

BROJ ISSUE 03-04 (682-683)  
GODINA YEAR LVII / 2011 ISSN 0011-0728 UDK 71-72  
CIJENA PRICE 40 kn

2 **UVODNIK** [INTRO](#)

4 **INFO**

— **NATJEČAJI** [COMPETITIONS](#)

9 **KUĆA TOLERANCIJE** [HOUSE OF TOLERANCE](#)

12 **PODCENTAR GRADA POREČA** [SUB-CENTRE OF THE CITY OF POREČ](#)

14 **CRKVENICA-CENTAR** [CRKVENICA-CENTRE](#)

15 **NASELJE BOSANKA U DUBROVNIKU** [BOSANKA SETTLEMENT IN DUBROVNIK](#)

16 **MISLI PROSTOR** [THINK SPACE](#)

— **TEMA BROJA: ZAŠTITA**  
[MAIN TOPIC: PRESERVATION](#)

18 **POVRATAK STVARALAŠTVU** [BACK TO CREATIVITY](#) — DINKA PAVELIĆ

20 **IZMEĐU APSOLUTNOG ŠTIĆENJA I APSOLUTNE KREATIVNE SLOBODE**  
[BETWEEN ABSOLUTE PROTECTION AND ABSOLUTE CREATIVE FREEDOM](#) — DINKA PAVELIĆ

22 **ARHITEKTURA I ZAŠTITA** [ARCHITECTURE AND PRESERVATION](#) — MARGARET ARBANAS

24 **BRAZILIJA: IZMEĐU VIDLJIVOG I NEVIDLJIVOG**  
[BRASILIA: BETWEEN THE VISIBLE AND THE INVISIBLE](#) — GUILHERME LASSANCE

26 **KONZERVATORSKI POSTUPCI, URBANISTIČKE PRAKSE I ARHITEKTONSKE VRIJEDNOSTI**  
[CONSERVATION PROCEDURES, URBAN-PLANNING PRACTICES AND ARCHITECTURAL VALUES](#) — ZLATKO UZELAC

28 **I BAŠTINA I ENERGIJA KAO ODRŽIVI RESURSI**  
[BOTH HERITAGE AND ENERGY AS SUSTAINABLE RESOURCES](#) — UNDP CROATIA

30 **SNIMAK POSTOJEĆEG STANJA: NEDOVRŠENA GRADILIŠTA** [SCAN OF THE EXISTING CONDITION: INCOMPLETE CONSTRUCTION SITES](#)

32 **PROCES: FRANCUSKI PAVILJON**  
[PROCESS: FRENCH PAVILION](#) — ALAN BRAUN

— **VIZUALNA KULTURA** [VISUAL CULTURE](#)

34 **SVIJET KAKAV JE MOGAO BITI** [WORLD AS IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN](#) — IVANA MANCE

36 **KNJIGA UMJETNIKA KAO PROSTOR SLOBODE**  
[A BOOK BY ARTISTS AS A SPACE OF FREEDOM](#) — BRANKA BENČIĆ

37 **PISMO S POVRATNICOM** [A LETTER WITH AN ADVICE OF DELIVERY](#) — MARKO GOLUB

38 **MJESTO IGRE, IZAZOVA I INICIJACIJE**  
[A PLACE OF PLAY, CHALLENGE AND INITIATION](#) — MARKO GOLUB

39 **DAN D IZMEĐU UTOPIJE I STVARNOSTI** [D-DAY BETWEEN UTOPIA AND REALITY](#) — MARKO GOLUB

40 **INTERVJU** [INTERVIEW: TOMISLAV PREMIERL](#) — ALEN ŽUNIĆ

41 **KUTAK ZA SAMOPROMOCIJU** [SELPROMOTION CORNER: RICARDO MAZZUCHELLI](#) — DINKA PAVELIĆ

42 **RECENZIJE KNJIGA** [BOOK REVIEWS](#)

44 **VIJESTI IZ REGIONALNIH DRUŠTAVA**

44 **PISMA ČITATELJA**



# ZAŠTITA PRESERVATION

BIROKRATSKO SHVAĆANJE KONZERVATORSKE STRUKE S JEDNE STRANE, TE TOBOŽE AVANGARDNO I ISKLJUČIVO SHVAĆANJE ARHITEKTONSKO-PROJEKTANTSKE ULOGE S DRUGE, ZASIGURNO NAM NEĆE POMOĆI U KVALITETNOM I KREATIVNOM OBLIKOVANJU NAŠEG OKOLIŠA

Većina arhitekata u svojoj se karijeri suočila sa sadatkom koji zahtijeva ugrađivanje u neki povijesni graditeljski kontekst. U Hrvatskoj, u njenim gradovima, bogatim povijesnim slojevima, gotovo da je nemoguće ostvariti projekt bez uvažavanja nekih konzervatorskih smjernica. Kako je u vrijeme "ubrzane modernizacije" od pedesetih do kraja osamdesetih godina prošlog stoljeća "ab ovo na tabula rasi" bio glavni princip gradnje, a širenje gradova osnovna premisa urbanizma, konzervatorska pitanja bila su od manjeg značaja osim u slučajevima gradnje interpolacije. U skladu sa tada vladajućom ideologijom, "moderno" i "suvremeno" imali su prednost pred povijesnim pitanjima zaštite naslijeđa.

U skladu s tim premisama obrazovane su generacije arhitekata, a unatoč velikom broju sati unutar kurikuluma koji je posvećen povijesnom razvoju arhitekture, biti arhitekt značilo je stvarati nešto novo, gledati u budućnost. Ta suvremenost i budućnost je, barem tako izgleda, uvijek nekako bila u antitezi sa naslijeđem.

Devedesetih godina situacija se mijenja. Osim što nas ratna razaranja bolno podjela na "što sve imamo", a u velikom broju slučajeva i bez rata smo se prepuštali propadanju, isto tako urbanistička praksa se djelomično<sup>1</sup>, a možda i ne skroz svjesno, okreće suočavanju sa stvarnošću. Demografska elika gradova, nakon prvobitnog aporboriranja izbjeglih i raseljenih, odražavat će smanjenje stanovništva u velikom broju slučajeva i stoga nije potrebno planirati nove tabula rasa zone. Zagreb početkom devedesetih deklarativno pristupa svojoj gradogradnji na način "popunjavanja rupa" i dogradnje postojećih struktura.<sup>2</sup>

**BACK TO CREATIVITY**  
THE BUREAUCRATIC INTERPRETATION OF THE CONSERVATION PROFESSION ON ONE HAND, AND THE SEEMINGLY AVANT-GARDE AND EXCLUSIVIST INTERPRETATION OF THE ROLE OF THE ARCHITECT-DESIGNER ON THE OTHER WILL CERTAINLY NOT HELP US TO SHAPE OUR ENVIRONMENT WITH HIGH QUALITY AND CREATIVITY by Dinka Pavelić

Most architects have during their careers met with a task that requires an interpolation into a historic building context. In Croatia, in its cities, rich in historic layers, it is almost impossible to realise a design without taking into account some conservation guidelines. Since the period of "hastened modernisations" between the 1950s and the late 1980s had "ab ovo on tabula rasa" as the main building principle, and the spreading of cities as the main premise of urban planning, conservation issues had less significance, except when building interpolations. In accordance with the ruling ideology of those times, the "modern" and the "contemporary" took precedence over the historic issues of heritage protection.

Generations of architects were educated in accordance with those premises, and despite the multitude of lectures in the curriculum dedicated to the develop-

ment of architecture through history, being an architect meant creating something new and looking into the future. That modernity and future were, it would seem, always somehow antithetical with heritage.

The situation changed during the 1990s. After being painfully reminded of "all that we had" by the ravages of war, although in many cases we let it all decay regardless of the war, the practice of urban planning has partially<sup>1</sup>, albeit perhaps not entirely consciously, been turning towards being reality. The state of demographics in our cities, after the initial absorption of refugees and displaced persons, will in many cases show population decreases so it is not necessary to plan new tabular rasa zones. In the early 1990s Zagreb declaratively approached its city-building through "filling the gaps" and completing existing complexes.<sup>2</sup>

As a paradoxical result of all those forces, both the general social ones and the strictly urban planning-architectural ones, we have the current state - most of the city centres are "protected" (A and B zones of conservation), but the buildings are by and large left derelict and without a possibility for renovation. The heritage rent improved the "blood count" of our cities, but not even close to its full potential. Cities like Dubrovnik, which also have agencies which are actively and systematically dealing with renovation, are exceptions.

Kao paradoksalni rezultat ovih tih silnica, što onih opće društvenih, što striktno urbanističko-arhitektonskih, imamo današnje stanje - većina gradskih jezgri je "zaštićena" (zona A i B zaštite), no ipak velikim dijelom građevine ostaju zapuštene i bez mogućnosti renoviranja.

Spomenička renta popravila je "krvnu eliku" naših gradova, no ipak ni izbliza u punom potencijalu svojih mogućnosti. Izuzetak čine gradovi poput Dubrovnika koji imaju i agencije koje aktivno i sustavno provode obnovu.

U budućnosti, osim standardnih pitanja, bit će važne bar tri osnovne teme:

- 1) što ćemo učiniti s industrijskim naslijeđem devetnaestog i početka dvadesetog stoljeća?
- 2) kako ćemo interpretirati kvalitetnu arhitekturu i urbanizam kaane moderne/CIAM-a - arhitekturu socijalističkog projekta?
- 3) kako ćemo uspješno ostvariti sinergiju turizma i zaštite arhitekture, odnosno urbanih cjelina?

Stanja lokacija kao što su *Gredelj, Paromlin, Gorica, Nada Dimić, Zagrepcanka*, lučka skladišta u Rijeci i alična govore o tome da u ovom stadiju tranzicijskog razvitka nismo u stanju pravovremeno uskočiti u projekt koji bi donio najviše kulturološke koristi.

Nasuprot tome, kao društvo, prepuštamo takve lokacije i objekte tržištu i investitorima koji ih opet prepuštaju propadanju kako bi "ekonomičnije" izgradili samu lokaciju od nule, tragajući samo za brzim profitom.

nastavak na stranici 18 >

In the future, along with the standard issues, there will be at least three important fundamental topics:

- 1) what shall we do with the industrial heritage of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries?
- 2) how shall we interpret the high-quality architecture and urban planning of late Modernism/CIAM - the architecture of the socialist project?
- 3) how shall we achieve a successful synergy of tourism and the conservation of architecture and urban complexes?

The condition of sites such as *Gredelj, Paromlin, Gorica, Nada Dimić, Zagrepcanka, Port Warehouses in Rijeka* and so on show that in this phase of transitional development we are not capable of a timely intervention which would bring along the best cultural benefits. On the contrary, we as a society give such sites and structures over to the market and investors who in turn give them over to decay in order to build the site "more economically" from the ground up, looking only for quick profits. The "added value" logics provided by such buildings and sites, not only to the investor, but also to the city and its cultural environment, are generally not recognised as operative. The proof of that is the attempt of activation of such places through

continue on page 18 >