

OŽIVITI POLJANE: DRUŽBENA POVEZANOST IN SKUPNOSTNI PROSTOR

POLJANE REINVENTED: SOCIAL COHESION AND COLLECTIVE SPACE

- Blaž Križnik

129

Trajnostno mesto in novi javni prostor sta osrednji temi zadnje izdaje *Europana*. Vendar bi radi na tem mestu pokazali, da je potrebno razpravo o trajnostnem mestu in novem javnem prostoru prevesti v bolj operativne koncepte, kot so družbena povezanost, skupnostni prostor ali identitetne politike, če želimo dejavno sodelovati v razpravi o prihodnjem razvoju Poljan, *Europanova* lokacije v Sloveniji, kakor tudi o vsakodnevni izkušnji Ljubljane nasploh.

Globalizacija in informatizacija družbe in gospodarstva sta spremenili naš način doživljanja mest v vsakdanjem življenju, kakor tudi način njihovega razumevanja. Vidimo, da čeznacionalni procesi na eni strani prevzemajo, kar je bilo nekoč domena nacionalnega družbenega, gospodarskega in političnega življenja. Vendar pa kljub nekaterim drugačnim napovedim nacionalne države na drugi strani niso povsem izgubile svojega pomena, kot tudi ni povsem upadel pomen lokalnih prizorišč. Prav nasprotno smo danes na nacionalni in lokalni ravni priče preobrazbe starih družbenih in prostorskih oblik, ki sledijo novim razvojnim smerem, pri čemer se preoblikujejo uveljavljeni odnosi in ustvarjajo novi pomeni. V času, ko postaja svet medsebojno vse bolj soodvisen in povezan, posamezniki, družbene skupine, mesta ali celotne družbe še nikoli niso imeli toliko različnih priložnosti za oblikovanje lastne, enkratne in razločljive prihodnosti. Prav zato sociologi ugotavljajo, da je za današnjo

Sustainable city and new public spaces are the main topics of the latest edition of *European*. We want to argue, however, that the debate about sustainable city and new public space needs to be translated into more operational concepts such as social cohesion, collective space or identity politics in order to become relevant for the future development of the Poljane area, the *European* site in Slovenia, and for the everyday experience of Ljubljana in general.

Globalisation and the informatization of society and the economy have changed the way we experience cities in our everyday life and also how we understand them today. On the one hand, we see transnational processes taking over what used to be the national domain of social, economic and political life. Yet on the other hand, national states have not yet lost their importance; nor have localities completely disappeared, as some have predicted not long ago. On the contrary, we can observe the transformation of old social and spatial forms at national and local levels, which are now taking new directions of development, rearranging hierarchies and acquiring new meanings. While the world is becoming more and more interdependent and unified, there have never been so many possibilities open for individuals, social groups, cities or even societies to create their own unique and particular futures. Sociologists therefore describe our time as being characterized by the unity of the contradictory processes of globalisation and individuation.¹

družbo značilna enotnost nasprotij procesa globalizacije in individuacije.¹

V tem kontekstu postajajo mesta prizorišča, kjer se globalizacija in individualizacija vzajemno odražata v svojih najbolj skrajnih oblikah, medtem ko sočasno delujeta na najbolj neposreden in nepredvidljiv način. Nacionalne in čeznacionalne strukture, kot so denimo nacionalno in čeznacionalno gospodarstvo, politični sistem, tehnološko in medijsko okolje ali globalna civilna družba, tako vse bolj neposredno vplivajo na mesta ali celo na soseske. Brez poznavanja delovanja in upravljanja mest na višjih ravneh družbeno-prostorske organiziranosti je tako vse težje govoriti o razvoju na lokalni ravni. Mesta so namreč vse bolj samostojni gospodarski in politični akterji, ki s ciljem zagotavljanja boljšega konkurenčnega položaja na globalnem tržišču in bolj prepoznavne podobe v mednarodni skupnosti pogosto tekmujejo med seboj. Zato mesta enostavno niso le žrtve globalizacije, ampak predstavljajo okolje, kjer se globalni tokovi ljudi, blaga, kapitala in kultur dejansko lokalizirajo, izkoriščajo in trošijo. Prav mesta so torej motorji globalnega gospodarstva, ki svetovni red proizvajajo vsaj v tolikšni meri, kot so sama njegova posledica. Rastoče družbeno razslojevanje, gospodarske neenakosti ali omejevanje političnih pravic v današnjih mestih tako pogosto ni samo nezaželena posledica oddaljenih globalnih sil, ki naj bi bile domnevno zunaj lokalnega dosega, ampak so posledica delovanja *razvojnih koalicij*, ki jih sestavljajo lokalne politične in gospodarske elite.

Kako torej razumeti vprašanje trajnostnega mesta in novega javnega prostora v okviru vedno večje tekmovalnosti mest, ki se globalizirajo, in posledičnega družbenega in gospodarskega razslojevanja, ki ga prebivalci teh mest doživljajo v vsakdanjem življenju?

In such a context cities have become places where globalisation and individuation are taking their most extreme forms, while at the same time interacting in the most direct and unpredictable ways. Cities or even neighbourhoods are thus increasingly influenced by national and transnational structures, such as the national and global economies, political systems, technological and media space, or global civic society. It is therefore immensely difficult to talk about development at local level without having some knowledge of how cities are managed at higher levels of socio-spatial organization. That is to say, cities have become increasingly autonomous economic and political agents, often competing with each other in order to achieve a better competitive position in the global market and a more recognizable image within the international community. In this sense, cities are not simply affected by globalisation. In fact, they are the very places where global flows of people, goods, capital and cultures are localized, explored or consumed. Cities are thus the engines of global economy, reproducing the global order as much as they are affected by it. In contemporary cities, emerging social polarization, economic inequalities or denied political rights are often not only an undesired consequence of distant global forces supposedly beyond local control, but the very consequence of urban policies and developments implemented by *growth coalitions* of political and economic elites.

How can we position issues of sustainable city and new public space against the backdrop of increasingly competitive and globalising cities and resulting social and economic polarisation experienced by their citizens in everyday life?

Let us examine first what sustainable city and new public space are supposed to mean. Both concepts are much contested, sometimes proposing even contrasting meanings. We have neither space nor an intention to enter those debates here, and a brief

Poglejmo najprej, kaj naj bi trajnostno mesto in nov javni prostor dejansko pomenila. Oba koncepta namreč nista povsem enoznačno opredeljena in v nekaterih primerih označujeta celo nasprotno pomene. Vendar pa v zvezi s tem nimamo niti prostora niti namena, da bi se spuščali v bolj podrobno razpravo, zato bo morala zadostovati zgolj bežna opredelitev. Trajnostno mesto je v splošnem opredeljeno z vidika celovitega in uravnoveženega urbanega razvoja, pri katerem naj bi bili gospodarski, družbeni in okoljski stroški rasti enakomerno porazdeljeni med različne družbene in gospodarske skupine v mestu. V zadnjem desetletju so se namreč številna mesta, ki se globalizirajo, pričela zavedati, da neomejena gospodarska rast dolgoročno ne zagotavlja večje konkurenčnosti niti ne izboljšuje kakovosti življenja na lokalni ravni. Lokalno opredeljene urbane politike zato niso več prepoznane kot pristop, ki bi zaviral hitrejši gospodarski razvoj mest, ampak vse bolj kot priložnost, ki tak razvoj dopolnjuje. V številnih evropskih mestih se tako vse pogosteje udeležujejo različne alternativne in tako imenovane post-razvojne strategije trajnostnega razvoja in upravljanja na lokalni ravni, ki se osredotočajo na revitalizacijo lokalnega gospodarstva in trga delovne sile, povečanje družbene povezanosti in razvojnovih oblik političnega vključevanja in lokalne demokracije. Politični vidik trajnostnega mesta je postal tesno povezan s političnimi inovacijami v procesu upravljanja mest, katerega glavni cilj je povezati različne interese in akterje

overview of the state of affairs should suffice. The sustainable city is generally approached in terms of integrated and balanced urban development, with the economic, social and environmental costs of growth equally distributed among different social and economic groups within it. During the last decade many globalising cities have become aware that unrestricted economic growth is neither the way to sustain long-term global competitiveness, nor to improve the quality of local life. Thus locally oriented urban policies are no longer seen as approaches opposing economic dynamism, but rather as contributing to it. Various alternative and so-called post-developmental strategies of sustainable local development and management have been practiced in cities around Europe, whereas a particular attempt has been made to revitalize the local economy and labour market, strengthen social cohesion and solidarity, and develop new ways of local political participation and self-management. The political aspect of the sustainable city has been closely related to political innovation, which brings together a variety of actors and interests from the public, private and civic sectors through the process of urban governance. Some have started to talk about sustainable cities as *slow cities*, emphasizing a different pace that local everyday life takes on local level compared to the excessive hustle and bustle of business and financial centres.²

On the other hand, the recent debates about public space in cities are mainly characterized by concerns

v javnem, zasebnem in civilno-družbenem sektorju. Nekateri so tako začeli o trajnostnem mestu govoriti kot o *počasnem mestu*, da bi tako poudarili razliko v hitrosti med vsakdanjim življenjem na lokalni ravni in pretirano naglico poslovnih in finančnih središč.²

Po drugi strani pa se nedavne razprave o javnem prostoru in mestih večinoma ukvarjajo z njegovo privatizacijo in fragmentiranjem. Večje varnostne zahteve in gospodarski interesi so med glavnimi razlogi za vse številnejše omejitve glede rabe, reprezentacije in institucionalne samostojnosti javnega prostora. Hkrati pa lokalna uprava v mestih vse težje zagotavlja prostorsko povezanost tradicionalnih javnih prostorov in novih projektov, ki jih poganja zasebni kapital. Nekateri opazovalci zato opozarjajo, da mesta, ki se globalizirajo, v tem pogledu vse bolj zaznamuje protislovje med globalnim *prostorom tokov* in lokalnim *prostorom krajev*.³ Tretja skrb, povezana s spremembami javnega prostora, naj bi bila predvsem posledica prvih dveh in predpostavlja, da bo javni prostor v pogojih globaliziranja mest izginil. Vendar se zdi takšna predpostavka nekoliko pretirana. Nedavne zahteve glede pravice do mesta, ki jih postavljajo nova družbena gibanja in tako imenovane *post-tradicionalne skupnosti*, kot so protiglobalizacijska gibanja, gibanja za enake možnosti, lokalne ali življenjsko-stilske skupnosti, prav nasprotno kažejo, da se javni prostor v mestih stalno vzpostavlja na novo, preoblikuje in tvori nove oblike in pomene. V tem smislu je novi javni prostor daleč od izginotja in postaja namesto tega enostavno vse bolj raznolik in hibriden.⁴

Kakšna je potem lahko vloga novega javnega prostora v trajnostnem mestu? Je mogoče razmišljati o upravljanju javnega prostora kot o orodju, s katerim lahko na lokalni ravni dosežemo in vzdržujemo trajnostni razvoj mesta?

related to its their privatisation and fragmentation. Security concerns and economic interests are among the main reasons that ever-stronger restrictions are placed upon the use, representation and institutional autonomy of public space. At the same time, it is increasingly difficult for local administrative bodies to maintain the spatial coherency of traditional public spaces and private, capital-driven urban developments. Some observers therefore describe globalising cities as being characterised by structural contradictions between the global *space of flows* and the local *space of places*.³ The third concern about public space, which is often seen as a consequence of the previous two and claims that public space is about to disappear, seems somewhat exaggerated. There is actually little evidence indicating the demise of public space - on the contrary. Recent claims to rights to the city that are raised by new social movements and so-called *post-traditional communities*, such as anti-globalisation groups, equal-opportunity movements, local or life-style communities, show that by being constantly reinvented, public space in globalising cities is simply taking new forms and meanings and is far from disappearing.⁴ Instead, new public space is becoming more diverse and hybrid.

What is then the expected relation between the sustainable city and new public space? Is it possible to conceive of the management of public space as an instrument to achieve and maintain sustainable development at local level?

In addition to the widely-known relations between public space, the urban economy and the environment - focusing on environmentally sound urban management, mixed land use, the promotion of public transport, the protection of the natural and cultural heritage, or alternative energy use, for instance - let us propose another approach here, one that relates emerging public space in globalising cities to concerns about their social cohesion.

Poleg sicer znanih povezav med javnim prostorom, mestnim gospodarstvom in okoljem, ki denimo opredeljujejo okoljsko vzdržno upravljanje mest, mešano rabo prostora, povečevanje javnega prevoza, zaščito naravne in kulturne dediščine ali rabo nadomestnih virov energije, želimo na tem mestu predlagati pristop, ki nove oblike javnih prostorov povezuje s težnjami po povečevanju družbene povezanosti v mestih. Čeprav je tudi družbena povezanost eden izmed pogosto ne povsem jasno opredeljenih konceptov, pa postaja vse bolj prisotna v razpravah o prihodnosti evropskih mest. Širše sprejeta opredelitev predpostavlja, da je na eni strani zaradi individuacije, nenehnega tehnološkega razvoja in kulturnih sprememb, kot tudi zaradi slabljenja socialne države na drugi strani, družbena povezanost naše družbe in mest v primerjavi s preteklostjo vse manjša. Zato postaja v tem pogledu, kot smo že pokazali, povečevanje družbenepovezanosti eden glavnih ciljev prevladujočih urbanih politik, ki skušajo na lokalni ravni zagotoviti trajnostni razvoj mest. Sam koncept družbene povezanosti naj bi poudarjal tudi potrebo po skupnih vrednotah in pomenih, neformalnem družbenem nadzoru, enakosti in solidarnosti med posamezniki oziroma posameznimi družbenimi skupinami. Različni dejavniki družbene povezanosti naj bi bili povezani z močnejšimi socialnimi vezmi, ki se razvijajo znotraj družine oziroma med sorodniki, sosedi, prijatelji, sodelavci in podobno. Kot viri družbene povezanosti imajo pomembno vlogo tudi *lokalna prizorišča*, saj ta ostajajo

Although social cohesion is also a contested concept, it is nonetheless increasingly present in debates about the future of European cities. There is a widely-held assumption that, due to individuation, recent technological development and cultural changes, and the parallel decline of welfare state, our societies and cities are losing social cohesion, especially compared to the past. In this sense, as we have already seen, improving social cohesion has become one of the main goals of mainstream urban policies trying to achieve sustainable development at local level. The concept itself is intended to emphasize the need for shared values and meanings, informal social control, equality and solidarity between individuals and different social groups. The various domains of social cohesion are a consequence of apparently stronger social relations developed within the family or between relatives, neighbours, friends, co-workers etc. *Localities*, too, have a rather important role as sources of social cohesion, because they are likely to remain the main sites for many of our mundane routines, which are believed to reproduce cohesive society. Neighbourhoods in this case are, perhaps, the most proximate form of socio-spatial organization to offer not only material support for everyday practices, but also represent cognitive and symbolic structures for individuals or communities. They are also important sources of ontological security in our society. Collective space, as the most direct spatial expression of everyday practices in neighbourhoods, is therefore the main instance where our personal

osrednji kraji številnih naših vsakodnevnih rutin, ki naj bi vplivale na močnejšo družbeno povezanost. Soseske kot morda najbližja oblika družbeno-prostorske organiziranosti mest imajo vlogo ne le materialne opore vsakdanjega življenja, ampak za posameznike in skupnosti predstavljajo tudi spoznavne in simbolne strukture. Ob tem so hkrati pomemben vir ontološke varnosti v družbi. Skupnostni prostor kot najbolj neposreden prostorski izraz vsakdanjega življenja v soseskah tako predstavlja središče oblikovanja naših osebnih in skupnih identitet kot tudi kraj, kjer kot posamezniki doživljamo mesto. Poleg tega je skupnostni prostor kraj, kjer posameznik postane občan, zaradi česar je skupnostni prostor v samem središču identitetnih politik in lokalne demokracije.

Na vprašanja o trajnostnem mestu lahko torej v celoti odgovorimo le, če prepoznamo družbeni in politični pomen skupnostnega prostora v mestih. Pokazali smo, da je skupnostni prostor kot oblika javnega prostora tesno povezan tudi z vsakodnevno izkušnjo sebe, soseske in mesta. Kot takšen lahko ima pomembno vlogo kot del urbanih politik, katerih cilj je večja družbena povezanost in trajnostni razvoj mesta na lokalni ravni. Ob tem pa lokalna prizorišča, o katerih govorimo v povezavi z družbeno povezanostjo v mestih, niso romantični kraji iz daljne preteklosti, ampak so, kot smo opozorili na začetku, hibridni in družbeno vključujoči prostori kulturne izmenjave, ki so odprti tako za globalne vplive, kot so rezultat različnih lokalnih tradicij in kulturnih praks. Poleg tega, da so predmet urbanih politik, pa so lokalna prizorišča tudi kraj intenzivnega družbenega in političnega delovanja od spodaj. Namesto o *izginevanju sosesk* sociologi v primeru preobrazbe lokalnih prizorišč danes raje govorijo o *ponovni oživitvi sosesk*.⁵

Je torej mogoče ponovno oživiti Poljane kot živo sosesko z razločljivo lokalno kulturo in bogatim

and shared identities are created and maintained, and where we experience the city as individuals. Furthermore, it is here that individuals become citizens, which brings collective space to the centre of identity politics and local democracy.

Debates about the sustainable city can therefore be answered only partially, unless we acknowledge the social and political importance of collective space in cities. We have shown that collective space, as a particular form of public space, is closely related to the everyday experience of the self, neighbourhood and city. As such, it can play an important role in urban policies that aim at stronger social cohesion and sustainable development on the local level. Yet we also should not forget what was said at the beginning - the localities that we are talking about in relation to social cohesion are not the romantic places of a distant past, but hybrid and socially inclusive places of cultural exchange, open to global influences as much as they are the result of different local traditions and cultural practices. Besides being a focus of urban policies, localities can also be places of intensive bottom-up social and political action. Instead of the *neighbourhood lost* argument, sociologists now explain the transformation of localities in terms of *neighbourhood reinvented*.⁵

So is it possible to reinvent Poljane as a lively neighbourhood with a distinct local culture and a rich social and economic life, while at the same time contributing to a more sustainable development of Ljubljana in general?

During the heyday of early urbanization, many undesired yet necessary urban services and industries in Ljubljana were sited around the Poljane area, which was conveniently situated next to the old city, whilst still outside of what used to be perceived as Ljubljana at that time. Later, when the city expanded beyond its

družbenim in gospodarskim življenjem, ki lahko sočasno prispeva h trajnejšemu razvoju Ljubljane kot celote?

V času herojskih dni zgodnje urbanizacije Ljubljane so bile številne nezaželene a hkrati nujne mestne dejavnosti in industrija umeščene na območju Poljan. Slednje so se pripravno nahajale v neposredni bližini starega mesta, a vendarle dovolj daleč od Ljubljane, kot so jo dojemali v tistem času. Ko se je mesto razširilo preko svoje najbližje soseščine, so bile Poljane pozabljene in marginalizirane, kar je postopoma pripeljalo do njihovega družbenega in gospodarskega nazadovanja in okoljskega razvrednotenja. V zadnjem času, ko se Ljubljana sooča s hitrejšo gospodarsko rastjo in razvojem mesta, je območje ponovno pridobilo veljavo. Kljub temu pa se zdi, da so ujete med svojo herojsko preteklostjo in prihodnjimi priložnostmi Poljane v tem trenutku bolj kot za svoje prebivalce zanimive za nepremičninske vlagatelje. V takšnem položaju je Mesto Ljubljana izbralo Poljane kot natečajno lokacijo, kjer naj udeleženci Evropana razmislijo o njeni mogoči prihodnosti in predlagajo nove pristope glede njenega razvoja. Brez poglobljanja v podrobnosti natečajnih predlogov lahko tako ugotovimo, da je odgovor na zgornje vprašanje nedvomno pritrdilen. Čeprav gre za zelo različne urbanistične in arhitekturne predloge, se namreč zdi, da med večino udeležencev natečaja vendarle obstaja *soglasje* o vlogi in pomenu skupnostnega

immediate surroundings, Poljane was forgotten and marginalized, which consequently led to the social and economic deprivation of the area and its environmental degradation. Recently, Ljubljana has been experiencing faster economic and urban growth, and Poljane has again gained a certain attention in the city. Yet, caught between its heroic past and future opportunities the area seems to offer more to real-estate investors than inhabitants at the moment. In such a situation the City of Ljubljana has selected Poljane as a site to be explored by European participants in order to imagine possible futures for the area and to propose innovative approaches for its coming development. Without going into more detail, a general overview of European proposals submitted definitely suggests an affirmative answer to the question posed above. Although different urban schemes and architectural plans have been proposed, it seems that the majority of participants share a certain *consensus* regarding the role and meaning of collective space for the future of Poljane, which also confirms our initial assumptions.

In conclusion, let us summarise some of the points related to collective space as they are defined by the proposals of European participants.

- Collective space is important as a spatial form mediating between the public and private domains of local life, contributing in this way to stronger social cohesion in Poljane and Ljubljana in general.

prostora za prihodnost Poljan, kar med drugim potrjuje tudi naše uvodne predpostavke.

Zato lahko v sklepu povzamemo nekatere poudarke, povezane s prihodnjo vlogo skupnostnega prostora, kot jih opredeljujejo natečajni predlogi Europeanovih udeležencev.

- Skupnostni prostor ima pomembno vlogo kot prostorska oblika, ki na lokalni ravni posreduje med javnim in zasebnim in na ta način prispeva k večji družbeni povezanosti Poljan in Ljubljane nasploh.
- Obroben položaj Poljan ni pomanjkljivost, ampak je možen vir novih kulturnih praks in izrazov.
- Prihodnji značaj Poljan ne bo odvisen samo od monumentalne urbane preobrazbe, ampak mora biti povezan tudi z ukrepi malega merila in povezovanjem zgodovinske dediščine, skupnih spominov in vsakodnevnih praks v novo sosesko. V primeru takšnega razvoja bo skupnostni prostor postal pomemben vir individualnih in skupnih identitet.
- Zgodovina Poljan in njene reprezentacije ne smejo biti privatizirane, ampak se morajo vključiti v skupno izkušnjo bodoče soseske in mesta nasploh.
- Različni skupnostni prostori morajo biti dostopni z javnim prevozom. Nove kolesarske steze in pešpoti morajo povezati Poljane z okoliškimi soseskami in pospešiti družbeno in urbano integracijo soseske v mesto.

Nedavne študije kažejo, da se večina prebivalcev Ljubljane še ne srečuje z družbenim razslojevanjem, gospodarskimi neenakostmi in omejevanjem političnih pravic. Prav tako se zdi malo verjetno, da bo imela globalizacija podobno močan učinek na družbeni, gospodarski in urbani ustroj Ljubljane kot v drugih večjih evropskih mestih. Kljub temu pa smo videli, da globaliziranje mest ni povezano samo z globalnimi pritiski, ampak

- The peripheral position of Poljane is not a weakness, but a possible source of new cultural practices and expressions.
- The future character of Poljane will depend not only on monumental urban restructuring. It must be also be related to small-scale restoration and the integration of historic remnants, collective memories and everyday practices into the new neighbourhood. If such development is exercised, the collective space will become an important source of individual and shared identities.
- The history of Poljane and its representations should not be privatised, but integrated into the shared experience of the future neighbourhood and the city in general.
- Different collective spaces must be accessible by public transport. New cycling and pedestrian routes should reconnect Poljane with the nearby neighbourhoods and foster its social and urban integration into the city.

Recent studies show that the majority of Ljubljana's inhabitants have not yet been confronted with social polarization, economic inequalities or denied political rights. It also seems unlikely that global restructuring will have a similarly profound impact on social, economic or urban structure of Ljubljana as it has on other larger European cities. Yet we have already seen that the globalisation of cities is not only a matter of global pressures, but also about local responses to the former. In this sense there is no evidence that the political or economic elites in Ljubljana are able or willing to react differently to the new challenges and opportunities of globalisation than those in other globalising cities. Therefore the question of the social and environmental costs of globalisation should be taken seriously in the case of Ljubljana as well. Poljane area gives the city an opportunity to take the pace of a slow city, where priority is given to sustainable development on the local level over large-scale urban restructuring.

tudi z lokalnimi odgovori nanje. V tem primeru tako nimamo zagotovil, da bodo lokalne politične in gospodarske elite v Ljubljani ukrepale drugače, kot so v sorodnih mestih. Zato je potrebno tudi v primeru Ljubljane vzeti resno ugotovitve o naraščajočih družbenih stroških globaliziranja mest. Preobrazba območja Poljan omogoča, da Ljubljana izbere pot počasnega mesta, kjer ima na lokalni ravni trajnostni razvoj prednost pred preobrazbo velikega merila. Europanovi natečajni predlogi so v tem smislu že napovedali prihodnost območja in opozorili na pomen skupnostnega prostora za bodoči razvoj Poljan kot žive soseske z razločljivo lokalno kulturo in bogatim družbenim in gospodarskim življenjem. Vendarle pa zaenkrat ostaja odprto, ali je transformativen potencial takšne lokalno opredeljene preobrazbe dovolj velik, da lahko sproži tudi širše družbene, gospodarske in urbane spremembe v mestu.

The Europan proposals have already anticipated a possible future for the area by emphasizing in this way the increasing importance of collective space for the coming development of Poljane, reinvented as a vibrant neighbourhood with a distinct local culture and rich social and economic life. Whether the transformative potential of the proposed locally-based development of Poljane is strong enough to trigger larger social, economic or urban changes is yet to be seen.

--

- 1 Scott Lash, John Urry (1994): *Economies of Signs & Space*. London: Sage Publications.
- 2 Heike Mayer, Paul L. Knox (2006): *Slow Cities: Sustainable Places in a Fast World*. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28 (4/2006).
- 3 Manuel Castells (1997): *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- 4 Jordi Borja (2003): *La Ciudad Conquistada*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- 5 Graham Day (2006): *Community and Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.

--

- 1 Scott Lash, John Urry (1994): *Economies of Signs & Space*. London: Sage Publications.
- 2 Heike Mayer, Paul L. Knox (2006): *Slow Cities: Sustainable Places in a Fast World*. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28 (4/2006).
- 3 Manuel Castells (1997): *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- 4 Jordi Borja (2003): *La Ciudad Conquistada*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- 5 Graham Day (2006): *Community and Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.