

## First signs of gentrification? Urban regeneration in the transitional society: the case of Croatia<sup>1</sup>

**Ognjen Čaldarović**  
**Jana Šarinić**

*University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,  
Zagreb, Croatia*

*e-mail: ognjen.caldarovic@ffzg.hr; jana.sarinic@vip.hr*

**ABSTRACT** Urban regeneration is usually defined as a structural and functional change of a certain part of the city powered by individual (corporate) or state initiatives. Many times the question what to regenerate, where and how to regenerate, remains unanswered. We will address the problem of the “sudden appearance” of new actors in urban politics and their growing influence on urban rehabilitation. The role of these corporate actors is more and more prominent due to their financial power and their “connections” with the city and state decision-making administration at various levels. The recent beginning of rehabilitation of one downtown block in Zagreb will be the topic of our case-study analysis. The citizens have protested on several occasions against the planned project, yet the mayor and the city administration have decided to continue with the project that will end as a typical dual-city structure. The paper will connect the current situation with the social and political organization patterns of a transitional society. The major problem concerns the sudden and deep change – new urban actors have replaced formerly existing social and state ownership and their interests. It is clear that the overall social and political system is not yet prepared to cope with the new contradictions and that institutional changes are to be applied.

*Key words:* gentrification, urban regeneration, new urban stakeholders, Croatia, Zagreb.

Received in November 2008

Accepted in December 2008

<sup>1</sup> This article is based on the paper “Inevitability of Gentrification in a transitional Society: The case of Croatia” that was presented at The First ISA Forum on Sociology, Barcelona, Spain, September 5–9 2008.

## 1. Introduction

We might argue that gentrification used to be an issue discussed among urban planners and other experts in Europe and in the USA mostly in the period 1980–1990. In transitional societies, such is also the Croatian society, it is becoming “a living reality” more recently but almost with no previous discussion, signs and “warnings”.<sup>2</sup> Changes in urban environment are recently happening almost everywhere with almost no discussions on the concepts, ideas, programs and plans in many transitional societies (Čaldarović, 1991b). One of the recent examples of urban regeneration in the Croatian capital city Zagreb will be used as a case study in this paper where we would like to show what were current mechanisms in the operational strategies of city’s government, of the investors, of corporate agents, politicians and urban planners in the pursuing of their goals mostly through “urban renewal” actions. The overall problem that will be discussed in details in this paper consists of several major aspects:

*The meaning of the city*

*The concept of urban renewal*

*The concept of public space*

*The proper role of urban actors*

*The democracy principles in urban planning and management*

*The meaning of a “better city”.*

## 2. The meaning of city

The city is not only a “big unified wholeness” nor is it only “my neighborhood”. In the conceptualizations of a unified city, the physical structure of the whole urban unit dominates over a comprehensive and sensible explanation. The city is simply seen as “big”, “great”, “the most important”, and “the center of ...”, “global”, “unique”, etc. But in the much narrower sense, the city could much more naturally be conceptualized as “my city”, my neighborhood, my place, my feeling of belonging, the place where I was born and spent my life, etc. (Čaldarović, 1997a; 1997b; 2005; Coing, 1966).

In a sense, all discussions on the meaning of the city (the philosophy of city) are partially discussion on the real and imagined qualities, ideas, and situations we attribute to any part of physical structure of our cities. It is true that, for every

---

<sup>2</sup> Some articles, investigations, etc. of a sporadic nature concerning rehabilitation reflected only the situation in post socialism, but not of any systematic nature (see in the bibliography).

individual, his or hers quarter is the most important, very specific part of the unified urban “wholeness” and in that sense all cities are just assemblies of different specific “pieces”, places or spaces<sup>3</sup>. So, the overlapping of different meanings and identifications as well as psychological qualities attributed to parts of cities makes at the same time a real and a symbolic wholeness called “the city”. We should not forget that each part of any city is more or less similar to other parts, but for the specific resident of any part of the city, his or hers part is the most important, specific and unique (Čaldarović, 2004a; 2001).

Therefore, we might say that all cities are at the same time very different but at the same time very similar. We might say also the same for the neighborhoods, quarters or areas – they are very similar, but to a certain extent, what makes them different, could be registered and noticed at the level of everydayness, at the level of everyday life, at the dynamic praxis of life. These different “usages” of spaces-places or quarters of any city make parts of each city specific, unique and “mine”. They manifest a specific “city character”, “city atmosphere” and in this sense it could be said that every city is very similar to each other, but at the same time very different. Is it still possible to say – “You’ve seen one city, you’ve seen them all”? In a sense it is true due to the fact that there is evidence that the similarities between cities are rising, and specificities are diminishing. For example, the erection of very similar skyscrapers on almost every piece of the Earth makes the cities more and more similar.<sup>4</sup> There is even a competition between cities how to reach higher level of Disneyfication of the current urban environments. But, cities are not skyscrapers, or Disney lands or McDonalds or shopping areas (cities) – they also have their souls, their populations that make the substance of their lives.<sup>5</sup> So, the buildings, structures, streets, parks, squares etc. make only a prerequisite – a suitable physical “shell” where social life might develop and produce some interesting social and artistic practices. The city life is mostly expressed in small scale parts, around and on the squares, on the open air, in the parks, at pedestrian streets, etc.

Gentrification from the other side, represents a universal process that diminishes the differences, makes urban situations more and more similar throughout the world and produces a recognizable “worldly lifestyle” that is suited for the people living in “dual cities”, and where the excluded ones can only participate in symbolic window-shopping and in the admiration of specific and unreachable lifestyle of the “better offs”.<sup>6</sup> In many situations in older cities throughout Europe and in the USA, urban renewal was a prerequisite for gentrification. The same started to happen also in a transitional society like Croatia. So, in the continuation of our pa-

---

<sup>3</sup> We will skip at this moment the discussion on the differences between “place”, “space”, “instrumental” and “use values” places. See also in Low at al., 1992; Low, 1992; Riley, 1992; Rivlin, 1987.

<sup>4</sup> See for the example interesting findings on the skyscrapers in Europe and in Zagreb, Čaldarović, 2004b.

<sup>5</sup> That was also discussed in the G. Simmel's essay *Metropolis and Mental life*.

<sup>6</sup> Zukin, 1982; 1987.

per, let us discuss firstly the meaning of the word “rehabilitation” (urban renewal, reconstruction, revitalization, regeneration, ...).<sup>7</sup>

### 3. Many faces of urban renewal – the meaning of “urban regeneration”

Urban renewal<sup>8</sup> has many faces where urban regeneration is probably the least used term, but at the same time a very precise term: it is a structural and functional deep change of a certain part of the city powered by individual (corporate) or state initiatives or by the combined initiatives. The key word-concept is “to regenerate”, which means to bring devastated situations (areas, neighborhoods, quarters, even buildings) again back to life. Regeneration is similar to the term “revitalization” that is even more closely connected with the idea of “bringing back to life” the forgotten, devastated and destroyed situations, buildings, milieus.<sup>9</sup> The term “reconstruction” means primarily the change – new “things”, new buildings, new contents to be placed in a certain part of the city. The major problem with reconstruction lies in the fact that it is very difficult to make a good and understandable balance between the newly constructed structures and the remaining old ones. How to make a good balance between “old” and “new”? Who is responsible to decide what is good and “not good” for a certain project of rehabilitation? One version of the idea of reconstruction is marked with the domination of new construction and “the philosophy behind” would claim that new must be placed instead of old, for example – not enough “representative buildings” and contents. We might call it “a radical transformation concept”, while the more modest one that will insist only on preservation of old structures etc. we might call “a conservative approach” to urban renewal and rehabilitation.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Even the terms are different, in many cases the actions forwarded under the umbrella of “urban renewal” could be very different. It is also clear that “urban renewal” could be seen differently by city officials, by city planners, by the experts who promote historical preservation as well as by the developers.

<sup>8</sup> Urban renewal was a general term that was used mostly in the USA especially during the 1960s to denote urban change, urban rehabilitation and reconstruction. In some cases, that term was used to describe the expulsion of lower strata of population to make room for the better off. In today’s use, this term has even a more narrowed angle – it is only a part of the overall and comprehensive study of rehabilitation and revitalization.

<sup>9</sup> We might accept the idea that regeneration implies also revitalization and some reconstruction. This last term is called upon only as the “last blast”, while regeneration, revitalization and preservation are actions and perspectives more used today. The respect towards the past (in general) is definitely one of the reasons and the idea that the past also used to have some values keep many older objects and areas still in existence.

<sup>10</sup> Conservative approach must not be at all “conservative”. It shows only the respect towards the past, the forgotten values in architecture, design of the cities and smaller units-squares, streets, buildings, for example. Many times efficient protection of historical and cultural values could save the parts or even whole cities! See in more details in Čaldarović, 1991a; 1991c.

Actually, it is always a question of scaling of drastic changes as opposed to the preservation of the existing structures and situations. How to pursue “a peaceful coexistence” between new and old (buildings, situations, contexts)? Is it possible to get a realistic impression with an idea that the new and old must cohabitate in a peaceful manner?<sup>11</sup>

But, the decisions must also be made on the following issues: what to regenerate, where and what to invest, who to invest, why to regenerate and when (and, most of all “why”)? Who are the actors, investors, decision makers? Who are the forces (people and agents) to invest into urban renewal?

#### 4. Actors

The principal actor – “the pusher” – in a socialist period was unquestionably the state. The state was a principal investor, and the decisions on where, when, how much and what to invest were made on a political level, but still based on professional and expert opinions and assessments, usually to follow urban plans – master and detailed ones. Today’s situation is quite different. New private, corporate actors are emerging and wanting to invest their money primarily in construction industry with almost no reference to the existing situations and contexts, structures, even rules.<sup>12</sup> So, in today’s situation we might claim that there is an inherent conflict between the interests of the investor (private actor) and the rest of society that do not have almost no means to represent, defend, discuss and eventually change the unwanted projects of proposed “urban renewal”.<sup>13</sup> The interest of the investor is – say – to build the highest skyscraper in the competitive local environment and to sell (or rent) all the floors of that building. Previous long-term “general” (master) urban planning today is replaced with a somewhat unclear idea of “project planning” (with or without “a vision” – usually, without it!) that claims that “the sense” of urban planning, or a sense of a whole urban unity will be seen, understood and accepted “afterwards”, when the individual object(s) will be constructed and completed to be integrated in micro spaces and/or in a more general space of an urban unit – in the city. We stated earlier that the state has lost its power of directive decision-making in urban planning, and that it is functioning in urban issues today mostly as a (weak) partner. But, when a strong, decisive and rich individual corporate actor comes to the scene, and when he or she offers money and show deterministic interest, a city urban administration is not only confused, but servile,

<sup>11</sup> “Every generation has the right to leave the mark on city’s structures and shape” – how many times we have heard this statement?

<sup>12</sup> There are rumors that nowadays, at least in transitional societies, the profit is the highest in construction industry, even up to 1000%. That could be the reason why, for example, a flourishing of the construction of “urban villas” (with up to 20 housing units in a single house!) takes place almost like the mushrooms after the rain.

<sup>13</sup> This represents “a structural deficit” in the process of decision making where the existing procedure is simply ineffective, slow and non interactive.

clientelist and prepared to adapt the existing rules of urban planning and city's design almost to any wish of the investor.

## 5. The importance of social elements

Earlier we stated that the city can be conceptualized as wholeness", but from the other side it is also a unique combination of smaller parts, neighborhoods, streets, squares, parks and buildings. The change of any part of the city does have an impact on the perception of the city's wholeness as well as on the change of the smaller scale elements. In another way, the change of physical elements will definitely change the image of the wholeness, the perception of different urban functions and – in a longer run – of the symbolic image of the city. So, the change of physical elements will definitely bring about to the change of social elements, of the composition of population and of social and cultural role of any transformed (gentrified) part of the city. Actually, through many physical changes, social change is also expected. Another "lifestyle" is expected to follow the change of physical environment and new rules, new people, new shops, new settings, new contents are to be placed, built and used in a new physical shell. So, in the concept of gentrification, there is definitely a certain kind of urban renewal, but not for the existing people, for the existing buildings, contents and ways of the existing kinds of usages of a certain part of the city. *Gentrification means the change of physical settings, shapes, symbols etc., but at the same time a change of type of population that will be more "carrying" (carrying capacity) to bring about to all planned and introduced changes.* It is interesting that in our case study exactly new inhabitants are expected – much richer than the existing ones – to populate the exclusive new environments that will be suited to satisfy the needs of the new members of the "new lifestyles". In another words, *gentrification means the introduction of new specific and exclusive elements and not the rehabilitation of the deteriorated conditions of life for the existing inhabitants, in its physical and social meanings.* When gentrification comes, then the elements of "normal life" are fading out, to be changed with attractions, Disneyfication, and semi public spaces and areas for the new, stratified, isolated inhabitants who will house now new gated communities. We should not forget also many visitors that will be enjoying new shopping areas and the sense of phony belonging to the "new lifestyles".

## 6. Transitional society and its urban regeneration- some dilemmas

We stated earlier that the gentrification processes are just starting to be developing in transitional societies with many beginners' mistakes. If transitional period is to be understood as a certain quantity of sudden and deep change in political, social and economic order and practices in a given society, that is at least in the case of Croatia sometimes called "a wild capitalism", then gentrification is only one, but very important aspect of that change. The problem of public space and its privatization, the design of public squares and places with literally no place to

sit on except the restaurant sittings, the diminution of pedestrian zones, the quality of parks and green areas in the city, the quality of public transportation and the investments into private traffic facilities are some of the present consequences of that transitional situation. We should not forget also the emergence of skyscrapers with no land-use plan and with no previous requirements and preparations to receive the increased traffic congestion as well as visual degradation and degradation of a symbolic and identification "picture" of the city (see in Čaldarović, 2004b; 2006). Finally, there is also a question of the responsibility and the acceptance of the principles of social justice in planning of the city – are political decisions on city development made in favor of private interests where no long term planning ideas exist, where no idea of what "green city" means no more exists and where all marginalized social strata (older population, children, disabled, poor...) are literally neglected? *City government and private investors are definitely in the opposition to civil society actors.* Who controls, for example, the development of public sphere (open places, public areas, squares) in cities in the transitional Croatia? Finally, whose city we are talking about? Then, there is an important question of city financing – how city assets are distributed, who directs the use of the money of the taxpayers? Or, in another words, who decides about the priorities in financing? Also, who are the experts that are making decisions – only the architects, urban planners, traffic engineers? What about the complete lack of some other disciplines, like for example sociologists which illustrates the lack of "political will" to deal with people's needs, wishes, where are sociological studies before the plan is elaborated, where and how the public is involved into the decision-making?

If we mention major features of the current process of pre-gentrification in a transitional society they could be summarized in the following way:

*The emergence of new actors.* These new actors as private persons or corporate representatives are now property owners and major developers. In these functions they replaced formerly existing social ownership as well as state ownership. Instead of state as a major entrepreneur, new, private, mostly corporate actors are the main investors in urban development.

*Financing and decision making.* Private investors do have money, but they are not answered in a proper way by city administration where, what and how to invest in a given city? Where is a plan for investors, developers? Usually, it is missing.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup> In practice, a private investor expresses his wish to build, say, a skyscraper somewhere in a precisely defined location in a city space. Urban administration can not say anything against those ideas, even they do know what to say about the height, the shape and functions of the future business building. Not to mention the complete lack of analysis and studies as preconditions that a micro plan for such a building must satisfy certain conditions to be given the permission for construction. The city urban administration simply does not have plans with many potential locations where an interested and motivated investor-developer could find also his interest that will be compatible with city interests, and interests of the inhabitants of local and wider areas.

*System preparation.* The overall system is not prepared to cope with new initiatives, new actors, and new investors – developers. Recent developments with private corporate investors show that the legislative backing of their actions, the rules, laws etc. still do not fully exist or exist in not so operationalized and clear way, which can give a lot of freedom, liberty and varieties of pressures and actions for the investor – developer. One improvement of the whole situation will be – at least – to supplement the existing rules and regulations with just procedures that will clearly say where the place of private investor is and what are the legal and necessary moves and fulfillments the investor must satisfy.

*Procedures.* In another words, a new legal framework for private developers is needed with precise rules and prescriptions of procedures to follow.

*Unclear situation concerning the use of city space.* Due to that situation, the city space seems to be mostly only a fertile ground for the investors who can build almost anything anywhere. Probably the public space is endangered the most due to its high symbolic and aesthetic value!

## 7. The meaning and importance of public space

It is interesting to note that many gentrification proposals are claiming that they are constructing new public spaces. The proposals are usually a combination of a passage and a smaller or bigger shopping mall with different shops, smaller coffees and restaurants, playing areas for children, big parking lot or a garage. Shopping malls are increasingly becoming “new public spaces”, many think, where people spend their time, walk around and imagine that they are also citizens of the world. But, real urban public spaces are mostly open places, where city life can easily be manifested and not scrutinized into pre-organized forms and schedules. Public spaces have their histories, their tradition, their own layers, they are full of memories of past generations and of existing people that remember past issues. Public spaces must be opened 24 hours in a day, they must be open for all citizens of a certain city or any kind of visitors. It is also very important that different activities could be organized on public spaces – organized and spontaneous. In another way, any public space must be permeable. In any public space, sudden changes in design or in the content of the space are not easily accepted by the general public. In another words, no great and quick change of the existing situation must not be approved by the city government. Also, every sharp and sudden change is seen as a break with continuity, with the past, tradition and usual perception of the existing public space.<sup>15</sup> So, in a shorter and longer run, it will be very difficult to organize a real public space in a gentrifying manner. This kind of newly constructed “public space” will be always artificial, superficial and not convincing product.

<sup>15</sup> See for the more elaborated discussion in: Čaldarović, O. (1996). Javni prostori u gradu. *Čovjek i prostor*, 3–6.

## **8. The meaning of “a better city”**

“Better city” in the gentrification project usually means “new city”, new shops, new construction, new completely constructed environments that are more or less similar everywhere. Also, “better people” who will shop and spend more money in cleaner and sterile environments will show up. In this sense, “a real city life” is losing its grounds, its temporality, its tradition, its known signs and natural environments due to the fact that everything represents newly constructed environments, recreated, fabricated and “new”, usually rather big and great for the new lifestyle people.<sup>16</sup> It is a case of newly “produced places” that could be situated almost everywhere and where no authenticity could be found as specific for a certain place, time and society.

## **9. Conclusions: The case study**

Continuing our paper, in a concluding manner, we will present an outline of the case study from the city of Zagreb illustrating the recent happenings that took place on one central city square place – The Cvjetni trg or The Flower Square during 2006–2007 year. This “Flower Square” is a part of tradition of city life in Zagreb and is known also as a place where you can buy flowers, where there had been 2 cinemas just around, and where children can play on a traffic free surface and where there were several coffees and small restaurants, library shops and a library and several small shops. The architectural and urbanistic layout is typical for the Middle Europe cities from the end of 19th and beginning of the 20th century.

In 2006 a private-corporate developer started to buy the properties in the western and southern part of the square and soon it came out that he would like to build a “new lifestyle center”, a passage with a shopping center, with luxury apartments. He himself invited several known architects to produce the project of reconstruction of a part of a square, established a committee for the evaluation, consisting of several architects and major city official urban planner that selected one of the proposal. The proposal is actually an urban passage, with small shopping center, with the “new elevated gardens”, with luxury apartments<sup>17</sup> and – strangely enough – an underground garage for ca 800 cars, busses and even lorries! To realize the project, 2 houses should be torn down, both of them under historical protection act, but soon to be liberated from this protection by the city office for the protection of cultural monuments.<sup>18</sup> When the project was displayed and became public,

<sup>16</sup> In the literature these kind of places are known also as “no-places”, or instrumental places that we only use and leave (gas stations, airports) and do not enjoy, spend some time, use it and feel satisfied.

<sup>17</sup> The developer himself explained that these apartments will be for diplomats!

<sup>18</sup> In one of the buildings, a famous Croatian poet was born, but the developer explained that it is of no importance and might be even false!

protest actions headed by the NGO group “Green Action” and the NGO group of organized citizens with an important name – “The Right to the City” (H. Lefebvre’s concept and the title of his book from the 1960s) – started. Many urban planners, known public cultural, political, artistic etc. figures started to protest, be active, write petitions and organizes other ways of citizens disobey and protest.

The private-corporate initiative for the reconstruction of that part of the city as was explained in a written material that followed the architectural competition – started with several statements:

- The Master Plan of the city does not satisfactorily take care of separate solutions. In this sense, the proposed rehabilitation solution might be a model for other parts of the city which in turns can influence the Master Plan itself;<sup>19</sup>
- A new project, and especially the new construction will bring “...new urban, social and living value in the center of the city”, or in another words, “an investor vision is to construct new space that will be an input for future creation of city’s centre”;
- The program task must “... reflect an interactive approach... must stimulate a feeling of citizen’s belonging... a feeling of freedom, openness, a view towards the sky...”.

The concept of the renewal plan is rather simple – exclusive housing, organized in “residential units” that will stimulate “the return to the Downtown area”, a shopping area, exclusive restaurants, coffee shops, and also “a lifestyle center” which was not explained at all, probably due to the fact that everybody must know what is the meaning of a lifestyle center!

Key critical elements are the following:

- It is not a reconstruction, nor revitalization or rehabilitation – it is a new construction that should replace the existing structures;
- These structures are not adequate due to their size, style, dimensions etc. in comparison with the remaining buildings around and on the square itself;
- Due to that, the square could easily loose its character;
- Due to the fact that this part of the city is a traffic free zone, it is really not understandable that the project brings back private traffic right in the pedestrian part of the city through the plan of a construction of an underground garage for ca 800 vehicles;
- The fact that organized citizens had protested several times and that it did not change the situation almost a bit, put forward the question of the effectiveness of decision making, of the legitimacy of all planned construction activities and

---

<sup>19</sup> This could be an example of “a project planning” which follows this kind of logic: firstly produce one project, then a second, then third... and through the agglomeration of “project”, you will get a new plan, new city!

on the future of democracy in a transitional society.<sup>20</sup> We might easily expect more gentrification in our cities, but at the same time also more democratic planning, more rules, and less freedom for private developers. When the transitional period will be over (soon?), then the rules of the game will probably be set more rationally, with more participation and with responsible planners, city officials and mayors.

In another words, gentrification, even at a small scale is-for the time-being our “destiny” soon to be re-thought and replaced by the real, sincere and adequate rehabilitation of deteriorated parts of downtown areas. But, the transitional situation must pass and the rules of democratic society must be effective applied.

### Literature

1. Coing, H. (1966). *Rénovation urbaine et changement social*. Paris: Les éditions ouvrières.
2. Čaldarović, O. (1991a). Public Participation and Restoration in Historic Cities: The Case of Zagreb and Dubrovnik. In: Deelstra, T.; Yanitsky, O. (Eds.). *Cities of Europe: The Public's Role in Shaping the Urban Environment*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenja Publishers, pp. 163–173.
3. Čaldarović, O. (1991b). Socialist Urbanization and Social Segregation. In: Simmie, J.; Dekleva, J. (Eds.). *Yugoslavia in Turmoil: After Selfmanagement*. London and New York: Pinter Publishers, pp. 131–143.
4. Čaldarović, O. (1991c). Urban Beautification in the Post-Socialist Society – A Beginning of Gentrification: The Case of Zagreb. In: Krueger, A.; Swain, G.; Vercseg, I. (Eds.). *A Challenge for Communities in Europe: Economy, Environment, Education*. International Community Education Association (ICEA), 2nd European Conference, Budapest, pp. 53–61.
5. Čaldarović, O. (1997a). Residential segregation and integration: The case of Zagreb (Dubrava). In: *Jugend zwischen Ausgrenzung und Integration. Theorien und Methoden eines internationalen Projekts*. Hrsg. Švob, M.; Held, J. (Eds.). Zagreb und Tübingen: Institut za migracije i narodnosti, Institut für Erziehungswissenschaft, pp. 101–107.
6. Čaldarović, O. (1997b). *Satisfaction with Urban Services and Local Democracy in Five Croatian Cities*. Zagreb: Department of Sociology. Departmental Research Unit. University of Zagreb and RTI-Research Triangle Institute, U.S.A.
7. Čaldarović, O. (2001). (with Podgorelec, S.; Brčić, C.; Švob, M.). Integrationsprozesse in Zagreber Stadtteil Dubrava. In: Leiprecht, R. et al. (Eds.). *International Lernen-Lokal Handeln*. Frankfurt am Main-London: IKO-Verlag, pp. 121–149.
8. Čaldarović, O. (2004a). Multiculturalism and territorialization: an example in transitional society (Croatia). In: Mesić, M. (Ed.). *Perspectives of Multiculturalism: Western and Transitional Countries*. Zagreb: Faculty of Philosophy & Croatian Commission for UNESCO, pp. 297–307.

<sup>20</sup> The activists collected more than 54.000 signatures of the citizens, handed the lists to the city government, but in vain. The mayor said – “We are elected officials. You are called to elect again someone in a 4 year time. In the meantime, leave us to do our job!”

9. Čaldarović, O. (2004b). Neboderi u Zagrebu – najznačajniji sociološki aspekti. (Skyscrapers in Zagreb – the Most Important Sociological Aspects). In: Mattioni, V. (Ed.). *Neboderi u Europi. (Skyscrapers in Europe)* (international workshop). Zagreb: Gradski zavod za planiranje Grada i zaštitu okoliša (City Bureau for Development Planning and Environment Protection), pp. 117–131. (croatian and english).
10. Čaldarović, O. (2005). Patterns of urbanization and the question of multiculturalism and territorialization: an example in transitional society (Croatia). In: Eckardt, F. (Ed.). *Paths of Urban Transformation*. Frankfurt am Main: Europaeischer Verlag der Wissenschaften, pp. 55–66.
11. Čaldarović, O. (2006). (with Podgorelec, S.; Brčić, C.; Švob, M.). Multikulturalität, Integration und Segregation – Überlegungen vor dem Hintergrund von Forschungsergebnissen im Zagreber Stadtteil Dubrava. In: *International Lernen – Lokal Handeln. Interkulturelle Praxis "vor Ort" und Weiterbildung im internationalen Austausch*. Frankfurt am Mein, London: IKO-Verlag, pp. 143–156.
12. Low, S. M.; Altman, I. (1992). Place Attachment: A Conceptual Inquiry. U: Altman, I.; Low, S. M. (Eds.). *Human Behavior and the Environment – Advances in Theory and Research*, Volume 12: Place Attachment, pp. 1–13.
13. Low, S. M. (1992). Symbolic Ties That Bind: Place Attachment in the Plaza. U: Altman, I.; Low, S. M. (Eds.). *Place Attachment*, pp. 166–186.
14. Riley, R. B. (1992). Attachment to the Ordinary Landscape. U: Altman, I.; Low, S. M. (Eds.). *Place Attachment*, pp. 13–36.
15. Rivlin, L. G. (1987). The Neighborhood, Personal Identity, and Group Affiliations. In: Altman, I.; Wandersman, A. (Eds.). *Neighborhood and Community Environments*, pp. 1–33.
16. Zukin, Sh. (1982). *Loft Living. Culture and Capital in Urban Change*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.
17. Zukin, Sh. (1987). Gentrification: Culture and Capital in the Urban Core. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 13:129–147.

**Ognjen Čaldarović**

**Jana Šarinić**

Filozofski fakultet u Zagrebu, Zagreb, Hrvatska

e-mail: ognjen.caldarovic@ffzg.hr; jana.sarinic@vip.hr

## **Prvi znaci gentrifikacije? Urbana regeneracija u tranzicijskom društvu: slučaj Hrvatske**

### **Sažetak**

Urbana regeneracija obično se definira kao strukturna i funkcionalna izmjena određenih dijelova grada koju financiraju privatni (korporativni), a nekada i državni akteri. U mnogim slučajevima pitanja o tome što regenerirati, gdje i kako regenerirati, ostaju neodgovorena. U ovom ćemo radu obratiti pažnju na "iznenadno pojavljivanje" novih aktera u urbanoj politici, te njihov rastući utjecaj na procese urbane rehabilitacije. Uloga navedenih korporativnih aktera sve je više prisutna zbog njihove financijske moći, te zbog njihovih "veza" na različitim razinama gradske i državne administracije koja donosi odluke. Nedavni prijedlog i sam početak realizacije obnove jednoga bloka u prostoru Donjega grada u Zagrebu u ovom će radu biti uzet kao studija slučaja. Građani su u nekoliko navrata protestirali protiv planiranoga projekta pa ipak su gradonačelnik i gradska administracija odlučili da se s projektom nastavi, a on će u konačnici završiti kao tipična struktura dualnoga grada.

U članku će se navedene pojave povezati s karakterističnim procesima u društvu tranzicije. Također, analizirat će se i osnovni razlog naglih promjena koje su uglavnom sadržane u djelovanju novih urbanih aktera koji su počeli zamjenjivati ranije oblike društvenoga i državnoga vlasništva, kao i političke i državne interese. Gotovo je potpuno jasno da ukupan društveni i politički sustav još uvijek nije dovoljno pripremljen da se nosi s novim kontradikcijama, te s potrebnim institucionalnim promjenama koje bi trebalo uvesti.

*Ključne riječi:* gentrifikacija, urbana regeneracija, novi urbani dionici, Hrvatska, Zagreb.

*Primljeno:* studeni 2008.

*Prihvaćeno:* prosinac 2008.