

# Kvaliteta života u stambenim naseljima u kontekstu zapadnoeuropskih i postsocijalističkih zemalja

---

**Svirčić Gotovac, Anđelina; Podgorelec, Sonja; Kordej-De Villa, Željka**

*Source / Izvornik:* **Geoadria, 2021, 26, 143 - 166**

**Journal article, Published version**

**Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)**

<https://doi.org/10.15291/geoadria.3414>

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:303:641740>

*Rights / Prava:* [Attribution 4.0 International](#)/[Imenovanje 4.0 međunarodna](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2024-12-26**



*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[Repository of the Institute for Migration Research - Institutional repository for storing papers and data sets](#)

# KVALITETA ŽIVOTA U STAMBENIM NASELJIMA U KONTEKSTU ZAPADNOEUROPSKIH I POSTSOCIJALISTIČKIH ZEMALJA<sup>1</sup>

## THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN HOUSING ESTATES IN THE CONTEXT OF WEST-EUROPEAN AND POST-SOCIALIST COUNTRIES<sup>1</sup>

ANĐELINA SVIRČIĆ GOTOVAC<sup>1\*</sup>, SONJA PODGORELEC<sup>2</sup>, ŽELJKA KORDEJ-DE VILLA<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu, Amruševa 11/II, 10 000 Zagreb, Hrvatska / *Institute for Social Research in Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia*, e-mail: angelinasg@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Institut za migracije i narodnosti, Trg Stjepana Radića 3, 10 000 Zagreb, Hrvatska / *Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, Zagreb, Croatia*, e-mail: sonja.podgorelec@imin.hr

<sup>3</sup> Ekonomski institut, Zagreb, Trg J. F. Kennedyja 7, Zagreb, Hrvatska / *The Institute of Economics, Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia*, e-mail: zkordej@eizg.hr

\* autor za kontakt / *contact author*

DOI: 10.15291/geoadria.3414

UDK: 911.375:316.728(4-11)(4-15)=163.42=111

Pregledni rad / *Review*

Primljeno / *Received*: 30-7-2021

Prihvaćeno / *Accepted*: 4-11-2021



Rad donosi uvid u kvalitetu života na razini stambenih naselja u europskim zemljama. Pri tome se stanovanje i zadovoljstvo stanovanjem u stambenim naseljima te okolnom prostoru i susjedstvu razmatra kao važna dimenzija kompleksnoga istraživačkog koncepta kvalitete života. Analiza kvalitete stanovanja donosi zanimljivu razdiobu na tzv. dvije Europe ili dva tipa stambenih naselja. U vrijeme planiranja i izgradnje zajednička im je bila ideja oblikovanja modernih i funkcionalnih, mješovitih naselja koja će riješiti stambeno pitanje većine stanovnika, odnosno različitih društvenih slojeva. Ipak, prvi tip naselja obilježava društvenopovijesni kontekst Zapadne, a drugi Istočne Europe ili, prema nekim autorima, razlike u kvaliteti stanovanja između „kapitalističkog“ i „socijalističkog grada“. Upravo se iz te perspektive čini korisnom analiza kvalitete života i mogućnost obnove sada već ostarjelih i depriviranih naselja izgrađenih nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata u oba tipa grada. Podjednako onih u Zapadnoj Europi, koje nerijetko obilježava značajno lošiji imidž i veći broj socioekonomskih problema (kriminal, segregacija, propadanje i dr.) kao i naselja u postsocijalističkoj Europi u kojoj su velika stambena naselja iz socijalističkog razdoblja još uvijek poželjna stambena opcija, ali također sa sve češćom pojavom problema vezanih uz održavanje i brigu o zgradama i izgrađenoj okolini (zajedničkim i javnim prostorima). Posljednjih desetljeća sve češće u oba tipa naselja dolazi do iseljavanja srednjih i viših slojeva stanovnika što postupno dovodi do segregacije, ali i propadanja u socijalnom i

<sup>1</sup> Ovaj rad je rezultat projekta *Kvaliteta života u stambenim naseljima iz socijalističkog i postsocijalističkog razdoblja: komparativna analiza između Slovenije i Hrvatske* / Znanstveni projekti / Slovensko-hrvatski bilateralni projekt (IPS-2020-01-7036) koji financira Hrvatska zaklada za znanost.

<sup>1</sup> This paper is a result of the project *Quality of living in the housing estates of the socialist and post-socialist era: a comparative analysis between Slovenia and Croatia* / Research projects / Slovenian-Croatian bilateral projects (IPS-2020-01-7036) financed by the Croatian Science Foundation.

fizičkom smislu. Navedeni negativni aspekti kvalitete stanovanja zahtijevaju donošenje nacionalnih stambenih strategija i programa obnove koji u zapadnoeuropskim zemljama postoje i provode se, a u većini postsocijalističkih zemalja ne postoje, u čemu Hrvatska nije iznimka. Obnova stambenih naselja neizostavan je dio stambene politike svake zemlje kojim se može ublažiti ili spriječiti daljnje opadanje kvalitete života stanovnika tih naselja.

**KLJUČNE RIJEČI:** kvaliteta života, zadovoljstvo stanovanjem, stambena naselja, Zapadna i Istočna Europa, obnova stambenih naselja, Hrvatska

This paper provides a clear insight into the quality of life on the level of housing estates in European countries. In doing so, the questions of housing and satisfaction with the housing situation in the estates as well as with surrounding areas and the neighbourhood, in general, is being considered as an important dimension of a complex research concept called the quality of life. In analysing the quality of housing, we inevitably encounter an interesting division into the so-called two different versions of Europe or two types of housing estates. In the phase of planning and constructing, they shared a common idea of designing modern and functional, mixed estates that would solve the housing question of most residents, i.e. of different social classes. However, the first type is marked by the socio-historical context of Western Europe, and the second by Eastern Europe, or as some authors like to frame it, the differences in housing quality between 'capitalist' and 'socialist' cities. From that perspective specifically, it seems useful to analyse the quality of life and the possibility of renewing both types of housing estates, by now deprived and decrepit, built after the Second World War in both types of cities. This applies equally to those in Western Europe, often marked by a significantly worse image and higher levels of socioeconomic problems (crime, segregation, deterioration and other), as well as the estates in post-socialist Europe, where large housing estates built during the socialist period remain a desirable housing option, but that are increasingly facing problems related to maintenance and upkeep of buildings and built environments (both public and communal spaces). In the last decades, in both types of estates there has been an increasing depopulation of middle and higher classes of residents, which progressively causes segregation but also deterioration in the social and physical sense. All the mentioned negative aspects of the housing quality require adopting national housing strategies and renewal programs which exist and are implemented in Western European countries, while they do not exist in most post-socialist countries, and Croatia is not an exception. Housing estates renewal should be an essential part of every country's housing policy, aimed at alleviating or preventing further degradation of the quality of life for housing estate residents.

**KEY WORDS:** quality of life, housing satisfaction, housing estates, Western and Eastern Europe, housing estates renewal, Croatia

## UVOD U KONCEPT KVALITETE ŽIVOTA

Dva su pristupa konceptu kvalitete života koji se nerijetko znatno razlikuju (MEGONE, 1992.). Uži pristup ili procjenjivanje privatne kvaliteta života pokazuje koliko dobro pojedinac živi svoj život, dok širi pristup ili javna kvaliteta života obuhvaća pokazatelje životnih uvjeta u pojedinom društvu. Na kvalitetu života pojedinca utječe okolina i kultura te vrijednosni sustav u kojem živi. Komparativna istraživanja kvalitete života u raznim društvima potvrđuju da razlike u kvaliteti života u većoj mjeri formiraju prevladavajuće društvene i kulturne vrijednosti nego postojeća kvaliteta života. Tako A. J. Culyer (1992., 21) opisuje kako se procjena o tome što je „pristojna“ (apsolutna) kvaliteta života ili životni standard mijenjaju tijekom povijesti ili na različitim prostorima, ali i s obzirom na uvjete koji je omogućuju. Budući da se rad bavi jednom dimenzijom kvalitete života, stanovanjem u zemljama koje su pripadale različitim društveno-političkim sustavima, za očekivati je da su društvene i kulturne vrijednosti imale važnu ulogu. Prema R. Veenhoven (1997., 19), u procjeni razlika u zadovoljstvu kvalitetom života stanovnika pojedinih zemalja životni događaji objašnjavaju 25 % razlike, a čak se 63 % može objasniti socijalnim razlikama. Upravo se o kvaliteti života gotovo uvijek razmišlja kao o lokalnom i političkom pitanju, a ne univerzalnom i apolitičnom, što omogućuje utjecaj na povećanje kvalitete života ljudi na određenom prostoru (PODGORELEC, 2008.).

Ono što C. Megone (1992.) dijeli na privatnu i javnu, literatura koja se bavi istraživanjima kvalitete života promatra kao dva teorijski gotovo suprotstavljena pristupa: američki (*quality of life approach*) i skandinavski (*level of living approach*). „Američka škola“ smatra da običan čovjek preko „subjektivne dobrobiti može najbolje evaluirati svoju kvalitetu života. Kao najvažniji indikatori subjektivne dobrobiti upotrebljavaju se mjere zadovoljstva i sreće“ (NOLL, 2004., 157). Slično se ocjenjuje i zadovoljstvo životom u cjelini ili pojedinim dimenzijama (materijalno stanje, obitelj, zdravlje i slično). Riječ je o osobnoj procjeni ispitanika pa se takvi indikatori nazivaju i indikatori „subjektivne dobrobiti“ (*wellbeing*) ili

## INTRODUCTION TO THE QUALITY-OF-LIFE CONCEPT

There are two approaches to the quality-of-life concept as defined by C. Megone (1992), which often significantly differ from one another. The narrower approach or assessing the private quality of life indicates how well individuals live their lives, while the broader approach or assessing the public quality of life encompasses indicators of living conditions on the level of individual societies. The individual's quality of life is influenced by the environment and culture, as well as the system of values of their place of residence. Comparative studies of the quality of life in different societies confirm that the differences in life quality are more shaped by the prevailing social and cultural values than the existing quality of life. So A. J. Culyer (1992, 21) describes how the assessment of what constitutes “a ‘decent’ (absolute) quality of life or living standard” changed during history or in different areas, but also depending on the conditions enabling it. Given that the paper addresses only one dimension of the quality of life, housing in countries belonging to different socio-political systems, the finding that social and cultural values played an important role is expected. According to R. Veenhoven (1997, 19) in assessing the differences in quality-of-life satisfaction of residents in individual countries, 25% of the differences can be explained by life events, while as much as 63% of the differences are linked to social differences. Quality of life is almost always viewed as a local and political issue, instead of a universal and apolitical one, which enables influencing the quality of life for people residing in a certain space.

The quality of life which C. Megone (1992) divides into private and public, most literature on research in the quality-of-life views as two theoretically almost opposed approaches: the American one (*quality of life approach*) and Scandinavian one (*level of living approach*). The ‘American school’ believes that the common man ‘is considered to be the best expert to evaluate his quality of life in terms of subjective well-being. The most important indicators of subjective well-being used actually are measures of satisfaction and happiness’ (NOLL, 2004, 157). Satisfaction with life in general or with individual dimensions (material assets, family, health, etc.) is evaluated

„subjektivni indikatori“. Američki pristup proširio se gotovo cijelim istraživačkim svijetom, a u osnovi je i mnogih agencijskih istraživanja koje prave liste gradova „najboljih za život“ ili zemalja s najvišom „dobrobiti stanovništva“ (KRIŠTOFIĆ, 2015., 125). „Skandinavski škola“ nastoji upravo suprotno, „ocijeniti razinu življenja individue tako da njezina evaluacija osobne situacije ima što je manje moguće utjecaja“ (NOLL, 2004., 156). Skandinavski autori usmjereni su na koncept „dobrog društva“ i društvene dobrobiti kao pokazateljâ kvalitete života odnosno blagostanja. Osim zadovoljstva životom općenito te stupnja sreće povezanog sa životom u cjelini, koje se vrlo često primjenjivalo kao pokazatelj subjektivne dobrobiti, ispituje se i zadovoljstvo pojedinim aspektima života (LUČEV, TADINAC, 2008., 68).

Bez obzira na to kako pristupili ovom kompleksnom interdisciplinarnom<sup>2</sup> teorijskom i istraživačkom konceptu, kvaliteta života uvijek se mjeri na objektivnoj i subjektivnoj razini (DIENER, SUH, 1997.; CUMMINS, 2000.; HAGERTY I DR., 2001.; FERRISS, 2004.; DIENER I DR., 2006.). Da bi se dobila što potpunija slika o ukupnosti kvalitete života, objektivni pokazatelji kao primjerice prihodi od rada, prihodi u kućanstvu, uvjeti rada, uvjeti stanovanja, ukupni troškovi i/ili opremljenost kućanstava te brojni drugi, nadopunjuju se subjektivnim pokazateljima – željama, očekivanjima, preferencijama pojedinaca. „Subjektivni su indikatori većinom utemeljeni na psihološkim stavovima kao što je zadovoljstvo životom, radom i osobnom srećom. Objektivni indikatori su mjere utemeljene na učestalosti ili fizičkoj kvantiteti, a primjeri su standard života, status fizičkog zdravlja i osobni prihod, među ostalima“ (HAGERTY I DR., 2001., 9). Međutim, mnogi istraživači kvalitete života nisu ustanovili korelaciju objektivnih indikatora kvalitete života sa subjektivnima (CUMMINS, 2003.). Osoba tako može izraziti visoku razinu subjektivnog zadovoljstva unatoč izrazito lošim okolišnim uvjetima koji će joj značajno smanjiti neposrednu kvalitetu života ili čak utjecati na njegovo trajanje. I objek-

in a similar manner. Since it is a personal evaluation of the subject, such indicators are also called ‘subjective well-being’ indicators or ‘subjective indicators’. The American approach spread almost all over the research world and it is also the basis of numerous agency studies that list ‘best cities to live in’ or countries ‘highest well-being’ countries (KRIŠTOFIĆ, 2015, 125). The ‘Scandinavian school’ aims to do the complete opposite; ‘to assess the individual’s level of living in a way which makes it as little influenced as possible by the individual’s evaluation of his own situation’ (NOLL, 2004, 156). Scandinavian authors are focused on the concepts of ‘good society’ and social well-being as indicators of the quality of life and prosperity. Besides a general feeling of life satisfaction and the level of happiness with life in general, which was often used as an indicator of subjective well-being, they also examined the satisfaction with individual aspects of life (LUČEV, TADINAC, 2008, 68).

Regardless of what approach is used in handling this complex interdisciplinary<sup>2</sup> theoretical and research concept, the quality of life is always measured both on the objective and subjective levels (DIENER, SUH, 1997; CUMMINS, 2000; HAGERTY ET AL., 2001; FERRISS, 2004; DIENER ET AL., 2006). To acquire a more complete picture of the total quality of life, the objective indicators such as income from work, household income, working conditions, housing conditions, total expenses and/or household appliances, along with numerous others are supplemented with subjective indicators – individual desires, expectations, and preferences. ‘Subjective indicators are mostly based on psychological responses, such as life satisfaction, job satisfaction, and personal happiness, among others. Objective indicators are measures based on frequency or physical quantity. Examples include standard of living, physical health status, and personal income, among others.’ (HAGERTY ET AL., 2001, 9). However, many researchers dealing with the quality of life failed to establish a correlation between objective and subjective quality of life indicators (CUMMINS, 2003). An individual can therefore express high levels of subjective

<sup>2</sup> Koncept kvalitete života u fokusu je više društvenih znanosti, a prije svih ekonomije, sociologije, psihologije i geografije, ali i drugih.

<sup>2</sup> Numerous social sciences are focused on the concept of quality of life, primarily economy, sociology, psychology, geography, but also other.

tivni uvjeti (npr. zdravlje, materijalni položaj) mogu vrlo malo utjecati na doživljaj subjektivnog blagostanja (zadovoljstva) (HAGERTY I DR., 2001., 8). Nerijetko i znatna poboljšanja u objektivnim životnim uvjetima imaju vrlo malo utjecaja na doživljaj subjektivnog blagostanja jer utječu samo na tzv. kratkoročno povećanje blagostanja (*short-term increases in wellbeing*) pojedinca zbog brze prilagodbe, primjerice na viši standard života (DIENER I DR., 2006., 116), ali zbog toga im se ne povećava i razina osobnog ili subjektivnog zadovoljstva. Subjektivno je zadovoljstvo stoga vrlo osjetljiva kategorija za mjerenje, ali svakako upotpunjuje sliku ukupne kvalitete života.

U procjeni i subjektivne i objektivne kvalitete života prostor i kontekst pojedinog prostora (nase-lje, grad, država i dr.) igraju važnu ulogu posebice ako se prihvati pretpostavka da se kvaliteta života mijenja ovisno „od mjesta do mjesta“ (ANDRÁŠKO, 2010.). Usprkos stvarnim razlikama između pojedinaca i skupina, različite su mogućnosti definiranja prostora u kojem se odvijaju njihove aktivnosti kao stanovnika određenog prostora. Istraživanja kvalitete stanovanja u gradu, naselju, gradskoj četvrti i sl. upravo su tipičan primjer takvog tipa istraživanja. Stoga je cilj rada analizirati stambena naselja izgrađena nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata s naglaskom na specifičnosti kvalitete života i stanovanja u postsocijalističkim zemljama, u prvom redu Hrvatskoj, te analizirati moguće modele njihove obnove. Posebna se pažnja usmjerava na objašnjenje pojma zadovoljstva kvalitetom života u naselju ili susjedstvu, kao i na uvjete koji više ili manje utječu na zadovoljstvo stanovnika u naseljima kako u zapadno-europskim i postsocijalističkim društvima, tako i u hrvatskim stambenim naseljima.

## ZADOVOLJSTVO KVALITETOM ŽIVOTA I STANOVANJA U STAMBENIM NASELJIMA

Stanovanje je važan element kvalitete života stanovnika na čije zadovoljstvo utječe i razina opremljenosti stambenog naselja, odnosno susjedstva ili stambene okoline. U urbanosociološkoj teoriji neposredna stambena okolina ili susjedstvo ponaj-

satisfaction despite markedly poor environmental conditions that will significantly reduce their immediate quality of life or even directly influence their life expectancy. Similarly, objective conditions (such as health, material assets) have very little influence on the perceived subjective prosperity (satisfaction) (HAGERTY ET AL., 2001, 8). Often even significant improvements to objective living conditions have little influence on the perceived subjective prosperity because they influence only the so-called short-term increases in the well-being of the individual, due to quick adaptation, for example to a higher standard of living (DIENER ET AL., 2006, 116), but this does not correlate to an increase in their personal or subjective satisfaction. Thus, subjective satisfaction is a very elusive category to measure, but it definitely completes the picture of the total quality of life.

In assessing both the subjective and objective quality of life, space and the context of individual spaces (housing estate, city, country, etc.) play an important role if we accept the assumption that quality of life changes, fluctuating ‘from place to place’ (ANDRÁŠKO, 2010). Despite actual differences between individuals and groups, as residents of certain spaces, we encounter different possibilities of defining spaces in which their activities take place. Research into the quality of life in a city, housing estate, neighbourhood, etc. represents a typical example of this type of research. It is therefore the aim of the paper to analyse housing estates built after the Second World War with a focus on the specificities of the quality of life and housing in post-socialist countries, primarily Croatia, and also to analyse possible models of their renewal. Particular attention will be given to the clarification of the notion of satisfaction with the quality of life in a housing estate or neighbourhood, and the conditions that influence residents’ satisfaction to varying degrees, both in Western European and post-socialist societies, and in Croatian housing estates.

## SATISFACTION WITH THE QUALITY OF LIFE AND HOUSING IN THE HOUSING ESTATES

Housing is an important element of the residents’ quality of life, and their level of satisfaction is influenced by how well a housing estate, neighbourhood

prije podrazumijeva područje unutar 15 minuta hoda od kuće (SEFERAGIĆ, 1988.; KEARNS, PARKINSON, 2001.; FORREST, KEARNS, 2001.; SVIRČIĆ GOTOVAC, 2015.) do mjesta u kojima stanovnici zadovoljavaju svakodnevne potrebe. Prema D. Seferagić (1993.), opremljenost stambene okoline važna je za svakodnevni život i obuhvaća niz institucija i usluga potrebnih za svakodnevno funkcioniranje: škole, ambulante, uslužne djelatnosti i javni prijevoz, kulturne i vjerske institucije. Njihova dostupnost vezana je, objašnjava, uz ekonomski (može li netko kupiti ili pribaviti ono što se nudi), socijalni (kojoj socijalnoj grupi pripada) i kulturni aspekt (koju vrstu potreba razvija), ali i za prostor. Stoga se opremljenost susjedstva osim na razini kućanstva može mjeriti i na razini susjedstva i to najčešće na dvije razine, primarnoj ili osnovnoj i sekundarnoj ili višoj razini. Ako susjedstvo u infrastrukturnom smislu (tehničkim i socijalnim uslugama) može na zadovoljavajući način ispuniti svakodnevne potrebe stanovnika na obje razine, imat će visoku upotrebnu vrijednost kako kod stanovnika lokalnog prostora tako i na tržištu, a imidž i percepcija naselja bit će pozitivnija.

Zadovoljstvo naseljem implicira i da se stanaru sviđaju susjedi, fizičko stanje u naselju ili lokacija koja je relativno blizu gradskom centru. Dio literature eksplicitno ističe da postoji bliska povezanost zadovoljstva stanovanjem (stanom) i zadovoljstva naseljem (PARKES I DR., 2002.; DEKKER I DR., 2011.). Ako postoji značajna zapuštenost zgrada, javnih prostora i nesigurnost u naselju, to će se reflektirati na percepciju i zadovoljstvo susjedstvom (GENT, 2009.). Nadalje, M. J. Sirgy i T. Cornwell (2002.) navode da je nezadovoljstvo fizičkim značajkama naselja kao što su neodržavnost zgrada i dvorišta, krajolika i sl. važno za zadovoljstvo stanara i utječe na odluku o mogućem preseljenju. Navedena istraživanja pokazuju i da su u procjeni zadovoljstva naseljem, osobne karakteristike stanovnika i njihov doživljaj o naselju ipak važnija nego obilježja naselja. Zadovoljstvo stanom važan je indikator zadovoljstva susjedstvom i nužan uvjet zadovoljstva naseljem (GENT, 2009.). Obje razine zadovoljstva – i stanom i naseljem, neodvojivo su povezane i na njih se mora usmjeriti određeni revitalizacijski tip stambene politike.

or surroundings are equipped. The theory of urban sociology defines immediate housing environment or neighbourhood as the area within 15 minutes of walking distance from the place of residence (SEFERAGIĆ, 1988; KEARNS, PARKINSON, 2001; FORREST, KEARNS, 2001; SVIRČIĆ GOTOVAC, 2015) to the places where residents fulfill their everyday needs. D. Seferagić (1993) says that the level of housing environment development is crucial for everyday life, encompassing a range of institutions and services necessary for daily life: schools, clinics, public services and transportation, cultural and religious institutions. As she explains, their availability is related to the economic (can someone purchase or acquire what is offered), social (belonging to a social group) and cultural aspect (which sort of need it develops), but also to space itself. Therefore, besides the household level, how well-furnished a neighbourhood is can be measured on the level of the whole neighbourhood, most often by perceiving two levels, the primary or basic level, and the secondary or higher level. If the neighbourhood can satisfyingly fulfil the everyday needs of residents in the infrastructural sense on both levels, it will have high service value both for the local residents and regarding the market value, while the image and overall perception of the estate will be much more positive.

Satisfaction with the housing estate implies that the residents like their neighbours, the physical condition of the estate or the location that is relatively close to the city centre. The close connection between satisfaction with housing (apartment) and satisfaction with the estate is clearly highlighted in literature (PARKES ET AL., 2002; DEKKER ET AL., 2011). If the buildings and public spaces in the estate are severely derelict or the estate is unsafe, this will undoubtedly reflect on the perception and satisfaction with the housing estate (GENT, 2009). Furthermore, M. J. Sirgy and T. Cornwell (2002) state that the dissatisfaction with the physical attributes of the estate such as the disrepair of buildings, yards and environments is important for the residents' overall feeling of satisfaction and influences the decision on a possible relocation. The mentioned studies also show that in assessing the level of satisfaction with the estate, the personal characteristics of the residents and their perception of the estate are more important than the objective characteristics of the estate itself. Satisfac-

## RAZVOJ MODERNIH STAMBENIH NASELJA U EUROPSKOM KONTEKSTU

Velika stambena naselja građena u Europi poslije Drugoga svjetskog rata istraživači (HALL, ROWLANDS, 2005., 48) sociokulturno se svrstavaju u vrstu izgrađene stambene okoline koja je u Zapadnoj Europi pripadala modernizmu,<sup>3</sup> a ekonomski fordizmu. Razvoj naselja veže se uz promjenu ekonomskih, ali i društveno-političkih temelja društava: nove izvore energije i masovnu proizvodnju, odgovor na rješavanje prijeratne velike nezaposlenosti i posljedica rata, koje u zemljama Središnje i Istočne Europe karakterizira centralna planska stanogradnja (HALL, ROWLANDS, 2005., 48). Nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata socijalističko se društvo razvijalo po direktivnim mjerama državnih organa, da bi se od 1950-ih razvilo tzv. centralno planiranje. Koncept razvoja društva ekonomski je orijentirano na razvoj teške industrije i ekstenzivnu upotrebu niskokvalificirane radne snage. Urbanizacija se zbivala neplanirano i nije zauzimala posebnu pozornost kreatora razvoja kao samostalan predmet interesa, a u skladu s načinom urbanizacije tekla je i početna stanogradnja (VEZILIĆ I DR., 2013.). U Zagrebu se, primjerice, stambena nestašica pokušava riješiti gradnjom novih stambenih naselja kao što je Novi Zagreb.<sup>4</sup> Prva planirana naselja u Južnom Zagrebu (Savski gaj, Trnsko i Zaprude) smatraju se jednim od najuspješnijih predstavnika planiranja te su primjer za većinu novih naselja u tadašnjoj Jugoslaviji. Svaka od novozagrebačkih „kazeta“ definirana je snažnim obodnim prometnicama i nosila je urbanistička i arhitektonska obilježja<sup>5</sup> vremena u kojem je

<sup>3</sup> Od 1928. CIAM-ov (Congres Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne) internacionalni arhitektonski kongres imao je najveći utjecaj na gradnju stambenih naselja u Europi, a velik utjecaj imao je švicarski arhitekt Le Corbusier. S Atenskom poveljom iz 1933. nastaje masovan, funkcionalan i moderan urbanizam koji je najveći uzlet imao upravo nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata u stvaranju boljeg stanovanja i bolje životne okoline za sve.

<sup>4</sup> Na temelju *Regulacijske osnove iz 1953. godine*, 1957. počinje gradnja prvih naselja 'preko' Save – Savski gaj i Trnsko. Osim Južnog Zagreba grade se i naselja u Dubravi i Volovčici te provodi rekonstrukcija Trešnjevke i Trnja (VEZILIĆ I DR., 2013.).

<sup>5</sup> Godine 1976. donosi se dokument tzv. DUSI (Društveno usmjerena stanogradnja) koji je u sadržajnom smislu bio koncept novoga stambenog naselja kao cjelovite stambene zajednice. Društveno usmjerenu stanogradnju pratio je integralni projekt standardizacije parametara u stanogradnji koji je rezultirao dokumentom smjernica pod nazivom *Standard stana, zgrade i naselja u društveno usmjerenoj stambenoj izgradnji* (JUKIĆ I DR., 2011., 30).

tion with their apartment is also an important indicator of satisfaction with the neighbourhood and a necessary precondition for satisfaction with the estate (GENT, 2009). Both levels of satisfaction – with the apartment and with the housing estate, are inseparably connected and they need to be the focus of a specific type of revitalizing housing policy.

## DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN HOUSING ESTATES IN THE EUROPEAN CONTEXT

Considering socio-cultural classification, researchers (HALL, ROWLANDS, 2005, 48) see the large-scale housing estates built in Europe following the Second World War as the type of built housing environment that in Western Europe belonged to modernism,<sup>3</sup> and in the economic sense, to Fordism. The development of housing estates is linked to the changes in the economic but also in socio-political foundations of society: new sources of energy and mass production, responses to pre-war mass unemployment and the aftermath of the war, characterized by centrally-planned housing development in the countries of Middle and Eastern Europe (HALL, ROWLANDS, 2005, 48). After the Second World War, the socialist society was developing by following the directed measures of state organs, and after the 1950s the so-called central planning was developed. The concept of social development was in its economic sense oriented toward the development of heavy industry and extensive use of low qualified work force. Urbanization was happening without a plan, and was not drawing any special attention of the creators of development as a separate subject of interest, and the initial housing development was happening in accordance with the way urbanization was carried out (VEZILIĆ ET AL., 2013). Thus, in Zagreb the lack of housing was attempted to be solved by building new housing estates such as

<sup>3</sup> After 1928 the CIAM (Congres Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne) international architecture congress had the greatest influence on the construction of housing estates in Europe, with the significant influence of Swiss architect Le Corbusier. With the Athens Charter in 1933, we see the birth of mass, functional and modern urbanism that had the strongest rise after the Second World War in creating better housing and a better living environment for all.



nastala (JUKIĆ I DR., 2011.).

Upravo su nova stambena naselja bila visoko organizirani pokušaj da se stvore nove okoline u kojima će se moći razviti novi obrasci društvenog života (TURKINGTON, 1996.) kako u socijalističkim tako i u zapadnim stambenim naseljima. Također su bila planirana kao modernistička i funkcionalna naselja kojima će se riješiti stambeno pitanje većine stanovnika s ciljem izgradnje tzv. mješovitih naselja različitih socijalnih slojeva. Ta su velika stambena naselja imala velike otvorene prostore unutar blokova te različite i odvojene funkcije, s velikim zelenim površinama sigurnima od prometa i pažljivo planiran urbani krajolik (DEKKER I DR., 2005.). Europska socijalna stambena naselja nisu bila planirana samo za radničku klasu već i za srednju, ali i onu najnižu, odnosno za većinu stanovništva u rastućim gradovima Europe. Vrhunac stambene gradnje bio je u kasnim 60-im i ranim 70-im godinama 20. stoljeća i ne slučajno u isto vrijeme kada je i visoka gradnja dosegla svoj vrhunac. Primjerice, između 1966. i 1973. više od 60 % ukupnoga stambenog fonda izgrađenog u Nizozemskoj i dvije trećine socijalne stanogradnje u Francuskoj sastojalo se od visoke gradnje (nebodera) (WASSENBERG, 2018., 43). Naselja izgrađena u Istočnoj Europi najčešće su bila mnogo veća od onih u Zapadnoj Europi, a i dulje su se gradila, sve do kraja 1980-ih godina, odnosno do kolapsa socijalizma (DEKKER I DR., 2005.).

Danas su ta stambena naselja izgrađena nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata stara 30, 40 pa čak i 60 godina pri čemu je izgrađena okolina i infrastruktura zapuštena jer su u izgradnji često korišteni građevinski materijali i građevinske tehnike jeftine i brze gradnje (DEKKER I DR., 2006.; HESS I DR., 2018.). To je uzrok određenih negativnih obilježja velikih stambenih naselja u koja pripadaju fizički i ekološki problemi, ekonomski i financijski problemi te društveni problemi i općenito problemi vezani uz imidž naselja (KNORR-SIEDOW, 1996.).

Neovisno o različitim društveno-političkim uređenjima u Europi, poslijeratna se stambena naselja ipak mogu svrstati pod zajedničku nomenklaturu sa sličnim elementima. Primjerice, prema F. Wassenbergu (2018.), velika su stam-

Novi Zagreb.<sup>4</sup> The first planned estates in Southern Zagreb (Savski gaj, Trnsko and Zapruđe) are regarded as one of the most successful examples of planning, and serve as an example for most new estates in ex-Yugoslavia. Each of the 'cassettes' in Novi Zagreb is bordered by high capacity roads and is characterised by contemporary urbanistic and architectural features<sup>5</sup> (JUKIĆ ET AL., 2011).

It was the new housing estates that represented a highly organized attempt to create new environments in which new patterns of social life could be developed (TURKINGTON, 1996) both in socialist and Western housing estates. Furthermore, they were planned as modernist and functional estates that will solve the housing question of most residents, with the aim of building so-called mixed estates with different social classes. These large housing estates had large open spaces inside the blocks and various and separate functions, with large green areas safe from the traffic and a carefully selected urban landscape (DEKKER ET AL., 2005). Social housing estates in Europe were not planned only for the working-class residents but also for both the middle-class and lower-class residents, or in other words, for most of the population of growing European cities. Housing production peaked in the late 1960s and early 1970s, not coincidentally the same era in which the construction of high-rise housing peaked. For example, between 1966 and 1973, over 60% of all housing built in the Netherlands, and two-thirds of social housing in France consisted of high-rise blocks (skyscrapers) (WASSENBERG, 2018, 43). The estates built in Eastern Europe were most often larger than those in Western Europe, and it took longer to build them, all the way until the end of the 1980s, i.e. the collapse of socialism (DEKKER ET AL., 2005).

<sup>4</sup> Based on the *Regulation plan of 1953*, in 1957 the building of first estates 'over' the river Sava began - Savski gaj and Trnsko. Apart from Southern Zagreb, estates in Dubrava and Volovčica were built and the reconstructions of Trešnjevka and Trinje were carried out (VEZILIĆ ET AL., 2013).

<sup>5</sup> In 1976 a document called DUSI (Društveno usmjerena stanogradnja – Socially Directed Housing), which was substantively the concept of a new housing estate as a wholesome housing community, was adopted. The socially directed housing was followed by an integral project of standardization of the housing parameters, which resulted with the document called *The standard of the flat, building and estate in the socially directed housing development*, comprised of the respective directives (JUKIĆ ET AL., 2011, 30). DUSI was the concept of a new housing estate as a complete housing community.

bena naselja sastavljena od kompleksa zgrada sa stanovima koji su: a) različiti oblikom, b) građeni kao planirani i masovni u lokalnom kontekstu, c) smješteni u visokim zgradama (vertikalnim neboderima), d) dovoljno visoki (obično pet i više katova) da se, u skladu sa zakonom, može ugraditi lift (prema HESS I DR., 2018., 9). Također, u naseljima s visokim zgradama izgrađenima od 1950-ih do 1980-ih kao koherentna i kompaktna planska cjelina, stanuje najmanje 1000 stanovnika. I iako je na razini europskih gradova teško uspoređivati tako velika naselja, ističe se da se udio ljudi koji žive u velikim stambenim naseljima kreće od manje od 5 % u Ateni do više od 80 % u Bukureštu i općenito većim udjelima u Istočnoj nego u drugim dijelovima Europe (HESS I DR., 2018, 9). Stoga su takva stambena naselja još uvijek značajan dio stambenog tržišta u istočnim i srednjoeuropskim gradovima (VAN KEMPEN I DR., 2005.).

No bez obzira na veličinu kao fizičko obilježje, razlike između 'dihotomizirane' Europe u razvoju i imidžu stambenih naselja očite su i danas pa kako neki autori navode „iako je kapitalistički urbani prostor izgrađen na sličnim modernističkim planskim idejama doseg i kvaliteta stambenih naselja razlikuju socijalistički od kapitalističkog grada“ (KOVACS, HERFERT, 2012., 326). K. Dekker i dr. objašnjavaju tri puta nastanka i razvoja stambenih naselja utjecajem različitih tipova urbanog i urbanističkog razvoja:

Sjeverni i zapadni put (*A northern and western pathway*) – manje od 10 % ukupnoga nacionalnog stambenog fonda je u velikim stambenim naseljima.

Jugozapadni put (*A south-western pathway*) – jača razdioba između najamnog socijalnog stanovanja i vlasničkog stanovanja.

Srednjoeuropski i istočnoeuropski put (*A central and eastern European pathway*) – dvije trećine stanovništva još uvijek žive u ovakvim naseljima pa ona čine neizostavnim dijelom lokalne i regionalne stambene opskrbe (housing provision) (DEKKER I DR., 2006., 24-25).

Hrvatska bi prema gornjoj podjeli bila dio trećega ili srednjoeuropskoga i istočnoeuropskoga puta koji karakterizira značajan udio nekadašnjih stambenih naselja u postojećem stambenom

Today, those housing estates built after the Second World War are 30, 40 and even 60 years old, with the built surrounding environment and infrastructure completely derelict because the construction process often utilized low-cost materials and techniques of cheap and quick construction (DEKKER ET AL., 2006; HESS ET AL., 2018). This is the cause of certain negative characteristics of large housing estates, which include physical and ecological problems, economic and financial problems as well as social problems and in general, issues with the housing estate image (KNORR-SIEDOW, 1996).

Regardless of different socio-political systems in Europe, post-war housing estates can still be classified under common nomenclature consisting of similar elements. For example, according to F. Wassenberg (2018), large housing estates consist of apartment building complexes that are: a) different in shape, b) built as planned developments on a massive scale in a local context, c) situated in high-rises (vertical skyscrapers), d) tall enough (usually 5 or more floors) so that an elevator, in accordance with the law, can be installed (according to HESS ET AL., 2018, 9). Also, high-rise estates built from the 1950s to 1980s as a coherent and compact planned unit, house a minimum of 1000 residents. And although it is difficult to compare housing estates of this size on the level of European cities, it stands out that the proportion of people residing in large housing estates ranges from less than 5% in Athens to more than 80% in Bucharest, with generally higher shares found in Eastern Europe than other parts of Europe (HESS ET AL., 2018, 9). Therefore, such housing estates still constitute a significant share of the housing market in East and Middle European cities (KEMPEN ET AL., 2005).

However, regardless of size as a physical characteristic, the differences between 'dichotomized' Europe regarding the development and image of housing estates remain obvious today, so as some authors state 'although capitalist urban landscapes were affected by similar modernist planning ideas, the scale and quality of housing estates distinguished the socialist city from the capitalist city' (KOVACS, HERFERT, 2012, 326). Dekker et al. explain three developmental pathways of housing estates influenced by different types of urban development and town planning:

A northern and western pathway – less than 10%

fondu te pozitivniji imidž življenja u ovakvim naseljima nego što je to u naseljima zapadnih gradova. U naseljima zapadnih i sjevernoeuropskih gradova češći su društveni problemi povezani s ekonomskim siromaštvom i problemima segregacije i stigmatizacije (DEKKER I DR., 2006.), etničke izolacije, zapuštenosti zgrada i javnih prostora (BOLT, 2018.). Iako su u zapadnim zemljama ovakva stambena naselja u prosjeku imala samo 10 % stanova, a u Istočnoj i Srednjoj Europi oko 40 %, s vremenom su ipak postala sve manje poželjna za život. Tome je osim starenja i slabijeg održavanja, svakako uzrok bio i rastuća imigracija neeuropskog stanovništva koja se intenzivirala nakon 1990-ih, a naročito nakon financijske krize 2008. godine. Etnički različito stanovništvo uglavnom se naseljavalo upravo u ovim naseljima i postupno ih učinilo mjestima jeftinog i sve manje poželjnog stanovanja. Iz toga se može objasniti i zašto određeni pokušaji uređenja naselja izgrađenih nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata koji su rezultirali i novom izgradnjom na drugim lokacijama nisu nužno poboljšali opće zadovoljstvo stanara (DEKKER I DR., 2011.). Većina zapadnih stambenih naselja poznata je po problematičnom imidžu, visokoj stopi kriminala, sigurnosnim problemima, problemima loše kvalitete života, siromaštva i propadanja (WASSENBERG, 2018.). I dok se većina stambenih naselja u Zapadnoj Europi pretvorila u disfunkcionalna mjesta za siromašnije stanovništvo, ona u Istočnoj i Srednjoj Europi trenutačno su naseljena milijunima Europljana i vitalni su dijelovi gradskog stambenog fonda (HESS I DR., 2018.).

U tom je kontekstu važno spomenuti da su mnogobrojni nalazi o stambenim naseljima rezultat tzv. paneuropskoga istraživačkog programa nazvanog *Restate* koji je financirala i započela Europska unija 2002. godine. Rezultati toga projekta (DEKKER, VAN KEMPEN, 2004.; VAN KEMPEN I DR., 2005.) značajno su pridonijeli analizi stambenih naselja te donošenju mjera obnove kako zapadnih tako i istočnih (postsocijalističkih) stambenih naselja. U tom je programu više puta sudjelovalo deset europskih zemalja (Nizozemska kao zemlja koordinator, Francuska, Njemačka, Mađarska, Italija, Poljska, Slovenija, Španjolska, Švedska i Velika Britanija), te je primjerice iz-

of the total national housing fund consists of large housing estates.

A south-western pathway – a stronger division between rental social housing and equity housing

A Central and Eastern European pathway – two-thirds of the population still live in these kinds of estates as they are an essential part of the local and regional housing provision (DEKKER ET AL., 2006, 24-25).

According to this division, Croatia would fall under the third or Central and Eastern European pathway characterized by a significant percentage of former housing estates in the existing housing fund as well as a more positive image of living in estates of this type than is present in the estates of western cities. The estates of Western and North European cities far more often feature numerous social problems linked with economic poverty and issues of segregation and stigmatization (DEKKER ET AL., 2006), ethnic isolation, neglected buildings and public spaces (BOLT, 2018). Although in Western countries such housing estates had only 10% of flats in this type of estates, and in Eastern and Middle Europe around 40%, over time they became less desirable for living. Apart from aging and inadequate maintenance, one of the main reasons was the growing immigration of non-European residents, which intensified after the 1990s, and particularly after the financial crisis of 2008. It was the mentioned estates that became mostly inhabited by ethnically different residents, gradually making these neighbourhoods the places of cheap and less desirable housing. The above could explain why certain attempts of organizing the estates built after the Second World War, also resulting with new constructing at other locations, did not necessarily improve the general satisfaction of residents (DEKKER ET AL., 2011). Most western housing estates are recognized for their problematic image, high crime rate, security problems, poor quality of life, poverty and deterioration (WASSENBERG, 2018). While most of the housing estates in Western Europe turned into dysfunctional places for the local residents, those in Central and Eastern Europe currently house millions of Europeans and constitute vital parts of the city housing fund (HESS ET AL., 2018). In this context, it is important to point out that numerous housing estate findings

dvojeno 14 gradova s izabranim naseljima.<sup>6</sup> Od bivših zemalja Jugoslavije sudjelovala je Slovenija, a Hrvatska, jer nije bila članica EU-a, nije ušla u program. Danas se, međutim, s vremenskim odmakom od dvadesetak godina može istaknuti da su „neki od ključnih problema ostali isti kao da postoje određena i različita iskustva života u naseljima u odnosu na Sjeverne/Zapadne i Južne/Istočne europske zemlje“ (HESS I DR., 2018., 5-6). I Z. Kovacs i G. Herfert ističu neke od rezultata istraživanja kvalitete života stanovnika stambenih naselja u nekoliko postsocijalističkih gradova važnih na dvije razine: prvo, ni u jednom gradu nezadovoljni nisu u većini pa pretpostavka o krajnje lošem imidžu stambenih naselja u postsocijalističkim gradovima nije potvrđena i, drugo, stanari su najmanje nezadovoljni u Leipzigu gdje su provodeni dugoročni programi regeneracije naselja, a od 1990-ih odvija se zamjena i iseljavanje velikog dijela stanovništva (KOVACS, HERFERT, 2012., 329). Istraživanja provedena u Leipzigu i Pragu pokazuju da velik broj kućanstava još uvijek velika stambena naselja navodi kao idealnu stambenu okolinu (GROSSMANN I DR., 2017.; BOLT, 2018.).

U isto vrijeme u većini postsocijalističkih zemalja ekonomske su (ne)prilike postupno dovele do naglog rasta prihoda i nejednakosti u naseljima iako razlike nisu odmah pretvorene u nejednakosti i podjele u prostoru (MARCINČZAK I DR., 2015.). To je dijelom i posljedica manjka novih stanova koji se u tim zemljama nastavio iz socijalističkog razdoblja pa su stanovnici ostali živjeti u postojećima. Tek od drugoga tranzicijskog desetljeća nova stanogradnja prati potražnju na tržištu, a gradilo se uglavnom na rubovima grada za srednje i više društvene slojeve. To postupno dovodi do rastuće socioekonomske segregacije (MUSTERD I DR., 2017., 64). Tako se nakon tri desetljeća tranzicije pokazuju neka značajna socioekonomska obilježja, ali i nedostaci prostorne preraspodjele koja se odigrala u stambenim naseljima, posebno onim starijima u kojima ostaje većinom ekonomski slabije i starije stanovništvo, a bogatiji slojevi

are a result of the so-called pan-European research study *Restate*, funded and initiated by the European Union in 2004. For almost 20 years now, the results of that project (DEKKER, VAN KEMPEN, 2004; VAN KEMPEN ET AL., 2005 and others) have significantly contributed to the analysis of housing estates as well as implementing renewal measures both in Western and Eastern (post-socialist) housing estates. In this program more than 10 European countries participated on multiple occasions (the Netherlands as the coordinating country, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Great Britain), and 14 cities were singled out with selected estates.<sup>6</sup> Slovenia was the only former Yugoslav country that participated in the study. Croatia was not included in the program because it was not yet an EU member state. However, today, with hindsight, we can point out ‘that some of the key issues remained the same, as well as, that experiences of life in housing estates differ in Northern/Western and Southern/Eastern European countries’ (HESS ET AL., 2018, 5-6). Kovacs and Herfert also highlight some of the results of studies into the quality of life of housing estate residents in several post-socialist cities that are important on two levels: firstly, those most dissatisfied do not represent a majority in any of the cities included, so the assumption on the ultimate bad image of the housing estates in the post-socialist cities is proved incorrect, and secondly, residents showed the lowest level of dissatisfaction in Leipzig, where long-term housing estates renewal programs were implemented, and from the 1990s the city experienced large population displacement and substitution (2012, 329). Studies conducted in Leipzig and Prague showed that a large number of households still cites large housing estates as an ideal residential environment (GROSSMANN ET AL., 2017; BOLT, 2018).

At the same time, in most post-socialist countries, varied economic circumstances, gradually caused a steep rise in income and housing estate inequalities, although those differences were not instantly translated into inequalities and divisions in space (MARCINČZAK ET AL., 2015). In part, this

<sup>6</sup> Atena, Berlin, Birmingham, Bruxelles, Budimpešta, Bukurešt, Helsinki, Madrid, Milan, Pariz, Moskva, Prag, Stockholm i Tallin.

<sup>6</sup> Athens, Berlin, Birmingham, Brussel, Budapest, Bucharest, Helsinki, Madrid, Milan, Paris, Moscow, Prague, Stockholm and Tallinn.

i mlađe obitelji najčešće kupuju novije stanove u predgrađu ili na atraktivnijim gradskim lokacijama. U tranziciji će se stoga povećati razlike u socijalnom statusu između manje ili više poželjnih lokacija (BOLT, 2018., 67). Starost i zapuštenost socijalističkih naselja i dalje ostaje neriješenim problemom kako u domeni održavanja i obnove tako i s obzirom na socioekonomske karakteristike te cjelokupni dojam naselja. U svim postsocijalističkim zemljama nakon procesa privatizacije u 1990-ima novi vlasnici stanova često nemaju dovoljno novca za održavanje i obnovu svojih nekretnina (DIMITROVSKA, SENDI, 2001.; CIRMAN, MANDIČ, 2012.). S iznimkom Istočne Njemačke, nedostatak financija za kompleksnu regeneraciju stambenih naselja u istočnoeuropskim gradovima još uvijek je središnji problem (HERFERT I DR., 2013.) koji utječe na percepciju i zadovoljstvo životom stanovništva. S druge strane u zapadnim zemljama češće dolazi do iseljavanja stanovnika srednje klase i veće mobilnosti u bolja i kvalitetnija naselja, često i obiteljskih kuća, čime se objektivna slika, ali i imidž o velikim stambenim naseljima dodatno pogoršava. Tome je uzrok i bolji životni standard stanovnika zapadnih zemalja koji omogućuje i bolji stambeni izbor. U isto vrijeme u postsocijalističkim zemljama je često da se iako potreba i želja za iseljavanjem postoji, ne može ostvariti zbog nižega životnog standarda i malih prihoda u kućanstvima, posebno kod starije populacije. Stoga su određeni slojevi stanovnika prisiljeni ostati u istom mjestu stanovanja.

## KONTEKST STANOVANJA U HRVATSKIM STAMBENIM NASELJIMA

Socijalistička stambena naselja bila su dio urbanističkog procesa planiranja i izgradnje grada na državnoj razini putem kojih se odvijala modernizacijska i urbanizacijska transformacija hrvatskih gradova. Ogladala se u preraspodjeli radne snage iz ruralnog u urbani kontekst življenja te, prije svega, prijelaza iz primarnog u sekundarni sektor rada. Tadašnja je Jugoslavija u usporedbi s drugim europskim državama do kraja Drugoga svjetskog rata pripadala izrazito nisko urbaniziranim

is a consequence of a lack of new flats carried over from the socialist period and resulting in residents remaining in existing housing. It was not until the second decade of the transition that new housing development begun following the market demand, with most of the new construction situated on city outskirts and aimed at middle and higher social classes. This gradually caused increased socio-economic segregation (MUSTERD ET AL., 2017, 64). Thus, after three decades of transition, significant socio-economic characteristics become apparent but also the deficiencies of the spatial redistribution that took place in the housing estates. This is especially visible in the older estates with prevailing elderly and economically weak population, while the wealthier classes and younger families mostly purchased newer flats in the suburbs or more attractive city locations. In this way, the transition process increases the differences in social status between more and less desirable city locations (BOLT, 2018, 67). The neglect and age of socialist housing estates remain an unsolved problem both in the maintenance domain and with regard to the socio-economic characteristics as well as the overall image of the housing estates. In all post-socialist countries, following the privatization process in the 1990s, new flat owners mostly do not have sufficient funds required for the maintenance and renewal of their real estate (DIMITROVSKA, SENDI, 2001; CIRMAN, MANDIČ, 2012). With the exception of East Germany, the lack of funds required for the complex regeneration of housing estates in Eastern European cities still remains a central problem (HERFERT ET AL., 2013) influencing the perception and life satisfaction of the population. On the other hand, in Western countries more often the middle-class residents move out to better and higher quality estates, often family houses, which further deteriorates the objective picture and the image of large housing estates. This is caused by a better living standard of Western countries' residents, enabling a better housing choice. At the same time in post-socialist countries, it happens that although the need and desire for moving out exists, it often cannot be accomplished due to a lower standard and low housing income, especially among the older population. Therefore, certain classes of residents are forced to remain living in the same place.

zemljama. Nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata stupanj urbaniziranosti postupno se mijenja kao posljedica brze industrijalizacije zemlje, deagrarizacije i migracije stanovništva iz sela u grad što je značajno utjecalo na demografske, društvene i prostorne promjene (NEJAŠMIĆ, 1988.; SEFERAGIĆ, 1993b). Pri tome druge urbane funkcije, osim stanovanja i rada, nisu podjednako brzo razvijane pa su mnoga naselja na periferiji gradova nazivana „spavaonicama“ iz koje stanovnici svaki dan putuju na posao i vraćaju se u njih. Kritizirane su kao dehumanizirano stanovanje jer su većinom bile visokogradnja s velikom gustoćom izgrađenosti te lošom kvalitetom stanovanja, posebno na razini stana i naselja (SEFERAGIĆ, 1988.; ROGIĆ, 1990.; KLEMPIĆ, 2004.; MIŠETIĆ I DR., 2004.; SLAVUJ, 2011.; KLEMPIĆ BOGADI, PODGORELEC, 2014.; PODGORELEC I DR., 2020.; SVIRČIĆ GOTOVAC, 2020.). D. Seferagić (1988., 28) definira nova stambena naselja u socijalizmu kao „kolektivne stambene zone s temeljnom urbanom infrastrukturom, okruženima glavnim prometnicama, izgrađenima relativno brzo na obodima velikih gradova da bi osigurali sve potrebno za svakodnevni život na lokalnoj razini“. Dobivanje posla u industriji i novoizgrađenim tvornicama često je značilo i dobivanje tzv. društvenog stana u kolektivnim stambenim naseljima čime se država, odnosno tadašnje radne organizacije, pojavljuju kao ključni akter stambene politike i odlučuju o dodjeljivanju prava na stan.

U Hrvatskoj je 1991. godine javni stambeni fond („društveni stanovi“) činio ukupno 25,1 %, a u Zagrebu 45,4 % stambenog fonda (Državni zavod za statistiku, 1995.). No bez obzira na stalnu državnu uključenost i stambenu kolektivnu gradnju, u bivšoj je državi bio stalni nedostatak stanova koji je s druge strane doveo do ilegalne gradnje na individualnoj razini u obliku gradnje obiteljskih kuća na perifernim gradskim lokacijama.<sup>7</sup> Bespravna naselja u najvećim gradovima (primjer Splita kao najznačajnijega imigracijskog središta u razdoblju industrijskog rasta, ali i po-

<sup>7</sup> Tako je, primjerice, prema podacima iz Popisa stanovništva iz 1981. godine, kvalitativni manjak stanova u Socijalističkoj Republici Hrvatskoj, kao dijelu bivše Jugoslavije, iznosio oko 100 000, a u Zagrebu je nedostajalo oko 20 000 stanova (BEŽOVAN, 1987., 86).

## THE CONTEXT OF HOUSING IN CROATIAN HOUSING ESTATES

Socialist housing estates were a part of the urbanist process of planning and developing cities on the state level whereby a transformation to modernize and develop Croatian cities took place. It was reflected in the shift of the workforce from rural to urban living context and, first of all, in the transition from the primary to the secondary sector. In comparison with other European countries, contemporary Yugoslavia belonged to the countries with very low urbanization until the end of the Second World War. After the Second World War the level of urbanization gradually changed as a consequence of rapid industrialization of the country, and deagrarization and migration of residents from village to city, which had a significant impact on demographical, social and spatial changes (NEJAŠMIĆ, 1988; SEFERAGIĆ, 1993b). At the same time, other urban functions, apart from housing and working, were not developing at equal pace, so that many estates on the cities' periphery were called 'dormitories' from which residents commuted to work. They were criticized as a dehumanized concept of housing because they mostly consisted of high-rise buildings with high building density and poor housing quality, especially on the level of flats and estates (SEFERAGIĆ, 1988; ROGIĆ, 1990; KLEMPIĆ, 2004; MIŠETIĆ ET AL., 2004; SLAVUJ, 2011; KLEMPIĆ BOGADI, PODGORELEC, 2014; PODGORELEC ET AL., 2020; SVIRČIĆ GOTOVAC, 2020). D. Seferagić (1988, 28) defined new housing estates in socialism as 'collective housing zones with basic urban infrastructure, surrounded by main roads, constructed relatively quickly on the outskirts of large cities to ensure everything necessary for everyday life on the local level.' Getting a job in the industry and working in the newly constructed factories was often accompanied with being awarded the so-called social flat in collective housing estates by which the state, or back then the labour organizations, started being a key actor in housing policies, deciding on who is entitled to a flat..

In Croatia, in 1991, the public housing fund ('social flats') constituted 25.1%, and in Zagreb as much as 45.4% of the total housing fund (Državni zavod za statistiku, 1995) but regardless of continuous state participation and collective housing development, there was a constant lack of housing in the

slije 1991.) nerijetko su nastajala na područjima koja nisu bila planirana za stambenu izgradnju pa najčešće imaju lošu komunalnu infrastrukturu, bez pratećih su društvenih sadržaja i s malo i, uglavnom, slabo održavanim javnim površinama (KLEMPIĆ, 2004.).

S osamostaljivanjem postsocijalističkih zemalja, među njima i Hrvatske, dolazi do intenzivnog procesa privatizacije u svim društvenim sektorima pa i do procesa privatizacije stanova i tzv. otkupa dotadašnjih društvenih ili javno-najamnih stanova. Gotovo je cjelokupni stambeni fond u stambenim naseljima hrvatskih gradova prešao u ruke dotadašnjih korisnika stanova. Nositelji stanarskih prava postali su stvarni vlasnici svojih stambenih prostora po uistinu niskim cijenama (neovisno o tržišnim cijenama i veličini stanova) i daleko ispod stvarne vrijednosti nekretnina (BEŽOVAN, 1993.; SPEVEC, KLEMPIĆ BOGADI, 2009.). Visoki udio vlasništva u Hrvatskoj vidi se i prema posljednjem popisu stanovništva iz 2011. godine iz kojeg je vidljivo da je 88,9 % stanova u Hrvatskoj bilo u privatnom vlasništvu ili suvlasništvu (URL 1). Slična je situacija bila i u gradovima drugih postsocijalističkih zemalja u kojima privatno vlasništvo nad stanovima ima najveći udio u ukupnom stambenom fondu, ali, kako će se brzo uvidjeti, proces će pratiti brojni nedostaci, ponajprije neodržavanje zajedničkih dijelova zgrada (fasada, stubišta, liftova i dr.), kao i javne infrastrukture u stambenim naseljima. Takvo će stanje voditi relativno zapuštenim starim naseljima pod egidom manje vrijednoga zajedničkog i javnog vlasništva o kojem brojni vlasnici ne vode računa, a stambeni propisi se ne provode ili uopće nisu doneseni. S druge strane, gradi se velik broj stanova komercijalnog tipa na atraktivnijim gradskim lokacijama, tzv. točkasta gradnja s manjim i nižim stambenim zgradama (najčešće do pet katova) i bliže gradskom centru. Takvi su stanovi često i veličinom i sobnošću neprimjereni, ali zbog toga što su novi i estetski privlačniji, za njima na tržištu postoji velika potražnja, posebno u Zagrebu i Splitu. Zbog pretjerane gustoće izgrađenosti te izmiješanosti stare i nove gradnje, stanovi su često nedovoljno infrastrukturno opremljeni te je potrebno poboljšavati i bolje tehnički i društveno opremiti njihovu stambenu okolinu. U

former state, which on the other hand caused illegal construction on the individual level in the form of building family houses on peripheral city locations.<sup>7</sup> Illegally constructed estates in the largest cities (for example, Split as the most significant emigration centre during the industrial growth period but also after 1991) often arose in locations that were not planned for housing development so they mostly had poor communal infrastructure, lacked accompanying social content and had very few, and mostly unkempt, public spaces (KLEMPIĆ, 2004).

Following the declaration of independence in post-socialist countries, Croatia included, an intensive process of privatization started in all social sectors, including the privatization of housing with the mass repurchase of former social or public-rental flats. Almost the entire housing stock of the Croatian housing estates became the property of former residents. Former holders of tenancy rights became actual owners of their residential spaces at truly bargain prices (independent of market prices and flat sizes) and far below actual real estate value (BEŽOVAN, 1993; SPEVEC, KLEMPIĆ BOGADI, 2009). A high portion of real estate ownership was evident in the last population census in 2011, when 88.9% of the housing in Croatia was in private ownership or co-ownership (URL 1). A similar situation took place in cities of other post-social countries in which privately-owned housing comprises the largest portion of the total housing fund, but as we will soon see, that process is accompanied by numerous shortcomings, primarily regarding the lack of maintenance of building communal areas (façades, stairways, lifts, etc.), and the public infrastructure in housing estates. This situation led to relatively run-down old housing estates under the aegis of less valuable communal and public property that has numerous unaccountable owners and housing ordinances that are either not being implemented or are non-existent. On the other hand, a large number of commercial flats are being constructed on more attractive city locations, the so called scattered building in smaller and lower residential buildings (mostly up to five floors high) and closer to the city

<sup>7</sup> For example, according to the data from the population census in 1981, the lack of qualitative housing in the Socialist Republic of Croatia, as part of the former state of Yugoslavia, was about 100,000 flats. For Zagreb, that number was about 20,000 flats (BEŽOVAN, 1987, 86).

postsocijalističkom kontekstu stanogradnje tako dolazi do postupnoga gubitka pojma tzv. standarda naselja koji je desetljećima ranije određivao osnovne urbanističke parametre u razvoju stambenih naselja. Stoga se analizom standarda naselja i njihove opremljenosti usporedbom prostornih standarda za gradnju i urbanističko-tehničkim uvjetima gradnje u GUP-ovima Grada Zagreba 1971., 1986., 2000., 2003. i 2007. može zaključiti da su se desetljećima postupno smanjivali, a neki su i potpuno nestajali (JUKIĆ I DR., 2011., 103). Tako, primjerice, u GUP-u iz 2003. godine još je vrijedio razmak između dviju građevina kao minimalan razmak od 12 metara između dviju visokih zgrada na istoj građevnoj čestici, no taj se standard više ne nalazi u važećoj prostorno-planjskoj dokumentaciji. Iz navedenog je očito da je standarde važno istražiti i vrednovati te ponovno ugraditi u buduće strateške planove grada i planove stambenih naselja (JUKIĆ I DR., 2011., 103).

Stoga se i starija i novija naselja u Hrvatskoj, posebno u najvećim gradovima, treba promatrati kao ona kojima je potrebna obnova i revitalizacija kako na razini postojećih naselja tako i na razini određenih novih gradskih stambenih lokacija<sup>8</sup> naknadno izgrađenih i proširivanih na postojeća naselja (primjerice Špansko, Malešnica, Ravnice, Trešnjevka i druge u Zagrebu).

## MOGUĆNOSTI OBNOVE STAMBENIH NASELJA

Početak 21. stoljeća društveno-ekonomska paradigma koja se ogleda u političkoj ekonomiji pluralizma, važnosti održivog razvoja i uzajamnoj ovisnosti države i tržišta potaknula je približavanje država Zapadne i Istočne Europe (HALL,

<sup>8</sup> U istraživanju iz 2015. o novozagrebačkim stambenim lokacijama pojmom lokacija nazivaju se novi i najčešće skuplji i poželjniji stambeni prostori koji nisu stambena naselja kao cjeline već su izgrađeni u Zagrebu nakon 1990-ih kao dijelovi dotadašnjih naselja, tzv. točkasto ili kao njihov produžetak. Kvaliteta života pokazala se najviše nezadovoljavajućom upravo na onim lokacijama koje su bile izgrađene izvan postojećih naselja. Time su dodatno bile izolirane i slabo opremljene iako moderne i često visokih cijena na tržištu (više u: ur. Svirčić Gotovac, A. i Zlatar, J. (2015): *Kvaliteta života u novostambenim naseljima i lokacijama u zagrebačkoj mreži naselja*, Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu.

centre. Such apartments are often unsuitable both in size and number of rooms, but because they are newly constructed and aesthetically more attractive, there is a great demand for them, especially in Zagreb and Split. Due to excessive building density as well as mixing of old and new construction, these apartments are often insufficiently equipped considering infrastructure, which requires additional improvements and better technical and social equipping of their surroundings. Thus, in the post-socialist context of housing, the notion of the so-called housing standard, which has been defining the basic urbanistic parameters of the housing estates' development for decades, is gradually lost. Therefore, analysing the standards of housing and their equipment by comparing the spatial standards for building and the urbanistic-technical conditions of building set in the Zagreb Master Plans of 1971, 1986, 2000, 2003 and 2007, it can be concluded that for decades they have been gradually reduced, and some disappeared completely (JUKIĆ ET AL., 2011, 103). Thus, in the Master Plan of 2003 a minimum distance of 12 m between two tall buildings on the same building plot was still valid, but this standard no longer exists in the valid spatial-planning documentation. This evidently suggests that standards need to be examined and evaluated, and again incorporated in future strategic plans of cities and housing estates (according to JUKIĆ ET AL., 2011, 103).

Thus, both the older and the newer estates in Croatia, especially in the largest cities, need to be observed as those that require renewal and revitalization, both on the level of existing estates and on the level of some new housing city locations<sup>8</sup> built afterwards and attached to the already existing estates (for example, Špansko, Malešnica, Ravnice, Trešnjevka and other in Zagreb).

<sup>8</sup> In a 2015 research on the housing locations in Novi Zagreb the term location stands for the new and most often more expensive and desirable housing spaces that are not wholesome housing estates, but were built in Zagreb after the 1990s as parts of previously built estates, in the so called scattered manner or as the continuation of the existing estates. The quality of life appeared to be most unsatisfactory exactly at those locations that were built outside the existing estates. This made them even more isolated and poorly equipped, although modern and often pricey at the market (more in: Svirčić Gotovac, A. Zlatar, J. (Eds.) (2015): *The quality of living in new housing estates in the settlement network of Zagreb*, Institute for Social Research in Zagreb.



ROWLANDS, 2005., 50). Stoga se programi i mjere za regeneracijom stambenih naselja mogu ujediniti suvremenim europeizacijskim trendovima kojima se promoviraju zajedničke i općeprihvaćene socijalne, demografske, ekološke, ekonomske i kulturne vrijednosti kojima se može poboljšati kvaliteta života u svim stambenim naseljima neovisno o kojim dijelovima Europe se radi. Obnova stambenih naselja siguran je put očuvanja kvalitete života i stanovanja. Takav pristup pomogao bi rješavanju problema koje danas nalazimo ponajprije u starijim, ali sve više i novijim stambenim naseljima. Starost zgrada i stambene okoline (susjedstva) traži nova ulaganja za postizanje energetske učinkovitosti i održivog načina života u gradovima (*urban sustainability*). Starenje stanovništva kao sveprisutni europski trend te promjena socijalne strukture koja se ogleda u odlasku srednjih i viših slojeva stanovnika iz naselja lošijeg imidža i slabije (niže) kvalitete života zahtijeva odgovor stambene politike.<sup>9</sup> Starenje stanovništva u sociodemografskom smislu dovelo je i do starenja stambenih naselja u strukturalnom i strateškom smislu koje stoga zahtijeva kompleksne odgovore. Obnova velikih stambenih naselja ne znači samo obnovu zgrada već i obnovu (revitalizaciju) lokalne ekonomije, lokalne zajednice i društvenog života. Stoga upravljanje, održavanje i obnova velikih stambenih naselja predstavljaju velik izazov za sve europske zemlje (DIMITROVSKA, SENDI, 2001., 235). U tome je značajnu ulogu i doprinos imao upravo spomenuti istraživački program *Restate* kao primjer paneuropskog istraživanja provedenog u različitim gradovima i stambenim naseljima Zapadne i Istočne Europe, a kojim su istražene mogućnosti obnove i konkretne mjere unaprjeđenja kvalitete stanovanja u ostarjelim i depriviranim naseljima.

<sup>9</sup> Negativni demografski trendovi u Hrvatskoj, među njima starenje stanovništva kako u Hrvatskoj tako i u drugim zemljama bivše Jugoslavije, dodatno su se produbili nakon Domovinskog rata u 1990-ima kada se masovno iseljavaju stanovnici iz ratom zahvaćenih područja. Hrvatski je prostor, i ruralni i urbani, desetljećima bio ugrožen procesima *privodne depopulacije* i intenzivne urbanizacije što ga je učinilo izrazito osjetljivim na demografska kretanja. Uza sve nepovoljne statistike i trendove danas je dobro poznata činjenica u kojoj je mjeri Hrvatska postala opterećena demografskim starenjem (AKRAP, 2015) te je jedna od najstarijih nacija EU-a, što utječe na sve sfere života i rada, a gospodarsku situaciju dodatno otežava.

## RENEWAL POSSIBILITIES FOR HOUSING ESTATES

At the beginning of the 21st century, the socio-economic paradigm that is reflected in the political economy of pluralism, the importance of sustainable development and the interdependence of the market and state stimulated Western and Eastern European countries to get closer (HALL, ROWLANDS, 2005, 50). Therefore, the measures and programs for the regeneration of housing estates can be united under contemporary Europeanisation trends that promote mutual and generally accepted social, demographic, environmental, economic and cultural values that can improve the quality of life in all housing estates, regardless of which part of Europe is in question. Renewal of housing estates is the safest path to preserving the quality of life and housing. That approach would help solve problems that are nowadays encountered primarily in the old housing estates but which are increasingly becoming commonplace in the new ones. The age of buildings and surroundings (neighbourhood) requires new investments in order to achieve energy efficiency and urban sustainability. Population aging as the omnipresent European trend and the change in the social structure reflected by the middle- and higher-class residents moving from the housing estates with declining image and quality of life, both demand an appropriate housing policy response.<sup>9</sup> Population aging has in the socio-demographic sense led to the aging of housing estates in the structural and strategic sense, which therefore demands complex answers. The renewal of large housing estates does not just refer to renewing the buildings; it also requires the renewal (revitalization) of the local economy, local community and the social life in the estate. Therefore, managing, maintaining and renewing large housing estates represents a huge challenge for all European countries (DIMITROVSKA,

<sup>9</sup> Negative demographic trends in Croatia, including population aging, both in Croatia and in other former Yugoslav countries, further deepened after the Homeland War in the 1990s when residents from war affected areas began with the mass exodus. Croatian territory, both rural and urban, has been threatened by the processes of *natural depopulation* and intensive urbanization for decades, which made it extremely vulnerable to demographic trends. Besides all the unfavourable statistics and trends, it is nowadays well known to what extent Croatia has become burdened with demographic aging (AKRAP, 2015), which affects all spheres of life and work, further aggravating the economic situation.

Navodeći mjere kojima se poboljšava kvaliteta života u naseljima T. Tapada-Berteli i W. Ostendorf (2006., 100) razlikuju „mjere koje u fokusu imaju revitalizaciju naselja i mjere koje su usmjerene na redizajn naselja“. Revitalizacijske mjere sadrže elemente poput poboljšanja pojedinačnih stanova, poboljšanja zajedničkih prostora (stepeništa, liftova, ulaza), poboljšanja zajedničkih servisa u zgradama (grijanje i ušteda energije), popravak krovova, fasada, prozora, poboljšanje područja među zgradama, poboljšanje javnih prostora, zelenih površina, igrališta, ulične infrastrukture (namještaja, klupa i sl.). Kada revitalizacijske mjere nisu moguće zbog visokih troškova ili zbog prirode materijala i dizajna, izglednija je radikalna intervencija redizajna naselja odnosno njihovo djelomično ili potpuno rušenje.

D. B. Hess i dr. (2018.) ističu tri načina kojima se može odgovoriti na obnovu stambenih naselja. Prvi, ne intervenirati i pustiti da tržište utječe na promjenu bez velikoga javnog uključivanja. Drugi, potpuno rušenje naselja s razmještajem stanovnika. Moskva je, primjerice, potpuno srušila neka naselja iz 1950-ih i 1960-ih i zamijenila ih modernim stambenim zgradama te time prerazmjestila oko 1,6 milijuna stanovnika. Treći, selektivno rušenje, prisutno posljednje desetljeće u zapadnim zemljama, posebno u Velikoj Britaniji, uspješnije povezuje prve dvije strategije kako bi intervencijama i mjerama poboljšali naselja, kako fizički tako i socijalno. Francuska je vlada, primjerice, mnogo uložila u poboljšanje kvalitete stambenih naselja popravljajući njihovu izgrađenu okolinu (HESS I DR., 2018., 4).

Kontinuirano zanemarivanje i neadekvatni stav prema problemima održavanja i obnove zgrada u stambenim naseljima dovodi do daljnje degradacije, ali i moguće getoizacije starijih naselja iz kojih se iseljavaju pripadnici viših klasa (DIMITROVSKA, SENDI, 2001.). Obnova je stoga ključan aspekt stambene politike kojim se negativne socioekonomske promjene može ublažiti ili čak spriječiti te postići humanije i održivije stambene modele (*human-scale urban models*). Iako postoje različiti modeli obnove u različitim europskim zemljama, važno ih je prilagoditi lokalnom prostoru i lokalnim uvjetima jer ni jedan model nije primjenjiv na sva stambena naselja. Važno je pro-

SENDI, 2001, 235). The previously mentioned *Re-state* study played a significant role and contributed as an example of a pan-European study implemented in different cities and housing estates across Western and Eastern Europe, that examined the possibilities for renewal and actual measures for improving the quality of life in aged and deprived housing estates.

Suggesting the measures for improving the quality of life in the housing estates, T. Tapada-Berteli and W. Ostendorf (2006, 100) distinguish *measures focused on estate revitalization and measures aimed at redesigning the estate*. The measures for revitalization include elements such as improving individual flats, improving communal areas (stairways, lifts, building entrances), improving communal services in the buildings (heating and energy savings), repairing the roofs, façades and windows, improving the areas between the buildings, improving public spaces, green areas, playgrounds, street infrastructure (furnishings, benches, etc.). When these kinds of revitalization measures are not feasible, due to high expenses or the nature of materials and design, then a more radical intervention is more likely, in the form of partial or complete demolition and redesign of the estate.

D. B. Hess et al. (2018) point out three possible ways of responding to the need for renewing housing estates. The first is not to intervene and allow the market to influence the occurring changes with little public involvement. The second is a complete demolition of estates and relocation of residents. For example, in Moscow they opted for completely demolishing several housing estates from 1950s and 1960s and replacing them with modern blocks of flats, causing the relocation of 1.6 million people. The third option is selective demolition, which has been present in many Western European countries in the last decade, especially in the United Kingdom. This option successfully integrates the first two strategies with measures and interventions aimed at improving housing estates, both physically and socially. For example, the French government made large investments in improving the quality of housing estates by upgrading their built surroundings (HESS ET AL., 2018, 4).

However, when there is continuous neglect and inadequate attitude towards the problems of maintaining and renewing housing estate buildings, it causes the process of further degradation and possibly even ghettoization of older estates, from which the mem-

naći tzv. integrativan pristup s pozitivnim učincima (WASSENBERG, 2018., 53).

S druge strane, postsocijalističke zemlje većinom, pa tako ni Hrvatska ni Slovenija kao jedine članice EU-a od bivših zemalja Jugoslavije, još uvijek nemaju stambene strategije ili stambene programe koji bi se sustavno bavili obnovom starijih naselja. U Hrvatskoj je, primjerice, prisutna samo tzv. energetska obnova (fasada, krovova i sl.) putem Programa energetske obnove kojim se starije zgrade uključuje u obnovu (energetsku izolaciju prema višim razredima očuvanja i štednje energije, povećanje učinkovitosti sustava grijanja/hlađenja, korištenje obnovljivih izvora energije i dr.), a putem EU modela koji se koristi bespovratnim sredstvima Europskog fonda za regionalni razvoj. Program provodi Ministarstvo graditeljstva i prostornog uređenja, a u lipnju 2014. Vlada je donijela Program energetske obnove višestambenih zgrada za razdoblje 2014. – 2020.<sup>10</sup> Najčešći su prijelazi iz energetske razreda E u B, dok prosječne godišnje uštede energije za grijanje/hlađenje iznose 66,71 %. Prosječna je starost višestambenih zgrada 49 godina (URL 2). Bez obzira na navedene brojke, velik dio stambenog fonda u Hrvatskoj još je uvijek neuključen u ovaj program obnove jer ne postoji sustavan nacionalni plan i dinamika provedbe koji bi olakšao obnovu svim zainteresiranim akterima (vlasnicima i suvlasnicima stanova i zgrada prije svega). Iako se njime dijelom poboljšavaju stambeni uvjeti i kvaliteta života, on je parcijalan i nedovoljno utječe na cjelokupnu obnovu stambenih naselja u socijalnom i fizičkom smislu. Na obnovu stambenih naselja u fizičkom smislu moglo bi utjecati i kružno gospodarenje prostorom i zgradama,<sup>11</sup> kao i

<sup>10</sup> U siječnju 2017. na prvi poziv Ministarstva pristiglo je 649 prijava, od kojih je 596 zadovoljilo kriterije. Ukupna investicija iznosila je više od milijardu kuna, a 560 milijuna kuna su bespovratna sredstva Europskog fonda za regionalni razvoj. Projektima je uključeno 16 000 kućanstava u 508 obnovljenih višestambenih zgrada (URL 3). Do danas nije bilo novog Poziva za višestambene zgrade za njihovu tzv. energetsku obnovu, a prema Ministarstvu, sljedeći se očekuje 2022. godine i za njega su zainteresirane mnogobrojne zgrade što ponovno pretpostavlja nedovoljna subvencionirana sredstva za sve zainteresirane.

<sup>11</sup> Kružno gospodarenje prostorom i zgradama značajno je kako u planiranju i gradnji novih zgrada, tako i pri revitalizaciji i obnovi postojećih zgrada. To uključuje produljenje trajnosti zgrada, fleksibilne prostore, smanjenje građevinskog otpada te povećanje energetske učinkovitosti zgrada što je u skladu sa Stra-

bers of higher social classes start moving out (DIMITROVSKA, SENDI, 2001). Therefore, renewal is the key aspect of housing policy that can serve to mitigate or even prevent negative socio-economic changes and achieve more humane and sustainable housing models (human-scale urban models). Although there are different renewal models in different European countries, it is important to adapt them to the local space and local conditions because no single model applies to all housing estates. It is important to find the so-called integrative approach that will result in positive effects (WASSENBERG, 2018, 53).

On the other hand, most post-socialist countries, and this includes Slovenia and Croatia as the only EU member states among former Yugoslav countries, still do not have housing strategies or housing programs systematically devoted to the renewal of aging housing estates. For example, Croatia features only the so-called energy-efficient renovation (façades, roofs, etc.) through the Program of energy renovation aimed at including older buildings into the renovation process (energy insulation to achieve higher grades of energy savings, increasing the performance of the heating/cooling systems, use of renewable energy sources, etc.), by implementing the EU model using the grants from the European Regional Development Fund. The program is implemented by the Ministry of Physical Planning, Construction and State Assets, and in June 2014 the Government of the Republic of Croatia adopted the Program of energy renovation of blocks of flats for the period 2014-2020.<sup>10</sup> Most of the buildings in the program transition from the energy class E to B, with average yearly savings of energy used for heating/cooling of 66.71%. The average age of blocks of flats is 49 years (URL 2). Regardless of the given numbers, a large part of the housing stock in Croatia is still not included in this renewal program, because there is no systematic national plan and dynamics of implementation that would facili-

<sup>10</sup> In January 2017, there were 649 applications to the first call to tender of the Ministry, 596 of which satisfied the criteria. The investment totaled over a billion Croatian kuna, with 560 million from the European Regional Development Fund grants. The projects encompassed 16 thousand households in 508 renovated multi-apartment buildings (URL 3). Until today there has been no new call for the so called energy-efficient renovation of multi-apartment buildings, and according to the Ministry the next is expected in 2022. As there is a large number of buildings interested in it, subsidised funding for all will be insufficient.

Program razvoja zelene infrastrukture u urbanim područjima za razdoblje 2021. – 2030. koji se planira usvojiti i koji bi slijedio načela Europskoga zelenog plana.

Nacionalne razvojne strategije trebaju odrediti lokalne i sveobuhvatne programe stambene obnove, razvoj lokalne ekonomije, poboljšanje fizičke okoline u naselju, promet, izgradnju trgovačkih centara, društvene usluge i poboljšanje osobne sigurnosti (DIMITROVSKA, SENDI, 2001., 250-251). U njihovu izradu, analizu i preporuku, ovisno o područjima, trebaju biti uključeni stručnjaci različitih struka (gradski i državni uredi, arhitekti, urbanisti i dr.), ali i stanari i predstavnici suvlasnika koji su najbolje upoznati s postojećim problemima, a sve radi što uspješnije implementacije dugoročnog programa regeneracije naselja i samih stambenih zgrada.

## ZAKLJUČAK

Kvaliteta stanovanja u stambenim naseljima i zapadnoeuropskih i postsocijalističkih zemalja pokazuje potrebu za sustavnom intervencijom i obnovom, posebno na razini starijih stambenih naselja izgrađenih nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata. Obrada zadovoljstva životom u naselju ili susjedstvu te uvjetima koji utječu na zadovoljstvo stanovnika u naseljima pokazuje osjetljivost i kompleksnost te teme koja zahtijeva analizu na razini objektivnih i subjektivnih indikatora kvalitete života. Starost i zapuštenost zapadnoeuropskih i postsocijalističkih naselja i dalje ostaje neriješenim problemom kako u domeni održavanja i obnove zgrada i naselja tako i s obzirom na socioekonomske značajke te cjelokupni dojam naselja. To je i temeljna sličnost ovih dvaju tipova stambenih naselja jer većina nekadašnjih razlika postoji i danas. U zapadnoeuropskim zemljama ogleđaju se u negativnom imidžu naselja koji prate veći socioekonomski problemi, dok je imidž postsocijalističkih

tegitijom niskougličnog razvoja Republike Hrvatske do 2030. s pogledom na 2050. godinu (NN, 63/2021). Ministarstvo prostornoga uređenja, graditeljstva i državne imovine u suradnji s Arhitektonskim fakultetom Sveučilišta u Zagrebu priprema Program razvoja kružnoga gospodarenja prostorom i zgradama za razdoblje 2021. – 2030. godine.

tate the renewal for all stakeholders (first of all owners and co-owners of flats and buildings). Although the program does improve housing conditions and the quality of life in part, it is partial and has insufficient impact on the overall renovation of housing estates in the social and physical sense. In the physical sense, the renovation of housing estates could also be influenced by the circular spatial and building management,<sup>11</sup> as well as formulating the Program of Green Infrastructure Development in Urban Areas for the period 2021-2030, which is in the process of development and adoption and is to adhere to the principles of the European Green Plan.

National development strategies should determine local and comprehensive programs of housing renovation, development of local economy, improving the physical environment in the estate, traffic, construction of shopping centres, social services and improving personal security of residents (DIMITROVSKA, SENDI, 2001, 250-251). Their development, analysis and recommendation, depending on the area they cover, should include experts from different areas (city and state offices, architects, urbanists and others) but also residents and co-owners' representatives who are most familiar with the existing problems. This will greatly contribute to the implementation of the long-term program of housing estates and apartment building regeneration in the best possible way.

## CONCLUSION

The quality of housing in housing estates of both Western European and post-socialist countries shows the need for systemic intervention and renewal, especially in the case of old housing estates built following the Second World War. By clarifying the notion of satisfaction with life in an estate or neighbourhood,

<sup>11</sup> Circular spatial and building management is significant both in planning and constructing new buildings and in the revitalization and renewal of the existing buildings. It includes extending building durability, flexible spaces, reducing construction waste and increasing energy efficiency of the buildings which is in accordance with the Low-Carbon Development strategy of the Republic of Croatia until 2030 with an outlook to 2050 (NN 63/2021). The Ministry of Physical Planning, Construction and State Assets, in cooperation with the Zagreb Faculty of Architecture, University of Zagreb, is preparing the Circular Spatial and Building Management Development Program for the period from 2021 to 2030.

kih nešto pozitivniji uz naseljenost znatno većeg broja stanovnika u odnosu na udjel u stambenom fondu. No tijekom tri desetljeća tranzicije i postsocijalistička naselja bilježe sve više problema i negativnih aspekata života u njima.

U većini postsocijalističkih zemalja nakon procesa privatizacije u 1990-ima dodatno se javlja problem održavanja zgrada i zajedničkog vlasništva u zgradama za koje novi vlasnici stanova često nemaju dovoljno novca. Jedna od posebnih karakteristika stanovanja u Hrvatskoj je visoka stopa vlasništva kao posljedica masovne privatizacije nekadašnjih stanova u državnom vlasništvu početkom devedesetih godina prošloga stoljeća te nedovoljne brige o ostarjelim zgradama i zajedničkom vlasništvu. Problem se dodatno zaoštrava nedosljednim provođenjem postojećih urbanističkih propisa, primjerice gubitkom uloge generalnoga urbanističkog plana. To je dovelo do problema komercijalizacije urbanog prostora i gubitka standarda stambenih naselja te tzv. točkaste gradnje koja često i u novim stambenim lokacijama dovodi do pada kvalitete stanovanja i opremljenosti susjedstva te na kraju i zadovoljstva stanovnika. Taj intenzivni proces stanogradnje od 1990-ih kojim se stambeni fond modernizirao i povećao najčešće je dostupan zaposlenim i višim slojevima stanovništva. Svi oni koji si nove stanove ne mogu priuštiti, stariji i niži slojevi stanovništva, prisiljeni su ostati u starim stanovima, odnosno stambenim naseljima izgrađenima nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata. Intenzivna stambena izgradnja u posljednjih dvadesetak godina stoga je dovela i do promjene socijalne strukture stanovništva gradova (naročito vidljivo na primjeru Zagreba i Splita). Socijalno-prostorna segregacija i diferencijacija stanovnika gradova značajno raste u odnosu na istraživanja iz sedamdesetih godina prošloga stoljeća. Navedeno pokazuje kako je u Hrvatskoj nužno provesti revitalizacijske programe kojima bi započelo sustavnije obnavljanje starijih stambenih naselja.

Uspješan odgovor politike mora uključiti mjere koje rješavaju društvene probleme i pomažu ojačati lokalnu zajednicu ili susjedstvo kako bi se kvaliteta života i stanovanja poboljšala i tako spriječiti negativne socioekonomske aspekte života u stambenim naseljima. Ističe se potreba za donoše-

as well as the conditions influencing the satisfaction of estate residents, we see that this topic is highly sensitive and complex, requiring analysis on the level of both objective and subjective quality of life indicators. The age and decay of West European and post-socialist housing estates continues to be an unsolved issue, both in the domain of building and estate maintenance and renewal, and in regard to socio-economic characteristics, as well as in regard to the overall housing estate image. This is also the fundamental similarity of these two types of housing estates, because most of the one-time differences persist to this day. In Western European countries they reflect in the negative image of the estates, followed by greater socio-economic problems, while the image of the post-socialist ones is somewhat more positive, with housing a significantly higher number of residents in relation to the proportion in the housing stock. However, after three decades of the transition process, even the post-socialist estates show an increasing number of problems and negative aspects of living in them.

In most post-socialist countries, following the process of privatization in the 1990s, there is an additional problem of maintaining buildings and communal property in buildings that the new apartment owners often cannot afford. One of the distinctive characteristics of housing in Croatia is a high rate of ownership, as a consequence of the mentioned mass privatization of former state-owned apartments in the beginning of the nineties, and the insufficiently present aspect of caring for the aging buildings and common ownership. The problem is further aggravated by inconsistent implementation of existing urbanistic regulations, for example by the loss of the role of the General Master Plan. This has led to the problem of commercialization of the urban space and the loss of the housing estate standard, and the so called scattered building that even in the new housing locations often leads to the downfall of the quality and equipment of housing estates and eventually lowers the residents' satisfaction. That intensive process of housing development from the 1990s onward, which modernized and increased the housing fund, is most often available to the well paid and higher classes. All those who are unable to afford new apartments, mostly the elderly and lower classes, are forced to remain in old apartments, i.e. in the housing estates built after the Second World War. Therefore, the intensive housing development of the

njem Strategije stanovanja za Hrvatsku, posebno u skladu s konceptom strategije socijalnog stanovanja, uz potrebu definiranja svih aspekata socijalne intervencije u stambenim izdacima. Javna politika može imati važnu ulogu u smanjenju netransparentnosti i poremećaja na tržištu nekretnina. Tada radikalna obnova stambenih naselja uz različite prateće aktivnosti neće ni biti nužna.

Iz spomenutih i poznatih mjera kojima se bavi europska znanstvena literatura vidljivo je da postoje različite i nejednako radikalne mjere obnove, od onih koje promoviraju revitalizaciju do onih koje promoviraju potpuni redizajn ili rušenje dijela ili čak cijelih naselja. Europski su primjeri poticajni i za naše lokalne prilike i svakako ih se može uzeti u obzir i prilagoditi specifičnom naselju ovisno o starosti, zapuštenosti i stanju u naselju u socijalnom i fizičkom smislu. Pojedina naselja zasigurno zahtijevaju rušenje, a pojedina se mogu obnoviti različitim revitalizacijskim mjerama (poboljšanje energetske izolacije stambenih zgrada, gradnja liftova i pristupa za ugrožene skupine stanovnika, popravljivanje zajedničkih prostora i poboljšanja stambene okoline u smislu opremljenosti javnim uslugama i zelenim površinama i dr.). Time će se i u socijalnom smislu unaprijediti doživljaj naselja, zadržati postojeće stanovnike i utjecati na smanjenje prostorne segregacije. Upravo je u tome ključna uloga nacionalnih programa i strategija koje slijede europske i aktualne stambene trendove proizašle dijelom i iz ovdje spomenutih istraživanja. Tako će se unaprijediti i olakšati obnova starijih stambenih naselja potrebna i određenim hrvatskim naseljima.

last 20 years has also caused a change in the city's social structure (especially visible in the examples of Zagreb and Split). The socio-spatial segregation and differentiation of city residents have grown significantly in relation to the research from the 1970s. Therefore, the revitalization programs in Croatia are necessary to initiate a more systematic renewal of old housing estates.

A successful policy response should include measures dealing with social problems and helping to strengthen the local community or neighbourhood to improve the quality of life and housing and prevent the negative socio-economic aspects of life in housing estates. We see the need for formulating the Croatian Housing Strategy, especially in accordance with the concept of social housing strategy, with the need to define every aspect of social intervention in housing costs. Public policy can play an important role in increasing transparency and reducing disturbances in the real estate market. Then the radical renewal of housing estates with all the accompanying activities will not be necessary.

From the mentioned and known measures detailed in European scholarly literature, it is obvious that there are different and unequally radical renewal measures, ranging from those promoting the revitalization of existing estates to those promoting a complete redesign with the demolition of a part of or even whole housing estates. The European examples are an incentive for our local circumstances and should definitely be considered and adapted to specific estates, depending on their age, state of disrepair and the estate conditions in the social and physical sense. Individual housing estates in Croatia definitely call for demolition, while others can be renewed using different revitalization measures (improving the energy insulation of blocks of flats, installing lifts and improving accessibility for persons of reduced mobility, improving communal spaces and built housing environment in the sense of public services, green areas, etc.). These interventions will also upgrade the estate image in the social sense, retain current residents and reduce spatial segregation. And this is precisely the key role of national programs and strategies following European and actual housing trends resulting in part from the studies mentioned in this article. This will improve and facilitate the renewal of old housing estates, which is really necessary for certain Croatian housing estates.

## LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AKRAP, A. (2015): Demografski slom Hrvatske: Hrvatska do 2051. Panel diskusija – Demografski slom Hrvatske: Hrvatska do 2051., *Bogoslovska smotra*, 85 (3), 855-881.
- ANDRAŠKO, I. (2010): *The Role and Status of Geography in the Quality of Life Research*, <http://www.akademickyrepozitar.sk/sk/repozitar/the-role-and-status-of-geography-in-the-quality-of-life-research.pdf>, 1. 7. 2021.
- BEŽOVAN, G. (1987): Stambena politika u poslijeratnom razvoju, u: *Stambena politika i stambene potrebe*, (ur. Graovac, V.), Biblioteka Iskustva, Radničke novine, Zagreb, 81-90.
- BOLT, G. (2018): Who is to Blame for the Decline of Large Housing Estates? An Exploration of Socio-Demographic and Ethnic Change, u: *Housing estates in Europe: Poverty, ethnic segregation and policy challenges*, (ur. Hess, D. B., Tammaru, T., van Ham, M.), Springer, Dordrecht, 57-74.
- CIRMAN, A., MANDIČ, S. (2012): Slovenia: The social housing sector in search of an identity, u: *Social housing in transition countries*, (ur. Hegedüs, J., Lux, M., Teller, N.), Routledge, New York, 286-299.
- CULYER, A. J. (1992): Commodities, Characteristics of Commodities, Characteristics of People, Utilities, and the Quality of Life, u: *Quality of life – Perspectives and Policies*, (ur. Baldwin, S., Godfrey, C., Propper, C.), London, 9-27.
- CUMMINS, R. A. (2000): Objective and Subjective Quality of Life: an Interactive Model, *Social Indicators Research*, 52, 55-72, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007027822521>
- CUMMINS, R. A. (2003): Normative life satisfaction: Measurement issues and a homeostatic model, *Social Indicators Research*, 64, 225-256, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024712527648>
- DEKKER, K., VAN KEMPEN, R. (2004): Large Housing Estates in Europe: current situation and developments, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 95 (5), 570-577.
- DEKKER, K., HALL, S., VAN KEMPEN, R., TOSICS, I. (2005): Restructuring large housing estates in European cities: an introduction, u: *Restructuring large housing estates in Europe* (ur. Van Kempen, R., Dekker, K., Hall, s., Tosics, I.), University of Bristol, Policy Press, 1-19.
- DEKKER, K., VAN KEMPEN, R., KNORR-SIEDOW, T. (2006): Qualities and problems, u: *Regenerating large housing estates in Europe: a guide to better practice*, (ur. van Kempen, R., Murie, A., Knorr-Siedow, T., Tosics, I.), Urban and Regional research centre Utrecht, pp. 192.
- DEKKER, K., DE VOS, S., MUSTERD, S., VAN KEMPEN, R. (2011): Residential Satisfaction in Housing Estates in European Cities: A Multi-level Research Approach, *Housing Studies*, 26 (04), 479-499, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2011.559751>
- DIENER, E., SUH, E. M. (1997): Measuring Quality of Life: Economic, Social, and Subjective Indicators, *Social Indicators Research*, 40, 189-216, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006859511756>
- DIENER, E., LUCAS, R. E., SCOLLON, C. N. (2006): Beyond the hedonic treadmill: Revising the adaptation theory of well-being, *American Psychologist*, 61 (4), 305-314, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.61.4.305>
- FERRISS, L. A. (2004): The Quality of Life Concept in Sociology, *The American Sociologist*, 35 (3), 37-51, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-004-1016-3>
- FORREST, R., KEARNS, A. (2001): Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood, *Urban Studies*, 38 (12), 2125-2143, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980120087081>
- GROSMANN, K., KABISCH, N., KABISCH, S. (2017): Understanding the social development of a post-socialist large housing estate: the case of Leipzig-Grünau in Eastern Germany in long-term perspective, *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 24 (2), 142-161, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776415606492>
- HERFERT, G., NEUGEBAUER, C. S., SMIGIEL, C. (2013): Living in residential satisfaction? Insights from large-scale housing estates in Central and Eastern Europe, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 104 (1), 57-74, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9663.2012.00727.x>
- HESS, D. B., TAMMARU, T., VAN HAM, M. (2018): Lessons learned from a pan-European study of large

- housing estates: Origin, trajectories of change and future prospects, u: *Housing estates in Europe: Poverty, ethnic segregation and policy challenges*, (ur. Hess, D. B., Tammaru, T., van Ham M.), Springer, Dordrecht, 3-31.
- HALL, S., ROWLANDS, R. (2005): Place making and large estates: theory and practice, u: *Restructuring Large Housing Estates in Europe*, (ur. van Kempen, R. Dekker, K., Hall, S., Tosics, I.), The Policy Press, University of Bristol, 47-63.
- JUKIĆ, T., MLINAR, I., SMOKVINA, M. (2011): *Zagreb – Stanovanje u gradu i stambena naselja*, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Arhitektonski fakultet, Zavod za urbanizam, prostorno planiranje i pejzažnu arhitekturu, Gradski ured za strategijsko planiranje i razvoj Grada, Zagreb, pp. 128.
- KEARNS, A., PARKINSON, M. (2001): The Significance of Neighbourhood, *Urban Studies*, 38 (12), 2103-2110, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980120087063>
- KLEMPIĆ, S. (2004): Razvoj stambenih naselja Splita nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata, *Hrvatski geografski glasnik*, 66 (2), 95-120.
- KLEMPIĆ BOGADI, S., PODGORELEC, S. (2014): Split – na dodiru urbanoga i ruralnoga, u: *Dalmacija u prostoru i vremenu – što Dalmacija jest, a što nije?* (ur. Mirošević, L., Graovac Matassi, V.), Sveučilište u Zadru, Zadar, 191-199.
- KNORR-SIEDOW, T. (1996): Present and future outlook for large housing estates, u: *Environmental improvements in Pre-fabricated Housing Estates*, European Academy of the Urban Environment, Berlin.
- KOVACS, Z., HERFERT, G. (2012): Development pathways of large housing estates in post-socialist cities: an international comparison, *Housing studies*, 27 (3), 324-342, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2012.651105>
- KRIŠTOFIĆ, B. (2015): Kvaliteta života i tranzicija: sociološka rekonstrukcija na primjeru Zagreba, u: *Kvaliteta života u novostambenim naseljima i lokacijama u zagrebačkoj mreži naselja*, (ur. Svirčić Gotovac, A., Zlatar, J.), Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu, 117-147.
- LUČEV, I., TADINAC, M. (2008): Kvaliteta života u Hrvatskoj – povezanost subjektivnih i objektivnih indikatora te temperamenta i demografskih varijabli s osvrtom na manjinski status, *Migracijske i etničke teme*, 24, 67-89.
- MARCIŃCZAK, S., TAMMARU, T., STROMGEN, M., LINDGREN, U. (2015): Changing patterns of residential and workplace segregation in the Stockholm metropolitan area, *Urban Geography*, 36 (7), 969-992, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2015.1012364>
- MEGONE, C. (1992): The Quality of Life – Starting from Aristotle, u: *Quality of life – Perspectives and Policies*. (ur. Baldwin, S., Godfrey, C., Proper, C), Routledge, London, 28-41.
- MIŠETIĆ, A. ŠTAMBUK M., ROGIĆ, I. (ur.) (2004): *Živjeti u Zagrebu. Prinosi sociološkoj analizi*, Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar, Zagreb, pp. 258.
- MUSTERD, S., MARCIŃCZAK, S., VAN HAM, M., TAMMARU, T. (2017): Socioeconomic segregation in European capital cities. Increasing separation between poor and rich, *Urban Geography*, 38 (7), 1062-1083, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2016.1228371>
- NOLL, H. H. (2004): Social Indicators and Quality of Life Research: Background, Achievements and Current Trends, u: *Advances in Sociological Knowledge, Over half a Century*, (ur. Genov, N.), Springer Fachmedien, Wiesbaden, 151-181.
- PARKES, A., KEARNS, A., ATKINSON, R. (2002): What makes people dissatisfied with their neighbourhoods?, *Urban Studies*, 39 (13), 2413-2438, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0042098022000027031>
- PODGORELEC, S. (2008): *Ostarjeti na otoku – kvaliteta života starijega stanovništva hrvatskih otoka*, Institut za migracije i narodnosti, Zagreb, pp. 306.
- PODGORELEC, S., KLEMPIĆ BOGADI, S., GREGUROVIĆ, M. (2020): Stambena integracija imigranata iz BiH u Hrvatskoj: primjer Grada Zagreba, *Geoadria*, 25 (1), 7-28, <https://doi.org/10.15291/geoadria.2891>
- ROGIĆ, I. (1990): *Stanovati i biti. Rasprave iz sociologije stanovanja*, Sociološko društvo Hrvatske, Zagreb, pp. 180.



- SEFERAGIĆ, D. (1993): Kvaliteta svakodnevnog življenja u prostoru, *Prostor*, 1 (2-4), 223-234.
- SIRGY, M. J., CORNWELL, T. (2002): How neighborhood features affect quality of life, *Social indicators research*, 59 (1), 79-114.
- SPEVEC, D., KLEMPIĆ BOGADI, S. (2009): Croatian Cities under Transformation: New Tendencies in Housing and Segregation, *Royal Dutch Geographical Society KNAG*, 100 (4), 454-468, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9663.2009.00552.x>
- SLAVUJ, L. (2011): Urban Quality of Life – a Case Study: the City of Rijeka, *Hrvatski geografski glasnik*, 73 (1), 99-110.
- Stanovi prema korištenju i druge nastanjene prostorije: po naseljima, Popis stanovništva, domaćinstava, stanova i poljoprivrednih gospodarstava 31. ožujka 1991.*, Državni zavod za statistiku, Zagreb, 1995.
- SVIRČIĆ GOTOVAC, A. (2015): New housing estates in the settlement network of Zagreb – community infrastructure, u: *Kvaliteta života u novostambenim naseljima i lokacijama u zagrebačkoj mreži naselja*, (ur. Svirčić Gotovac, A., Zlatar, J.), Institut za društvena istraživanja u Zagrebu, 45-72.
- SVIRČIĆ GOTOVAC, A. (2020): Učinci procesa privatizacije stanovanja u postsocijalističkoj Hrvatskoj, *Geoadria*, 25 (2), 151-176, <https://doi.org/10.15291/geoadria.3083>
- SIRGY, M. J., CORNWELL, T. (2002): How neighborhood features affect quality of life, *Social indicators research*, 59 (1), 79-114.
- TAPADA-BERTELI, T., OSTENDORF, W. (2006): Improving the built environment, u: *Regenerating large housing estates in Europe. A guide to better practice. Restate*, (ur. Van Kempen, R., Murie, A., Knorr-Siedow, T. Tosics, I.), Urban and Regional research centre Utrecht, 97-108.
- TURKINGTON, R. (1996): The Renewal and Redevelopment of Large Scale Housing Estates: High-rise for the Twenty First Century? Keynote paper presented to the European Network for Housing Research Conference, 26-31 August, Helsingor, Denmark.
- URL 1, *Popis stanovništva, kućanstava i stanova 2011. Stanovi prema načinu korištenja*, Državni zavod za statistiku, Zagreb, 2017., [https://www.dzs.hr/Hrv\\_Eng/publication/2016/SI-1586.pdf](https://www.dzs.hr/Hrv_Eng/publication/2016/SI-1586.pdf), 15. 2. 2021.
- URL 2, *Energetska obnova višestambenih zgrada*, Ministarstvo prostornoga uređenja, graditeljstva i državne imovine, <https://mpgi.gov.hr/o-ministarstvu-15/djelokrug/energetska-ucinkovitost-u-zgradarstvu/energetska-obnova-zgrada-8321/energetska-obnova-visestambenih-zgrada-8323/8323>, 16. 7. 2021.
- URL3, I. Androić Brajčić, *Energetska obnova, dosadašnja iskustva i prilike za budućnost*, Ministarstvo graditeljstva i prostornog uređenja, 2019., [https://mpgi.gov.hr/UserDocsImages/EUFondovi/2019\\_12\\_4\\_Konferencija/1\\_MGIPU\\_Dosadasnja\\_iskustva\\_i\\_prilike\\_za\\_buducnost\\_IAB.pdf](https://mpgi.gov.hr/UserDocsImages/EUFondovi/2019_12_4_Konferencija/1_MGIPU_Dosadasnja_iskustva_i_prilike_za_buducnost_IAB.pdf), 15. 7. 2021.
- VAN GENT, W. P. C. (2009): Estates of Content: Regeneration and Neighbourhood Satisfaction, u: *Mass Housing in Europe: Multiple Faces of Development, Change & Response*, (ur. Van Kempen, R., Musterd, S., Rowlands, R.), Palgrave, Hampshire, 77-100, [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230274723\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230274723_4)
- VAN KEMPEN, R., DEKKER, K., HALL, S., TOSICS, I. (ur.) (2005): *Restructuring large housing estates in Europe – restructuring and resistance inside the welfare industry*, Policy Press, University of Bristol, pp. 392.
- VEENHOVEN, R. (1997): Advances in the Understanding of Happiness, *Revue Québécoise de Psychologie*, 18, 267-193.
- VEZILIĆ STRMO, N., DELIĆ, A., KINCL, B. (2013): Uzroci problema postojećeg stambenog fonda u Hrvatskoj, *Prostor*, 21 (2), 340-349.
- WASSENBERG, F. (2018): Beyond an ugly appearance: understanding the physical design and built environment of large housing estates, u: *Housing estates in Europe: poverty, segregation and policy challenges*, (ur. Hess, D. B., Tammaru, T., van Ham, M.), Springer, Dordrecht, 35-55.