration system (similar to the zones in neighbouring countries; Italy, Austria, etc.).

5. A more integrated approach to plan preparation, planning, and implementation (individually named and defined mandatory expert studies, durability date of PIAs, durability date of zoned land use, etc.).54

6. In the planning of new, and reanimation of existing zones, a reliable cost–benefit analysis should be produced.

7. Observing the principle of rationality (the planning of new zones must be rational; until the general economic and social conditions improve the activation of new locations can be only a "theoretical" planning measure.

[Translated by: MOJCA VILFAN, univ. dipl. angli., nemešč./BA (Engl., Germ.)
Proofread by: JOSHUA BIRCH-ROCCHIO, MA]
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Sažetak

Predmetom ove radionice je smjesta gospodarskih aktivnosti i problemi razvoja poslovnih zona u Istri.

Iako su područja tih zona precizno određena prostornim dokumentima, te su sasvim suvremene industrijske i obrtničke zone iz prethodnih planova, dok se u hrvatskim dijelovima Istre, koja treba tretirati kao cjelinu u pogledu geografskoga, kulturnoga i teritorijalnoga razvoja, takoj je etapi izvedeni zaključci i predložene smjernice za promociju, 7) prednosti i nedostatki razvoja. U trećoj etapi primijenjena opisna metoda kako bi se definirali i odgovarajući planski dokumeni za planiranje mreže različitih tipova zona.
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