

FROM INDUSTRIAL PASTS TO CULTURE-ORIENTED FUTURES: URBAN PLANNING IN POSTINDUSTRIAL RIJEKA AND ZAGREB

DOI: 10.17234/SEC.37.16

Original scientific paper

Received:

26th August 2025

Accepted:

23rd October 2025

NEVENA ŠKRBIĆ ALEMPIJEVIĆ

Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet /

University of Zagreb,

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Ivana Lučića 3,

HR-10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska / Croatia

nskrbic@ffzg.unizg.hr

 orcid.org/0000-0002-8653-7954

PETRA KELEMEN

Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet /

University of Zagreb,

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Ivana Lučića 3,

HR-10000 Zagreb, Hrvatska / Croatia

pkelemen@ffzg.unizg.hr

 orcid.org/0000-0002-3372-8175

This paper is open access and may be further distributed in accordance with the provisions of the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 HR licence.

This article examines how urban planning discourse and policy documents in Rijeka and Zagreb articulate the two cities' futures in the context of postindustrial transformation. The analysis reveals that policy makers' strategies for the revitalisation of deindustrialised sites prioritise two central dimensions: space as a resource and the value of industrial heritage. Other dimensions of industrial identity, such as knowledge, skills, and social ties developed through industrial work, are largely neglected. By adopting a presentist theoretical lens, the authors show that urban planning in the two postindustrial cities seeks to reconfigure urban space while simultaneously reimagining the cities' temporal horizons.

Keywords: postindustrial cities, imagining time, urban planning, Rijeka, Zagreb

INTRODUCTION: INTERPRETING THE “POST-”¹

“With the disappearance of local manufacturing industries and periodic crises in government and finance, culture is more and more the business of cities – the basis of their tourist attractions and their unique, competitive edge. The growth of cultural consumption (of art, food, fashion, music, tourism) and the industries that cater to it fuels the city’s symbolic economy, its visible ability to produce both symbols and space.” (Zukin 1995:1–2)

In this statement, Sharon Zukin summarises her view of a structural and paradigmatic shift from an industrial to postindustrial city, wherein culture plays a vital role in transforming deindustrialised (primarily American) cityscapes into different, yet still effective, landscapes of power (cf. Zukin 1991:5). The author critically examines the economic, political, and social processes often signified by the prefix “post-” in both academic and policy discourse – a meaning-making tendency that also frames the context of our urban research and the analysis developed in this text. For Zukin, the prefix “post-” (as in postmodern condition or a postindustrial city) relates to transformation in material as well as interior landscapes, “conveying a sense of rupture and discontinuity” with longstanding social orders, worldviews, and beliefs in progress (ibid.:27).

Such an approach resonates with the insights of numerous critical readers of diverse postscapes. Many emphasise that the prefix “post-” does not merely denote a specific moment within a linearly-conceived, progress-driven chronology. Rather, it articulates a particular perspective – an approach to understanding our realities that seeks to leave the past behind and mark a new beginning, often in a manner more definitive and clear-cut than the complexities of our everyday lives allow. Along those lines, for instance, in his discussion of “When was the post-colonial,” Stuart Hall argues that, acting as both a paradigm and a historical moment, “the ‘post-colonial’ is no different from other ‘posts’”. It is not only ‘after’ but ‘going beyond’ the colonial, as post-modernism is both ‘going beyond’ and ‘after’ modernism, and post-structuralism both follows chronologically and achieves its theoretical gains ‘on the back of structuralism’” (Hall 1996:253). In that sense, post- can be interpreted as “a way of staging or narrating a history” (ibid.). At the same time, post- also functions as a platform to ask which social orders, worldviews, and forms of (re)development are probable or might become possible within the context in

¹ This work was supported by the Croatian Science Foundation under the project “The Transformation of the Postindustrial City: Space, Community, and Work” (HRZZ-IP-2022-10-2473), URL: <https://postcity.ffzg.unizg.hr/>.

which the break from past orientations is signalled by this prefix. It directs our attention toward the question of future planning.

In this article, we are interested in a specific niche of postscapes – cities defined as postindustrial. Following the previous line of theoretical argumentation, our approach to their post-aspect is twofold. On the one hand, we discuss what the contemporary gaze towards the industrial past brings – namely, which categories and specific locales linked to it are selected for revitalisation and preservation. On the other hand, we analyse what going “after” and “beyond” the industrial past truly means in concrete urban contexts – that is, what kinds of postindustrial futures are currently being imagined and planned for today. By weaving together these multiple temporalities (cf. Potkonjak and Škokić 2021), intertwining reminiscences of the cities’ pasts with projections of their futures, we seek to understand the *present-day* politics and practices of city-making.

To shed light on these processes, our aim is to examine how postindustrial futures are strategically envisioned in urban planning discourse and articulated in policy documents, drawing on case studies from two Croatian cities: Rijeka and Zagreb. We refer to Rijeka and Zagreb as postindustrial cities as both cities were prominent industrial centres during the 20th century and have undergone significant deindustrialization since the 1990s. While they share much of their modern history, the two cities have followed different developmental trajectories and occupy varied contemporary positions. Yet, their strategic documents show notable similarities in how they conceptualise visions of their futures. Some of these visions rely heavily on the cities’ postindustrial aspect. In policy documents, both Zagreb and Rijeka place emphasis on the planned transformation of former industrial sites. However, while Rijeka’s strategies explicitly define the city as postindustrial from the outset, Zagreb’s postindustrial character is articulated more implicitly. This is primarily reflected in initiatives aimed at redeveloping deindustrialised urban areas.

The policy documents of both cities also share an emphasis on culture as a generator of urban renewal. In our paper that deals with the role of culture in the urban planning of Zagreb and Rijeka (Kelemen and Škrbić Alempijević 2025), we analysed how culture is framed in policy documents, and how it is positioned within a broader framework of urban development. Our analysis of the focal points of the planned cultural development – e.g., cultural infrastructure, institutions, and programs – led us to conclude that these policy documents employ an authorized cultural discourse, one that privileges officially confirmed forms of culture while sidelining everyday cultural expressions. Accordingly, we argued that cities hold the potential to broaden the conceptualisation of culture to align with the anthropological understanding of culture as a way of life, encompassing lived experiences and social interactions (ibid.).

In this text, we bring together two important layers of interpreting the cities by reading their documents – their (post)industrial context and their projected culture-driven urban regeneration. As Zukin's quote at the beginning of this chapter suggests, the strategy of transforming former industrial locations into cultural hubs is a tendency present across the globe. Here, we focus on its local manifestations while acknowledging the national, regional, and international networks and frameworks that influence policy-making processes in the two cities. We examine how the policy understanding of culture as a regenerative force (cf. Kelemen and Škrbić Alempijević 2025; Veselinović and Škrbić Alempijević 2023) is manifested in relation to former industrial locations within these cities. Due to deindustrialisation, both Rijeka and Zagreb contain vacant former industrial sites awaiting repurposing, some of which have become focal points for planning culture-oriented initiatives. This aspect positions them, as we will show, as arenas where postindustrial futures can be reimagined through the creation of new urban spaces for culture within policy frameworks.

PLANNING THE FUTURES OF POSTINDUSTRIAL CITIES: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

By analysing urban contexts, we engage with the notion of future-making and understand urban (cultural) policies as “top-down urban policies” (Gulin Zrnić and Poljak Istenič 2022:155). This term, applied by Valentina Gulin Zrnić and Saša Poljak Istenič, points at one of three interconnected levels through which urban futures are imagined and constructed: a) *top-down urban policies of the future* – city visions articulated in official documents, b) *bottom-up perspectives of the future* – civil society organizations and initiatives, civic engagements and projects, and c) *futures at the individual level in everyday life* (ibid.). In this text, we approach such future-planning strategies, homogenised and articulated in policy documents, as a specific mode of future-making. In that context, contemporary discourses about the future operate as realities in their own right, shaping and affecting the present lived experiences within postindustrial urban settings.

While addressing the two cities as postindustrial, we ground our analysis in the presentist theoretical perspective on postindustrial futures developed by Felix Ringel. By the presentist approach to ethnographic material, both methodologically and conceptually, the author refers to an orientation towards how people attach meanings to “whatever ‘temporality’ or ‘historicity’ they construct in their respective presents” (Ringel 2018:8). Such a stance towards ethnographic material enables the researcher to study temporalities – “invocations of pasts that potentially never were and of futures that

potentially never will be” (ibid.) – as lived experiences and reflections of the current social contexts, collective and individual attitudes. In his study of Hoyerswerda, a postindustrial city marked by the collapse of industry-based plans and the non-fulfilment of past futures, the author examines how various relations to the future are activated and negotiated, and how they are embedded in present-day worldviews, strategies, narratives, and practices within the city (ibid.:5). Writing an ethnography of the postindustrial future, in this sense, entails attending to multiple “kinds of representational and nonrepresentational forms of knowledge” enacted in the present, which enable the cities and their people to look beyond futures lost to social, political, and economic changes (ibid.:6).

In our search for “futures after (industrial) progress” in policy documents of Zagreb and Rijeka and for the role of culture in these processes, we also draw inspiration from the work of Chloe Ahmann, who explores “experiments in hoping after former futures faltered” in late industrial Baltimore (Ahmann 2024:xv). For Ahmann – and for us in this article – the future is not merely “some time off in the distance” but something people actively strive toward, work for, dream about, hope for, and plan for in the present (ibid.:3).

Finally, Deana Jovanović, another anthropologist tackling future-planning in the postindustrial context of Bor, draws our attention to the transformative power of promises tied to coveted futures, particularly those imposed from the top-down (Jovanović 2024). Her analysis informs us about the power relations incorporated in future-making mechanisms and the ways in which plans for the future become part of the city’s present reality (ibid.:3). We adopt a similar standpoint in our analysis of policy documents, focusing on how projected futures shape current urban imaginaries.²

In terms of research methods, to understand how the postscapes of Rijeka and Zagreb have been conceptualised and constructed within urban planning, we conducted a discourse analysis examining how policy language produces and sustains visions of postindustrial cities. Our analysis is grounded in several key categories of policy documents.³

² Academic literature on culture-led regeneration in postindustrial cities is extensive. The purpose of this work is not to compare the issues observed in Zagreb and Rijeka with examples from other European cities or beyond. Rather, the aim is to examine how plans for urban transformations are defined locally, albeit under the influence of broader European and global tendencies and frameworks, and to highlight the ways in which future-making is enacted in specific postindustrial contexts. A review of the mechanisms underlying certain culture-led regeneration processes has been presented in our previous work, in relation to the concept of future-making and its European (i.e., EU) dimension within the context of European Capital of Culture projects (Veselinović and Škrbić Alempijević 2023). In this chapter, and throughout the article, we refer exclusively to those studies that have informed the theoretical and conceptual framework of our analysis.

³ The analysed policy documents are grounded in the *Act on the Local and Regional Self-Government (Zakon o lokalnoj i područnoj (regionalnoj) samoupravi, Narodne novine, 33/2001, 60/2001, 129/2005, 109/2007, 125/2008, 36/2009, 150/2011, 144/2012, 19/2013, 137/2015,*

The first category comprises the current development plans of the two cities – namely the *City of Rijeka Development Plan 2021–2027* (Grad Rijeka 2021) and the *Development Plan of the City of Zagreb until the End of 2027* (Grad Zagreb 2023a), accompanied by its appendix titled *Description of Development Needs and Potentials* (Grad Zagreb 2023b). The second group of the cities' plans includes cultural development strategies – specifically, the *Cultural Development Strategy of the City of Rijeka 2013–2020* (Grad Rijeka 2013a) and the *Culture Development Programme of the City of Zagreb 2024–2030* (Grad Zagreb 2023c).⁴ While Zagreb's *Programme* addresses the current period, no comparable strategy has yet been adopted in Rijeka for the present timeframe. Thirdly, our analysis also encompasses policy documents from the two cities' urban agglomerations – namely, the *Development Strategy of the Urban Agglomeration of Rijeka for the Financial Period 2021–2027* (Grad Rijeka 2023) and the *Development Strategy of the Urban Agglomeration of Zagreb until the End of 2027* (Grad Zagreb 2024).⁵ Adopted in accordance with national

123/2017, 98/2019, 144/2020) and in the *Act on the System of Strategic Planning and Development Management of the Republic of Croatia (Zakon o sustavu strateškog planiranja i upravljanja razvojem Republike Hrvatske, Narodne novine, 123/2017, 151/2022)*. Based on the existing administrative framework, the City of Rijeka holds the status of a city and it also serves as the administrative seat of Primorje-Gorski Kotar County. The City of Zagreb holds a special status as both a city and a county. Zagreb also serves as the administrative seat of Zagreb County, but the City of Zagreb is a separate territorial unit, distinct from the county that surrounds it. Additionally, both Rijeka and Zagreb serve as the centres of their respective urban agglomerations, as regulated by the *Act on the Regional Development of the Republic of Croatia (Zakon o regionalnom razvoju Republike Hrvatske, Narodne novine, 147/2014, 123/2017, 118/2018)*.

⁴ A study of the specific cultural programmes developed within the institutions referenced in the cultural development strategies would provide further insights into the ways postindustrial futures are being activated in the Zagreb and Rijeka contexts. However, such an analysis, due to the scope of the undertaking and the difficulty of achieving a comparative overview of activities, extends beyond the research framework defined in this article. In this regard, it is worth highlighting materials related to the Rijeka 2020 European Capital of Culture project. The Rijeka ECoC bid book and the implemented ECoC programme have already been extensively explored in our previous scholarly work (see Škrbić Alempijević and Gulin Zrnić 2022; Veselinović and Škrbić Alempijević 2023). These studies demonstrated that the ECoC aimed to establish itself as a platform for culture-led regeneration of the city, while engaging with the multiple facets of its postindustrial identity (ibid.). This analysis is one of the factors that revealed the need to more deeply examine other broader policy documents that conceptualise urban regeneration through culture, primarily the cultural development strategies. Due to that, our analysis did not encompass the planning documents of individual cultural institutions or specific cultural projects; rather, it focused on policy documents produced by and for the city and regional levels.

⁵ Our research extended beyond the aforementioned policy documents to include a range of additional sources, which will be introduced into the discussion where relevant. These include, among others, initiatives, materials, and publications from the Urban Planning Institute of the City of Zagreb and the Institute for Physical Planning of Primorje-Gorski Kotar County Public Institution. Valuable insights into the topic of this article are provided by the publication *Brownfields Planning. Planning Methods and Tools for Urban Revitalization of Brownfield Areas,*

legislation and EU funding mechanisms, these strategies enable us to consider our two case studies within a somewhat broader scope.⁶

SETTING THE SCENE: POSTINDUSTRIAL RIJEKA AND ZAGREB

The first case study examines Rijeka, Croatia's third-largest city and its largest seaport, situated in the bay Kvarner. Policymakers frequently frame Rijeka's development as "cutting-edge" and "high-risk, high-reward" (cf. Škrbić Alempijević and Gulin Zrnić 2022:237). This narrative – articulated, for instance, in Rijeka's cultural strategy – highlights the city's rapid development from the second half of the 19th century, driven by global capital and ambitious infrastructure projects, primarily the railway that connected the city to other parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Grad Rijeka 2013a:10). The production of the world's first torpedoes, the establishment of numerous factories – such as a sugar refinery, tobacco factory, metalworks, industries in oil, chemicals, and paper – and the expansion of port infrastructure and shipbuilding, transformed Rijeka into the most dynamic industrial city on the eastern Adriatic coast.

Following World War II, Rijeka emerged as a symbol of socialist modernization, anchored by its role as Yugoslavia's largest port. Since the mid-1990s, however, it has come to represent the challenges of postsocialist deindustrialization, marked by job insecurity, social precarity, and economic stagnation. Today, Rijeka is undergoing a significant population decline, shrinking by approximately 16% between 2011 and 2021, according to census data, from 128,624 to 107,964 residents (Državni zavod za statistiku 2011, 2021) – a decrease that notably outpaces the national average of around 10% (ibid.).

Along with the industrial past, another influential narrative emphasised in policymaking relates to "the historical continuity of culture in Rijeka" and the city's cultural diversity, which are used as arguments to foster "the image of Rijeka as a European city with a rich cultural tradition and a dynamic cultural future" (Grad Rijeka 2013a:9–10). Local

published by Zagreb's Urban Planning Institute (Meštrović 2025), as well as by the study and online catalogue *Brownfield in the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County* (Zavod za prostorno uređenje Primorsko-goranske županije 2024).

⁶ In order to better understand the policy documents of both cities, we also consulted the documents that preceded them (Grad Rijeka 2013b, 2017; Grad Zagreb 2015, 2017) and traced both the continuities in urban development visions and the emergence of new emphases or alternative interpretations of certain policy directions. We argue that these differing articulations of development visions are linked, among other factors, to policy foundations, expert perspectives, and broader strategic orientations at the European and global levels. However, a detailed comparison of these tendencies lies beyond the scope of this article.

policy frameworks and initiatives underscore the role of culture as a means to stimulate urban renewal and socio-economic revitalization.

The reason Rijeka became the first city in Croatia to adopt a cultural policy document lies in the city's early announcement of its candidacy for the title of European Capital of Culture in 2020. The candidacy aimed to bring "positive cultural, economic, social, and environmental effects, which will introduce long-term positive changes in the perception and energy of the city" (ibid.:66). The bid was ultimately successful, and the city chose to present itself as a cultural capital under the slogan "Port of Diversity," defining its industrial – port character and cultural diversity as its core identification strategies. Despite extensive planning and preparations – which included securing cultural infrastructure and designing cultural activities – Rijeka, along with much of the world, due to restrictions caused by the coronavirus pandemic, experienced 2020 as a place of empty streets and squares, closed cultural institutions, and postponed urban redevelopment projects (cf. Škrbić Alempijević and Gulin Zrnić 2022:229–232; Veselinović and Škrbić Alempijević 2023:83–84). Still, the ECoC legacy is frequently evoked in policy documents, primarily through lessons learned on circular urban governance, which promotes "the use of existing unused spaces and industrial heritage" (Grad Rijeka 2021:88).

The second case study examines Zagreb, the capital of Croatia, the country's largest city and its political, administrative, economic, healthcare, cultural, and educational centre. Policymakers acknowledge the city's strategic position, geographical characteristics, numerous institutions, and wide range of economic, cultural and social activities as significant developmental strengths. At the same time, a number of developmental constraints have been identified, including underdeveloped infrastructure, limited investment, inadequate intersectoral and regional cooperation, insufficient healthcare and social system facilities and programmes, and relatively low level of citizen engagement in cultural activities (Grad Zagreb 2023a, 2023b).

During the 20th century, Zagreb was an industrial centre that attracted residents from other parts of the then-existing states (cf. Arčabić 2018a, 2018b). Since the 1990s, however, the city – like the rest of Croatia – has undergone a process of deindustrialization. The war of the 1990s, the postsocialist transition, privatization, and global economic crises have all contributed to profound political, social, and economic transformations. Although economic indicators show that Zagreb remains the strongest economic centre in Croatia (Grad Zagreb 2023a:35–36), a clear trend of "structural changes in the City's economy towards a further decline in the share of industry and construction" can be observed (Grad Zagreb 2023b:71). Concurrently, the share of trade, financial activities, information and communication, real estate, as well as professional, academic and other services has grown (ibid.). The industrial decline has had complex effects on the everyday lives

of individuals and communities (cf. Rubić 2017), and its impact is also reflected in the abandoned industrial facilities scattered across Zagreb's landscape (cf. Potkonjak 2024).

Despite experiencing a population decline of approximately 3% between 2011 and 2021, from 790,017 to 767,131 residents (Državni zavod za statistiku 2011, 2021), Zagreb's decrease was lower than the national average of around 10% (ibid.). The city continues to attract people from other parts of Croatia and neighbouring states, while in recent years it has also become a destination for labour migrants from more distant countries (cf. Valenta et al. 2023; Gregurović et al. 2024).

In 2020, Zagreb was struck by severe earthquakes that caused extensive material damage across the city, with the historical centre being particularly affected. Over the past five years, the urban landscape has been significantly shaped by a wide range of construction and regeneration projects. These include the reconstruction of essential public institutions, including hospitals and schools, as well as the renewal of heritage sites in the city centre, such as museums and churches. The renovation and sustainable use of cultural heritage (Grad Zagreb 2023c:7), as well as culture in general, are considered important for urban transformation and sustainable city development (ibid.:1).

While the two cities differ in their local histories, regional contexts, and recent trajectories, they share a common emphasis on the strategic role of culture in envisioning urban development. We will now delve into the postindustrial cityscapes of Rijeka and Zagreb, considering how cultural initiatives aim to repurpose former industrial spaces and which specific locales have been chosen for such transformations. In doing so, we explore the interconnectedness of different temporal dimensions in the two postindustrial cities: the industrial pasts and the culture-oriented futures, all viewed through the lens of present-day urban planning.

TRANSFORMING FORMER INDUSTRIAL SITES FOR/THROUGH CULTURE

“Given that culture manifestly exists, it must exist somewhere, and it exists more concretely and completely in places than in minds or signs.” (Casey 1996:33)

With these words, American philosopher Edward S. Casey pointed toward a phenomenological turn – an orientation toward the material and spatial dimensions of cultural phenomena and processes. However, the agenda to spatialise culture in strategic plans for Zagreb and Rijeka also invites a more practical reading of this quote: if culture

is to act as a generator of urban transformation, it “must exist somewhere” within the city structures. In order for culture to fulfil its mission, specific urban spaces must be repurposed to accommodate it.

This idea is consistently reflected in policy documents from both Rijeka and Zagreb. In the case of Rijeka, the urgent need to make (adequate) space for culture is explicitly articulated in the description of the general strategic objectives of the City of Rijeka’s cultural policy up to 2020:

“One of the greatest problems facing Rijeka’s culture is its inadequate infrastructure. Many of the venues used for cultural programmes are currently in poor, even dilapidated condition, due to insufficient funding for their regular maintenance and renovation. It is widely acknowledged that no cultural activity can flourish without appropriate spaces” (Grad Rijeka 2013a:21).

Similarly, Zagreb’s present cultural strategy highlights the need for “the transformation of the city through the enhancement, construction, and decentralization of cultural infrastructure in order to ensure cultural and artistic development across a broader urban area” (Grad Zagreb 2023c:7). While Rijeka’s strategy places greater emphasis on the overall lack of cultural space, this document focuses less on the absolute scarcity of infrastructure – indeed, it notes that Zagreb has the highest number of institutions and actors involved in culture in the country (ibid.:1) – and more on their uneven distribution across the city (cf. Kelemen and Škrbić Alempijević 2025). To foster more balanced urban and cultural development, the strategy proposes “the reconstruction, repurposing, completion, remediation, and/or renovation of existing facilities in various parts of the city” to serve as spaces for culture (Grad Zagreb 2023c:7).

The resources frequently referenced for this purpose in official plans are the former industrial plants, along with the associated brownfield areas in both cities. This stems, as shown previously, from a shared aspect of Zagreb’s and Rijeka’s history – the significant role manufacturing industries played in their urban development. Each city experienced industrial decline starting in the 1990s, a period during which Croatia lost two-thirds of its industrial jobs and the bulk of its industrial infrastructure (Penava and Družić 2014). The policy documents of both cities reflect the transition in their socioeconomic orientation – moving away from traditional manufacturing sectors toward an increased emphasis on creative industries, innovation, and sustainability. Rijeka aspires “to be fully transformed into a city of contemporary industries, especially creative, technologically innovative, and green ones” (Grad Rijeka 2021:79), while Zagreb’s vision is to become “a green, innovative and sustainable city” (Grad Zagreb 2023a:2).

In the wake of this transition, the specific social dynamics shaped by industrial

rhythms, layers of urban identities, and ways of life tied to the experience of living and working in former industrial strongholds have been pushed to the margins. However, the policy documents do not attempt to holistically grasp the consequences and discontinuities produced by this complex, large-scale and still ongoing transformation. In seeking new spaces for culture, they draw on the value of abandoned industrial complexes. In the documents, those spaces are treated simultaneously as urban weakness and potential. In many respects, the policies' narratives about the former industrial sites within contemporary urbanscapes reflect the notion of "the beautiful wasteland." That concept has been introduced and critically examined by American Studies scholar Rebecca J. Kinney through the case of postindustrial Detroit (Kinney 2016). She demonstrates how the city's politics of future revolve around the notion of a "comeback city," drawing on the aesthetic and heritage value of ruins left by economic crisis, as well as the perceived functional and symbolic emptiness of deindustrialised urban zones – now reimagined as "a space of possibility" (ibid.:x).

Along such lines, the call of policy makers to revitalise deindustrialised sites in Rijeka and Zagreb addresses two key components: *space as a developmental resource* and *the value of industrial (primarily tangible) heritage*. What remains largely absent from the analysed documents are other possible dimensions drawing back on the cities' industrial past, such as industrial labour,⁷ workers' expertise, and the forms of social cohesion historically grounded in factory-based communities. These aspects encompass a combination of material traits, social relations, and symbolic practices that emerged through industrial production and its organisation. Beyond the spatial components, they also include, among other aspects, the skills, knowledge, and work ethic of former industrial workers – elements of an intangible nature that, in the context of the current postindustrial economy, could be reconsidered as valuable assets. The systematic recognition and reapplication of such competences could enable the creation of new niches for these workers within the transformed labour market. Furthermore, worldviews, senses of place, and social bonds formed through shared industrial life, whether in the workplace or in residential areas built for industrial workers, constitute additional yet overlooked dimensions of industrial heritage. None of these aspects are explicitly incorporated into the development strategies of the two cities.

⁷ Certain cultural institutions and independent actors address industrial labour, thematising industrial history and work within cultural programmes and artistic projects, thereby maintaining its visibility in the public sphere. However, here we do not refer to industrial labour as staged or thematized in cultural production. Rather, the focus lies on the ways in which competences derived from industrial work are reimagined and reactivated – or not – within the postindustrial context in the analysed documents.

POSTINDUSTRIAL SPACE

Regarding the first component – the spatial potential of former industries – both cities' policy documents stress the importance of revitalizing brownfield zones and adapting disused industrial buildings for new urban uses. This approach corresponds to broader trends aimed at recognizing the regenerative potential of brownfield areas, particularly within the frameworks of institutes for physical planning.⁸ Their initiatives not only draw attention to the opportunities such sites offer, but also provide concrete measures and techniques for their revitalization. In Zagreb, this has recently resulted in the publication *Brownfields Planning. Planning Methods and Tools for Urban Revitalization of Brownfield Areas* (Meštrović 2025). In this text, the revitalisation of brownfield areas is defined as

“a key instrument of sustainable urban development. Bringing new, modern and functional facilities to these spaces, while preserving spatial identity and responding to the real needs of the community, is necessary to prevent further degradation of urban space and ensure its integration into urban life” (ibid.:4).

Five locations have been presented as the city's strategic urban projects, all of them formerly tied to industry, with the potential to stimulate redevelopment across the wider urban area (ibid.:71).

Similarly, in the study and online catalogue *Brownfields in the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County*, space is defined as “a limited resource that must be used wisely and rationally” with brownfield sites – abandoned buildings and their associated land – regarded as “a significant spatial potential for future development” (Zavod za prostorno uređenje Primorsko-goranske županije 2024:6). The Institute conducted analyses using various criteria to identify which areas could be classified as brownfields. Based on an analysis of physical plans covering all settlements within the county, the Institute listed 44 sites as potential brownfield areas. Of the six sites located in Rijeka, five relate to former industrial complexes (ibid.:17). Comparable data are presented in the Institute's analysis of policy documents, specifically the development strategies and plans of municipalities and cities

⁸ The decisions and recommendations issued by institutes for physical planning differ in their territorial scope in the cases of Rijeka and Zagreb. Physical planning for the Rijeka area falls under the jurisdiction of the Primorje-Gorski Kotar County Institute, while in Zagreb the institute is established by the city itself. This arrangement partly reflects the territorial organization of the Republic of Croatia, where the City of Zagreb holds a special status as both a city and a county. It also derives from the provisions of the *Physical Planning Act*, which stipulates that spatial planning institutes are generally organized at the county level, but “city institutes for physical planning may be established if founded by a large city” (*Zakon o prostornom uređenju, Narodne novine*, 153/2013, 65/2017, 114/2018, 39/2019, 98/2019, 67/2023).

within Primorje-Gorski Kotar County. These documents identify a total of 46 areas that can be considered brownfields – five of them in Rijeka, all of which are deindustrialised zones (ibid.:24).

In the policy documents of the two cities, the tendency to revalorise the spatial potential of brownfield areas is clearly articulated. For instance, the current *Development Strategy of the Urban Agglomeration of Rijeka* acknowledges that development prospects for the city and its surroundings lie “in the valorisation of the favourable geographic and transport position and available resources – primarily the preserved environment and unused brownfield infrastructure” (Grad Rijeka 2023:24). The document highlights the principle of circular building management, proposing its application to deindustrialised sites as a strategy for addressing the city’s shortage of functional space. As stated:

“The rich industrial heritage, which in its neglected state poses a threat to the environment and the inhabitants, can be repurposed for socio-economic uses and thus reduce further urbanization through the revitalization of existing infrastructure” (ibid.).

Aligning with the same principle, the *Development Strategy of the Urban Agglomeration of Zagreb* recognises the sustainable use of space, aiming at the regeneration and revitalization of derelict sites, as one of its specific objectives (Grad Zagreb 2024:168, 185). That objective, which explicitly addresses former industrial zones, is defined as follows:

“In the context of sustainable use of space in the agglomeration, an important aspect is the reuse and revitalization of brownfield sites as a local development resource. This goal is intended to be achieved by encouraging integrated, multifunctional, and multidisciplinary investments in cultural and natural heritage as well as brownfield locations, thus enabling the most efficient use of space in accordance with up-to-date professional standards and requirements, while taking into account protection against natural and ecological disasters and other risks” (ibid.:168).

Such a vision, which calls for the revitalisation of decaying spaces – including former industrial zones – in order to address pressing urban challenges, is also echoed in other policy documents of both cities. For instance, Rijeka’s development plan draws attention to the need to resolve the shortage of space for diverse functions throughout the wider city centre by revitalising these derelict areas:

“Continued investment in the repurposing of similar facilities is a matter of great importance for the city, given that Rijeka faces a shortage of space for

expansion. The potential for growth can be realised precisely through the utilisation of long-neglected industrial buildings and their adaptation to new functions and purposes” (Grad Rijeka 2021:53).

In a similar vein, Zagreb’s development plan reflects on the benefits of regenerating brownfield sites to revitalise life in the city centre, but also to address issues arising from the recent earthquake and the city’s approach to green policies:

“Within the City of Zagreb, there are numerous brownfield areas that hold development potential through urban revitalisation. The need for revitalisation arises from the underutilised opportunities for developing the city’s facilities, which provide added value to the experience of being in the space, as well as from insufficiently exploited resources within the city centre and beyond. Urban revitalisation, alongside the urban renewal of buildings and infrastructure following the earthquake that struck Zagreb in 2020, presents an opportunity to significantly enhance the integration of the city core by transforming parts of abandoned urban zones into successful, green, and high-quality locations” (Grad Zagreb 2023b:79).

The discourse in both documents depicts deindustrialised urban space as a hazard, emphasizing two key determinants: environmental pollution and physical neglect. The documents also indicate the necessity of conducting assessments of potential site toxicity, together with the implementation of ecologically sustainable remediation measures (Grad Rijeka 2021:52; Grad Zagreb 2024:120). Simultaneously, its potential is derived from the spaciousness of deindustrialised complexes and their integration within the urban fabric. The specific qualities of former industrial materiality, its adaptation to previous functions and particular forms of work, are not regarded as significant features to be preserved or meaningfully integrated into renewal plans. A common objective of the strategies in both cities is to leverage the resources of postindustrial spaces to meet the needs of the cultural sector. While mixed-use redevelopment remains the dominant approach, the majority of former industrial sites in Rijeka and Zagreb are reimagined as cultural and educational hubs – locations of cultural institutions such as libraries, museums, and archives, as well as youth and children’s clubs, schools, multifunctional and intercultural centres, venues for public events, and the like.

INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE

The second component highlighted in culture-driven urban regeneration strategies – the protection of industrial heritage – is rooted in cultural heritage discourse. This discourse stresses the need to safeguard the material witnesses of the industrial past while simultaneously contributing to contemporary place-making strategies, place branding, and socio-economic development, primarily through cultural tourism. The deconstruction of that discourse relies on an understanding of heritage as, in Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's words, "a mode of cultural production in the present that has recourse to the past," rather than a recovery of the past itself (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998:149). Approaches grounded in this perspective – which we also employ in our analysis – conceptualise heritage production as a selective metacultural, socioeconomic, and political process. It draws from broad and heterogeneous cultural inventories to foreground representative elements of the past in order to serve contemporary needs and reinforce existing power structures (ibid.:150–151).

This tendency can be observed in the policy documents of both Rijeka and Zagreb, which value industrial heritage for its aesthetic appeal, historical significance, authenticity, cultural and artistic dimensions, and its role in highlighting specific layers of the cities' histories for future generations. At the same time, both policy frameworks acknowledge the neglect and degradation affecting many industrial heritage sites and emphasise the need for their more systematic protection.

In the case of Zagreb, the city's current *Culture Development Programme* outlines such an approach in the specific objective aimed at contributing to "sustainable urban transformation and city development through the renovation and sustainable use of cultural heritage" (Grad Zagreb 2023c:7). It highlights the pressing imperative to restore cultural property affected by the recent earthquakes, while also noting that "certain cultural goods primarily connected to industrial heritage have long suffered significant deterioration due to the absence of clear plans for their restoration and repurposing, which this objective seeks to set in motion" (ibid.). The objective's description concludes by affirming that the planned revalorization of cultural heritage – including industrial heritage – is significant for the local public while simultaneously stimulating cultural tourism. This quote frames industrial heritage as a subset of cultural heritage. Such an approach can be traced in other Zagreb policy documents as well. For instance, in the *Description of Development Needs and Potentials*, an appendix to the city's development plan, the chapter titled "Cultural Heritage" mentions various heritage categories, including the following: "Zagreb possesses a rich industrial and postindustrial heritage, for example, the areas of Paromlin, Gredelj, and Badel, whose revitalization will strengthen the city's

development potential in the fields of culture, creative industries, tourism, and the quality of life for both residents and visitors of the City of Zagreb” (Grad Zagreb 2023b:15). In the same document, the heritage planned for regeneration and preservation in this manner is defined as predominantly architectural. In the chapter aimed at defining the layers of Zagreb’s identity, the document states the following: “An important aspect of the city’s identity is its architectural heritage – whether in the form of buildings serving their original purpose, repurposed industrial and similar complexes, or protected architectural structures” (ibid.:17).

In Rijeka’s documents, industrial heritage occupies a more prominent position. Unlike Zagreb’s policies, Rijeka’s plans repeatedly name industrial heritage as a distinct category, treating it mostly as parallel to cultural heritage rather than as its subcategory. This is emphasised in one of the four strategic objectives in the city’s development plan titled “Preserve Rijeka 2030,” which notes: “Over the next 10 years, Rijeka must sustainably fit within a limited space by continuing to repurpose its existing areas as it has done so far, using and revitalizing its cultural and industrial heritage” (Grad Rijeka 2021:79). Industrial heritage is also identified as a relevant strategic field in Rijeka’s cultural strategy (Grad Rijeka 2013a). One of its objectives focuses on revitalizing the city’s industrial and technical heritage, presented as follows:

“A part of the identity of the city of Rijeka is strongly connected with its industrial and technical heritage, as a result of the historical period during which the established industry played a key role in the city’s economic and urban development. This legacy is recognised by the citizens; however, the material cultural property tied to industrial heritage has not been properly preserved or adequately utilised” (ibid.:31).

This strategy attempts to take a step forward in redefining industrial heritage by evoking the city’s industrial past also within the section dedicated to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage:

“From the Chakavian dialect, through traditional folk values and customs, intangible heritage linked to the period of the emergence of today’s industrial and technical heritage, intangible maritime heritage, to traditional skills and crafts, all of these are embraced by the citizens of Rijeka as part of their cultural heritage, providing them with a sense of identity” (ibid.:33).

However, in contrast to the specific examples of musical traditions and customs deemed worthy of protection, the document remains vague in identifying the intangible cultural traces of Rijeka’s industrial era.

So, sets of policies in both cities highlight the material and tangible elements of industrial heritage, focusing mainly on buildings, objects, and technical equipment considered worthy of preservation. Their cultural value, recognised in the documents, grounds efforts to make them new homes for cultural institutions and initiatives. Intangible aspects of industrial heritage are not directly addressed in the documents. Although they are implicitly hinted at through the inhabitants' attitudes toward former industries, specific skills, practices, oral histories, traditions, values – in short, the knowledge and experiences of living and working in an industrial city – they are not included in strategies designed to safeguard the cultural assets of the industrial past.

WHERE EXACTLY DOES (FORMER) INDUSTRY MEET CULTURE?

To anchor these plans in the urban fabric, policymakers in both cases reference examples and projects intended to regenerate former industrial sites for and through culture. In order to “revitalise the industrial and technical heritage of the city of Rijeka within its financial means,” the *Cultural Development Strategy* identifies several deindustrialised buildings and complexes – abandoned for decades – as priorities for such repurposing (Grad Rijeka 2013a:31). Those include, in order of appearance: the Torpedo factory, the Rikard Benčić industrial complex (which, in its history, hosted a sugar refinery, a tobacco factory, and, after World War II, a motor equipment factory and foundry), then the Hartera factory (a paper production complex), port warehouses, the Rade Končar electrical equipment factory, the tram depot building, parts of the former oil refinery, and the slaughterhouse complex. The document also lists items of technical and industrial equipment that should be revalorised as a part of the city's new cultural offering, such as the port cranes, machinery related to paper processing, the torpedo launch ramp, and others (ibid.). Some of these locations are only listed, with their future purposes not specified in detail within the documents. In certain cases, unresolved ownership issues or shared property structures are cited as reasons why concrete regeneration plans have yet to be negotiated: for instance, in the case of Hartera with its partial private ownership, and port complexes under state government management (ibid.:33, 44).

However, a few former industrial sites located within the contemporary city centre are concretely reimagined in policy documents, and their restructuring is already well under way. One of them symbolically places Rijeka's industry at the forefront on a global scale. It focuses on the remnants of the world's first torpedo factory, established by Robert Whitehead & Co. in the second half of the 19th century. According to the document, the former workshops and warehouses, protected as industrial heritage sites by the Ministry

of Culture and Media of the Republic of Croatia, should be put in use through two main initiatives. One of them, highlighting the citizens' initiative *Return Life to Baračeva Street*, promotes the research and public presentation of the former Torpedo factory and aims to transform the entire street into a heritage site that "would enrich the tourist offer of the city and the wider region" (ibid.:33). Another segment is related to developing the business support infrastructure, by establishing the Technological and Educational Entrepreneurial Incubator – Production Park Torpedo. This Incubator, opened in December 2020, is oriented towards fostering local entrepreneurship, forging new industrial paths for the city, and "integrating new technologies into the economic sector" (Grad Rijeka 2021:38).

The already realised example that has been placed at the heart of Rijeka's postindustrial urban transformation by policymakers is the redevelopment of Rikard Benčić Motor Equipment Factory into a complex of cultural institutions. Heritagisation processes at this site have been occurring since 1970, when certain buildings were categorised as protected cultural property. However, although plans for the revival of the zone, located close to the city's main railway station, have existed ever since, it was not until 2013 that collaboration and reconstruction contracts were signed between the Ministry of Culture and the City of Rijeka (cf. Škrbić Alempijević and Gulin Zrnić 2022:233). It was recently completed as part of the momentum carried over from the Rijeka 2020 European Capital of Culture project. Today, the so-called Art Neighbourhood Benčić includes the Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art, the City Museum of Rijeka, the City Library, and the Children's House. The City's strategic documents describe it as the city's "living room," accessible and inclusive, a symbolic and functional centre of Rijeka's cultural life (Grad Rijeka 2021:93). The new energy inscribed in this deindustrialised zone through culture is expected to vibrate throughout the city:

"The task of the city and the cultural organizations managing the complex is to provide the programmatic and content grounds for the entire neighbourhood to become and remain a vibrant cultural and social hub that attracts citizens and generates cultural and social contents for a number of other venues in other parts of the city" (ibid.).

This example clearly shows what it means for policymakers to make Rijeka, as the regional industrial and port centre, recognizable for "the new industries, education, culture, and tourism" (ibid.:6).

In the case of Zagreb, policymakers have formulated two lists of strategic projects. Out of 27 projects on the first list – which comprises projects under the authority of the City government or connected bodies – six are linked to former industrial sites in different city districts, one of which, Paromlin, is already under construction. The

planned transformation of the remaining five is defined as crucial “for urban renewal and development, as well as for creating new value for the City of Zagreb” (Grad Zagreb 2023a:173). Descriptions of plans for these specific locations provide a view into their projected future, one bearing an imprint of inevitability and factuality, produced from the top of the City’s hierarchy.

In that discourse, according to the *Development Plan of the City of Zagreb for the Period until the End of 2027*, the former “Janko Gredelj” railway rolling stock factory site is reimagined as “a new mixed-use city centre with public, social, cultural, business, residential, and leisure functions” (ibid.:188). The transformation of this brownfield zone, located in downtown Zagreb, is to be achieved primarily through spatial revitalization and improved transport connections with other city districts. Similarly, the abandoned city slaughterhouse and livestock market Zagrepčanka site should become “an attractive location for business, living, and leisure time” (ibid.:189). The plan envisions the structural repurposing and adaptation of the complex’s remaining buildings and infrastructure, as well as the preservation of green spaces and “the historical identity” of this former industrial area in the east part of the city, presented as “a new axis of urbanity” (ibid.). Another location reflecting the processes of industrialization and urbanization of the city that is incorporated in the *Development Plan* is the Zagreb Fair, defined as “a meeting point between East and West” (ibid.). The strategic vision reconfigures the Fair for mixed use, while respecting the heritage dimension of the space. It is “where, alongside a redefined trade fair function, new innovative economic activities can be located, a congress centre with a hotel, educational facilities, the cultural industry, business hubs, sports and recreational facilities, and hybrid multifunctional public spaces” (ibid.). This site should also play a vital role in activating a wider zone of New Zagreb, which should be transformed into a nucleus of urban transformation. The Badel Block, on the other hand, is identified in the document as the most development-ready project. The former distillery premises are planned to be turned into “a hotspot for business, tourism, hospitality, cultural and artistic events,” featuring “an art school and a cultural centre with a hall, along with residential and commercial facilities,” with the aim of becoming “a driver and multiplier of development in the surrounding area (Zagreb downtown, the City of Zagreb, and the wider metropolitan area)” (ibid.:190). The postindustrial strategic planning reaches also to Zagreb’s easternmost city district of Sesvete. There, the vast area of the former “Sljeme” meat industry is expected to host

“new central public, social (a music school), and business/innovation facilities, enhanced urban public transport and the establishment of a transport terminal adjacent to the railway station, city parks, sports and recreational areas, and pedestrian-cyclist connections within the green infrastructure that focuses on

safe and unobstructed pedestrian movement, with the aim to improve the quality of life in Sesvete and transform the neighbourhood into a desirable place for residence, living, and leisure” (ibid.:191).

The key strategic project currently underway in Zagreb is the reconstruction of the deindustrialised Paromlin steam mill. It holds a special status in Zagreb’s *Development Plan*, as it aligns with the document’s specific objective of “empowering culture and creative production” (ibid.:185). This row of abandoned industrial buildings, listed in the Ministry of Culture and Media’s inventory of cultural property – much like Benčić in Rijeka – will house the new City Library and the socio-cultural centre. The complex combines restored heritage-protected buildings with newly added edifices. According to the document, this ruinous space, located at the edge of Zagreb’s innermost centre, will be recreated as a source of new value for the city – “a space for intensive public life with dominant public and cultural functions” (ibid.).

In all the cases we have depicted, situating strategic urban interventions in specific locales and materializing otherwise abstract mission statements within deindustrialised spaces in Rijeka and Zagreb acts as a mechanism for directing the cities’ urban futures.

RESTRUCTURING URBAN SPACE, REIMAGINING URBAN TIME

In conclusion, we return to the question of how remnants of the industrial past in Rijeka and Zagreb – carefully selected, materialised within deindustrialised spaces, and valorised through the label of industrial heritage – are integrated into visions of the transformed, postindustrial cities. Our analysis shows that these often-ruinous locales acquire new forms of agency, with policy discourse mobilizing them both as stages for and generators of urban redevelopment.

Former industrial sites – once closed and abandoned – are nowadays reimagined as important spaces of the urban future. In planning documents, they are transformed into vibrant, attractive, and desirable places, in some cases envisioned as the city’s “living room.” Designed as new urban centres, they are expected to host essential public institutions and activities, and to bring solutions for pressing contemporary challenges. Once-abandoned areas – some still awaiting a new purpose and others already undergoing transformation – are being reframed as hubs of social life, generating new value and contributing to sustainable urban development. The proposed revitalisation aims to breathe new life into decaying sites, where industrial buildings and equipment have either been left to rust or removed as obsolete or hazardous.

Opportunities for revitalizing abandoned and deteriorating industrial sites are most frequently linked to the cultural sector. This tendency, noticeable in both Rijeka's and Zagreb's policy documents, points to a shared orientation towards culture-led urban transformation – one that reflects wider regional and national policy influences and frameworks, European urban development and cultural agendas, and the common challenges stemming from postindustrial restructuring. Two lines of revitalization have been recognised as crucial for achieving postindustrial large-scale regeneration: construction and infrastructural interventions on the one hand, and spatial reinvention through cultural programmes on the other. In policy narratives, culture is envisioned as a niche of creativity and innovation, a plausible framework for novel forms of production, offering responses to the current needs of urban dwellers and visitors alike. This process draws on the reinvigoration of spatial resources, heritage, and aesthetic values of deindustrialised sites to generate new products for the cultural-tourism market and fresh content for local inhabitants. However, it simultaneously marks a clear rupture with the lived experiences of the cities' industrial pasts.

At the same time, the somewhat vague but positively connoted attributes – such as vibrant, attractive, and desirable – used to describe the envisioned future of former industrial sites leave policy documents open to multiple interpretations. They also raise a crucial question: what will the future of these sites actually look like – and for whom? The documents we analysed reveal only part of the complexities behind the planned transformations, their administrative and financial frameworks and constraints, as well as obstacles such as ownership disputes and related challenges. Ultimately, they offer only a glimpse into the future of these spaces.

Detailed plans for each location will have to address a multitude of potential uses and their coexistence. The prevailing mixed-use approach to redevelopment will inevitably require dialogue and negotiation among diverse groups of prospective users, raising fundamental questions of inclusion and exclusion. Equally complex is the issue of heritage: not only in terms of interventions on properties protected by the Ministry of Culture and Media, but also in relation to questions of meaning, memory, and value ascribed to industrial complexes by local inhabitants, former workers, various organised and interested groups, experts, and other actors. In this sense, heritage is not merely about protected buildings or the question of what to do with them. Rather, it concerns multiplicity of meanings of the past, and it involves the questions of identity, belonging, and exclusion (Kuutma 2013:22). In line with this, and consistent with our conclusion that cities hold the potential to broaden the conceptualisation of culture (Kelemen and Škrbić Alempijević 2025), we argue that urban planning in postindustrial context would benefit from a broader conceptualisation of industrial heritage – one that embraces the

knowledge, skills, and social ties developed through industrial work.

In order to transform and reinvent urban space, policy documents simultaneously reinterpret and reimagine the time of the two cities. Urban planning is thereby transformed into an arena in which diverse temporalities are brought together and renarrated. Within this discourse, images of pasts and projections of futures are intertwined to explain, contextualise, and address the present-day neuralgic spots, challenges, and needs identified by policymakers in Rijeka and Zagreb. These glimpses into times past or yet to come are presented as factual, whether in the form of data derived from the reconstruction and condensation of the cities' histories, or through concise and neutral descriptions of projected future outputs. Yet they are far from factual. In both cases, they represent imaginaries of particular temporal dimensions of urban development.

The past evoked in urban planning in both cities is frequently tied to their industrial era, though this connection is more pronounced in Rijeka than in Zagreb. In Rijeka, its industrial past serves as a prominent marker of the city's identity, and its postindustrial transformation is explicitly articulated. By contrast, Zagreb's postindustrial character is expressed more subtly, with industrial heritage playing a less dominant, though still significant, role. One of the factors contributing to this difference in the treatment of the postindustrial as an element of urban identity lies in the fact that Zagreb, although the strongest industrial centre in the former Yugoslavia (V. R. 1971), is also the capital and the administrative centre of the country, with more diversified urban roles and more dispersed identity anchors – a tendency that is also reflected in its policy documents, particularly in the list of identity potentials defined for the city (Grad Zagreb 2023a:9–10, 2023b:16–17). The differences between the two cities illustrate how varying memory-making strategies related to industrial times contribute to the construction of distinct urban imaginaries. However, both gazes toward the industrial past encompass what heritage politics consider most representative and what urban planning treats as a spatial resource. What is rarely addressed in the analysed policy documents, however, are the relinquished imaginaries of industrial progress – the past production-based politics and practices of urban futures.

When it comes to post-industrial futures – or rather, their imaginings – policy documents operate as systematically structured guidelines through which improved prospects for the two cities are envisioned and pursued. The plans reframe industrial sites as mementos of a celebrated past while simultaneously positioning them as resources for future development. In this vision, urban progress is conceived primarily through culture-based strategies. That process entails selecting from “a variety of possible futures” and activating the one deemed desirable and probable in policy and planning discourses (Ringel 2018:9). It is an attempt of transferring the subjunctive mode (which diverse futures of/in the city could lie ahead) into a more structured future tense, about manoeuvring

towards a postindustrial development in the aftermath of an era of industrial progress (cf. Ahmann 2024:5). That is how the prefix “post-” is imbued with meanings in these cases: through the mapping of pathways after and beyond the industrial past, urban-planning strategies strive to simultaneously recreate urban space and reimagine urban time.

REFERENCES

- AHMANN, Chloe. 2024. *Futures after Progress. Hope and Doubt in Late Industrial Baltimore*. Chicago – London: University of Chicago Press.
- ARČABIĆ, Goran, ed. 2018a. *Industrijski centar države: zagrebačka industrijska baština 1918. – 1941*. Zagreb: Muzej grada Zagreba.
- ARČABIĆ, Goran, ed. 2018b. *Vrijeme giganta: planska industrijalizacija i naslijeđe 1947. – 1952*. Zagreb: Muzej grada Zagreba.
- CASEY, Edward S. 1996. “How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time. Phenomenological Prolegomena”. In *Senses of Place*, eds. Steven Feld and Keith H. Basso. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 13–52.
- DRŽAVNI ZAVOD ZA STATISTIKU. 2011. *Popis stanovništva, kućanstava i stanova 2011*. [*Census of Population, Households and Dwellings 2011*]. Zagreb: Državni zavod za statistiku. URL: <https://dzs.gov.hr/istaknute-teme-162/popisi-stanovnistva-2/popis-stanovnistva-2011/196> (accessed August 4, 2025).
- DRŽAVNI ZAVOD ZA STATISTIKU. 2021. *Popis stanovništva, kućanstava i stanova 2021*. [*Census of Population, Households and Dwellings 2021*]. Zagreb: Državni zavod za statistiku. URL: <https://dzs.gov.hr/u-fokusu/popis-2021/88> (accessed August 4, 2025).
- GRAD RIJEKA. 2013a. *Strategija kulturnog razvitka Grada Rijeke 2013. – 2020*. [*Cultural Development Strategy of the City of Rijeka 2013–2020*]. Rijeka: Grad Rijeka. URL: <https://www.rijeka.hr/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Strategija-kulturnog-razvitka-Grada-Rijeke-2013.-%E2%80%932020.pdf> (accessed August 4, 2025).
- GRAD RIJEKA. 2013b. *Strategija razvoja grada Rijeke 2014. – 2020*. [*The City of Rijeka Development Strategy 2014 – 2020*]. Rijeka: Grad Rijeka. URL: <https://www.rijeka.hr/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Strategija-razvoja-Grada-Rijeke-za-razdoblje-2014.-%E2%80%932020.-godine.pdf> (accessed August 4, 2025).
- GRAD RIJEKA. 2017. *Strategija razvoja Urbane aglomeracije Rijeke za razdoblje 2016.–2020. godine* [*Strategy for the Development of the Urban Agglomeration of Rijeka for the Period 2016–2020*]. Rijeka: Grad Rijeka. URL: <https://www.rijeka.hr/urbana-aglomeracija/urbana-aglomeracija-rijeka-2016-2020/strategija-urbane-aglomeracije-rijeka-2016-2020/> (accessed August 4, 2025).
- GRAD RIJEKA. 2021. *Plan razvoja grada Rijeke 2021. – 2027*. [*City of Rijeka Development*

Plan 2021–2027]. Rijeka: Grad Rijeka. URL: <https://www.rijeka.hr/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Plan-razvoja-Grada-Rijeke-za-razdoblje-2021.-2027..pdf> (accessed August 4, 2025).

GRAD RIJEKA. 2023. *Strategija razvoja Urbane aglomeracije Rijeka za financijsko razdoblje 2021. – 2027. godine [Development Strategy of the Urban Agglomeration of Rijeka for the Financial Period 2021–2027]*. Rijeka: Grad Rijeka.

URL: <https://www.rijeka.hr/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/Strategija-razvoja-Urbane-aglomeracije-Rijeka-za-financijsko-razdoblje-2021.-2027.-godine.pdf> (accessed August 4, 2025).

GRAD ZAGREB. 2015. *Strategija kulturnog i kreativnog razvitka Grada Zagreba 2015. – 2022. [Cultural and Creative Development Strategy of the City of Zagreb 2015–2022]*.

Zagreb: Grad Zagreb. URL: <https://www.zagreb.hr/UserDocImages/arhiva/04%20Strategija.pdf> (accessed August 4, 2025).

GRAD ZAGREB – Gradski ured za strategijsko planiranje i razvoj Grada. 2017. *Razvojna strategija Grada Zagreba za razdoblje do 2020. godine [Development Strategy of the City of Zagreb for the Period until 2020]*. Zagreb: Grad Zagreb. URL: https://www.zagreb.hr/UserDocImages/gu%20za%20strategijsko%20planiranje/Razvojna%20strategija%20Grada%20Zagreba_SGGZ_18-17.pdf (accessed August 4, 2025).

GRAD ZAGREB – Razvojna agencija Zagreb za koordinaciju i poticanje regionalnog razvoja. 2023a. *Plan razvoja Grada Zagreba za razdoblje do kraja 2027. [Development Plan of the City of Zagreb for the Period until the End of 2027]*. Zagreb: Grad Zagreb. URL: https://www.zagreb.hr/UserDocImages/001/Plan_razvoja_Grada_Zagreba_za_razdoblje_do_kraja_2027.pdf (accessed August 4, 2025).

GRAD ZAGREB – Razvojna agencija Zagreb za koordinaciju i poticanje regionalnog razvoja. 2023b. *Plan razvoja Grada Zagreba za razdoblje do kraja 2027. Opis razvojnih potreba i potencijala [Development Plan of the City of Zagreb for the Period until the End of 2027. Description of Development Needs and Potentials]*. Zagreb: Grad Zagreb. URL: https://www.razvojnaagencijazagreb.hr/images/Prilog_-_Opis_razvojnih_potreba_i_potencijala.pdf (accessed August 4, 2025).

GRAD ZAGREB. 2023c. *Program razvoja kulture Grada Zagreba 2024. – 2030. [Culture Development Programme of the City of Zagreb 2024–2030]*. Zagreb: Grad Zagreb. URL: <https://www.zagreb.hr/UserDocImages/kultura/Programa%20razvoja%20kulture%20Grada%20Zagreba%202024-2030.pdf> (accessed August 4, 2025).

GRAD ZAGREB – Gradski ured za gospodarstvo, ekološku održivost i strategijsko planiranje. 2024. *Strategija razvoja Urbane aglomeracije Zagreb za razdoblje*

- do kraja 2027. [Development Strategy of the Urban Agglomeration of Zagreb until the End of 2027]. Zagreb: Grad Zagreb – Gradski ured za gospodarstvo, ekološku održivost i strategijsko planiranje. URL: https://www.zagreb.hr/userdocsimages/arhiva/prostorni_planovi/Strategija_UAZ_2027_e_knjiga.pdf (accessed August 4, 2025).
- GREGUROVIĆ, Snježana, Margareta GREGUROVIĆ, Sanja KLEMPIĆ BOGADI, Sonja PODGORELEC and Simona KUTI. 2024. "Radne migracije na rubu Europe: dolazak stranih radnika u Hrvatsku". In *Migracije na rubu Europe: trendovi, politike i izazovi*, eds. Sanja Klempić Bogadi, Snježana Gregurović and Dubravka Mlinarić. Zagreb: Institut za istraživanje migracija, 191–205.
- GULIN ZRNIĆ, Valentina and Saša POLJAK ISTENIČ. 2022. "Etnologija i kulturna antropologija budućnosti: koncepti za istraživanje nečega što (još) ne postoji". *Narodna umjetnost: hrvatski časopis za etnologiju i folkloristiku*, 59/1:137–162. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15176/vol59no109>
- HALL, Stuart. 1996. "When was 'the post-colonial'? Thinking at the limit". In *The Post-Colonial Question. Common Skies, Divided Horizons*, eds. Iain Chambers and Lidia Curti. London: Routledge, 242–260.
- JOVANOVIĆ, Deana. 2024. *Staging the Promises. Everyday Future-Making in a Serbian Industrial Town*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- KELEMEN, Petra and Nevena ŠKRBIĆ ALEMPIJEVIĆ. 2025. "Culture and Planning in Zagreb and Rijeka: Anthropological Reading of Cultural Policy Documents". *Sociologija i prostor*, 63/2:175–197. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5673/sip.63.2.1>
- KINNEY, Rebecca J. 2016. *Beautiful Wasteland: The Rise of Detroit as America's Postindustrial Frontier*. Minneapolis – London: University of Minnesota Press.
- KIRSHENBLATT-GIMBLETT, Barbara. 1998. *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- KUUTMA, Kristin. 2013. "Between Arbitration and Engineering: Concepts and Contingencies in the Shaping of Heritage Regimes". In *Heritage Regimes and the State*, eds. Regina F. Bendix, Aditya Eggert and Arnika Peselmann. Göttingen: Göttingen University Press, 21–36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.gup.367>
- MEŠTROVIĆ, Mirna, ed. 2025. *Planiranje brownfielda. Planske metode i alati za urbanu revitalizaciju brownfield područja / Brownfields Planning. Planning Methods and Tools for Urban Revitalization of Brownfield Areas*. Zagreb: Zavod za prostorno uređenje Grada Zagreba. URL: <https://www.zzpugz.hr/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Planiranje-Brownfielda-Brownfields-Planning.pdf> (accessed August 7, 2025).
- PENAVA, Marija and Marko DRUŽIĆ. 2014. "Industrijska politika Hrvatske – pogled s aspekta deindustrijalizacije". In *Zbornik radova znanstvenog skupa: Razvojni*

- potencijali hrvatskog gospodarstva*, eds. Gordan Družić and Ivo Družić. Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Ekonomski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 153–174.
- POTKONJAK, Sanja. 2024. "Zagreb – misliti postindustrijski". URL: https://postcity.ffzg.unizg.hr/2024/06/05/zagreb-_misliti-postindustrijski/ (accessed August 18, 2025).
- POTKONJAK, Sanja and Tea ŠKOKIĆ. 2021. "Višestruke temporalnosti: konceptualni izazov u promišljanju postindustrijske etnografije Siska". In *Transformacija rada: narativi, prakse, režimi*, eds. Ozren Biti and Reana Senjković. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku, 139–158.
- RINGEL, Felix. 2018. *Back to the Postindustrial Future: An Ethnography of Germany's Fastest-Shrinking City*. New York – Oxford: Berghahn.
- RUBIĆ, Tihana. 2017. *Nezaposleni u gradu – antropologija rada i neformalne ekonomije*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko etnološko društvo. URL: https://hrvatskoetnologodrustvo.hr/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Tihana-Rubic_-Nezaposleni-u-gradu-%E2%80%93-antropologija-rada-i-neformalne-ekonomije.pdf
- ŠKRBIĆ ALEMPIJEVIĆ, Nevena and Valentina GULIN ZRNIĆ. 2022. "Rijeka 2020: resemantizacija gradskog identiteta kulturom". *Sociologija i prostor*, 60/2:223–244. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5673/sip.60.2.1>
- VALENTA, Marko, Jo JAKOBSEN, Margareta GREGUROVIĆ and Drago ŽUPARIĆ-ILJIĆ. 2023. "Changes in the Croatian migration system: conceptualising the complexities of migrations, 1990-2023". *Labour History*, 65/4:510–527. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0023656X.2023.2280052>
- VESELINOVIČ, Jaro and Nevena ŠKRBIĆ ALEMPIJEVIĆ. 2023. "Future-Making in the European Capitals of Culture. Rijeka and Nova Gorica Compared". *Etnološka tribina*, 53/46:77–97. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15378/1848-9540.2023.46.02>
- V. R. 1971. "Zagreb". In *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, vol. 8. Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod, 580–583.
- Zakon o lokalnoj i područnoj (regionalnoj) samoupravi [Act on the Local and Regional Self-Government]. *Narodne novine*, 33/2001, 60/2001, 129/2005, 109/2007, 125/2008, 36/2009, 150/2011, 144/2012, 19/2013, 137/2015, 123/2017, 98/2019, 144/2020. URL: https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2001_04_33_569.html (accessed August 18, 2025).
- Zakon o prostornom uređenju [Physical Planning Act]. *Narodne novine*, 153/2013, 65/2017, 114/2018, 39/2019, 98/2019, 67/2023. URL: https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2013_12_153_3220.html (accessed August 11, 2025).
- Zakon o regionalnom razvoju Republike Hrvatske [Act on the Regional Development of the Republic of Croatia]. *Narodne novine*, 147/2014, 123/2017, 118/2018. URL: https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2014_12_147_2751.html (accessed August 18, 2025).

Zakon o sustavu strateškog planiranja i upravljanja razvojem Republike Hrvatske [Act on the System of Strategic Planning and Development Management of the Republic of Croatia]. *Narodne novine*, 123/2017, 151/2022. URL: https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2017_12_123_2798.html (accessed August 18, 2025).

ZAVOD ZA PROSTORNO UREĐENJE PRIMORSKO-GORANSKE ŽUPANIJE. 2024. *Brownfield u Primorsko-goranskoj županiji. Ekspertna studija i katalog*. Rijeka: Javna ustanova Zavod za prostorno uređenje Primorsko-goranske županije. URL: <https://gisportal.pgz.hr/portal/apps/experiencebuilder/experience/?id=f109186540a747aa8648d9afda62d174&locale=hr> (accessed August 7, 2025).

ZUKIN, Sharon. 1991. *Landscapes of Power. From Detroit to Disney World*. Berkeley – Los Angeles – Oxford: University of California Press.

ZUKIN, Sharon. 1995. *The Cultures of Cities*. Malden, Massachusetts – Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Od industrijskih prošlosti do kulturom određenih budućnosti: urbano planiranje u postindustrijskoj Rijeci i Zagrebu

Nevena Škrbić Alempijević

Petra Kelemen

Ovaj članak propituje kako diskurs urbanoga planiranja i javne politike u Rijeci i Zagrebu osmišljavaju vizije budućnosti gradova u kontekstu njihove postindustrijske transformacije. Analiza pokazuje da planovi za revitalizaciju deindustrijaliziranih prostora prioritet daju dvjema središnjim dimenzijama: prostoru kao resursu i vrijednosti industrijske baštine. Druge se dimenzije industrijskoga identiteta, poput znanja, vještina i društvenih odnosa razvijenih industrijskim radom, u njima ne promišljaju. Polazeći od prezentističke teorijske perspektive, autorice zaključuju da urbano planiranje nastoji istodobno preoblikovati urbani prostor te nanovo zamisliti vrijeme ovih dvaju postindustrijskih gradova.

Ključne riječi: *postindustrijski gradovi, zamišljanje vremena, urbano planiranje, Rijeka, Zagreb*



Articles published in this journal are Open Access and can be distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons license Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

