

is essentially financial incapacity of the tenants to (co)finance the rehabilitation. The poll results namely indicate that approximately just one-third of the respondents are financially capable to finance the maintenance of the neighbourhood at a higher level and the rehabilitation.

12. A missed implementation of the rehabilitation probably means a moving out scenario involving the respondents who can afford it. It also means that vacancies will be occupied by financially less successful new tenants or that especially smaller dwellings will be intended for letting, which is not a novelty in the neighbourhood now.
13. Without carrying out a complete rehabilitation accompanied by appropriate credit facilities, we assume, assessing the tenants potential for maintenance and renovation, that in the next decade the quality of maintenance will decline and consequently property value in the neighbourhood will reduce correspondingly. The disgruntled residents of a neighbourhood in the process of decay, will then be blockading through rejection and protests every inclusion of the neighbourhood into overall rehabilitation projects by the Municipality of Ljubljana.
14. Considering the results of the survey and the analysis of the interviews with the residents at the workshop, we suggest a gradual implementation of the rehabilitation whereby the initially renovated parts of the neighbourhood would act as a motivating force acquiring sympathies for the rehabilitation of the remaining not yet renovated parts.
15. In our view the quartet of apartment buildings in Črtomirova Street (n° 2, 3, 4 and 5) would be an acceptable and manageable initial block to be rehabilitated. According to the statements made by the tenants' representatives the residents of the said block already consider the necessity to regenerate the facades and harmonise the glazing of their balconies. Therefore we suggest that the Municipality of Ljubljana help to implement a thorough rehabilitation of this block by means of credit facilities and co-financing. Besides it would be necessary to first tackle the parking problem on the corner of Vilharjeva and Topniška streets which is most densely inhabited and has the most of the stationary traffic.

Assist. prof. dr. Franc Trček, Ph.D., sociologist, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of social sciences, Ljubljana
E-mail: franc.trcek@fdv.uni-lj.si

For sources and literature turn to page 35.

*Translated by Studio Phi, d.o.o., Ljubljana
(studio.phi@volja.net)*

Matjaž URŠIČ

Changing the quality of living and housing (residential) mobility in Ljubljana:

Increase of social instability in larger housing estates?

1. Urbanisation and the dynamics of residential mobility of the inhabitants of Ljubljana after World War 2

The highest growth of urban population in Slovenia was seen at the end of the seventies of the 20th century. Despite the detached or private housing type prevailing in suburban areas of the bigger cities (Ljubljana, Maribor), which represented a more readily available ^[1] and cheaper way of fulfilling housing needs due to inclusion of own labour, materials and in most cases also own land, socially organised construction of multi dwelling housing estates in the cities represented was important factor in the after-war urbanisation process in Slovenia.

Social housing construction ^[2] was especially intensive in the cities where individual building was significantly restricted by lack of building plots and nationalisation of land. For this reason the portion of newly built communal dwellings – flats in the former five municipalities of Ljubljana annually reached between 60% and 90% (Rebrnik, 2002: 464). Construction of communal housing started to decrease after 1985, with another turning point occurring after Slovenia gained independence in 1991. The decrease of social housing construction should be attributed to the abandoning of the existing Housing financing system (1989), introduction of the new Housing Bill (1991) that opened the possibility of privatisation of the housing stock and the increase of »profit-based« market-oriented housing construction.

The legacy of intensive construction in the period 1960–1985 is the quantity of dwellings – flats in relatively large housing estates that today in most cases need renovation. As the property market is coming alive the differences in quality of living in older, not renovated housing estates as opposed to the newly constructed ones, becomes even more important. There is a real danger that the decrease of the quality of living will be accompanied by the moving out of economically stronger groups of residents and consequently decrease of the socially heterogeneous makeup and therefore increase of social instability (concentration of socially weaker social groups) in some of the bigger housing estates in Ljubljana. In this context we used a public opinion research to analyse how changes in the quality of living in larger housing estates affect housing mobility and readiness of the inhabitants to relocate.

Housing mobility, described in this paper as intra-urban relocation of the population with the aim of assuring better living environment, was low in the period just after the Second World War.^[3] That period was mostly marked by rural-

urban migrations (de-agrarisation and relocations from the countryside to cities) while intra-urban migrations were rare. In the period after independence (1991) the share of the intra-urban migrations slightly increased, but is still low when compared to other economically developed western countries.^[4] Higher housing mobility is in part frustrated by low dynamics on the Slovene residential property market, where lack of offer of residential flats persists, and specific socio-cultural factors pointing at relatively low mobility of the Slovene population and its high esteem of flat/dwelling ownership. Slovenia is among those European countries that have an extremely high share of privately owned dwellings (according to the 2002 census data this share is 92%) while in the most public opinion researches the ownership of a dwelling is valued very highly and defined as one of the most important lifetime goals. In the Re-Urban Mobil (2004) as much as 89% of interviewees marked dwelling ownership as one of the more important aspects of living in urban areas.

While the period between 1950 and 1990 was characterised by a relatively diverse class structure in Slovenian cities, the period after independence was marked by growing class segregation and socio-demographic homogenisation, the embryo stage of »gentrification« (Downs, 1981; Hamnett, 1984; Smith, 1996). We can presume that in the forthcoming years the process of growing economical and social differentiation among individual social groups will notably influence the dynamics of urban development of Ljubljana and other townships in Slovenia. Because of social transformations in urban areas there are emerging notable differences in maintenance of buildings, in their use, modernisation and last but not least the adequacy of dwellings for specific social groups. Especially notable are processes of suburbanisation of the countryside in the surroundings of Ljubljana and socially selective settlement of urban areas, revealing a new dynamics of space evaluation.

2. Residential mobility as an indicator of residential quality of a neighbourhood

The lack of housing/flats in Ljubljana significantly hinders residential mobility. As a consequence there is a growing trend of population moving to suburban areas and countryside. Since inhabitants are unable to find suitable residences or residences that would correlate to their lifetime goals and »value expectations« (Golledge, Stimson, 1997) inside the city they opt for moving to surrounding areas.

There«s a variety of motives conditioning the people«s wish to relocate to other areas. Basically people are moving in accordance with their own cost-benefit analysis of living in particular area. Among other Sako Musterd and Roland Goetgeluk (2005) have identified three important motives that influence people«s decision to move to a different living environment. They are primarily related to adapting to different life or career paths and therefore attempting to organise their time and space in the most suitable way. The first motive is the course of education and career, the other household career and the third, housing career. Here it has to be noted that one of the careers usually acts as a relocation trigger and asserts itself as a motive. Other careers are involved as accompanying conditions and are integrated in the context of relocation motive. Careers are therefore interconnected even though they differ in importance within

the decision making process. Moving into a certain housing unit/flat is thus (according to Musterd and Goetgeluk (2005) described as »strategic choice that combines all career activities of all members of the household in time and space«.

Education and career related motives can force the user to dwell in a certain environment on the short term. On the other hand certain events related to operation of the household (e.g. marriage, decision for cohabitation, divorce) can lead to faster relocation into other housing unit/flat. Other motives that are related to desire to upgrade one«s living standard and/or progress in the housing career work slower and only rarely relate to moving within a one year period. Pacione (2003: 192, 193) warns that factors influencing the decision to move are often unforeseen and irrational events that have no direct relation to one«s life career. Such unexpected elements in decision for/against are: social and cultural norms, access to information about relocation possibi-

Tables 1 and 2: In which housing area in Ljubljana or surroundings would you prefer to live if you could choose freely? (first table); which housing area would be at the bottom of your preferences? (second table)

Table 1

Pogoj	Skupaj (%)
Vič	3,8
Bežigrad	3,0
Rudnik	0,9
Šiška	1,9
Center	46,8
Murgle	2,8
Rožna dolina	10,9
Kodeljevo	1,1
Moste	0,6
Trnovo	10,5
okolica Tivolija	0,6
Krakovo	0,9
okolica Ljubljane	4,7
Prule	7,1
Polje	0,2
Tacen	0,2
Grad	0,2
Podutik	0,9
Koseze	1,1
Črnuče	0,6
Barje	0,6
Sostro	0,2
Vrhovci	0,4

Table 2

Pogoj	Skupaj (%)
Vič	2,2
Bežigrad	2,7
Rudnik	0,8
Šiška	5,7
Center	6,7
Murgle	0,3
Štepanjsko naselje	8,1
Kodeljevo	0,5
Moste	18,9
Fužine	41,0
Trnovo	1,1
okolica Lj.	3,5
Rakova Jelša	1,6
Polje	0,5
Novo Jarše	1,9
Zalog	1,6
Koseze	0,3
Črnuče	1,1
Barje	0,8
Sostro	0,5
Tomačevo	0,3

Source: (2004) Re-urbanisation of housing areas in city nuclei (common research project Re-Urban Mobil): Final Report, Ljubljana, Faculty of Social Sciences and Mestna občina Ljubljana (Urbanism Department)

* Re-Urban Mobil research (2004) included only households in Ljubljana city centre (N=593).

lities, individual or personal characteristics (attitude towards risks) etc. Especially social and cultural habits can to a large degree cause incongruence among relocation motives and actual people's behaviour. What causative connection is there between cultural patterns, habits and wishes to relocate or how people »read« these signals cannot always be explained with rational causes. This is well illustrated by unjustified stigmatisation of particular neighbourhoods/housing estates in Ljubljana (Table 1 and 2) which are despite their relatively high housing and living standards regarded as less valuable and unpopular areas (e.g. Fužine, Moste).

The process of choosing housing location can be conceptualised as a product of stress caused by inconsistency between household needs, expectations and aspirations of household members and factual quality of living environment. When stress surpasses the boundary values or threshold, up to which the individual household members are able to tolerate living conditions in the neighbourhood, the pressure becomes intolerable and the household has to implement one of the possible measures. In doing so the decision making process or cost-benefit calculation first centres on the question whether it is better to stay and attempt to improve living conditions or to relocate. In the context of stress, included among »costs« of living at certain location, are also the time spent and efforts needed for execution of everyday activities, such as travelling to work, shopping, attending school or kindergarten etc.

Residential mobility is therefore a sum of all elements that, apart from career activities of all the household members and physical characteristics of the neighbourhood (the quality of living environment), also include unexpected or irrational individual events and motives of inhabitants. Through analysis of public opinion surveys in individual residential areas of Ljubljana we shall analyse readiness of their inhabitants to relocate and search for reasons or motives leading them to such decisions. In doing so we shall also try to distinguish some irrational elements or perceptions of inhabitants about living quality in Ljubljana neighbourhoods/housing estates that could influence residential mobility and changing of socio-spatial structure in the future. The possibility of increase in residential mobility warns us that changes are happening in the social structure of neighbourhoods (housing estates) and as such represents an indicator of living quality in the neighbourhood. But to define more precisely the changes that are emerging and how these changes are influencing the future development of the city further analysis of specific residential characteristics of neighbourhoods as seen by inhabitants is needed. Through the analysis of their responses about residential characteristics of neighbourhoods (housing estates) we shall conclude what should be the consequences of changing the present social structure of population and in what direction (degradation/revitalisation) are larger housing areas in Ljubljana developing.

3. Analysis of changes in residential quality and potential residential mobility in selected estates in Ljubljana

In continuation we shall first analyse the changing of residential quality and potential residential mobility or readiness of inhabitants in the broader Ljubljana area to relocate. For

this purpose some data will be shown that indicates possible reasons for relatively high potential residential mobility of the population in several housing estates in Ljubljana. That will be followed by detailed analysis of a case of changes in residential quality and potential residential mobility in the housing estate Savsko naselje.

3.1 Potential residential mobility in multi-apartment housing estates in Ljubljana

The research about the attitudes of housing estate dwellers in Ljubljana (Rebernik, 2002) towards their living environment showed that inhabitants of older estates more often or with more persuasion expressed their desire to relocate from the estate. The research included nine housing estates that were mostly constructed in the period before independence with the exception of estates Bežigranski dvor and Nove Poljane, built after 1991. Interviewees from older estates such as Litostrski bloki (built in the fifties of the 20th century), Na jami and Savsko naselje (from the sixties) and Bratov Babnik (eighties) expressed to a higher degree their discontent with their residences and desire to move their household (Table 3).

Table 3: Evaluation of the suitability of residence and potential residential mobility.

Blokovske Housing estate	Share of households dissatisfied with their apartment (%)	Share of households planning to move (%)
Litostrski bloki	26	39
Na jami	28	42
Savsko naselje	29	35
Bratov Babnik	39	46
Nove Fužine	25	46
Brilejeva	24	36
Trnovski pristan	23	26
Bežigranski dvor	22	25
Nove Poljane	10	12

Source: Rebernik, Dejan (2002). Urban-geographic research of blocks of flats / housing estates as an element of urban planning. Geography and its application possibilities / Melik days, Portorož, 27. and 28. September 2002, Geography Department, faculty of philosophy, Ljubljana, page 463-475.

In older estates (built before independence) the share of households dissatisfied with their residence varies between 23% in Trnovski pristan and 39% in the Bratov Babnik estate, the latter having also the highest share of households planning to relocate (46%). Households most satisfied with their residences are to be found in new housing estates: Bežigranski dvor and Nove Poljane (22% and 10% respectively) where there is also the lowest share of households considering relocation (25% and 12%). Such a result is understandable since newer estates provide for higher residential standard than older ones. Furthermore Rebernik (2002: 469) also concludes that the key reasons for dissatisfaction with residence that appear most often are: unsuitable size of the residence, unsatisfactory quality and to lesser extent: location, bad rapport with neighbours, noise and lack of privacy. Those complaining about the size of resi-

dence are most often families with children while the undesirable structure of neighbours is mostly expressed by dwellers of older estates that need renovation (Litostrojski bloki, Savsko naselje, Na Jami).

Table 3 illustrates that the share of households planning to relocate is often higher than that of households unsatisfied with their residence. Results show that aspiration for better housing standard is often suppressed on account of desire or need of a residence that offers some kind of a short term advantage (e.g. lower price rent of the residence, location, accessibility of the work place etc.). We talk about households that generally aren't discontented with their residence, but for different career reasons (course of education, work career, expanding family) plan on long term relocation to another residence. It has to be noted that residential mobility of tenants is also strongly influenced by ownership of the residence/flat. Consequently higher residential mobility is more characteristic for those renting and younger households than for older inhabitants (ibid.).

Data on potential residential mobility of population in chosen Ljubljana housing estates warns that in the future there may occur a remodelling of the socio-geographical makeup that may cause gradual degradation of living quality in bigger housing estates. That may eventuate especially in case of continuing relocating of younger and middle generations outside the city because of inadequate housing standards. Here an important role will be played by the offer of housing on the residential property market and renovation of housing estates that could improve dwelling conditions for the mentioned groups of inhabitants. In continuation we shall examine in more detail motives for relocation on the example of the housing estate Savsko naselje and attempt to define the mechanisms that could diminish outflow of certain population groups and decrease the possibilities for further social homogenisation of housing estates typified by multi-apartment housing blocks.

3.2 Potential residential mobility in the housing estate Savsko naselje.

The data about potential residential mobility in the housing estate Savsko naselje (research: Renovation of housing estates in Ljubljana - Savsko naselje (Kos, Trček, 2004)) correlate to data from the 2002 research (Rebernik, 2002). When asked: »Do you wish to move to another neighbourhood?« (Table 4) one fifth of interviewees replied that they indeed consider such a move. About 43% replied that most likely they won't consider moving and 35% that they definitely don't intend to move.

Asked whether they are already planning relocation 16.1% of interviewees answered positively. Among these interviewees

Table 4: »Do you wish to move to another neighbourhood?«

1. Definitely not	35,4%
2. Probably not	42,9%
3. Yes, probably	16,9%
4. Yes, definitely	4,8%

Source: Kos D., F. Trček (2004). Prenova stanovanjskih sosesk v Ljubljani – Savsko naselje. Sociološka anketna raziskava (research project report), Center za prostorsko sociologijo, FDV-IDV, Ljubljana.

approximately one quarter lived in the estate less than 5 years and between 6 and 15 years and one quarter of interviewees were younger than 40 years. Those desiring to move to another estate are mostly from younger (up to 30 years) and middle (between 31 and 50 years) age groups (Table 5). In the category of those who would »definitely« want to move these two age groups cover 100% of interviewees expressing their desire to relocate. With older age the share of interviewees planning to move is diminishing. Among those older than 56 years only 7% are considering relocation.

Table 5: Do you wish to relocate to another housing estate?

Do you wish to relocate to another housing estate?	Age (%)				Total (%)
	to 30 year	31–50 year	51–70 year	more 71 year	
Definitely not	16,1	23,9	34,4	25,6	100
Probably not	27	41,4	24,2	7,4	100
Yes, probably	35,6	48,3	14,9	1,1	100
Yes, definitely	46,2	53,8	0	0	100
Total	25,6	37	25	12,4	100

Source: Kos D., F. Trček (2004). Prenova stanovanjskih sosesk v Ljubljani – Savsko naselje. Sociološka anketna raziskava (Poročilo raziskovalnega projekta). Center za prostorsko sociologijo, FDV – IDV, Ljubljana.

Relocation inside the estate was also rejected by most interviewees. About 40% answered that they wouldn't want to move to another flat in the estate while 16% considered this possibility. Relocating inside the estate would be acceptable to little less than one quarter of those living there less than 16 years and those living there permanently (17.4%). In this case we again mostly talk about interviewees from younger and middle age group.

Apart from age, income (total monthly income of the household) and education level seem to be significant for potential residential mobility analysis. Among those planning to relocate there seem to be 33% interviewees from the highest income group (table 6) while declining to relocate seems to be the characteristic of lower income groups. For example, among households replying that they don't consider moving there are about 31% and 26% from groups with monthly income between 100.000–200.000 (4000–8000 EUR) and 200.000–300.000 SIT (8000–12.000 EUR).

Influence of education level on willingness to move is shown in Table 7. Among those interviewees planning to relocate 51.7% are from the category with the highest level of education. Likewise those that do not plan any relocation are predominantly from the lower education level group (15.1% and 41.1%)

Other factors influencing planning to move are also dwelling status and number of persons in the household. Those renting flats are expressing a higher desire to move. Among those planning to relocate are tenants (31%), non-profit flats dwellers (25.3%) and flat owners (41.4%).^[5] Among interviewees not planning to relocate are predominantly flat owners (67%). Higher desire to relocate is also characteristic for households with higher number of household members. This is especially the case with households with three or four members or families with children. Among house-

Table 6: Planning of relocation in relation to household total monthly income

Your joint monthly income	Are you planning to relocate?					Total (%)
	up to 415 € (%)	from 415 to 830 € (%)	from 830 to 1245 € (%)	from 1245 to 1660 € (%)	more than 1660 € (%)	
Yes	8,4	18,1	22,9	18,1	32,5	100
No	15,6	30,9	25,9	16,7	10,8	100
Total	14,4	28,8	25,4	17,0	14,4	100

Source: Kos D, F. Trček (2004). Prenova stanovanjskih sosesk v Ljubljani – Savsko naselje. Sociološka anketna raziskava (Poročilo raziskovalnega projekta). Center za prostorsko sociologijo, FDV – IDV, Ljubljana.

Table 7: Planning of relocation with regard to the education level of interviewees

Planning to relocate?	Education level of interviewee				Total (%)
	Completed 2 or 3 year vocational school or less (%)	Incomplete higher education or university or high school graduate (%)	Completed 2-year higher education, faculty, masters or Ph.D. (%)	No answer (%)	
Yes	9,2	37,9	51,7	1,1	100
No	25,1	41,1	27,5	6,4	100
Total	22,5	40,6	31,4	5,5	100

Source: Kos D, F. Trček (2004). Prenova stanovanjskih sosesk v Ljubljani - Savsko naselje. Sociološka anketna raziskava (Poročilo raziskovalnega projekta). Center za prostorsko sociologijo, FDV – IDV, Ljubljana.

holds that plan to relocate 27.1% have three members and 28.2% four members. Households with one or two members or couples express much lesser willingness or desire to relocate, which is illustrated by their share in the group that doesn't consider relocating (27.4% of one member households and 34% of two member households).^[6]

Relatively high potential residential mobility of families with children is confirmed by or consistent with reasons influencing planning of relocation. Among these reasons the interviewees most often state the need for a bigger flat (16.6%), the intention to buy their own house (9.6%) or their own flat (8.7%) and that the size of family will change (8.7%). Among important reasons for considering relocation are also less noise (9.6%), desire for more cultivated housing environment (7.6%), too high price of flat (7.4%), lack of greenery (7%) and need for higher safety (6.6%). Among those not considering relocating the most common reason for staying in the estate, apart from the fact that »they feel good here« (15%), are: vicinity of the city centre (16.2%), proximity of the railway and bus stations (9.1%), tranquillity of the estate (8.9%), proximity of workplace (7.4%) and the fact that acquiring another flat would be too expensive (8.9%). The cited reasons are related mostly to the lifestyle suited to households with smaller number of members (single dweller or a couple) and correlates with the data indicating higher potential residential mobility of families with children.

If we compare the data about potential residential mobility with answers about fondness of the estate we can establish that a high number of tenants are actually entrapped in the estate because of lack of financial sources needed to improve the quality of their residential environment. Even though only 17% of residents are actually planning relocation most of them have no strong emotional ties to the estate. As much as 53.4% don't identify with it and 20.6%

don't feel any ties with the estate at all. The exemptions are those living in the estate for 31 years or more. This group consist mostly of pensioners that are to a high degree satisfied with their residential environment.

Even though most of the residents considering relocation from the estate, the source of most concern are data showing that higher income households and families with children are more inclined to move. Potential residential mobility of inhabitants of Savsko naselje estate warns about processes that can in the future remodel the social and age structure of this part of the city. Answers by interviewees demonstrate that suitable policies of renovation that would include extensions and additions could, for all those considering relocation, secure the solving of their housing needs within the estate, without significantly enlarging the number of residents or density of buildings.

We can conclude that continuation of existing (too) slow renovation of estates will result in »ageing« of population and increase the share of socially weaker groups, which will in turn slow the process of estate renovation even further or for a certain period even stop it all together and initiate the process of estate degradation. This will be paralleled by the enhanced process of suburbanisation since a large portion of interviewees planning to relocate (39.3%) state that they will move to the surroundings rather than to Ljubljana's centre (15.5%) or elsewhere in the city (21.4%). Because of the specific housing policies, small offer on the property market and personal and cultural values of inhabitants of Slovenia (Hočevar, 2004)^[7] suburbanisation may become one of the dominant processes that influence the changing of residential quality in Slovene cities and townships.

Downs (1981) identified a five-degree scale or continuum of estate transformation that continuously changes in one or other direction. Thus estates are either developing or de-

Table 8: The continuum of transformation of estates

Revitalisation and the growth of real-estate value				
Phase 1 Stability and vitality	Phase 2 Lesser decay	Phase 3 Apparent decay	Phase 4 Advanced decay	Phase 5 Unhealthy and uninhabitable
Relatively new, successful or old and stable estates without symptoms of decay or loss of property value.	Mostly older estate with some functional and small physical shortcomings. Estates have larger number of younger families than on the construction of the estate. Estates slowly gaining on value. Degree of development of public services is under the phase 1 level.	Rental flats are prevailing. Smaller physical shortcomings are evident everywhere and many structures have been changed into dwelling units with higher density than first envisaged. Notable are individual abandoned structures.	Most of the housing fund is in need of renovation and property is being sold only to lower social groups. Profitability is low. Large number of households with minimal income. Large number of abandoned structures.	Most of the structures being abandoned. Inhabitants from only low social groups with minimal income. Inhabitants keep moving out of the estate.
Degradation and falling property value				

Source: A. Downs (1981). Neighbourhoods and Urban Development. DC: Brookings Institution, Washington.

caying, although a state of relative stability is also possible. He adds that estates don't transform according to pre-determined patterns of rising or falling, but can at any point reverse into the opposite trend (see below). In case the estate is momentarily degrading an investment from outside and renovation can turn the tendency into the opposite phase while the estate in the rising phase can be thrown into degradation by construction of »harmful« objects in its imminent surrounds (e.g. freeway, chemical plant, etc.).

If we try to position Savsko naselje estate into Dawson's (1981) five-degree scale of estate transformation on the basis of the 2002 and 2004 surveys we can conclude that at the moment it is somewhere between the second and the third phase. Even though it is most likely still in the second phase its inclination leans strongly towards transformation into the third phase (apparent decay) unless faster renovation is implemented. It has to be mentioned that Dawson's Continuum of Estate Transformation is only partly acceptable on the example of Savsko naselje since the vicinity of the city centre gives this estate a much better position to reverse the process than is the case with estates on the city outskirts. When it comes to »rental disparity« (Smith, 1996) Savsko naselje estate will always keep a certain value when compared to the estates more distant from Ljubljana's centre. The key problem in this case estate is the possibility that there won't be significant changes in the foreseeable future when the estate as the logical extension of the city centre shall rise on the scale towards revitalisation and property value growth. Keeping the Status Quo could block the process of renovation of the housing estate and the development of the city centre.

4. Conclusion: Accelerating renewal and diminishing social instability in housing estates

While the inhabitants of the Savsko naselje estate are aware that the estate as a whole needs renovation (two thirds

of inhabitants approve of it) a large portion of interviewees wouldn't be willing to co-operate or invest in renovation and maintenance of the estate (44.4%). Negative attitude towards active participation in estate renovation indicates the lack of information and low awareness of inhabitants of harmful influences of decrease of residential quality in the estate. The control question »Experiences of many cities shows that in badly maintained estates the value of property is decreasing. Do you think this can happen in your estate as well?« was answered negatively (less likely) by roughly two thirds of interviewees. Unawareness of the life cycle of the estate, which is closely related to the property value raises concerns that the process of slow renovation will continue and possibly influence the gradual lowering of the residential quality and relocation of certain groups of inhabitants.

If the renovation is not executed in time there is every likelihood of enhanced outflow of financially stronger households (over 300.000 SIT (1250 EUR) monthly) to suburban areas. The analysis of residents' willingness to relocate demonstrated that the group of potentially most likely migrants represent population groups with high income and high level of education. Very prominent are also young families and population groups expressing the desire to enlarge their families, as well as flat tenants. Considering the profile of the potential migrants we can conclude that the continuous delaying of renovation will result in the estate losing not only economical capital but also social capital, embodied in population groups with higher education. Here we must also mention the ageing process; through the outflow of younger families the estates are gradually losing the vitality and energetic town-like lifestyle.

When drafting the guidelines and ways to improve existing housing conditions and diminishing social instability in housing estates the example of Savsko naselje can serve as an ideal type or model. Through solving problems that were especially stressed by interviewees in the research: Prenova stanovanjskih sosesk v Ljubljani (Housing Estates Rene-

wal in Ljubljana): Savsko naselje (Kos, Trček, 2004) we shall demonstrate some measures that might help prevent the blossoming of the darkest scenario of social homogenisation in other similar housing estates in Ljubljana as well.

Measures in question are combination of different revitalisation concepts and proposals by inhabitants themselves, that were given during the workshop organised as a part of the exhibition *Prenova stanovanjskih sosesk v Ljubljani* (Housing Estates Renewal in Ljubljana): Savsko naselje (2004).^[8] One of the ways to improve housing standards in Savsko naselje estate would be the improvement of infrastructure elements (e.g. construction of sufficient parking lots or garage) that interviewees identify as the most disturbing shortcoming in their everyday life. Investment in important infrastructural object in the neighbourhood would represent a sort of »flagship concept«^[9] (Plazza 2000, Hočevar, 2000, Uršič, 2003) on the estate level and sufficient initial motivation capital for further renovation. In doing so the big investments into infrastructure improvement would be conditioned by projects of comprehensive estate renewal or formation of acceptable financial-loan policies and active involvement of residents in the project of renewal aligned to *quid pro quo* principles.

The other way of improving the residential quality of the estate demands more time and is from this point of view also much more risky. Namely, many urban architects (Musterd, Goetluk, 2005, Clark, Deurloo, Dieleman, 2005) are pointing out the multi-directional character of urban environment development. Outflow of stronger social groups and inflow of weaker ones doesn't necessarily mean the degradation of the estate. It happens that the time span between immigration and migration of an individual allows gaining of social capital that enables him or her to rise on the social scale (Musterd, Goetluk, 2005). Despite the tendency of outflow of higher income population there may still be inflow of population with potentially prosperous economical basis. The result of such dynamics is a system that remains inside »the situation of dynamic balance!« (ibid.). The concept of the so-called »resident filtration« (Piacione, 2003: 220) doesn't demand direct intervention of the state or municipal institutional structures but presumes the market circumstances alone will take care of renovation and rise of residential quality in areas with good market prospects, despite current decrease in property value since they have important advantages over other (sub)urban areas.

Even though the Savsko naselje estate does have some advantages (proximity of the city centre, retaining the high value of property) that could sustain this sort of scenario, some mechanism of at least partial levelling of social structure of the estate should nevertheless be designed in order to avoid spontaneous market gentrification of the estate. In the other case we risk relocation of certain groups of population due to the expanding process of suburbanisation and, according to the worst case scenario, even possible degradation of housing estates in Ljubljana.

Dr. Matjaž Uršič, sociologist, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of social sciences, Ljubljana
E-mail: matjaz.ursic2@guest.arnes.si

Notes

- [1] Detached housing actually represented one of the important social »buffers« (equalisers) of negative effects of improper spatial policy of the state that had partially held back more intensive building in urban areas.
- [2] Before the privatisation of socially owned housing in 1991 most of the tenants held the so-called »residential right« to »communal« property or communal housing that was in fact no-one's property or a part of the state's property. Rent was minimal (»non-profitable« or »social«) and because of the lack of funds from rents the maintenance of buildings and estates was also minimal or even insufficient (ZLRP, 2002).
- [3] According to the research »The quality of living in Slovenia – Housing Parameters of the quality of living and changes in the last decade (Kakovost življenja v Sloveniji - Stanovanjski parametri kakovosti življenja in spremembe v zadnjem desetletju) (Mandič, 1995) and Statistic Yearly Records (Statistični letopis 1995) between 1989 and 1993 residential mobility was approximately 3% (residential mobility was defined as percentage of households relocated in the period between the census years). She (1996: 114) states that in societies with highest income the average level of mobility is 12% and in societies with middle income 7%. Among highest income societies are most notable USA (17.2%), the Netherlands (10.1%) and Sweden (13.3%), while Austria defies the rule with extraordinarily low mobility (3.8%) (ibid.).
- [4] In Ljubljana mobility inside the city is relatively low. In 1998 it was only 45 relocations per 1000 inhabitants and between years 1995 and 1999 the total of relocations in Ljubljana was 31.770. (Dolenc, 2000: 87). In the research *Space and Environment Values (Vrednote prostora in okolja)* (2004) that relates to Slovenia, the actual mobility of population in the entire life span of the respondent is excessively low: in average an individual has moved once or twice (1.69 folds) and in the age group over 60 years 2.7 folds in the distance over 15 km (EU average is 6-7 folds and in the US 13-14 folds) (Hočevar, 2004: 16).
- [5] Despite the biggest share of those planning relocation being of those owning the property it needs to be considered that residence owners also represent by far the biggest share of all interviewees in the research (63%) while renters represent only 12% of all the research sample.
- [6] The result showing higher willingness to relocate among households with three or four members is consistent with the 1991 and 2002 Census data. Comparison reveals that mostly families with two children moved to the non-city areas in the surroundings of the bigger cities. The number of families with two children has in 2002 (in regards to 1991) decreased in city areas while the number of families with two children in the non-city has in 2002 increased. In 1991 the number of families with two children was higher in city (urban) areas, while the year 2002 represents the turning point demonstrating decrease of number of two children families whilst their number simultaneously increases in non-city (non urban) areas (for more see Census (Popis), 1991 and 2002, Uršič, 2005).
- [7] According to the research *Space and Environment Values (Vrednote prostora in okolja)* (Hočevar, 2004) more than half of those asked would prefer to live in a smaller or bigger village or country town while only about 5% indicated bigger or big town as their preferred choice.
- [8] Workshops and analyses of interviews with residents are described in detail in the paper on housing estate renewal by Drago Kos (see »Theory and Praxis« (Teorija in praksa) for details)
- [9] These are large and drastic interventions into urban space, believed to add to an area's attractiveness and offer and elevate it on the residential quality scale. This concept was prevailing mostly in eighties and is a result of American re-

alisation examples. It included mainly one-sided, physical (construction) regeneration of the town on account of neglecting other urban characteristics. New flagship approaches of urban revitalisation are somewhat different and attempt to include or adopt themselves to specifics of local urban space (for more see Plaza, 2000; Hočevar, 2000; Uršič, 2003; Honigsbaum, 2001).

List of figures:

Illustration 1: *Scheme of the Savsko naselje estate (Jan-kovič Potočnik)*

Source: Knjižnica savsko naselje, site: HYPERLINK

»http://sikbez.lj-bez.sik.si/slo/html/enota_savsko.html« http://sikbez.lj-bez.sik.si/slo/html/enota_savsko.html (7. 1. 2006)

Illustration 2: *Linhartova cesta (Linhart Street)*
Photo: Matjaž Uršič (20. 1. 2006)

Illustration 3: *Majaronova ulica (Majaron Street)*
Photo: Matjaž Uršič (20. 1. 2006)

Illustration 4: *Fabianijeva ulica (Fabiani Street)*
Photo: Matjaž Uršič (20. 1. 2006)

Illustration 5: *Ulica Luise Pesjakove (Luisa Pesjakova Street)*
Photo: Matjaž Uršič (20. 1. 2006)

For sources and literature turn to page 46.

Translated by Aleksander Jankovič Potočnik.

Kovič (1992) defines the macro-location of buildings by the area's macro-climate, latitude and elevation above sea level, which are also the factors that define the general typology of architectural form. She nevertheless points out that artificially transformed cities demolish the precarious balance of natural climate and form the so called urban climate that is characterised by typical increase in temperature, which is caused by a city's operation, i.e. larger accumulative capacity of the built urban structure, increased absorption of sun rays because of multiple reflection and absorption, hindered emission of reflected heat in the night time, increased reflection, vicinity of buildings and reflection of heat from smog layers above the city, weakened and damaged vegetation, quick draining of rainwater, lack of water surfaces, windless and dormant air layers above the city and constant additional heating.

The city is a space that indivisibly connects three elementary environmental components: natural environment, which provides the basis with its terrestrial form, structure and properties, water, vegetation, fauna and climate; social arrangement, which includes the individual and community, activities, institutions, culture with folklore and habits; physical products, which form the societal culture, with buildings, apparatus and means. Together they express the comprehensiveness of occurrences and nature's participation, beings and objects in a dynamic process of change and renewal, which doesn't exclude the past or the future oriented development. Nevertheless, in modern man, the artificial environment, which has become the dominant living environment of the post-industrial, consumer society, has been building a great void, a sense of social disparity, lack of communal spirit, local identity and spiritual dimensions of life. (Siregar, 2002)

Social behaviour in a given living space is affected by physical properties, such as size, distribution of spaces, sound, colour, age, height, views, orientation, access to communications, shops and other services, size, arrangement and form of furniture, heating, humidity, availability of communication utilities, spatial use, neighbourhood status etc.

Trstenjak claims that the visual sensation is dynamic (1987). The individual person doesn't notice only colours, shapes, motion and size of objects, one doesn't perceive only the »visual object«, but also oneself as the observer, albeit in the visual sense object orientation is the most pronounced. When observing space one is in expectation: perception depends on the viewing position, method of motion, time and duration, scope and form of pre-information. Urban perception can be structured according to the course of deliberate action, availability of information and sequence of perception. Perception adds only a barely significant part to objective reality, while memory only a part of the past, but imagination expands the data and describes the image of the world.

Psychological environmental studies deal with interaction of the individual with the physical environment and particular features of that environment. Hereby the subject is the mutually dependent relationship or environmental effect of the environment on the individual and vice versa. Piaget (1965) described this interactive process by the process of assimilation (adaptation of something to oneself) and accommodation (adapting oneself to the environment). Socialisation as the social implication of interaction between the individual and the physical environment is the result of factors

Alenka TEMELJOTOV SALAJ

The synergetic effect of the observer on the built environment

1. The relationship between the observer and the environment

Living space can be divided into the micro and macro environment. The micro-environment is the space of our immediate surroundings, where we live, work and spend our leisure time. The properties of the micro-environment, especially the living and working environment, can significantly affect our quality of life. (Rus, 1997) The physical environment is the environment that exists independent of »human intervention«, while the designed environment is the opposite. Numerous components of the present physical environment are nevertheless directly or indirectly the consequence of human intervention. (Rus, 1997)