

- [2] Besides retail contents, some shopping centres in the USA integrate city-building contents, such as theatres, churches, hotels etc. (Strong, 2003)
- [3] A simulacrum is a copy, imaginary condition (act), which appears real (Baudrillard, 1999).
- [4] Urban locales as defined by Hočvar (2000) are places with intentionally or unintentionally constructed events that occur in open or closed public spaces and private places with public access. The placed temporary or permanent situational settings increase their attractiveness and stimulate involvement in the place's issues. Hočvar (2000) describes urban locales as a unity of functional, symbolic-signifying and formal-design dimensions of performative action and a certain pattern of social (re)production of space in the city.
- [5] Form follows function.
- [6] The investors of modernist architecture for office and administrative buildings, developed in the 1950s in the USA, were large corporations. They represent the framework of capitalist operation, while social orientation is being lost.
- [7] Form follows finance.
- [8] In the same year the National agency for safeguarding monuments produced a conservation document with inventory and categorisation of cultural monuments in the Koper town core. The document was produced by dr. Cerk, dr. Komelj, dr. Sedej, dr. Šumi and dr. Zadnikar. The inventory contained the building stock of the town core with topographic treatment of monuments and most important urban places. It covered the territory of the historical town core and housing estate Semedela, still under development at the time.
- [9] The facade of the new primary school on Bonifika, which replaced Mihevc's modernist one, carries a political manifesto. Its front facade bears the share of support for the present local government and word »Thanks«. A public building has become the bearer of the present government's political will.

List of figures:

- Figure 1:** Example of incompatible linkage of contents by the nature reserve in Koper – the shopping mall and town prison share a common parking lot. (Foto: Grögl, 2004)
- Figure 2:** Based on division of programmes, urban locales are designed in various city quarters (Source: Bugarič, 2006)
- Figure 3:** The silhouette of the Koper town core in time. (Source: Guček, 2000)
- Figure 4:** Proposal for the rehabilitation of the Koper town core and proposal for new development. (Source: Guček, 2000)
- Figure 5:** Simulation of the Koper townscape based on the development of the consumer city. (Source: author)
- Figure 6:** Mihevc's skyscraper demolishes scales in the old town core. (Photo: Grögl, 2004)

For literature and sources turn to page 11.

Translated by Ivan Stanič.

Aleksander Jakš

Ljubljana – Phases of Urban Development

1. Introduction

The emergence of the first settlement (Emona) on the territory of the present Ljubljana was conditioned by its geographical position near the Ljubljanica river and between Polhograjsko hribovje (*the Polhov Gradec Highlands*) and Posavsko hribovje (*the Posavje Highlands*).

Because of its defensive character the town was a long time spatially limited. In 1800 Ljubljana had around 10.000 inhabitants. The tearing down of the last ramparts towards the end of the 18th century was very important for the development of Ljubljana as it was liberated from the medieval bonds. The town began to spread and the number of inhabitants increased rapidly. The town seeped into the nearby suburbs that became a part of it (e.g. Spodnja Šiška, Trnovo, Vodmat) and in the year 1948 the town had nearly 100.000 inhabitants. Agricultural land separated the town from other nearby settlements which are now an integrating part of the Municipality of Ljubljana. Around 25.000 inhabitants lived in those settlements which equated to a quarter of the population of the town itself. Altogether, the 1948 Census enumerated 123.149 inhabitants on the territory of the Municipality of Ljubljana. Morphologically speaking, Ljubljana was a compact town with 100.000 inhabitants and a fairly clear boundary line between itself and neighbouring settlements. Then commenced the development of the modern, present-day Ljubljana which began to expand, and the town limits are ever more difficult to determine since urbanisation altered the nearby settlements. Urbanised landscape expands especially along radial motorways and reaches far into the territories of other communes.

After the World War II the development of Ljubljana went through characteristic phases of urban development:

- urbanisation
- counter-urbanisation
- reurbanisation

Ljubljana developed similarly to other European capitals in the periods of industrialisation and deagrarianisation. Growth of towns was initially conditioned by industrialisation, and an ever-faster deagrarianisation after World War II sped up the growth of towns and urbanised their surrounding areas. Greater population mobility (traffic) made suburbanisation possible. The following two phases were not so distinctive in Ljubljana and have practically still been going on simultaneously. But we can denote counter-urbanisation as an escape from town because of the cost of life (lodging), which means that the cost of municipal services has exceeded the effects of the city-building activities. Reurbanisation, however, is a process brought about consciously in order to restore values as well as life into towns.

As for Ljubljana we can say that in the first two phases it developed by the book. The third phase manifests itself clearly in migrations from the town, but it hasn't reached the phase of physical degradation of individual town sections.

As the counter-urbanisation process has not produced its worst outcomes, a significant reurbanisation is not possible either, given that there are no extensive old and completely run down urban areas where a new town within town might be built. The last two processes have been less marked, but very important for further development strategies of Ljubljana.

2. Urbanisation

Until the beginning of industrialisation it was characteristic of European towns to be physically fairly well separated from the rest of the country. Industrialisation didn't change it to a greater extent as the first factories were set up inside towns, and the same held true for the population. Industrialisation contributed to the growth of towns but eventually it began to represent a spatial impediment to their development. Towns were still fairly well separated from their surroundings. Ljubljana experienced another thrust towards industrialisation immediately after the World War II even though it has never been a markedly industrial town.

Higher standard of living and the development of agriculture have produced a very intense deagrarianisation of the countryside which has enabled urbanisation. Urbanised landscapes have emerged and characteristic physical separation of towns from their surroundings has faded away. The urban way of life and work has rapidly expanded out of towns while the construction accompanying this urban sprawl has no longer had the typical urban character.

The height of buildings has lowered outward from the town centre to reach the ground floor at the edge which is by no means a typical urban construction. Due to large influx of new population huge residential neighbourhoods have begun to rise on the edge of towns. Height of their buildings has exceeded even the tallest buildings in the urban core. Even greater disharmony has been caused by new office buildings which have found no place in urban cores. The city's townscape has also been significantly modified.

The most intense and characteristic process of urbanisation of Ljubljana took place from the end of the World War II onwards until approximately 1980. During the first phase Ljubljana gained people due to internal migration from the Slovenian countryside. After the war the number of inhabitants increased largely even in the town centre, populated by new residents of the nationalised bourgeois apartments and villas. But first large blocks of flats were built, too (Litostrojski bloki).

The first post-war period in Slovenia was characterised by concentration of population at the level of the republic, and numerically speaking, Ljubljana gained the most in this period. The construction of blocks of flats outside the city centre continued, and some surrounding settlements also increased the number of their inhabitants. The number of inhabitants increased from 141.340 in 1953 to 170.505 in 1961. In Slovenia then followed a period of concentration of population at the regional level, and the influx of the rural population to Ljubljana somewhat slackened. Nevertheless the growth of Ljubljana did not slow down since ever more intense immigration from ex-Yugoslav republics began. The number of inhabitants amounted to 218.081 by 1971. In the middle of the seventies the number of inhabitants doubled with respect to 1948 and amounted to 265.355 inhabitants in 1981.

In Ljubljana, especially at Šiška, Moste and Bežigrad, some very large residential neighbourhoods were built, which gave a new character to the town. However, the nearby surroundings also urbanised rapidly and some old settlements began to disappear. In Ljubljana the process of cityzation has started already in the sixties and the number of inhabitants of the town centre (after a short post-war growth) has initially diminished and then begun to reduce rapidly. In the seventies this process has to a smaller extent affected also the remaining compact parts of the town. The ascending of tertiary and quaternary activities has started, too.

In twenty years Ljubljana practically gained 100.000 new inhabitants. This period is characterised by the so-called »socialist neighbourhoods«. Due to very small dwellings their emergence solved a lot of housing problems, but now we question ourselves about their future. The problem is not only small dwellings but also unnormally high densities and lacking adequate infrastructure.

It was first of all the young people at the beginning of their career who would move in Ljubljana. Today this population massively enters the retirement age. Ljubljana has an unnormally high share of elderly people and thus »pays back« its fast development in the sixties and seventies.

3. Suburbanisation

We cannot distinguish between phases of urban development by dates, nevertheless the changes characteristic for Slovenia as well as for Ljubljana began to occur around 1980. Immigration into Slovenia from the ex-Yugoslav republics began to slacken. Developing tertiary and quaternary sectors of economy drastically cut the need for male workforce and immigration favoured female workforce. Decline in women's fertility was, however, detectable back in the seventies, but the consequences began to show only later. Birth rate dropped to under 30.000 a year, and dropping stopped at a little less than 18.000 after the year 2000. It's also characteristic of Ljubljana that the construction of big residential neighbourhoods came relatively quickly to a complete halt.

The process of suburbanisation has begun already in the time of urbanisation, but it reached more or less only the areas along radial motorways. The process gained momentum when Ljubljana stopped building large residential neighbourhoods. Building a one-family house as close to the town as possible emerged as one of the most cost-effective possibilities of residence in Ljubljana, which also permitted the use of the public urban transport. This is why construction was tied to major radial routes where the public passenger transport already ran.

Motorisation gave suburbanisation full swing. Pricewise a car was becoming ever more accessible and prices of fuel presented a negligible cost. Commuting to work each day became a life-style, morning and afternoon rush hours shape commuters' lives as well as those of the inhabitants of Ljubljana. Daily commuting has developed to such a degree to determine traffic regime in Ljubljana.

Suburbanisation has profoundly transformed the outskirts of Ljubljana. Ljubljana has begun to swallow the neighbouring settlements and at the same time the best agricultural

land, reservoirs of water, etc. have been built upon. In the final phase the onetime suburbia have not only lost their basic function and morphological characteristics but even names and with them an important part of the local identity. People have no longer been concerned about their village, their characteristics, but have lightheartedly succumbed to the pressure from the new residents. The villagers namely could have »profitably« sold their fields, grassland and gardens for building plots. With the money they have got they have destroyed their onetime farmhouses and added house extensions to their suburban artisanal and proletarian villas with a mixture of tastes from all around the world (from garden dwarfs to corinthian pillars to garden pavilions to futuristic forms in glass and steel).

The number of inhabitants of Ljubljana has not notably increased after 1981 as suburbanisation was in a great measure connected with the people moving from the city centre and older suburbs. Immigration, which still existed, was markedly oriented towards sites with no public energy, waste and water infrastructure and so typical squatter settlement were growing on the town's edge. Fortunately, the pressure wasn't very strong and municipal authorities finally managed to stop such developments also by regularising settlements, connecting them to utilities etc. It is a matter of course that the architecture of these houses is »ennobled« by numerous extensions, garages, artisanal shacks and similar.

It was characteristic of this period that Ljubljana was spreading out in an amorphous way. More solid constructions were erected only alongside radial routes and in areas close to previously existing settlements while in the midst of them abusive properties and real shanty towns could be found. Stricter urban planning regulation and enhanced control began to mitigate the most negative aspects of such sprawling of Ljubljana. But the housing problem in Ljubljana remained unsolved. Renewing residential dwellings in older town sections costs very dear, there's little social housing, and prices of building lots for individual construction projects were rocketing. The logical response to such a situation was moving out and constructing in more remote areas (for example at Grosuplje, Logatec and practically in all Ljubljana's edge areas), thereby spreading suburbanisation ever farther from Ljubljana. The logical consequence of such a development was also the beginning of recession of the town itself, suffocated by the lack of younger population and overwhelmed by daily commuters who have flooded all town streets, pavements, parks, and courtyards (wherever the access has not been barred).

The institution of the new local self-government in 1994 has substantially decreased the expanse of Ljubljana with regard to the municipal territory. Statistically speaking, the number of the inhabitants of Ljubljana has substantially declined as all migrations to the edge of the town have become intra-communal while in the past period they were not recorded at all as they were occurring inside the municipality. Since it has been an intense process over the past years, we may already speak about the process of counter-urbanisation.

4. Counter-urbanisation

Counter-urbanisation is a process derived from suburbanisation, but we may also conceive it as its source. The processes are conditioned by each other, they only take place

at different locations. Suburbanisation means migration to the former countryside, and steady moving from towns triggers more or less significant counter-urbanisation. Both processes have a negative connotation.

From 1995 to 2005 the Municipality of Ljubljana (MoL) experienced a net loss of 17.500 inhabitants. So many more people moved out than moved in. These data hold true only for the Slovenian citizens. As for foreigners Ljubljana records a positive balance which, however, is not very high. Altogether there are 12.000 foreigners living in Ljubljana (holding permanent or temporary residence permits). Among them 85% come from the area of ex-Yugoslavia and only 6% from the European Union. The unnormal gender proportion indicates this is not a population group planning their life in Ljubljana because 75% of foreigners are males. It is above all the young who are moving out, which is particularly critical in view of the already »aged« Ljubljana. Only 13,2% of Ljubljana's population is younger than 14 years, while 17,8% of inhabitants are older than 65 years. The national average percentage of young people is 14,2% whilst it's 15,5% for the elderly. But among all those who moved from Ljubljana there was 18% of young people and only 7% of the elderly. Already today, nearly every fifth inhabitant of Ljubljana is older than 65 years and if this development continues it will soon be one out of four. In the 1998-2002 period alone Ljubljana experienced a loss of more than 1.200 highly educated inhabitants on account of the neighbouring communes. It's an unpleasant fact that young and educated families are moving from Ljubljana. Migration from Ljubljana has other negative consequences, too, one of them being an irrational land use. A simple theoretical calculation shows that 17.500 inhabitants mean 6.500 households, and if a building lot measures 1.000 m² it means 650 ha of surface in ten years. These inhabitants would use up (in nine-floor buildings with the density of 150 inhabitants/ha) less than 120 ha of surface in a high density area. We may say that such a development is just as much questionable from the national point of view. Besides dispersed construction makes organisation of the suburban public transportation difficult.

We may claim without any doubt that in regard to demographical changes Ljubljana is undergoing a classical process of counter-urbanisation. Considering the extent of the loss of people from this migration it is not only manifest in the age, educational and social structure of the population but also in the dereliction of individual residential buildings and entire neighbourhoods. But the young people who are moving out keep their jobs in Ljubljana, and so step up the daily commuting (also to schools) which results in Ljubljana losing green spaces and even central town squares to car parks. The full-fledged capitalism has additionally affected the central part of the town. We may speak of the emergence of de-urbanization. Shopping malls at the edge of the town have literally devastated all supply activities in the town (with the exception of tourist shops and activities). While cityization shifted the residential function to a non-residential one and thereby enlivened the town, the present process is different. It has caused the disappearance of nearly all daily supply functions which have served the people who still live here. One of the phases in the urban development of Slovenia was markedly characterised by suburbanisation, which was evaluated as a negative (unwanted) model of development. Reasons lie above all in extensive use of land, difficulties with the provision of infrastructure services, particularly the communal ones (energy, waste and water infrastructures),

and in the emergence of an urbanised townless landscape. Presently we face a similar phenomenon on the wider edge of Ljubljana, the difference being that a partially urbanised countryside has been suburbanised by Ljubljjaners.

This new suburbanisation has all the weaknesses of the previous one if we exclude the joy of the new communes due to the fast development and increasing number of inhabitants. But these communes are still to receive invoices for the building of kindergartens, schools, shops and numerous other activities claimed by modern urbanised population. Many communes will have to cross new infrastructure thresholds as they will not be able to infinitely stretch the existent communal infrastructure, but will have to provide for a new one (new sources of water, capacities of electric mains and transformers, water treatment plants, waste management etc.). Migrations from Ljubljana are markedly dispersed and in no way conducive to creation of new urban centres in the neighbouring communes. The neighbouring communal centres (for example Vrhnika, Domžale, Grosuplje) have gained absolutely nothing in the sense of construction and design of a modern town. In most cases it is all about expansion of former large villages (e.g. Mengeš, Trzin, Škofljica, Brezovica, Medvode itd.) which are large only by the number of inhabitants and keep spreading out on agricultural land.

Such a regional development makes traffic regulation in Ljubljana and in the region even more difficult. We have to realise that people who move to areas with an easy access to Ljubljana refuse to build houses on even cheaper building plots at more remote locations first of all because they have jobs in Ljubljana. Given the prevalence of young families it means that Ljubljana has gained over 10.000 new daily commuters in the past ten years. But they are far from living in areas with an appropriate urban density that might offer transport systems other than private cars.

The process of counter-urbanisation in Ljubljana has not developed to such an extent as was the case with some big cities where entire neighbourhoods or large industrial areas have been abandoned (e.g. London's docks) since Ljubljana is a relatively small town according to European standards. Nevertheless the consequences of a long-lasting process of especially young families moving out have already been clearly apparent in Ljubljana, too. And the inhabitants of the urban core have also been heavily affected by the shutdown of small convenience stores. It is only logical then that we attempt to carry out the re-urbanisation of Ljubljana.

5. Reurbanisation

Reurbanisation is a process that Ljubljana has already been in part undergoing now although it has not yet managed to restrain counter-urbanisation and suburbanisation. Generally speaking, reurbanisation expresses a wish to revive the town by prompting the population to come back (or at least stop moving out) into old urban cores which would also mean the return of all supply functions.

We may say that reurbanisation is a very wished for process, but an extremely expensive one. Preservation of architectural heritage in its original form is in itself a very demanding (costly) task, but wishing at the same time to transform interiors into living spaces in accordance with modern times makes the task even more demanding. If we have solved the money

problem, we still have to tackle another issue which is how to bring back to town the urban retail activities that only can really revive it. After de-cityzation which has almost entirely destroyed urban retail activities and has »made us happy« by setting up shopping giants on former Ljubljana's fields, a time for re-cityzation should follow. This again poses the problem of profitability and high prices of commercial property in the town centre. While counter-urbanisation was a spontaneous process and a response of the population to the housing shortage in town (due to unacceptable prices), and a consequence of intrusion of the classical capitalism (malls), reurbanisation is not a spontaneous process, it must be consciously encouraged. At least in the first phase reurbanisation requires considerable financial resources for regeneration, and on the other hand we are faced with a loss of money due to selective tax policy towards tenants. The result should be a regenerated town centre, with numerous permanent residents, offering good daily retail supply as well as high quality services and products as it is becoming to a European capital. Finally, it should restore profitability to the town centre.

Reurbanisation is a more or less conscious, planned process attempting to reverse the negative consequences of excessive outbound migration of especially young population. It tries to improve residential conditions of an aged housing stock and give back to town retail supply as well as high quality services and products. It may be said that Ljubljana has achieved a certain success especially with regard to regeneration whilst it has not yet managed to restrain outbound migration as 1.500 inhabitants (citizens) more moved out than moved in Ljubljana in 2005.

6. Conclusion

In a few words we may say that urbanisation has built up Ljubljana, suburbanisation has spread it out, counter-urbanisation has especially impoverished its core, reurbanisation should restore new values to the town.

At present Ljubljana's biggest problem is still the outbound migration of population, which occurs in the first place due to an acute housing shortage. Housing renewal contributes a lot to a nicer aspect of the town, but the housing problem can only be solved by the housing development. It is needed not only because of immigration but above all for the sake of the inhabitants who already today live in town but in dysfunctional and too small dwellings. According to the estimate I produced in 2004 Ljubljana was short of 40.000 dwellings (for inhabitants residing in Ljubljana) not considering substantially higher standards of the EU 15 as to the surface and number of rooms per household member.

Negative outcomes of migrations from Ljubljana also show in communes bordering on the town where we are confronted with a completely uncontrolled housing development, a kind of secondary suburbanisation accompanied by all the negative consequences impacting the town (especially the amount of daily commute to and from work) as well as the immigration areas (unurban construction and communal infrastructure thresholds).

An impediment to the development of Ljubljana as an important regional and state centre can also be identified in the present local self-government which has divided the Ljubljana metropolitan area in numerous communal »feuds«

pursuing their own local policies. In order to ensure a more quality growth of the town and region, the Ljubljana urban region should as soon as possible become a full-fledged entity. Any further development undoubtedly requires the elaboration of a Spatial Development Strategy for the central Slovenian region and the elaboration of a Spatial Order for the Municipality of Ljubljana area and at least other 14 neighbouring communes.

Aleksander Jakoš, geographer and history professor,
Urbanistični inštitut RS/Urban Planning Institute of the Republic
of Slovenia, Ljubljana
e-mail: aleksander.jakos@uir.si

For literature and sources turn to page 17.

Translated by Studio Phi.

Matjaž URŠIČ

Modernisation of transport during the period of industrial urbanisation – a rich legacy or burden of trends in increasing mobility in Slovene cities

1. Introduction – increasing mobility as acceleration of city development

Cities aren't »machines for living« as Le Corbusier described, but 'machines' with capacity to control flows, which can, on the basic level, be distinguished into internal or inter-urban and external flows.

Internal flows are those of people, goods, information, that circle between public/private spaces in cities, while external flows can be simply described as interactions between the city and immediate/wider surroundings. The history of cities is closely knit with possibilities for maintaining and mastering these flows since they determine development and complexity of the urban structure.

Mumford (1969) finds that the first towns actually »crystallised« out of the possibility of controlling flows of people, goods and capital. Places of exchange and trade or retail quickly emerged, which represented crossings of flows and furthermore intertwined with towns as spatial concentrations of social product surplus. Concentration of flows in towns generated suitable spatial organisation, which furnished safeguarding of the condition. Harvey (1973: 240) adds that if »there is no geographical concentration of social product

surplus, then there is no urbanism«. Therefore places that don't offer places of exchange or points of concentration, which could stimulate or maintain internal and external flows, there is no differentiation of labour, surplus product or adequate density of people ready to trade and there is also no complex spatial urban development, which could generate new places needed to maintain the circle of exchange of goods and capital.^[1]

The birth, expansion and development of cities have their fundaments in processes that stimulated external and internal flows i.e. ensured mobility of people, which was the rationale driving development of commerce and capital in cities. The article predominantly deals with analyses of certain types of mobility or physical mobility of people in cities and urban regions, but doesn't go into detailed accounts of other types of mobility (e.g. housing mobility, social mobility etc.). From this aspect, mobility pertains to the possibility of moving people between various places and locales (Handy, Niemeier, 1997), where certain activities unfold (e.g. place of work and residence, places of consumption, culture etc.).

The major significance of mobility for urban development is mirrored in development of urban service functions, which enable economic development of cities and safeguard established mechanisms of production and exchange. Administration, policing, tax collection, utilities services and similar institutions grow complementary to city growth. The more cities grow historically speaking, the more differentiation occurs in urban services and collective, common services, which cities need to maintain and operate themselves and foster further growth. Accordingly Castells (1977: 460) finds that cities are not only places of production, but at their most basic level function as spaces of organised consumption or places of »collective consumption«, mostly implying various services and infrastructure amenities provided by the urban authority for »reproduction of energy, knowledge and labour force«. (1977: 460-462)^[2] Establishment of suitable systems of public transport, schools, hospitals, shops and other infrastructure (roads, railroads, electrification, housing, water supply, telephone lines etc.), enables faster, more efficient operation of the city and entire social system. Thus cities evolve into organised systems of conditions, which enable adequate mobility of people, transfer of goods and exchange of information, all leading to increased capital and further spatial development.

Castells' concept of collective consumption illustrates how city authorities constantly strive for such spatial organisation, which can ensure faster growth of capital in cities. For this purpose, especially in the period of intensive industrialisation, the drive for increasing mobility in cities was strongly supported. Greater mobility should condition stronger flows of people, goods and information, thus also faster accumulation and growth of capital in cities.

2. Modernisation of transport during the period of industrial urbanisation – from collective transport modes to individualised transport

When we speak about intensive industrialisation and industrial urbanisation, we above all imply processes unfolding in the second half of the nineteenth century and continuing