

Urban Regeneration Policy in Serbia- three case studies from Belgrade, Snežana Đorđević, Faculty for political sciences, Belgrade University

Panel: T18P34 - Urban regeneration policies in Europe: Theory and practice.

This article presents the way of creation of urban and spatial policy in Belgrade, the capital of Serbia, as transitional society. This ambience characterizes insufficient normative regulation, weak institutions, small transparency in decision making process, insufficient participation of important professional subjects in big projects, corruption and ad hoc arrangements which seriously favor private and group interests (income, profit) over public interests etc. Text has three case studies: *Belgrade Port* is an example for misuse of privatization procedure for getting valuable cities` lots and building land cheaply; *Resettlement of wild Roma settlements* represents ad hoc project which "cleaned" vital city locations without plan, and with jeopardizing elementary human rights of this ethnic group; and ambitious project *Belgrade Waterfront* (redevelopment of Sava amphitheater) has been created as arrangement between top Serbian leadership and foreign company, without including public and domestic experts and their associations in this project. The most important missing factors are: project justification study, "value for money" analysis, risk matrix, clear share of responsibilities for the risks between partners, and guarantees given by private partner for protection of Belgrade concerning various risks, absence of public competition, as well as absence of monitoring mechanisms for contract implementation.

INTRODUCTION

Belgrade is a capital of ex Yugoslavia, and now capital of Serbia with the population around 1.7 million inhabitants. Belgrade is the most developed part of Serbia and participates with over 40% in GDP; it is located on corridors 10 and 8, and has excellent connections with neighboring countries.¹

Based on its economic potentials, Belgrade attracts population (between 1998 - 2002 Belgrade population increased by 4.8%) while at the same time, eastern and southern parts of Serbia lost population. Factors which contribute to these conditions are centralization and reluctance of political elite to procure substantial, fiscal and financial autonomy to local government (even to Belgrade as capital city) in order to let them to stimulate autonomously economic development.

Serbia is transitional country. Its political system has problems with legal state, rule of law, partly implemented decentralization, limited capacity of civil society, corrupted and influential political parties which stimulate system of political preys and gains over professionalism and merit system.

In the process of public policy creation, political influence is often more important than professional standards and criteria.

Legal ambient is in transformation; a number of good laws has been adopted, but there is still an absence of a numerous of sublegal acts (procedures are often weakly regulated).

¹ On the list of 10 municipalities with the highest level of average income in Serbia, 8 of them are Belgrade and its 7 municipalities (Novi Beograd, Lazarevac, Surčin...)

Law on urban planning and building has been adopted in autumn 2014 from 183 countries, Serbia is at 179th place, regarding the duration of procedure necessary for issuing building permit. Main reasons for it are: bribery, corrupted administration and bodies, weak quality of management etc.

Political status of Belgrade

In political and normative sense, Belgrade has a status of **city, metropolitan region** (Law on local government, Law on City of Belgrade) and the **statistical region** (Law on regional development). In 2002 The Law on local government introduced model of directly elected mayor and the Law from 2007 returned to model of weak mayor (assembly - mayor model). Law on Belgrade in 2007 stipulated some general questions, letting City of Belgrade to arrange its organization by Charter.² This possibility was used to strengthen city with huge competencies and financial power, leaving 17 city municipalities with small competencies and in complete financial and fiscal dependency. Belgrade became very centralized city. This solution is highly odd having in mind that all Belgrade municipalities are densely populated, that they have good and experienced administration with capacities and long tradition in procuring various scope of public services. Such solution provoked a numerous of functional problems in the city, jeopardizing the quality and efficiency of public services and leaving citizens often dissatisfied.

Image

In Yugoslavia Belgrade had the reputation of political and economic center (industrial, financial, banking and service), as well as a center of science, culture and art. Good connections of Yugoslav society with the western world enabled its inclusion in modern and alternative artistic movements in the field of theater, film, music, painting (Belgrade theatre, painting, and musical festivals, BITEF, BELEF, BEMUS). Architecture and urban design of Belgrade represents a mixture of styles from various time periods, which create an interesting and original impression.³ The decade at the end of 20th century, with war conflicts and dissolution of Yugoslavia, economic sanctions, crises, decrease of standard of the population, and serious political turbulences, left deep scars on the face of this city. Since 2000, Belgrade has partly succeeded to recover.

In 2009 "Lonely Planet", famous travel guidebook, praised Belgrade as the destination with the best entertainment in the world.⁴ Openness and friendliness of population, rich intellectual inheritance, intriguing and eclectic night life offer for, full restaurants, lively clubs in the old city, summer clubs, and floats on the banks of Danube and Sava, were especially stressed etc.

² Constitution formally allows cities to have directly elected mayor and lets legal regulations to develop it as a kind of amenities for greater units. But, none of the cities use this possibility because such solution conflicts with the interest of party leaders to control "their" mayors.²

³ In various parts of the city one can witness the influence of various building and architectural styles: Kalemegdan fortress has rich remnants of buildings through centuries from Celts, Slavic inhabitants, over remnants of Ottoman Empire; parks and especially etnopark, Great War Island, Ada Ciganlija, remnants and "paths" from Roman period, buildings, towers and part of city from Turkish period, manastiry, churches, building of classical central European style (like these in Wien, Prague, or Budapest) and modern buildings with interesting, creative solutions as a symbol of readiness of society for changes.

⁴ See: <http://www.lonelyplanet.com/canada/travel-tips-and-articles/39339>.

However, the rating agencies which evaluate and rank cities by investment potentials, evaluated Belgrade with rather low rating.⁵ Serbia as a state, was ranked as BB-, which represents a rating for speculative, risk investments, and logically Belgrade as individual destination in the state can't get better rating. In short, Belgrade shares all system problems with Serbian society.

Loughborough University established *Globalization and World Cities Research Group* that conducted empirical study and made classification of cities regarding level of development and upgrading quality of services. Therefore, cities are classified in 5 categories: alpha world cities as the best one, beta cities, gamma cities, cities of high sufficiency and sustainable cities.⁶

Belgrade is ranked in the group of cities of high sufficiency (4. group) while Bratislava, Zagreb, Ljubljana belong to category of gamma cities (3. group), Sofia beta city (2. group) and, Prague, Wien, Budapest, Warsaw, Athens and Istanbul are in the first group of alpha cities.⁷

Unsolved problem of public property creates a lot of functional problems to Belgrade as well. Regime of Slobodan Milošević, frightened by possibility of losing power has, over the night, without explanation and repayment taken property from local governments and transferred its legal status to state property. In this occasion, the Agency for state property management, has been established. It has worked very inefficiently and has caused a numerous problems up to now.⁸ All demands of local governments and civil society (Alliance of local government, NGO, professional groups etc) to state officials for returning property back, didn't meet their understanding. Even after 2000, new political elite although it represented the symbol of new democracy, wanted to keep property as instrument of influence on local government, leaving it in position of dependency.⁹

⁵ So, for example, The Anholt GfK Roper City Brands Index-a or European Cities Monitor didn't include Belgrade at all in their analytical maps, because it didn't fulfill the basic requirements for their analysis. These agencies research and evaluate cities' success in attracting investments and making friendly ambiance for business, local community, youth population, tourists etc. (See:

http://www.gfkamerica.com/practice_areas/roper_pam/placebranding/cbi/index.en.html.)

In 2010 Belgrade was included for the first time on European Cities Monitor's list. See more on:

<http://www.europeancitiesmonitor.eu/>. This change is not the consequence of substantial changes in the organization, management and the way in which the policies in Belgrade are created and implemented in order to upgrade investment image. It is rather a part of general assessment that cities of central and eastern Europe, including Belgrade, could upgrade standards and become more attractive locations for investment in future.

⁶ University Loughborough, University Gent and Chinese Academy for social sciences implemented **Project 71** in which they included 175 extraordinary companies from 525 cities around the world. For more details on this topic see: <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/world2008.html>. The project resulted in creation of the data base (1999) under the name „World cities values“ which is permanently upgrading and improving.

⁷ It is interesting, for example, that Krakov, Ankara, Skoplje are cities from regional surrounding which have low rating then Belgrade and are evaluated as sustainable cities (fifth group).

⁸ Institute G17 made in 2004 an analysis of the way in which works Agency. It turned out that the Agency didn't respond on more than 80% of demands. For the answers, local governments have to wait on average around 7 years, and in 90% of cases the answer is negative. In short, Agency is narrow passage in the system, which pushes local governments to break the law and manage a property without permission.

⁹ State officials prefer that local government stay dependant. In all governments since 2000, there is a lack of political will for decentralization and strengthening of local government. See: Snežana Đorđević (2012): "Modeli regionalizacije za Srbiju" in book: "Nove regionale politike i evropska iskustva", Megatrend, Beograd. pages 301-321.

Pressured by European Union Serbian officials have, finally in 2011, stipulated the Law on public property. However, they changed the first (pretty good) version of the law with numerous corrections, in order to make the process of returning property as slow as possible. Therefore, most of local governments up to now only made inventory of their potential property and only a small part of property has been returned.¹⁰ In such circumstances Belgrade and its municipalities are allowed to use property but are obliged to ask the Agency for permission in cases if lending, selling etc. Agency is usually reluctant to answer on these requests except in the cases when the state is interested in transaction.

One of the good regulations, stipulated by the Constitution of Serbia (2006), allows cities and municipalities to possess public building land. That was a precondition for creating better conditions for building. Law on spatial planning and building from 2009 justified and more detailed regulated this right.

Ability of local governments for strategic thinking and planning and to implement adopted plans is important indicator of local governments' development capacities. It turns out that Belgrade lacks strategic documents,¹¹ adequate spatial and action plans,¹² as well as political elites devoted to their implementation. Belgrade also lacks adequate political organization (decentralized system, and good system for coordination) and good management necessary for effective and efficient implementation of decisions.

Developmental Strategy of Belgrade City¹³ has been made in 2008 with high participation of city and municipal representatives, bodies and administration, NGOs, Association of local governments, foreign and domestic experts etc.¹⁴ This document had strange "destiny", as it usually is the case with a numerous of qualitative developmental documents in Serbia. Although it has been presented and made available to all relevant city and municipality bodies and to public, strategy has never been formally adopted by Belgrade Assembly. Therefore it is not political document which influences strategic development of Belgrade.¹⁵ For analyst which evaluates developmental potentials of cities, Belgrade didn't make even this first step in strategic development and transforming city (Strategic plan is inevitable instrument for development and branding). It didn't develop action plan with commitment to implement the goals previously determined in time schedule. Therefore, in comparison to other cities and potential regional competitors, Belgrade is in delay.¹⁶

¹⁰ Law on public property allows one Agency to be in charge for returning property to all cities and municipalities in Serbia which strongly slowed the whole process.

¹¹ Even when strategy has been made, its happens not to be adopted by Assembly, like Developmental Strategy of Belgrade!

¹² Belgrade City possess all planning documents but general plan stipulates urban planning in too many details, limiting possibilities for municipalities to influence and better arrange land use and building.

¹³ Draft of Developmental Strategy of Belgrade City can be found on web address:
http://www.beograd.rs/download.php/documents/nacrt_strategije_razvoja.pdf

¹⁴ It was co-financed by city and international donor.

¹⁵ Developmental Strategy defines identity of the city, defines goals in all important fields for Belgrade and defines time limits for implementation of these goals through Action plan.

¹⁶ Problem has been partially alleviated by adoption of Strategy for development of tourism in Belgrade until 2018. and Regional Spatial plan.

Present executive government of Belgrade has a vision of this city as „city of culture, sport and entertainment". They stress that „ its spiritual, cultural and intellectual potentials has a power to attract business world, investors, tourists, and creative sector.“¹⁷ One can reach to Belgrade as "creative city", to "third Belgrade as a city of future", over public competitions, conceptual studies and projects which will allow inclusion of knowledge, imagination and creativity of the whole community. This is modern and democratic approach.

Draft of Developmental Strategy of Belgrade defines that for transforming this vision of city in reality, the following activities are to be implemented:

- a. to use rich historical heritage for **city branding**,
- b. to use excellent **geostrategic position** on two European corridors in order to connect and collaborate with other cities and regions in Europe,
- c. to develop **sustainable economy** by supporting high accumulative service sector and activities (culture, sport, entertainment, knowledge),
- d. to rebuild existing **urban structure**, upgrade its compactness, strengthen its identity, made better connection of river banks,
- e. to develop **democratic decision making processes**, strengthen participation and include community in identification of priorities, in creation and implementation of important projects, as well as development of horizontal and vertical coordination of all subjects etc.

Operative goals

Belgrade still doesn't have, in urban sense, balanced relationship between its parts and the entirety. It is considered that poli-centric organization could procure better harmony between various parts of Belgrade and more effective use of territorial capital especially poorly used potentials in optimal way in order to diminish regional disproportions.

In **political sense** Belgrade is too centralized; Charter has diminished competencies of municipalities which have great developmental potentials and long tradition of successful managing (great competencies and budgets). Today, they are put in a position of passive executives of decisions made by the city.

Offered and rejected alternatives

Draft Laws on Belgrade with decentralized concept of organization has been offered in several occasions. It has strong municipalities with great scope of competencies and City would have narrowed competencies, necessary for good functioning of the entirety of the city and region. Municipalities have financial and fiscal autonomy, they have original income, and right to collect taxes and fees. City collects its own taxes and there is also **equalization fond** which can help in diminishing great differences between various parts of Belgrade. In future, this fund ought to use model of project financing.

In order of better **executive** work, as important coordination instrument Council of mayors (Belgrade mayors and mayors from municipalities) was introduced. **Assembly** has two bodies (chamber for city municipalities and chamber for municipalities from wider region, and work in plenum about strategic topics of development of the Belgrade as a metropolitan region).

¹⁷ Draft of Developmental Strategy of Belgrade City, page 17.

This solution has never been adopted, and city government chose centralistic concept in spite of the fact that from 1997 up to 2013 city government was held by Democratic Party, which ought to be comfortable with democratic and decentralized concepts and model of organization and management.

Centralization led to great dysfunctions in city services, great burdening of city administration and offices, inefficient and slow way of work, modest quality services for citizens etc.

Belgrade has often been shaken by various scandals: Bus plus, taxi, building bridge over Sava and island Ada, transfer from concept of building metro to 'light' metro concept, questionable projects of garbage collection etc.

The general goal for Belgrade is to become a more competitive city and to improve its positioning compared to other European metropolitan cities.¹⁸

* * *

Following case studies can be useful for better understanding of various factors which influence process of urban regeneration.

Case study 1 Belgrade Port

The Belgrade Port study demonstrates the challenges of regeneration of city port. They include: problematic privatization, serious jeopardizing of public interest, acquiring public building lots for small some of money (problem of corruption), conflict between various power centres, interest plots and conflicts on the relations between state -city, poor institutions (city, state) and long term conflict about change of purpose of land in this part of the City.

This case study starts with privatization of Belgrade Port, then presents ambitious project Belgrade on Waters, financed by owners of the privatized Port, and finishes with the conflict between Belgrade authority and owners of the Port around property over the land on which Port is situated.

Belgrade Port is located on Dorćol, attractive part of city on the board of Danube, in the bottom of old part of city: it is part of industrial zone. Number of factories are located here together with, following storages and selling objects, custom zone etc. Port part of Belgrade settlement, as it used to be the case in a number of other European cities, is a pretty neglected part of town¹⁹ near the centre, which has extraordinary developmental potentials. General urban plan of Belgrade defines that this part of the city can be used for economic activities, including port (space of Marina Dorćol, over Port space until to Pančevo bridge).²⁰

¹⁸ For strengthening competitiveness of Belgrade, a number of measures has been considered as a part of economic, communal, land and tax policies. They will lead to decentralization of public services and strengthening cooperation between private and public sector (PPP). Same, page 24.

¹⁹ Negligence of this part of city is highly increase by decades of war and sanctions, between 1990 do 2000, when investments almost completely vanished.

²⁰ General urban plan of Belgrade 2021, Official Gazette RS, number 27/2003, 25/2005, 34/ 2007 i 69/ 2009.

In some strategic visions of Belgrade development and in some plans appears option that Port should be moved from this part of town because of lack of land available and necessary for normal activities of modern port: limited space, as well as insufficiently developed traffic infrastructure and capacities (traffic jams)²¹. It would be logical and normal that state, together with city makes changes of General urban plan, and move Belgrade Port on the location on which it can develop and function²² and sell it to the investor interested for development of port activities. On the other side, urban space and land in this zone of Port can be converted from industrial to some other activities, which can enrich city like: housing, business, shopping zones, places for public meetings, cultural, sport recreational zones, etc. Such changed purpose of lots of this zone could be given to public selling for much higher prices procuring Belgrade budget with substantial sum of money. Rules of the game would be clear and there would not be a chance for misuse, frauds, and dissatisfaction of all subjects.

Neither state, nor city have made an order in these processes which left an allowed various misuses. So, in 2009 the journalist of TV serial "Official misuse" ²³ identified that city building land, as important and valued city resource, has been given for nothing to buyers of old factories, mills, printing and other enterprises. Buyers would dissolve enterprise, fire workers, and use the lots to build on these lots some commercially lucrative objects, procuring building land form small sum of money. It happened sometimes that investors built on agricultural land and afterwards that state would adopt detailed urban plan, that converts the purpose of this land in building land. ²⁴

Belgrade Port become a case in public because it united problematic privatization with serious preparation of the leadership of Port to develop and put into practice ambitious project on this part of city which lay on Port land, and made luxury housing zone with marina, as well as attractive business, shopping and cultural district.

It was clear to the public that the main motive for buying of Port was city land and enormous potential income and profit made by realization of project Belgrade on Water.

Privatization of the Belgrade Port

City of Belgrade established Belgrade Port in 1961 as public enterprise. Its importance for Belgrade economy can be seen by fact that 5% of means in city (send over Agency for building land) was sent to the development of this enterprise.

²¹ General urban plan of Belgrade 2021, include option that, from that part of the city port activities ought to be moved.

²² One of the locations which has been mentioned is left (on side where city Pančevo is located) bank of Danube on which exist a great space, available for building necessary traffic and other infratstructure, like precondition for normal functioning for modern ports.

²³ Research journalist serial "Official misuse" on TV chanal B92 , See:

http://www.b92.net/video/video.php?nav_category=906&nav_id=355656, visited on May 12th, 2015.

²⁴ In this moment (2009) it is identified that almost around 300 ha of building land in Belgrade didn't go, on this base, to public auction, by which citizens, city and state are literary robbed from these subjects (buyers and representatives of government).

Belgrade Port has been privatized in 1998 when the first cycle of property transformation has been done. After that, Action fund possessed 30,88% shares, Republic fund for retirement and invalid insurance 10%, and 60% of shares possess small share-holders.²⁵ In that time, in 1998 (time of economic crises, isolation and sanctions) the Port's share value has been pretty low (494 dinars). After 2000 Serbia redeveloped and in 2005 leadership of Belgrade Port engaged Institute of Economic Sciences to make new assessment of the Port's capital value. In this assessment process period, Managing Board of the Port called the meeting for Annually Assembly of all share holders in order to analyze financial reports and adopt further business policy of the Port. Then they announced to share holders about new assessment process of the Port's capital but the proposed report was adopted without correction of the value of capital. Share holders have been left in believe that the value of shares is still 494 dinars.

At the same day, Securities Commission approved the offer of Investment Fund "Worldfin" from Luxemburg²⁶ to buy Belgrade Port. It offered with start price of 800 dinars for one share.²⁷ Managing Board of Port suggested to shareholders to wait for other possible offers that could appear by final date and then to decide if they would sell their shares or not. Since there was no other offers, state (PIO fund, 10% of shares) and then Action fund sold their shares to Worldfin. Their example has been followed by small shareholders (60% of all shares) who sell their shares believing that offer is quite profitable for them. In this way Worldfin became the owner of 93% of Port shares (it turned out that Worldfin is owned by two domestic businessmen: Miroslav Mišković and Milan Beko, which had excellent relationship with the representatives of government. Not long after that, Institute for Economic Sciences released the results of their evaluation which identified that the value of one Belgrade Port's share is 1774 dinars.²⁸

In short, state approved the sale of Belgrade Port in the ambience, knowing that Port will be moved from this location and that the main motive of these investors was very valuable land. On the other side, small share holders have been fooled by new Belgrade Port owners and government representatives (coordinated activities of Security Commission and representatives of state PIO fund which sold their shares to Port. Privatization of Belgrade Port is one of 24 problematic privatizations criticized both by EU, and the Anti- Corruption Council.

Right for using port land

It is interesting that in 2004 city of Belgrade managed²⁹ to become the owner of the land of Belgrade Port. In that property regime, Port can only use this land. New owners of Belgrade Port paid no attention on this fact, because of their close relationship with state officials and because of common practice of getting lots by buying objects on it. So, they were convinced that they have a right to start the building process of on the land of Belgrade Port. Therefore they financed ambitious project "Belgrade on Water" in order to build completely new part of city and make

²⁵ See: <http://www.lukabeograd.com/press/iz-naseg-ugla/155/QA+Luka+Beograd.html>, visited on May 15th, 2015.

²⁶ It turned out that the owners of this firm are domestic businessmen.

²⁷ Offer is announced in daily newspapers with the price of 800 dinars per share.

²⁸ In 2010 small shareholders submitted criminal charge on the base of doubts that they are fooled in the process of selling shares in 2005. By their calculations multimillions damage has been made to them, as well as for society.

²⁹ ...although in that moment legal base for it was inadequate: in that moment new Constitution was not stipulated (2006), nor Law on spatial planning and building (2009)!

big profit from it. They engaged top niderlander team with famous architect and planner, who made excellent project, skillfully combining tradition and nature of the city, specifics of the lots, using traditional and modern architectural forms, and with smart inclusion of all important aspects for life and development of modern city.³⁰



Their desire was that this part of city can be seen in completely different light, as new and exciting place full of life, activities and initiatives. Project was inspired by practice of experience economy³¹ by which this part of town ought to be transformed and to offer interesting and stimulating experiences and contents, strenghtening brend of city center with cultural, artistic contents, squares, places for meeting, etc.

Conflicts between Belgrade Port and City of Belgrade

Unexpectedly, the owners of Belgrade Port were faced with new political situation. DSS (Democratic party of Serbia) which was a kind of protector of interests of Port`s owners lost on state elections in 2008. The winner on this election was DS (Democratic Party), the same party who held power in city of Belgrade. In this new political ambience, the owners of the Belgrade Port were clearly told that buying Port didn`t mean buying land. Owners of the Port felt fooled because other investors used the same matrix taking land by buying old factories and building with later conversion of land purpose (even when this possibility was not predicted by plans). In the case of Port existed the plan that Port would be moved on other bank of the Danube, with proposition that in this part of city, the land purpose ought to be changed, corresponding to the contents of their project.

³⁰ "Daniel Libeskind, one of today`s most prominent architects, and Jan Gehl, a prominent city planner and expert for public spaces, were hired for this project with the idea to redevelop that part of Belgrade waterfront. „City on Water" project is the first significant step in activating Belgrade's great potential which stems from its rivers. ***Created entirely in line with contemporary town planning principles***, the project will be a significant contribution to Belgrade's transformation into a European capital with unique and recognizable identity and will also confirm that, as an international city, it belongs to modern societies."

See: <http://www.lukabeograd.com/GradNaVodi/Masterplan.html>, visited on May 28th, 2015.

³¹ Snežana Đorđević (2012): "Savremene urbane studije" Čigoja, Beograd. page 189-192.

Belgrade officials, as well as state officials, offered to Belgrade port owners option to buy this land and to pay normal price for it, but the Port`s owners refused this offer.³²

This led to long-term conflict, unthinkable in legal state which has clear norms and rules. In august 2013 Belgrade Port reported bankruptcy which led to conclusion of this conflict.

Redevelopment of his part of city should have been created by city officials, who ought to work together with citizens, professionals, civil society, interest groups and public. Instead of that, this job has been done by businessmen, owners of Belgrade Port, which have been primarily motivated by profit. Even so, experts gave excellent grades for the quality of this project in professional sense, but paradoxically its realization has been blocked because of the explained circumstances.

This case shows poor quality of legal state, poor quality of land property regulations which open space for creation of various interest arrangements between business and political officials. It could be identified misuses, domination of the state over the city, unclear rules of game, irresponsible governments which instead of protecting public interest give priority to personal and group gains from public resources. Public has been suppressed, poorly informed and unable to influence redevelopment and re-shaping of their city. Ironically in such ambience citizens are always losers: when investors get valuable land for free, as well as when excellent project of regeneration of neglected part of city has been stopped.

Case study 2 Resettlement of wild Roma settlement from location near Gazela bridge

In summer 2009 city of Belgrade was preparing Universiade, sport manifestation and therefore took a number of measures which contain resettlement of wild settlements in the area of New Belgrade.³³ Participants were settled in newly build housing complex, University village (popularly named Bellville). After this manifestation, flats have been offered on market, for sale.³⁴

City officials prepared city for this sport and cultural manifestation, cleaning ugly and neglected part of city. In this process wild Roma settlement on the left bench of river Sava, near Gasela bridge, visible from old part of city, has been completely removed, which beautified this part of city.

City officials stressed that they are devoted to move the wild settlements which are located on important traffic and developmental spaces and lots. In spite of that, a part of inhabitants of

³² New Law on urban planning and building (2009) opened a possibility of buying lots, on the base of the given Constitutional norm.

³³ Summer Universiade was held in 2009 from July 1st to 12th.

³⁴ Settlement Belville, in the heart of New Belgrade represents completely new housing complex. It is characterized by innovations in building, great functionality, modern technical solutions, and unusual system of spatial organization. It is from 14 housing buildings on the space of 15 ha (each building is named by one flower), with almost 2000 modern flats, with business and management buildings. Investors are society *Block 67 Associates d.o.o.* which founder is *Hypo-Alpe Adria Bank*.

Roma settlement across Bellville was not ready to move on city periphery or in collective centers,³⁵ where refugees and inhabitants resettled from Kosovo have been settled. They stated that this ambience is not suitable for their work and earning for living. So, a part of inhabitants of this settlement (around 250 families, each with 5 members in average) stayed on this location, which is very suitable for collecting row materials, as main activities of these families.



Public enterprise Universiade in this situation, found the solution in putting 2 m high iron wire fence around remnants of this settlement, and hiding it with screens from Bellville. This measure made huge problem to everyday life of the inhabitants from this settlement: it prevented their normal moving, access to water (public fountain, from which they use water, has been separated from them by wire fence). They were also prevented to go to flea market over parking lot, forcing them to go over grass field full of broken glass, making damage on their trolleys` tires, which made unbearably cost for them.

Beside this, fence prevented the access of fire engine and ambulance to the settlement, upgrading inhabitants` sense of treats in the case of fire or illness. Some problems with installation led to often loss of electricity. Permanent police patrols, included for procurement of security, made an additional pressure on these inhabitants who had a feeling that they live in a kind of a camp.

On all these measures, public reacted with displeasure, and some political parties, as well as NGOs, demanded removal of wire fence, to procure inhabitants normal circumstances for life and work. This demand was supported by Ombudsman demanding "that Roma people should have normal access to their homes, to water, and to collect row material without problems because it is their main working activity."³⁶

Goran Miletić, representative of Swedish Helsinki Board for human rights, stressed that with that kind of attitude toward Roma population, Serbia broke international conventions on which Serbia have been obligated by ratification.

³⁵ Roma people refused to go in collective centers because they could not work and earn for living there.

³⁶ See: http://www.b92.net/info/vesti/index.php?yyyy=2009&mm=04&dd=03&nav_id=353579, visited on May 22nd, 2015.



Mayor of Belgrade, disputed these statements with words: "Roma settlements is not the one that is fenced. It is University village." He added that city officials are persistent with decision to move wild settlements from these two locations (near Gazela and Bellville) up to the end of the year, promising that their inhabitants will be procured with settlement, water, sanitary circumstances, but under condition that their kids go in school from September 1st.

Mayor has tried, in this awkward way, to point out that city officials try to solve the problem of inadequate housing of Roma population. This resettlement will give them a chance for better life by solving their other problems as well (integral approach). Since it was apparent that the aim of this package of measures was cleaning and beautifying a city, this statement provoked additional reactions.

One group of NGOs and concerned citizens formed Anti-fascistic campaign and have organized protest meeting for support inhabitants of this enclosed settlement (on June 27th, four days before start of the manifestation). They claimed that city officials together with rich people jeopardized the rights and working and living conditions of Roma inhabitants. They pointed out that city government, instead of solving problems of inhabitants from such settlements, "hide terrible living conditions with wire fence and Universiade`s screens, and public bluffed with spectacle paid by our money."³⁷

After the end of the meeting, pro-fascistic organization Obraz attacked representatives of this campaign both near the place of that meeting, as well as in the centre of the city.

These events provoked new wave of dissatisfaction of public, NGO and certain number of political parties (Social-democratic League of Vojvodina, LSV, Social-democratic Union, SDU). Critics went particularly on account of complete unpreparedness of Ministry of interior affairs to react and prevent incidents on the meeting of high risk. They reminded that Prosecution didn`t support initiative of the Ministry for human and minority rights, to prohibit activities of pro-fascistic organization Obraz, which has been encouraged in this way to continue with this sort of activities.

³⁷ See: http://www.b92.net/info/vesti/index.php?yyyy=2009&mm=04&dd=03&nav_id=353579, visited on May 22nd, 2015.

Roma people are one of the biggest ethnic communities in Serbia, which hardly ever get out from poverty cycle and social isolation. Data on the size of Roma population in Serbia varies (from 150 000 up to 800 000).³⁸

This ethnic group is poorly socially integrated: poor inclusion of children and adults in educational programs, they are poorly educated and have weak professional structure, high level of unemployed, high concentration jobs in grey economy, great poverty etc. Marginalization can also be seen in the fact that state rarely supports this group in solving housing problem etc. They traditionally solve alone their housing needs which have for results poor quality of housing, as well as great number of wild settlements. There is an estimation that in Belgrade exist around 100 wild Roma settlements.³⁹

Roma population are five times more threatened by conditions of poor housing (64%) in comparison to rest of the population in Serbia (15%).⁴⁰

State adopted program "Roma Decade 2005-2015" with complex approach to the improvement of the quality of life in this minor and seriously threatened social group. This program includes all aspects of their lives (housing, education, social and health care, employment) and demands inclusion of state officials, but also local government officials, who should procure successfully implementation.⁴¹ This case pointed out that Belgrade`s officials didn`t even know for the existence of this program, as well as its aims, standards, principles and methods of work in this policy field.

Coordination between city and the state

This case showed a weak coordination in the process of creating and implementation of policy, programs and projects in government, between ministries, agencies, as well as between government and local governments (Belgrade). Belgrade officials decide to resettle these two wild settlements without understandings that this process means. Such project requires devoted building quality of urban space with sensibility to understanding of the special needs and rights of people from this social group.

At the same time state secretary of Ministry for human and minority rights, Marko Karadžić, announced that they will start with gathering data on the number of Roma settlements, and their inhabitants. It was obvious that beside permanent inhabitants of these settlements, there is permanent inflow of Roma population from various parts of ex-Yugoslavia, which additionally complicated the possibility of reaching sustainable solution of these problems.

³⁸ See: According to the official list data in 2011. this number is 150 000, by assesment of Council of Europe this number is around 450 000 and estimationf of Roma people is that there is around 800.000. See for more detail: Kovačević, O. (2009), „Socio-economic analysis of Roma people in Serbia”, Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju, Belgrade.

³⁹ Researches pointed out that from around 600 Roma settlements, half of them are getthoes. 70% has been illegally built. This settlements often have not connection sewage systems, (75%) and with waterwarks network (53%), sometimes they don`t have electricity (10%). See: Jaksic, B., Basic, G. (2005): The Art of Surviving: Where and How Roma Live in Serbia, Beograd: Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju, Belgrade.

⁴⁰ See: Strategy for improvement condition of Roma population, <http://www.housingcenter.org.rs/download/Strategija-za-unapredjenje-Roma-u-RS.pdf>, visited on May 28th, 2015.

⁴¹ See: <http://www.mc.rs/dekada-roma.1095.html>, visited on May 22nd, 2015.

He also announced that in the settlements that fulfill certain preconditions the process of legalization will be allowed. He added that in the process of resettlement one has to keep in mind that Roma people should have the necessary conditions for work and living.

Certain help in these processes procured Ombudsman Saša Janković who talked to city officials about possibilities of more adequate approach in solving these problems. He helped city officials to understand basic standards, stressing that resettlement inhabitants from wild settlement, mostly Roma population, have to be made by protection of their human rights, on sustainable, permanent way, which cover all aspects of their life (procuring basic circumstances for housing, including them in education process, as well as in programs of social and health care protection, including in kindergartens and schools, employment etc). He offered his support and cooperation to Belgrade authorities and officials stressing that his legal duty as ombudsman is to help protection of the most vulnerable categories of population.⁴²

Weak learning city officials from experiences

Interestingly, one could conclude that Belgrade government didn't even learn from good practices of previously city governments. Project of redevelopment of one Roma settlement ***Eagle settlement***, on the periphery of greater Belgrade settlement Mirijevo, has been between 1990 and 2000 successfully implemented.

Urban plan predicted for this territory building green city belt, outer highway ring and Mirijevo boulevard, forbidding any building. These plan limitations caused leaving of richer population, impoverishment of space, inhabitants and this settlement.

Project started with founding of the Society for upgrading quality of life in Roma settlement, in order to create and implement a program for sustainable redevelopment of Eagle Settlement. Program was complex and contained all aspects of life: upgrading quality of houses with including personal capacities (program of ***houses restoration***), ***establishing local government bodies*** (neighborhood community, like sub-municipal unit, has been established). Municipality Zvezdara committed to procure means for the part of projects. Settlement was ***connected to waterworks and sewage system*** and in the system of ***garbage*** collection and disposal. Huge efforts have been made to achieve that Roma children regularly ***go to school***, as well as to procure social and health support for inhabitants.

Creators of the program have been very proud on success with part of the program devoted to ***upgrading tolerance*** of neighborhood inhabitants toward Roma population, which in social sense highly improved quality of their life. Important part of the program was training of unemployed adults in order to enable them to start family business (production, service). By the end of 2010. Belgrade officials have chosen territory of this settlement for the location of the first garbage recycling center, which increased the welfare of this population.⁴³ Belgrade

⁴² See: <http://www.mc.rs/upload/documents/izvestaji/2009/Jun/29-6-Regionalni-centar-za-manjine.pdf>, visited on May 22nd, 2015.

⁴³ Recycling centre covers around 200 m², it is excellent equipped and financed by Government of Norway. In organizational way it is cooperative of Roma people, and is a part of Municipal entrepreneurila association. See: "Sustainable housing for Roma population in Serbia", Palgo center, Belgrade 2012, pages 39-41, See on: <http://www.palgo.org/cms/en/publications/publications?start=12>

officials were completely unconscious they closed the cycle of this very successful and sustainable project of Roma settlement redevelopment.

Conclusion

When Universiade was finished, life went on in a regular course. Inhabitants of Roma settlement near Bellville didn't move away, city officials didn't offer them integral program for upgrading quality of their life: finding better jobs, restoration of their houses, higher attendance of children in school, better social and health protection, which mayor of Belgrade mentioned in his speech. On the other side, the owners of Bellville housing complex still complain to Belgrade officials that existing problem of flea market as well as wild Roma settlement, seriously diminishes demand for the flats as well as their prices. Company "Block 67 Associates" can't solve these problems alone and city officials forgot about them.

Case study 3. Belgrade Waterfront

In media appearance Prime Minister suddenly announced implementation of the project *Belgrade Waterfront*, that means building gigantic business and housing complex in Sava amphitheater - in the foothill of the old part of town, at the bank of river Sava (right side). This project was presented as a cooperation with private partner from Arabic Emirates "*Eagle Hills*". It was presented as already finished project in whose preparation hasn't been included anyone from Serbia, nor from Belgrade: city authorities, urban - planning institutions, domestic planners, urbanists, architects, association, civil society, NGO, citizens.

Project is a kind of public private partnership, but it is conducted out of legal frame. It is possible because the Law on public private partnership and concessions, left possibility that international cooperation are free of this kind of domestic legal obligation.⁴⁴ This is in conflict with EU laws breaking principles of contract and let space for direct bargaining and corruption on the highest level.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Law on public private partnership and concessions, Official Gazette of RS, number 88/2011, art. 3.

⁴⁵ See also: Vladimir Vasiljev: "Javno privatna partnerstva", PhD thesis, 2015. Faculty for Political Sciences, Belgrade. Page 192.



Plan was presented through *model*⁴⁶ and the picture of huge complex of tall buildings (neither remarkable nor interesting architecture) in which dominates huge tower, then high buildings for housing and huge shopping mall.

This project is about creation of *housing-business complex of 1,8 million square meters, for which hasn't been done study on justification and identification of needs for the project, value for money analysis, cost benefit analysis, as well as financial cost construction.*⁴⁷

In architectural terms plan was made for abstract area and not to Sava Amphitheater. A lot of important facts and factors have been overlooked: consciousness of tradition, historical layers of Belgrade's settlements, geophysical features and narrowness of this belt at riverbank, poor connection with the entirety of the city as well as impossibility for procuring adequate traffic infrastructure for the project.

Project can hardly be included in the realistic space for which it is designed. It is not tested by alternatives although which exist as a part of long-term concept of descending city and citizens on riverbanks and are materialized in urban plan and various previously made studies. These alternatives could be very useful for correction and improvement of the project, although numerous subjects consider that best solution for this project is to be completely changed.⁴⁸

On the first sight, it is clear that the main interest of this project is *business and profit*. This overbuilt complex with high buildings actually prevents and disables approach to Sava riverbanks, and separates it from other parts of the city.⁴⁹ Main dilemma is if Belgrade needs such housing and business space.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ ASA points out that it is humiliating that instead of urban plan, this new model, for which neither the author, nor the origin are known, became instrument of regeneration for the most valuable part of the city.

⁴⁷ At the area of 177 hectares, it is planned to achieve more than 1,000,000 square meters of housing, approximately 750,000 square meters of office and commercial space, more than 62,000 square meters of public facilities such as kindergartens, schools, cultural institutions, social and health care and about 242,000 square meters of new green spaces. These capacities, will procure jobs and living space for more than 13,000 employees and more than 17,000 residents.

⁴⁸ In the Declaration of Belgrade Waterfront, the Academy of Serbian Architecture points out that "Article 89 of the Constitution, which protects cultural heritage and the public interest, is violated. A number of laws, international charters, conventions, resolutions, rules and guidelines adopted by the Council of Europe on the right on city, the European Landscape Convention (2000) given by Council of Europe, UNOSEK recommendations on the historic urban landscape and so on, which Serbia has signed and ratified, are also broken". See:

⁴⁹ Therefore, experts suggest that it is to reduce the number of tall buildings and move them upstream, towards the Fair (to the south).

⁵⁰ There is no need for a huge housing fund for 17 000 inhabitants, 6130 apartments (average size of 170m²). Belgrade already has higher housing supply than demand.

Great problem of the project is impossibility to procure **traffic accessibility** to this space, and adequate infrastructure support for kind of settlement. It is predicted by project to build underground garage on the soil with high level of underground water, what is huge overlook. Project has been criticized regarding its **identity**, because huge buildings haven't **symbolism** important and relevant for Belgrade. It is also unacceptable that this project avoids **public competition** for conceptual design for objects, which seriously damage to public interest.

Alternative

The majority of Serbian experts in this field have alternative proposition. They stress that the vision for this part of the city, included in urban plan, requires the arrangement which enables descend of city and citizens on riverbanks. That means building smaller number of lower objects, with domination of contents and activities connected to recreation (green area), meeting people (squares and meeting places), entertainment, culture, and sport. Therefore this areas and objects on it should nicely be arranged in balanced entity descending to waterline, connecting both benches of river with light pedestrian bridge, and making possible for city to develop, and to "breathe". In symbolic sense, instead of gigantic tower as a symbol of money and power, experts consider that the replica of Tesla tower as identification sign of Belgrade and Serbia, much better fit in this space. It is stated that this whole project have to use **public competition** for ideas, suggestions, designs in order to procure the best possible solutions.

Despite public discontent, state was persistent to implement project according to original model, without any serious corrections. Political majority in Serbian Assembly turned out to be sufficient instrument for project's implementation.

Ambience for creation of policy and decision making

Existing atmosphere of **secrecy and information withholding** in the decision making process in this project, led to additional doubts. So, Director of Belgrade Agency for Urbanism publicly said that Belgrade Waterfront's model, which was made by potential investor Eagle Hills, has been starting point for making **Plan of detailed regulation** for the territory of Sava Amphitheater. On demand of NGO, Transparency Serbia to give them that plan, he rejected by explanation that he hasn't these data.⁵¹

State Agency for planning and building (recently dissolved) has formed to make Report from the public debate on Draft of Spatial plan for special purpose area.⁵² Commission discussed and debate about these remarks at one open and **seven closed sessions**. Finally Report was made public only after official demand and it turned that the report was pretty modest. City architect destroyed voice recording, and his office cut off contacts with the public. Mayors' Cabinet stated

⁵¹ See more at:

file:///C:/Users/sneska/Documents/MILANO%202015%20IPP%20CONFERENCE/DUJINI%20PRILOZI/Gradski%20arhitekta%20oduzeo%20snimke%20sednice%20o%20E2%80%9CBeogradu%20na%20vodi%20E2%80%9D%20_%20Istinomer.htm#sthash.FX28qocD.dpuf

⁵² The remarks were, among others, given by Association of Serbian Architects, Association of Belgrade Architects and the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts.

that: “It is not allowed to go in public with information regarding Belgrade Waterfront project, until the first object would be opened”.⁵³

Legal instruments

Since the existing *Urban plan* represented barrier for implementation of this project, Serbian government decided to make *Lex specialis* and to regulate this area through *Spatial plan for special purpose area*. This kind of plan in Serbian normative system can be used only for the protection of strategic interests of Serbia, what housing and business, as main activities in this project, are not. Beside this, plan for spatial purpose area in our legal system is not intended for arrangement of territory; general urban plan and plan of detailed regulations has been used for this purpose. At this point numerous domestic laws, including even Constitution and a number of international conventions and standards have been broken.

In addition, this project establishes a complicated relationship between the state and local government (as the main actors). Government, regardless of the law, took right to decide on the part of the territory of the city of Belgrade, and all that without serious scientifically based and professionally supported studies, or convincing analysis of the economic and social justification of the project. In such a way, institutions for spatial planning, managing and inspections, have been put in dependant position of an obedient executor, which has seriously weakened them. Main creator of the project, protected by government, stays invisible and untouchable.

Expropriation

Because of mixed ownership structure (majority of the land and lots belong to the state, a smaller part belongs to the city and at the end private entities have the smallest share of it), *Lex specialis* allows *expropriation of land*⁵⁴ in order to use whole area for project needs, which further brings unrest and anxiety in the public.⁵⁵

The main objection is that the expropriation is done in this project, due to private, rather than public interests. This raises a number of problems, it creates insecurity of private property, which certainly doesn't encourage future investments. The group of well known lawyers (15 of them) has announced that the expropriation is unacceptable. It is a dangerous precedent because it is being implemented based on private interests. They offer to defend, all people whose lots the state would like to expropriate, free of charge.

⁵³ See: <http://www.nspm.rs/politicki-zivot/beograd-na-vodi-kolosalna-obmana-sa-nesagledivim-posledicama.html?alphabet=l>, visited on May 15th, 2015.

⁵⁴ *Lex specialis* regulates that the expropriated property should be paid at its market value, or exchange for some other adequate property.

⁵⁵ In this area exists urban disorder, characteristic to all parts of the country: there are a numerous illegally constructed buildings, as well as numerous requests for property restitution by previous owners, which will certainly cause additional challenges in this project.

Financial analysis

For such a complex project, only rough and approximate cost analysis has been done. It is obvious that the private partner got privileged position by contract. The contract obliges the state (city obediently followed state`s decision) to prepare the land and gave it to the private developer at disposal. Even rough calculation of the land preparation costs, indicates that it represents double the sum of the funds necessary for the construction. This leaves public in doubt if the state had their best interest in mind in concluding this business contract.

The costs of the state, the city of Belgrade and investors are not divided clearly. It is concluded, only roughly, that under perfect circumstances public would profit 33% of value of investments. These ideal conditions are completely unrealistic, assuming that all built would be sold. In that calculation time dimension was not developed and defined. In this prediction size of state`s and city`s investments have been underestimated, due to the fact that they took great responsibilities with contract.

Beside this, financial sources are not identified (like: the budget, the public-private -partnership or some other source), which creates uncertainty regarding the possible future costs for the citizens in this project.

It is not predicted that private investors would financially compensated the preparatory work such as expropriation, demolition, decontamination, development of primary infrastructure, even by 2016.

In addition, indirect costs for the city and state, in order to bring this project to function, have been completely ignored from financial point of the view. In the list of detailed regulation plans these obligations are implied demanding a variety of capital investments in infrastructure outside this area, like the construction of tunnels, bridges, traffic lanes etc. State officials didn`t define who will work on them, in which timeframe it must be done, through which phases and finally who will finance this projects and how.

Conclusion

The government has created a project alone, imposing it to the public and Belgrade city, ignoring that Belgrade should be, at least, equal participator. Professional and other associations in this field were actively involved in debate with a series of suggestions, analysis, alternative proposals, but these efforts have mostly been ignored. The Serbian Assembly adopted the *lex specialis*, the city of Belgrade and its bodies (Agency for Urbanism, institutions for urban planning and building) obediently supported implementation of the project, violating professional and other standards. Assembly of Belgrade adopted detailed regulation plan and city architect has led consultations and decision-making process non-transparently.

Civil society, professionals and political organizations were actively involved in debate. Association of Architects of Serbia, SANU, the Academy of Architects of Serbia, experts with reputation, Transparency Serbia, NGOs and some opposition parties) were opened dilemmas about the purpose of the project, the way of its creation and implementation and offered solutions. They initiated the interruption of the project and have suggested numerous corrections.

In the declaration, architects paid special attention to *technical and financial aspects of the project*, pointing out that the implementation of the "Belgrade Waterfront" requires huge funds and long period for implementation. The total value of the infrastructure equipment for the whole area exceeds, at least twice, the maximum amount of investment in the building. In that light, they ask the question who allowed partners from the Emirates to make sovereign decisions, thereby investing, for the time being, only in "cosmetic work".

Although serious arguments have been given against original model of Belgrade Waterfront model, state and city government persist on its implementation without providing necessary explanation.

Representatives of the ruling Serbian Progressive Party in Assembly announced that they will support a law on Spatial Plan for special purpose areas, because they consider this project as exceptional and very important not only for our country but also for the whole region. They pointed out "that construction starts soon, and that they already have, in the first stage, removed 166 objects and displaced 88 families which had been living in inhumane conditions".

This case shows that governments and institutions in Serbia often don't use scientific data and evidence as main indicators in creation an implementation of policy, which caused huge troubles and costs for citizens.

Main Conclusions

1. Urban regeneration policy in Belgrade is formed by model which exists for most other policy fields. It is not evidence based policy making, but rather ad hoc decision making, that partially leans on plans.

2. Belgrade hasn't adopted Developmental strategy and this problem is partially alleviated only with existence of Strategy for tourism.

3. Spatial and urban plans exist but they often do not apply (so, plan to relocate the Port is not being implemented, or easily giving up of planned concept of the land purpose and the vision of Sava amphitheater).

Plans are being made far from the public eye, although in the adoption procedure exist a stage of public in-view. In practice, experts are participate and debate about major projects but if their propositions are in conflict with political officials' interest, they simply ignore them (like in case of changing metro building concept, Sava Amphitheater looks and land purpose etc). The public remains silent observer of these processes or dissatisfied witness of unsuccessful or partially successful city reconstruction projects.

4. Institutions are weak, which is largely caused by the systemic problems of the lack of: rule of law, clear rules, transparent decision-making processes as well as often lack of political officials' accountability for the quality of public projects and services. In Serbia (including Belgrade), exists permanent problem of the party state, the regime of party loot division over public goods and services.

5. The party arrangements often decisively influence policy instead of an institution in charge (an excellent example is the Port of Belgrade: the changing of ruling political party at state elections turned project prepared for implementation with the highest level of possibility, into utter impossibility).

6. Poor cooperation and coordination between different levels of government:

a. State - City of Belgrade

City officials don't know for the realization of numerous projects at the state level, as has been shown in the case of "the Roma Decade". On the other side, state often has no idea of the government' needs and plans: Belgrade (Waterfront project which change the developmental vision of the Sava amphitheater);

b . City of Belgrade - the city municipality

City of Belgrade often pays small attention to projects of municipalities, and isn't real partner in mutual projects. Instead of partnership this relation is mostly hierarchical and city often ignores needs and projects of municipalities (case of Eagle Settlement).

In both cases the relationship between different levels of government is hierarchical and characterized by poor ability of subordinate subjects to influence at process.

7. Poor learning from experience

City officials and administration rarely learn from successful, already implemented projects by their predecessor (the case of renewal of Roma settlements Eagle settlement etc).

8. Serbia belongs to countries with the high level of corruption. Political parties and government representatives at all levels are main participants of these processes. Building processes are extremely suitable for corrupting activities, and public interest and goods are often scarified at that point. The consequences are great loss of public values and money (misuse of privatization procedure for getting valuable cities` lots and building land cheaply; Belgrade Waterfront project which has been implemented out of standards stipulated for PPP projects, and even so by breaking laws and international conventions, and standards).

Main words

Urban planning, spatial planning, zoning, land purpose conversion, urban regeneration, urban sustainability, resettlement, social inclusion, corruption.

References:

1. Alan Harding a& Talja Blockland (2014), *Urban Theory*, Sage Publications.
2. *Urban Politics* (2014), ed. by Mark Davidson & Deborah Martin, Sage Publications.
3. *Researching the City* (2014), Ed. Kevin Ward, Sage Publications.
4. *Cities and crisis* (2014), Ed. Kuniko Fujita, Sage Publications.
5. David Wolfe (2014), *Innovating in urban economies / Economic Transformations in Canadian city regions*, University of Toronto Press.
6. Bradfore & Bramwell, (2014) *Governing urban economies, Innovation and Inclusion in Canadian City Regions*, University of Toronto Press.
7. Edward Soja (2010) *Seeking Spatial Justice*, University of Minnesota Press.
8. *Cities and Sovereignty, Identity Politics in Urban Spaces* (2011), eds. Diane Davis, Nora Libertun de Duren, Indiana University Press.
9. *Urban Planning in the 21st Century* (2009), Ed. Daniel Graber, Kenneth Birmingham, Nova Scienca Publsihers, Inc, New York.
10. John Frece (2009), *Sprawl and Politics, Inside Story of Smart Growth in Maryland*, University Press of New York.
11. M. Gottdienr & Leslie Budd (2005), *Urban Studies*, Sage Publications.
12. Robert Agranoff & Michael McGuire, *Collaborative Public Management- New Strategies for Local Governments* (2003), Georgetown University Press, Washington, DC.
13. M. Petrović, B. Žarković, G. Vele, O. Babić, K Pivić, D. Damjanović (2012): "Sustaiable Housing for Roma Population in Serbia", Palgo center, Belgrade
14. Snežana Đorđević (2012): "Savremene urbane studije" Čigoja, Beograd.
15. Snežana Đorđević (2012): "Modeli regionalizacije za Srbiju" in book: "Nove regionalne politike i evropska iskustva", Megatrend, Beograd.
16. Jaksic, B., Basic, G. (2005): *The Art of Surviving: Where and How Roma Live in Serbia*, Beograd: Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju, Belgrade.
17. Kovačević, O. (2009), „Socio-economic analysis of Roma people in Serbia”, Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju, Belgrade.
18. Vladimir Vasiljev: "Javno privatna partnerstva", PhD thesis, 2015. Faculty for political sciences, Belgrade.