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## ABSTRACT

This paper presents the final findings of the project on the post-socialist urban form undertaken over the last two years with the support of ISUF, University of Belgrade - Faculty of Architecture, and Cracow University of Technology. Historical evolution, a general review of the planning contexts, analysis of urban tissues, and field visits to Krakow and Belgrade, conducted in the first year, have shaped the selection of cases and the general study that has been undertaken for five case studies from both cities. The cases vary from peripheral areas to major city streets and modernistic settings specific for both cities. The final phase implied a review of three pairs from both cities, preparation of the GIS database, and comparison on several grounds: land use pattern, year by year establishment of new plots, FAR and BAR. Plot by plot development is mainly observed through the analysis of interdependences between construction year and plot size, number of buildings on the plot, and the increase of urban parameters and built and unbuilt ratio. The project highlights parallels of conditions to which similar urban tissues in different countries have been exposed in the post-socialist period and reveals the variety of problems and challenges of urban regulation, land ownership and housing investments in relation to postsocialist urban form. Keywords: urban morphology, post-socialism, urban tissues, Poland, Serbia

## INTRODUCTION

This is about an ISUF Small-scale Project: Research and Practice "Plot by plot urbanism". Mapping post-socialist changes in urban tissues: A Comparative Study of Krakow and Belgrade awarded 7000 euros by ISUF in December 2017 for cooperation between the Faculty of Architecture, Cracow University of Technology, the Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade, Institute of Architecture and Urban \& Spatial Planning of Serbia and the Urban Morphology Research Group, University of Birmingham. Belgrade and Krakow schools granted an additional 4000 euros.

## BACKGROUND

Post World War II Poland and Serbia (Yugoslavia) were dominated by the political ideologies of the Soviet Union resulting in deep cultural and economic transformations including profound changes to urban space and planning. One of the results on urban structures was a centralized city planning unrestrained by land ownership subdivisions and especially large urban housing complexes based on modernistic zoning.

Political changes at the end of the twentieth century returned to policies based on democratic systems and a decentralized market economy with private land ownership.

The study presents the contemporary situation of Krakow and Belgrade - the current transformations of urban structure, obligatory urban law and a comparison of cases from both cities.

The history of both countries after 1989 shows the political and economic changes which led to the return to democratic systems and neoliberal economies with intensive spatial development based on new economic principles but without continuity of use of the existing infrastructure. The main difference in current history between the two countries was the political destabilization of Serbia (1990-2000).

1. The project shows three main characteristics that influence urban form development after 1989.

- Urban law

The situation is different in both cities. In Serbia the system is based on the Master Plan which does not exist in Poland. As a consequence, in Serbia there is the extensive phenomenon of illegal buildings while in Poland there is a chaos of bottom-up private decisions.

- Land ownership

With the general return to public and private land ownership of the collective land of previous housing estates - privatization in Serbia resulted in the private ownership of flats without land ownership while in Poland ownership of apartments included the adjacent land.

- Investments

Decentralized economies and a diversity of investors (public and private), mainly produced a large number of small investors and developers.

To summarize the main features of spatial development in both countries (Attachment I) we use the notion of plot by plot development, which means dispersed, bottom-up development. It means primarily:

- the domination of the single plot over its surroundings,
- marginalization of the role of architects and urban planners,
- the problem of structures which are erected either illegally (Belgrade) or without a plan for the wider area (Krakow),
- urban infill without respect for the original concept and considerations of the new development in relation to its context,
- unregulated way of managing open spaces within the block (ownership problems),
- the uncontrolled increase in density with a demand for parking spaces and a reduction in greenery and open spaces.

2. It should be noted that important dissemination activities have resulted from this ISUF Smallscale Project: Research and Practice including the strengthening of cooperation between academics and Krakow, Belgrade and Birmingham, joint publications and conference presentations (Attachment II).

|  | SIMILARITIES | DIFFERENCES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BELGRADE - KRAKOW | BELGRADE | KRAKOW |
|  | - 1945-1989 Spatial planning acts and laws control the planning system which is hierarchical with planning documents obliged to consolidate at different spatial levels divided into general (strategic) and detailed (operational, regulatory) plans. |  |  |
|  | - after 1989 hierarchical system of planning preserved with new instruments introduced to regulate the new types of spatial developments in the changed political and socio-economic context but they have not succeeded in establishing a spatial order; <br> absence of advanced instruments for controlling spatial qualities. | - after 1989 the plan is the obligatory document for spatial development; often with legal amendments the latest of which requires the development of general regulation plans for whole settlements: it demonstrated among its flaws the impossibility in one document of making rules for morphologically heterogeneous areas. | - after 1989 and until the end of 2002, the Master Plan formula was gradually abandoned. Initially, Master Plans developed before 1989 remained an instrument determining land use and general building conditions but they expired in 2002. In the meantime, new formula of detailed spatial development plans was introduced as not compulsory. For areas without new plans, an alternative legal instrument has been created an administrative decision on building conditions. Due to the unwillingness of municipalities to create new detailed plans (new ones cover only $30 \%$ of Poland) this decision has become a basic tool leading to chaotic spatial development; |
|  | - 1945-1989 land nationalization and the elimination of private property |  |  |
|  | - after 1989 public and private land ownership | - after 1989 Ownership of flats without land ownership. The city remains the owner of the land but has no funds for its maintenance. | - after 1989 Ownership of apartments together with the adjacent land. Various types of ownership (private, mixed, public) are available. Krakow authorities identified up to 18 types of ownership resulting from the various shares of private and public entities. |
|  | - 1945-1989 centralized city planning and public investments <br> -after 1989 decentralized economy and a diversity of investors (public and private) implementing plans |  |  |


|  | $\frac{-1945-1989}{\text { concepts }}$ social systems and | -1945-1989 social systems but of a specific kind following the political break with the Soviet Union in 1948 | 1945-1989 Socialism under domination of Soviet Union |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbf{O}} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\mathbf{\omega}} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbf{n}} \end{aligned}$ | - after 1989 political and economic changes - return to democratic systems and neoliberal economy intensive spatial development based on new economic principles. Also infrastructure investments (transportation system, trade, industry) The collapse of many industrial sectors | - after 1989 Political destabilization 1990-2000 | - after 1989 Stabilization of the political situation after 1989 |
|  | - 1945-1989 functional zoning based on modernist spatial concepts; <br> In both cities a second major center formed during the period of Socialism as an alternative to the historical one; both new centers were developed under the principles of Modernism - superblocks with an urban structure which was determined by the traffic network. | 1945-1989 New Belgrade: the political break up with Soviet Union opens up Serbia (part of Yugoslavia at the time) to western influences. Not only urban layout but also the erected buildings were modernistic. | - 1945-1989 Nowa Huta: was meant to be a socialist city, designed and built following the stylistic conventions of socialist realism. This convention assumed that buildings were meant to be socialist in content ie available to the workers, and national in form. le through decorative rooflines and palatial forms. |
|  | after 1989 <br> 1. dispersed, 'plot by plot' development, 'spatial chaos': - dispersed and inconsistent development without taking into consideration its implications on the plot surroundings; <br> - domination of private interests in space creation has its manifestation in the domination of a single plot over its surroundings; <br> -the difficulty of economically providing adequate infrastructure <br> - marginalization of the role of architects and urban planners and underestimating the basic aesthetic principles in architectural and urban compositions: inadequate spatial solutions become the basis for further administrative decisions (Poland) and building permits (Serbia) and the argument for developers and architects to pressure local authorities to replicate the same (inadequate) solutions; |  |  |



ATTACHMENT 2

| List Dissemination activities that have resulted from the grant project to date including conference |
| :--- | :--- |
| presentations and/or forthcoming publications. |$|$| 2019 | A. A. Kantarek <br> The 3rd Conference. Facing Post War Urban Heritage in Central and Eastern Europe, <br> Budapeszt, 2019 <br> Member of Scientific Board of the Conference |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2019 | A.A. Kantarek, V. Diokic, K. Kwiatkowski, A. Niković, W. Korbel, A. Diordjevic, I. <br> Samuels "Plot by plot urbanism". Mapping post-socialist changes in urban tissues of <br> Krakow and Belgrade. p.p 163. 26th ISUF I International Seminar on Urban Form I <br> Cities as Assemblages, 2-6. July, 2019. The 26th ISUF Conference, Nicosia, Cyprus |
| 2019 | I. Samuels, A. A. Kantarek, A. Diordjevic, May 2019, TU Darmstadt, International <br> Conference on City and Change. Three Decades of Post-Socialist Transition <br> Proposed and chaired session: The Urban Morphology of Post Socialism |
| Presentation Post socialist or global capitalist? Recent urban form in Belgrade and <br> Krakow compared with developments in the UK |  |

$\left.\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline 2018 & \begin{array}{l}\text { A. A. Kantarek, October 2018 } \\ \text { Birmingham, Urban Morphology Research Seminar Series, Birmingham University - } \\ \text { "Post-Socialist urban form: plot-by-plot urbanism in Krakow", keynote speaker }\end{array} \\ \hline 2018 & \begin{array}{l}\text { A. A. Kantarek, April 2018 } \\ \text { tódź, International Seminar "Between Theory and Practice of Urban Morphology" } \\ \text { presentation "Development of the Urban Morphology in Poland. Introduction" }\end{array} \\ \hline 2018 & \begin{array}{l}\text { Aleksandra Diordjevic February 2018 } \\ \text { Birmingham, Urban Morphology Research Seminar Series, Birmingham University - } \\ \text { "Plot-by-plot urbanism in Post-Socialist Belgrade", keynote speaker }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { PUBLICATIONS }\end{array} \right\rvert\, \begin{array}{l}\text { Samuels, I. Kantarek, A.A.. Diordjevic, A. "Keep the lot : Housing development on the } \\ \text { peripheries of cities in Poland, Serbia and the United Kingdom" Focus, Journal of City } \\ \text { and Regional Planning Department, California Polytechnic State } \\ \text { University, San Luis Obispo. No 16, 48 -54 }\end{array}\right\}$
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