

Vladimir BREZAR

## Stanovanjska gradnja v Sloveniji včeraj in danes

# Housing Construction in Slovenia in the Past and Present

### *Stanovanjsko gospodarstvo Stanovanjska gradnja Slovenija*

*Avtor opisuje "milieu" v preteklosti, ki je poleg gradnje stanovanjskih sosesk, dopuščal številnim legalnim in nelegalnim samograditeljem gradnjo individualnih hiš, neracionalno razpršenih po celi Sloveniji. Nerešeni problemi stanovanjske gradnje iz preteklosti se, navkljub spremembam na stanovanjskem področju po letu 1991, kažejo danes v obliki številnih in prepletanih posledicah.*

### *Housing economy Housing construction Slovenia*

*The author discusses the milieu of the past which, besides housing neighbourhoods, allowed many legal and illegal self-help housing builders to construct single-family houses, dispersed all over Slovenia. Notwithstanding the changes introduced in the housing sector after 1991, the unsolved housing construction problems of the past are presently manifested in a variety of interrelated aftereffects.*

Naš sedanji stanovanjski fond je skupaj s komunalno infrastrukturo največja posamična postavka narodnega premoženja. Stanovanjske in komunalne gradnje so v preteklih desetletjih pomenile eno tretjino vseh investicij. Pridobitev stanovanja zajema sedem do deset let najproduktivnejšega obdobja v življenju povprečnega Slovenca.

Analiza našega stanovanjskega fonda je zahtevna naloga, ker črpa iz različnih virov, ki so med seboj različni, v izhodiščih, metodah in ciljih. Nekaj nam o tem povedo statistični letopisi, nekaj popisi prebivalstva, toda za stroko je to vse premalo. Raziskava, ki je bila narejena za potrebe vladnega programa v zvezi z energetske sanacije stanovanj in stanovanjskih hiš, se je približala realni oceni stanovanjskega fonda glede na tipe zgradb, tipe stanovanj, starosti in tehnične lastnosti.

Ta raziskava sicer potrjuje nekaj, kar na splošno že vemo: da obstajata dve vrsti stanovanjske gradnje, ki sta po drugi svetovni vojni vtisnili pečat slovenski krajini in našemu vsakdanjemu okolju. To sta:

- družbeno usmerjena (socialna, solidarnostna) množična gradnja večinoma večstanovanjskih objektov in velikih agregatov (sosesk) ter
- množična enodružinska gradnja, narejena pretežno s samogradnjo

Obe sta enako agresivni, enako se polasčata prostora, tako da izkoriščata bližino komunalnih naprav (npr. vpadnic) in urbanih središč. Za obe vrsti gradnje je značilno tudi,

Slovenia's present housing stock is, together with the communal infrastructure, the biggest single national asset. Throughout the last decades, housing and communal construction constituted one third of all investments. Securing housing takes between seven to ten years of the most productive period of the lifetime of an average Slovene.

Analysing our housing stock is a demanding task, since the analysis draws from various sources which differ from one another fundamentally, methodologically and with respect to their goals. Some information is available from annual statistics publications and some from population censuses, but this is all too little for professional purposes. Research which was done for the government's energy-saving renewal programme for apartments and houses came close to the true estimate of the housing stock, categorised into building type, type of apartment, housing age and technical properties.

This research confirms what we generally already know i.e., that there are two types of housing construction which left their mark on the Slovene landscape and on our immediate surroundings, after the Second World War. These are:

- public (social, solidarity) mass construction, mostly in multi-family apartment blocks and big housing complexes (neighbourhoods), and
- mass single family housing construction mostly of the self-help type.

da ne upoštevata nobenega konteksta. Individualizem se kaže v prostostoječi enodružinski hiši, v prostostoječem bloku ali stolpnici, kot tudi v prostostoječi soseski, ki nima roba, fasade, zaključka – konča se "kar tako". Pri nobeni ni izraženega zunanjega, javnega ali celo urbanega prostora: pri enodružinski gradnji po naravi tipa, pri soseskah zaradi "tehnokratskega" urbanizma, ki ga narekujejo žerjavne proge, osončenje, tehnologija gradnje, normativi, diferenciacija prometa. Za arhitekturo enodružinske gradnje je značilen princip aplikacije in dekoracije, za arhitekturo sosesk pa velike dimenzije in dispozicije, ki ne upoštevajo človeškega merila.

V Sloveniji se kot v večini držav in režimov neprestano ubadamo z reševanjem stanovanjskega vprašanja. V preteklih desetletjih smo to počeli na dva načina: organizirano in stihijno.

Povojna načrtna industrializacija dežele, ki je povzročila priliv ter s tem pritisk (in uvoz) delovne sile v sta asimptotično povečala potrebo po stanovanjih. Prostorska in časovna koncentracija te potrebe je zahtevala učinkovite rešitve. Ti so bili znani že od drugod: množična organizirana gradnja stanovanj po meri povprečne (statistične) delavske družine je znana že iz časov industrijske revolucije, nemških "Siedlungen" (Berlin, Frankfurt) in številna satelitska naselja ob velikih mestih po 2. svetovni vojni (London, Pariz, Stockholm itd.). Graditev stanovanjskih naselij postane dejavnost, ki traja kar nekaj let; pri gradnji sodeluje obsežen aparat, uporabljajo pa hitre industrijske metode. Na podlagi racionalnega zavidalnega vzorca, tipskih objektov (ali vsaj stopniščnih lamel), tipiziranih elementov zgradb (vhodi, balkoni, okna, vrata...) so v kratkem zgradili naselja za 5, 10, 15 tisoč ljudi. Enako velika ali manjša lepa stara slovenska mesta so nastajala nekaj stoletij. Gradnjo je pospešilo še sistemsko, načrtno zbiranje sredstev z obveznim prispevkom od osebnih dohodkov. Pri gradnji so bila uspešna le velika podjetja (tako so tudi nastala), ki so zaposlila množico uvoženih (nekvificiranih) delavcev

Both are equally aggressive and equally presumptive in space so as to take advantage of proximity to communal infrastructure (e.g. roads) and urban centres. It is typical of both types not to follow any context.

Individualism is exemplified in the detached family house, in the detached block or skyscraper, as much as in the detached neighbourhood, lacking an edge, facade or ending. It ends "just like that". None of them has a defined exterior, public or even urban space. This is due to the nature of housing type, in the case of single family construction, and due to "technocratic" urbanism, dictated by crane rails, daylight standards, building technology, standards and traffic segregation, in the case of neighbourhoods. The principle of application and decoration is characteristic of the architecture of single family housing while big size and extensive dispositions that pay no attention to human scale, characterise the architecture of neighbourhoods.

In Slovenia, like in the majority of other countries, we have endlessly been struggling to solve the housing problem. In past decades, we approached this problem in two ways: organised and randomly.

The planned industrialisation of the nation after the Second World War, which caused the influx and, thus, the pressure and import of the work force into towns, asymptotically increased the need for housing. The concentration of housing need, both in terms of space and time, demanded effective solutions. These had been already known from other places. Organised mass housing, built to the scale of the (statistical) average working family, is known from the period of the Industrial Revolution, the German "Siedlungen" (Berlin, Frankfurt), and several post-war "satellite" settlements near big cities (e.g. London, Paris, Stockholm).

Housing construction becomes an activity that lasts several years. Construction consists of an extensive apparatus involving the appli-

in uporabljale uvoženo tehnologijo, ki temelji predvsem na armiranem betonu. Prišlo je do absurdnega položaja: gostujoči delavci potrebujejo stanovanja (imajo velike družine, torej ugoden položaj na prednostni lestvici), tu pa so zato, da gradijo nova stanovanja torej zase. S tem v zvezi je treba poudariti, da je nenadna koncentracija ljudi iz različnih okolij (geografskih in kulturnih) povzročila sociološki šok, ki ga naselje preboli šele čez mnogo let, morda po eni celi generaciji, ko zrastejo prvi otroci in prva drevesa (otroci se intimneje polasčajo okolja, v katerem odrasčajo – ga raziskujejo<sup>1</sup>).

Bivalno kulturo v teh okoljih kritizirajo stanovalci, sociologi, pa tudi arhitekti in urbanisti. O negativnem odnosu do okolja v gosto naseljenih stanovanjskih soseskah doma in po svetu so bile narejene številne raziskave. Osnovne ugotovitve teh raziskav so predvsem: nenamenska raba stanovanjskih prostorov (drugačna od projektirane), prenaseljenost stanovanj (cenzus), nenamenska raba skupnih prostorov (ali celo neraba: kolesarnice sušilnice), nenamenska raba skupnih površin (zelenice, parkirišča, igrišča – getozacija ali coning) in slabo vzdrževanje; pomankanje smisla ali motiva za skupnost in sodelovanje, vandalizem, odmetavanje odpadkov, graffiti, prilaščanje skupnih prostorov in površin... Za te soseske je značilna splošna odtujenost, brezosebnost, pomanjkanje stikov s sosedi; srečanja na stopnišču, v dvigalu, na vhodu imajo zgolj formalni značaj – ljudje se pozdravijo, ker pač živijo skupaj. Povsem drugače je na deželi ali v okolju z enodružinskimi hišami, kjer lahko vedno skozi okno (tako da smo sami neopaženi) opazujemo sosede pri njihovem vsakdanjem delu, prihajanju domov, kajti dokler vemo, kaj delajo, se počutimo varne. V stolpnici pa nikogar ne vidimo, vse je skrivnostno, zato pa tudi sumljivo.

Tako stanje je seveda tudi eden od razlogov za razcvet drugega, nenačrnega načina "reševanja stanovanjskega problema". Končni cilj stanovalcev v blokih in stanovanjskih soseskah je, da bi enkrat v življenju prišli do svoje hiše z vrtom.

cation of fast industrial methods. On the basis of a rational model plan, standardised buildings (or at least the staircase lamellae), standardised parts of buildings (entrances, balconies, windows, doors, etc.), a settlement for five, ten or fifteen thousand people was constructed in a short time. It took several centuries for equally big or smaller beautiful Slovene towns to develop.

Construction was further accelerated by the systemic, planned fund raising through compulsory contributions deducted from personal income. Only the big building companies were successful in construction (so big companies were created) which employed masses of imported (unskilled) workers and applied imported technology primarily based on the use of reinforced concrete.

An absurd situation soon arose as the visiting workers themselves needed housing. They were, therefore, here to build new housing (with their big families, they had to be given priority on the waiting list) for themselves. It is necessary to emphasise, at this juncture, that the sudden concentration of people from different environments (geographical and cultural) caused a sociological shock from which any settlement would require many years to recover. This may probably take a whole generation, when the first children and trees grow up (the children cling to the environment in which they grow up more intimately. They investigate it).<sup>1</sup>

The living traditions in these environments have been criticised by the residents and sociologists, as well as by architects and town planners. Several studies have been done, both at home and abroad, on the negative relationship to the environment in the densely populated housing neighbourhoods. The main revelations from these studies are: the improper use of housing space (different from the planned use), overcrowding (censuses), improper use or even no use at all of common areas (bicycle storerooms, laundry drying rooms), improper use of common space (green areas, parking

Čeprav je hiša z vrtom želja večine ljudi po vsem svetu, je enodružinska hiša v Sloveniji po 2. svetovni vojni prav poseben pojav. Trdimo lahko, da je pojav množične gradnje enodružinskih hiš in samograditeljstva nekakšno nadomestilo za: sanjsko vilo v vrtu, bivanje, ki bi omogočalo stik z naravo (ki smo ga bili večinoma vajeni iz otroštva zaradi svojega kmečkenga porekla), za izgubljeno identiteto, ki je bila v obdobju kolektivizma nezaželena in v stanovanjskem bloku nemogoča, za kompetitivno uveljavljanje v družbi (status). Ali drugače povedano: okoliščine za takšen pojav so ustvarili različni ekonomski in politični dejavniki. To je dopuščala predvsem država oziroma režim (s svojim popuščanjem pri uresničevanju načel), ker je želela ohraniti socialni in politični mir. Tako je reševala tudi stanovanjsko problematiko; sistem ni dopuščal lastništva, torej tudi ne investiranja v proizvodna sredstva; ljudje so lahko vrednost svojega denarja zaradi velike inflacije ohranjali tako, da so denar sprti vlagali v zidove lastne hiše; zemljišče je bilo splošna družbena last, torej brez realne cene (renta), zato ni nikogar motila nena (r)na in neracionalna zidava; delovni čas, pri katerem so popoldnevi prosti, omogoča razcvet "nacionalnega športa" - mešanje betona. Vendar ima država, ki vse to dopušča, tudi svojo korist: zastojno zemljišče obremenjeno z dajatvami, ravno tolikšnimi, da jih vsak zmora (prispevek za spremembo namembnosti, komunalni prispevek itd.). Urbanistične službe pa pridno parcelirajo teren in rišejo vanj kvadratke (kajti to je tudi zanesljiv in stabilen vir dohodka).

#### Kakšna je slovenska enodružinska hiša in zakaj?

Čeprav niti dve hiši nista enaki, lahko govorimo o nekem splošnem tipu, ki ga lahko opišemo takole:

- to je prostostoječa zgradba sredi parcele;
- njena tlorisna velikost se giblje od 8 x 8 do 12 x 12 metrov, po obliki tlorisa je ponavadi podobna kvadratu;
- višina obsega: klet, pritličje, nadstropje ali (in) podstrešje, pritličje

space, playgrounds, the creation of ghettos or zoning) and bad maintenance, lack of a sense and motive for community life and co-operation, vandalism, littering, graffiti, usurping common areas and space, etc. Among the other characteristics of these neighbourhoods, are: general alienation; impersonality; lack of contact with neighbours, and meetings in the stairway, lift or entrance hall are only of a formal nature. Greetings are exchanged only because people live together. The situation is quite different in the countryside or in single family housing areas where it is always possible to watch (unnoticed, of course) our neighbours at their daily work or, coming home. For we always feel safe as long as we know what they are doing. In the skyscrapers, on the other hand, we do not see anyone. Everything is secret and therefore raises suspicion.

This situation is one of the reasons that led to the development of another unplanned method for "solving the housing problem". The ultimate goal of residents in blocks and housing neighbourhoods is to acquire their own house with a garden, at one point in their lifetime.

Notwithstanding the aspiration of the majority of people all over the world to own a house with a garden, the single family house is a special phenomenon in Slovenia. It is possible to state that mass single family house building and self-help practice is a substitute for a variety of things. It is a substitute for the dream mansion with a garden, which would allow us contact with nature (to which we were accustomed in childhood days in our rural environment). It is also a substitute for the lost identity which, during the period of collectivism, was undesirable, and unattainable, in a housing block. It also serves to competitively assert oneself (achieve status) in society. In other words, the circumstances that led to this phenomenon were created by different economic and political factors. These developments had been possible because the state (which was tolerant in the implementation of regulations) was thus able to

je navadno kak meter nad ravno terena; okna v klet so pomembnejša od stika stanovalcev s terenom, saj bivanje zunaj ni posebej značilno za naše navade, celo na Primorskem ne – klet pa je zelo uporabna dodatna površina, polna šare, ozimnice, delavnic itd.;

- garaža je v objektu (klan(ina v klet) ali posebej kot provizorij itd.

Prostornina teh hišje podobna prostornini kocke, načrtovana je torej skrajno racionalno. Streha je preprosta dvokapnica, kritina je odvisna od cene ali mode (tegola canadese, salonit...). Okna in vrata so tipska konfekcija. Z ograjo in opaži ter s cokli pa se že kažejo individualna hotenja po identiteti in statusu. Arhitektura to ni, čeprav so projekte podpisali arhitekti. Opozoriti pa je treba na fenomen tipskih projektov in dodatne spremembe pri graditvi. Navsezadnje tudi množica odličnih arhitekturnih objektov ne zagotavlja tudi izredne kakovosti – kar kaže spet na pomen urbanističnega oblikovanja oziroma koncepta zunanjega prostora.<sup>2</sup>

V čem je torej prednost enodružinske hiše? Predvsem v lastništvu in uporabi, ki ju ni treba deliti z drugimi; parcela ima tudi druge nebivalne funkcije (delo na vrtu, parkiranje, prostor za domače živali), hkrati pa se rabi kot nebivalni prostor vrt; enodružinsko hišo lahko v skladu s svojimi potrebami širimo in prilagajamo (gradnja prizidkov in ureditev podstrešij); poleg tega ima tudi veliko stanovanjsko površino (povprečna enodružinska hiša ima 120 – 200 m<sup>2</sup> bivalne površine – brez kleti, to pa je 2 do 3 – krat več bivalne površine, kot jo ima stanovanje v bloku).

V odnosu do drugih oblik bivanja je enodružinska hiša znak, ki izraža lastnikovo individualnost in prisotnost, celo njegov status (imetje); zunanji prostor je določen samo z zunanjo pojavnostjo, ograjo, urejenim vrtom itd. Enodružinska hiša ne ustvarja in določa zunanjega ali celo urbanega prostora, to ni niti njen namen. To je skrajna oblika individualizma, kot protiutež "vsemu ostalemu" (državi, družbi), kar je

maintain social and political tranquillity. The housing problem was tackled in a similar manner. The system did not allow for ownership, and therefore no investment into the means of production. Due to high inflation, the people tried to maintain the value of their money by investing it into building their own house. Land was public property, therefore without true value (rent), and as such nobody was bothered by unplanned and irrational construction. The working time, where the afternoons were free, allowed for the spreading of the "national sport" of concrete mixing.

By allowing all this to happen, the state too, has its own advantage. It levies the "free" land with just as much tax (contribution for change of land use, contribution for communal infrastructure, etc.) as everyone can afford to pay. On their part, the town planning departments diligently parcel out the land and draw plots (as this is also a reliable and constant source of income).

#### **What is the Slovene single family house like and why?**

Although not even two houses are identical, it is possible to identify a common type which may be described as follows:

- it is a detached building in the middle of the parcel,
- its plan dimensions range between 8x8 m and 12x12 m; the shape of its plan is generally similar to a square,
- in height, the structure includes the basement, ground floor, upper floor or (and) the attic. The ground floor is generally one metre above the level of the terrain since living outside is not particularly typical of our tradition, not even in the coastal region of the country (Primorska). The basement offers very useful additional space for storing junk, winter stores, as a workshop, etc.
- the garage is in the building itself (accessible by a gradient into the basement), or a free standing makeshift structure.

skupno, naše, kolektivno in samoupravno (v drugih okoljih lahko tudi totalitarno, npr. v Afriki...).

## Kakšno vlogo ima pri vsem tem stroka – arhitektura, urbanizem?

Če vleče pri oknih ali puščajo pipe, se stanovalci navadno jezijo na arhitekto; na druge negativne pojave v bivalnem okolju pa se odzivajo bolj podzavestno. Arhitekti se izgovarjajo na urbaniste (žal to že dolgo ni več ena in ista oseba ali celo institucija), ti pa spet na politike...

Tudi v obdobju "moderne" urbanizma je stroka uspela projekte prikazati v najboljši luči, vsaj v okviru konkretnih natečajev. Ljubljanske soseske imajo – razen morda Savskega naselja – svojo izrazito fiziognomijo, poteze, ki ostanejo v spominu kot predstava o točno določenemu kraju. Pojem ulica se je pojavil že zelo zgodaj: v DGŠN, kjer je to le ime, a je v resnici nezaznavna; v soseski pri Ruskem carju je to le glede na dimenzije, a je bolj "ploščad"; v Šiški je ni niti v konceptu, ker temelji na teoretični zasnovi soseske (delno), v Fužinah je obstajala ulica (Zaloška) že pred njihovo izgradnjo, a jo pozidava popolnoma negira; v Zupančičevi jami je ulica res ulica, ki pa nikamor ne pelje...

Vse to govori o tem, da smo že zelo daleč od "heliotropičnega urbanizma" kaknega Langenscheidta ali Hilbersheimerja. Tuji kolegi, ki so si ogledali Ljubljano, trdijo, da je lepa – tudi njen moderni del. Očitno torej nismo dosegli mega-merila predmestij v velikih mestih; ko smo ponavljali napake drugih, smo jih prenesli na naša tla v okviru svojih možnosti in svojega prostora.

Tudi razvojni lok v naslednjem primeru je poučen: v DGŠN lahko še vedno vidimo "bloke sredi zelenja", med objekti so sicer zelenice, toda namenjene so zgolj gledanju. V Zupančičevi jami so porušeni vsi normativni o zelenih površinah, odmiških, igriščih itd., tudi segregacija prometa ni več tako izrazita. DGŠN je agresivni kolos, ki so ga zgradili poleg ob stari vasi brez vsakega pomisleka; Zupančičeva jama se

The shape of these houses is similar to the area of a cube. It is thus planned very rationally. The roof is a simple double roof construction, the covering being dependent on the price or fashion (Tegola Canadese, asbestos cement sheets etc.). The windows and doors are standardised components. The fences, panneling, and edges indicate a desire for personal identity and status. This is not architecture, although the plans have got an architect's signature on them.

It is also necessary to point out the phenomenon of standard plans and the additional changes that are made on them during construction. It must also be admitted that even some of the excellent architectural structures do not provide remarkable quality. This, once again, points to the importance of town planning and the concept of open space.<sup>2</sup>

What then is the advantage of the single family house? The main advantage arises from ownership and right of use. There is no need to share the property with anyone else. Besides accommodation the plot offers other functions too (gardening, parking space and room for domestic pets). The single family house may be freely extended to suit our needs (by building extensions and planning the attics). On top of that, the single family house offers more floor space (the average single family house has 120-200 m<sup>2</sup> of living area without the basement, which is 2 to 3 times more than the average apartment in a block).

In comparison with other housing types, the single family house is the feature that marks the owner's individuality and presence, or even his status (property). The outside is defined only by exterior features, by the fence, the tidy garden, etc. The single family house does not create or determine the exterior or urban space. And nor is this its purpose. This is an extreme type of individualism, contrasting "all the rest" (the state, society) that is common, ours, collective and self-managed (possibly totalitarian in other areas, e.g. in Africa).

skrbno navezuje na obstoječo zazidano strukturo, in sicer s smermi, merilom, profili itd. Seveda pa ni bilo mogoče spremeniti sistema, ki je omogočal sredstva in zemljišča, v katerem so načrtovali tako velike agregate, ki so jih nato izvedli v eni sami tehnologiji.

Razvoj urbanistične misli se izraža (tudi) v soseskah, večinoma pa ga pri njihovi gradnji niso upoštevali. Teorija je vedno prehitela prakso, hkrati pa se je sproti odrekala. Večina urbanističnih teoretikov se je do sosesk distancirala – delno namenoma, delno pa zato, ker ni bila "kompatibilna" s surovo prakso, ki si je za najpomembnejši cilj postavila racionalizacijo, tehnologija gradnje pa je pri tem postajala sama sebi namen. Pomembnejši od sosesk so zato manjši ansambli, nekateri od njih so postali paradigma in vzorec za mnoge posnemovalce (Ferantov vrt), predvsem pa primeri, ki se odmikajo od tipa bloka in stolpnice (Kotlje, Murgle, Dvori, Črnuška gmajna...). Tu je stroka tako ali drugače pridobila razmeroma večji vpliv (z organizacijo natečajev, delovanjem v institucijah, kot so npr. optimalni tipi stanovanj (OTS) pri Zvezi stanovanjskih skupnosti Slovenije (ZSSS); tako so nastale alternative tako množični (blokovni) kot tudi individualni (razpršeni) gradnji.

Arhitekti so si zelo prizadevali, vendar pa niso nikoli presegli problema prevelike (kritične) količine enakih razpetin, tlorisov, kopalnic, oken itd. Soseska je vedno delo velikih projektantskih skupin – najprej urbanističnih, nato pa skupin, ki objekte projektirajo; navadno je ostalo pri konceptu enega projektanta, ki so ga nato izvajalci do konca ponavljali. Ker je bilo osnovno merilo racionalizacija, je bilo najlažje varčevati že pri zasnovi stanovanjskih objektov: omejene tehnološke možnosti, omejene površine, omejena raven opremljenosti, omejen okvir standardnih funkcij, omejen izbor načinov bivanja (vsaka soba ima dostop iz predprostora) – vse to je privedlo do razmeroma velikega stanovanjskega tlorisa ali vsaj do nekakega določenega konsenza v standardnem stanovanju (ki pa sploh ni

### **What is the role of the profession (architecture and town planning) in all this?**

Residents usually blame the architect for draughty windows or leaking pipes, while their reaction to other negative occurrences in their living environment is more of a subconscious nature. The architects blame the town planners (unfortunately this has long ceased to be one and the same person, or institution), while these put the blame on the politicians.

During the period of "modern" urbanism the profession succeeded in presenting the projects in the best possible light, at least within the framework of specific architectural competitions. Apart from Savsko Estate, Ljubljana's neighbourhoods do have their distinct physiognomy and features that stick to the memory in relation to a specific area. The notion of the street was developed very early, for example: in the Štepanko Housing Estate Demonstration Project (ŠHEDP) where it exists only in name although imperceptible in reality; in Ruski Car neighbourhood it only exists in terms of size although more as a "platform": in Šiška, it is not present even in concept: in Fužine the street (Zaloška) existed long before the construction of the neighbourhood, although the development completely negates it; while in Zupančičeva Jama estate, the street is truly one, which however leads to nowhere.

All this indicates that we have already gone way off the "heliotropic urbanism" of Langenscheidt or Hilbersheimer. Colleagues from abroad who have visited Ljubljana say that it is beautiful, the more modern part of it inclusive. We obviously did not go as far as creating mega-size suburbs in big cities. While repeating the mistakes made by others, we adapted them to the possibilities and circumstances offered by our space. The development trend in the following example is also indicative: in ŠHEDP we may still see "blocks in the middle of green areas", although the green patches between them are meant only for viewing. In Zupančičeva Jama, all standards

bil nizek, če ga primerjamo z razvitejšimi deželami – problem je bil le v prenaseljenosti stanovanj). Manj uspešno je bilo strukturiranje celih objektov in njihovo oblikovanje.

Stroka je ponujala kar nekaj "rešitev": proti monotoniji in ponavljanju se je zoperstavila z barvanjem fasad, drobljenjem (zamikanjem) gabaritov in izborom različnih variant osnovnih tipov objektov (vrstni bloki, zamikani nizi, terasasti bloki); proti togosti stanovanjskih tlorisnih zasnov pa se je upirala s fleksibilnostjo (najprej v strukturi celega objekta, nato v samem stanovanju: variantne rešitve tipske lamele, nato vzdolžne nosilne stene, Gradisov "prosto oblikovani prostor" itd.). Na koncu pa z uvajanjem arhitekturnih elementov, kot sta dodatek, dekoracija (venci, cokli, rustika, portali, arkade...), prodre tudi najmodernejša, da ne rečemo modno arhitekturno izražanje (novi racionalizem), znova pa se pojavijo nekateri tipi objektov (vila, blok, stolpič).

V zvezi z enodružinsko gradnjo je vloga stroke kompleksnejša in nekoliko manj učinkovita. Urbanizem je bil razpet med dve skrajnosti: na eni strani gre za pritisk morebitnih graditeljev, na drugi strani pa za varovanje kmetijskih zemljišč. Zazidalni načrt je bil – kot posledica nenačrtovane in črne gradnje ter prometa z zemljišči (na podeželju, v predmestjih) – narejen šele kasneje, pravzaprav kot nekakšna legalizacija in sanacija neurejenih razmer. Le redko je bil presežen princip mrežne parcelacije, kar je tudi neke vrste popuščanje "trgu", torej temu, kar so ljudje želeli in počeli: parcele s površino 400 – 1000 m<sup>2</sup>, po obliki kvadratne, na njih pa na sredini hiše P + 1, prav tako podobne kvadratu, (v zadnjem času je vendar opaziti premik k podolgovatim gabaritom). Določila v lokacijski dokumentaciji so navadno precej natančna (odmiki, višine, smer slemenca, toleranca, naklon strehe, kritina...) in upoštevajo določen programatičen red. Vendar gre nadaljevanje – življenje samo – po svoje naprej.

Naslednja faza je projekt. Na izbiro so tipski projekti v birojih (celo po

relating to green areas, distances between buildings, playgrounds, etc. were violated, and nor is traffic explicitly segregated. ŠHEDP is an aggressive colossus built next to an old settlement without due consideration. Zupančičeva Jama is carefully incorporated into the existing built structure with regard to direction, scale, size, etc. It, of course, was not possible to change the system which provided the funds and land and, thus, allowed for the planning of such huge complexes which were then erected by the application of one single technology.

The development of urban thinking is also expressed in the neighbourhoods although, in most cases, it was not taken into consideration during construction. Theory was always ahead of practice, which it also always rejected. The majority of urban theorists disassociated themselves from the neighbourhoods, partly on purpose and partly because this was not "compatible" with the raw practice which set rationalisation as the most important goal, while building technology was only the means with which to achieve it. More important than the neighbourhoods therefore are, the smaller developments, some of which became paradigm and models for many emulators (e.g. Ferantov Vrt). These are, above all, examples, which departed from the block and skyscraper types (e.g. Kotlje, Murgle, Dvori, Črnuška Gmajna, etc.). In these cases, the profession somehow managed to achieve relatively greater influence (through organising competitions and institutional work). In this way, alternative construction, both mass (blocks) and individual (dispersed) was developed.

The architects strove but never succeeded in their effort to overcome the problem of excessive (critical) amounts of identical spans, plans, bathrooms, windows, etc. The neighbourhood is always the work of big consultant groups, first town planning groups and then architectural groups. In most cases the concept of one architect was adopted and this was applied all through the process of realisation. Since ratio-



katalogih), ki so razmeroma poceni in prilagojeni vsakršnim okoliščinam, torej v resnici pa nobeni. Druga možnost je naročilo pri arhitektu (za 6- do 8- kratno ceno tipskega projekta), ki zaradi določil lokacijske dokumentacije lahko stori le to, da karseda ustreže naročniku glede zasnove zgradbe; seveda so znani tudi primeri, da je LD narejena po idejnem projektu, a rezultat je vseeno neprepičljiv, saj se redke izjeme, delo dobrih arhitektov, izgubijo v množici ostalih kot razstavni unitati.

Sledi faza izvedbe. Ta je najpomembnejša, ker je zanjo značilen največji voluntarizem. Osebnost ne poznam hiše, ki bi bila zgrajena dosledno po načrtu. Vzrokov za to je več: tipski projekt je dosegel svoj namen s pridobitvijo gradbenega dovoljenja, investitor pa sam najbolje ve, kaj potrebuje; dialog med njim in projektantom je bil pomanjkljiv (tudi zaradi kratkih rokov, saj se vedno neznansko mudi). Ko zgradba raste, človek vidi tisto, česar si na papirju ni mogel predstavljati. Tudi nasveti prijateljev in "strokovnjakov" imajo svojo vlogo, prav tako razpoložljiva sredstva, modne smernice in reklama (npr. tegola canadese).

Rezultat poznamo. Posebej je treba opozoriti na pravni okvir: urbanistična inšpekcija sicer deluje in sankcionira črne gradnje, toda gradbena inšpekcija pravzaprav ne obstaja. Inštitucija tehničnega prevzema in uporabnega dovoljenja se izvaja le izjemoma. Skladnost izvedbe s projektom ni "zaščitena", še manj pa avtorstvo (kar velja tudi za bolj legalno večstanovanjsko gradnjo).

Lahko bi torej trdili, da je stroka z dejanskim dogajanjem premalo povezana. Morda je za to kriva tudi sama, saj noče videti tistega, kar ljudje hočejo, temveč jim ponuja svoje predstave o tem, kako naj bi stanovali. Redki poskusi novih oblik organizirane strnjene (enodružinske) gradnje težko uspejo, zlasti zato, ker so organizirani in zato finančno težko dostopni. Stanovanja v bloku niso nič bolj privlačna, če so "fleksibilna" (saj tega dejansko nih-

nalisation was the basic factor, the easiest way to achieve this was at the stage of designing the buildings themselves. This called for limiting: the technological requirements, areas, the level of equipment, the framework of standard functions, the choice of type of living (every room is accessible from the entrance hall). All this led to a relatively big plan of the housing unit or at least to a certain consensus on a standard housing unit. This, in comparison with other developed countries, was not at all small. The problem was only the overcrowding of the housing units. The structuring and design of whole buildings was less successful.

The profession offered some "solutions". It countered monotony and repetition by painting the facades, breaking heights and through a selection of various basic types of buildings (rows of blocks, indented building lines and terrace blocks). The rigid housing plan concepts were countered by allowing flexibility, first in the structure of the whole building and then in the housing unit itself with the use of variant solutions of typical lamellae, and longitudinal load bearing walls, freely planned space, etc.). With the introduction of architectural elements such as supplements, decorations (cornice, recesses, rustic work, portals, arches, etc.) the most modern architectural expression (new rationalism) ultimately surfaces. New types of buildings (mansions, blocks and the tower block) appear.

The role of the profession, in relation to single family house building is somewhat more complex and less effective. Town planning was stretched between two extremes. There was the pressure from potential builders on the one hand, and the need to protect agricultural land, on the other. The building plan was (as a consequence of unplanned, squatter building and informal land transactions in the rural and suburban areas), prepared later, in fact as some sort of legalisation and reorganisation of an unregulated situation. The iron-grid principle of parcelling was rarely applied. This, in a sense, was giving way to the

če ne izkoristi) ali fasade lepo pobarvane. Edino, kar lahko opazimo v zadnjem času, je to, da postaja za ljudi bolj privlačno bivanje bliže urbanih središč, v varnih, dobro izvedenih in izoliranih objektih, ki omogočajo parkiranje v kleti (Zupančičeva jama, Kotnikova).

### Kaj se dogaja danes in kakšna bo prihodnost stanovanjske gradnje pri nas?

Trenutno smo v fazi uveljavljanja novega stanovanjskega zakona, čeprav smo odkup stanovanj in registracijo črnih gradenj že izvedli. Toda najpomembnejši izvedbeni akti šele pridejo: kategorizacija stanovanj, zakon o urejanju prostora, metodologija za legalizacijo črnih gradenj, metodologija za zagostitev sedanje razpršene gradnje... V zvezi s prostorskimi dokumenti pričakujemo cel kup novosti, ki bodo zajele celo državo, vse občine. Obenem pa tudi svež investicijski zagon, zlasti kar zadeva najemniška stanovanja. Vse to bomo v novih "kapitalističnih razmerah" skrajno težko uresničili, kajti pojavili se bodo novi (stari) lastniki zemljišč, ki bodo imeli v zvezi s cenami gradbenih parcel različne interese. Te so se naenkrat zelo povečale, pa še malo jih je. Ravno cene zemljišča (renta) bi lahko zavrle eks-tenzivno urbanizacijo in omogočale racionalno rabo parcel v smislu rentabilnosti, torej kvalitete in ne cenenosti: na veliko parcelo zato spada "bogata" vila ali pa kvalitetna večstanovanjska hiša z udobjem, ki upravičuje visoko ekonomsko najemnino, v katero je vključen tudi dobiček (stimulans).

Stanovanjska gradnja bo – tako kot je bila v preteklosti – še vedno odvisna od politike, ali drugače povedano, politika se bo še naprej ukvarjala s stanovanjskim vprašanjem. Težko rečemo (glede na sedanje razmere), da bo imela v prihodnosti stroka kaj večji vpliv. Ne glede na tuje vzore (npr. Gradec) in domače znanje, ki smo ga pridobili v zadnjih desetletjih (GCS, UI, FAGG), se bomo vsi na novo učili urbanizma in gradnje, ki ju zahtevajo kapitalistične tržne razmere. Zelo verjetno pa se bo zgodilo to: ne

"market", to satisfy people's needs and actions. These were lots measuring 400-1000 m<sup>2</sup>, square in shape, in the middle of which stood a one-storey house also in the shape of a square (recent trend indicates a move towards rectangular shapes). The requirements of the planning permission are normally quite precise (sight lines, ridge direction, tolerance, roof slope, roof covering, etc.), and take into consideration a specific programmatic order. From here onwards life, however, takes its own path.

Then follows the phase of the plan. There is a choice of standard plans (even in catalogue form) available from architectural consultancies. These are relatively cheap and adapted to all types of situations, thus, to none in reality. The other possibility is to commission a plan with an architect (for a price 6-8 times higher than the standard plan) who in accordance with planning permission requirements may do his best to satisfy the needs of his customer with regard to the concept of the building. Cases are also known of, where planning permission documents were prepared on the basis of the preliminary sketch drawings of a building. Even in these cases, the results are not impressive, since the rare exceptions of good architectural work get lost among the rest as unique exhibition pieces.

The construction stage then follows. This is the most important because it is here that voluntarism is most rampant. I, personally do not know of any house that was built consistently with the plan. There are several reasons for this. The standard plan achieved its purpose the moment it secured the building permit. At the same time, the owner knows best what he wants. The dialogue between the client and architect was inadequate (for, due to the short periods set, everything is always done in a great hurry). When the building stands out in space, one then sees what he was not able to imagine on paper. The advice given by friends and "experts", available funds, modern trends and advertisements (e.g. Tegola Canadese), also do play a role.

bo več velikih sosesk, sredstev za stanovanjsko gradnjo, ki bi jih zagotavljal sistem, manj bo črnih gradenj; prišlo pa bo do diverzifikacije stanovanjskega standarda, tipov zgradb in zazidalnih vzorcev. Zatenkrat bo prevladala miselnost "small is beautiful", predvsem pa bo gradbena tehnologija speš samo "dekla", ki služi arhitekturi.

prof. dr. Vladimir Brezar, dipl. inž. arh.,  
Fakulteta za arhitekturo, Ljubljana

#### Opombe

- <sup>1</sup> Zanimiv primer je bilo demonstracijsko gradbišče Štepanjsko naselje (DGŠN): v objektih P+4 so bili sami najemniki (večinoma z juga in podeželja), v stolpnih P+12 pa sami etažni lastniki, torej premožnejši srednji sloj, večinoma domači.
- <sup>2</sup> Primer Harvard: ko je Stirling utemeljeval svoj prizidek t.i. Fogg galerije, je dejal, da je pač "postavil še eno žival v živalski vrt..."

#### Note

- <sup>1</sup> The Štepanjsko Housing Estate Demonstration Project (ŠHEDP) presents an interesting example. The residents of the housing units in the four-storey buildings were all tenants (mostly migrants from the southern parts of the former Yugoslavia, and from rural areas, while apartments in the twelve-storey blocks were owner occupied by the more affluent middle class, mostly local inhabitants.
- <sup>2</sup> The Harvard example: In justifying his extension, to the Fogg Gallery, Stirling said that he "only put another animal in the zoo....".

The result is known. There is a need to point out the legal framework in particular. The town planning inspectorate operates and sanctions unauthorised housing construction but the building inspectorate does not exist. The measure of technical examination and the issuing of the operation permit is only rarely effected. Reconciliation of construction with the plan is not "secured", less still are the copyrights protected (which applies even to more legal multi-family construction).

It is therefore possible to state that the profession is not sufficiently in touch with real events in practice. May be the profession itself is to be blamed for this since it does not want to recognise what people really want and instead it is offering them its own view as to how they ought to live. The rare attempts at new forms of organised, compacted (single family) house building can hardly succeed, especially because they are organised and, as such, access to them is financially difficult. Apartments in blocks are also not more attractive just because they are "flexible" (since in effect nobody exploits this possibility), or because the facade is beautifully painted. Recently, however, it has been possible to observe that living near urban centres, in safe, well constructed and insulated buildings, with parking space in the basement (Zupančičeva Jama and Kotnikova housing estates) is becoming more attractive.

#### What is happening today and what is the future of housing construction in Slovenia?

We are presently at the stage of implementing the new housing act, although housing privatisation and the legalisation of unauthorised housing have been accomplished. Nonetheless, the most important implementation provisions (including the categorisation of housing units, the physical planning act, methodology for the legalisation of unauthorised housing, methodology for compacting the present dispersed building pattern) are yet to follow. With regard to planning documents, a number of new appro-

aches is expected to be introduced over the whole country. At the same time, fresh investments are to be expected, particularly in the field of rented housing.

It will be extremely difficult to achieve all this in the new "capitalist circumstances", since the new (old) landowners are going to emerge with quite different interests with respect to the prices of building plots. These prices have suddenly increased, while there are only a few plots available. The price of land itself (rent) could put a halt to extensive urbanisation and allow for the rational use of plots in a more profitable way, in favour of quality instead of low price. A big plot is, therefore, appropriate for a "luxurious" mansion or high standard multi-family housing offering comfort which justifies the high economic rent, which also includes profit.

Housing construction will, as it has always been, continue to depend on politics. To put it another way, politics will have to continue dealing with the housing problem. It is difficult to say (judging from the prevailing situation) whether the profession will have any greater influence in the future. Notwithstanding the foreign models (e.g. Graz) and the knowledge that we have acquired at home in past decades (the Construction Centre of Slovenia, the Urban Planning Institute of the Republic of Slovenia and the Faculty of Architecture, Civil Engineering and Geodesy), all of us will, once again, have to study the urbanism and construction that will be suitable to the demands of the market economy. It is very likely that there will be no more big neighbourhoods, no more public funds for housing construction and less unauthorised construction. This will lead to diversification in housing standards, building types and settlement patterns. For the time being, the notion "small is beautiful" will dominate, while building technology will once again be a "maid" at the service of architecture.

Dr. Vladimir Brezar, Professor and Dean of Faculty of Architecture, Ljubljana.