



Keeping up with technologies to imagine and build together sustainable, inclusive, and beautiful cities

PLACES AND TECHNOLOGIES 8th International Academic
Conference on Places and Technologies

2023 Belgrade, 19-21 October 2023

DIGITAL Proceedings

PUBLICATION DOI: https://doi.org/10.18485/arh\_pt.2024.8

EDITORS Aleksandra Djukić

Aleksandra Krstić-Furundžić

Eva Vaništa Lazarević Milena Vukmirović

PUBLISHER University of Belgrade

**Faculty of Architecture** 

FOR PUBLISHER Vladimir Lojanica

DESIGN Vladimir Kovač

TECHNICAL SUPPORT Jelena Marić

Nikola Mitrović Ana Šabanović

CIRCULATION 50 copies

PLACE AND DATE Belgrade, April 2024

ISBN 978-86-7924-343-0

PLACES AND 23 +ECHNOLOGIES

# PLACES AND TECHNO LOGIES 2023



### WORD OF THE CONFERENCE DIRECTOR

### \_ Aleksandra Djukic

Ph.D, Full Professor, University of Belgrade - Faculty of Architecture; Director of the Conference

This Proceedings from the 8th International Conference Places and Technologies: Keeping up with Technology to act Responsively with Urban Environment, which was held in Belgrade in October 2023, contributes to the discussion about the future of society and places and the role of technology in it and discussions with respect to strategy for responsive quality environment. More than 85 papers from 20 countries were presented during the conference. The organizers of the conference were: University of Belgrade (Faculty of Architecture) and Professional Association Urban Laboratory (UrbanLab). This time we have a joint event with CIRRE conference which contributed with18 conference papers.


The conference aimed to raise questions about the future of cities and the environment, emphasizing the critical role of technology in designing innovative solutions to enhance urban spaces. It underscored the importance of a multidisciplinary approach, bridging engineering, humanities, and social sciences to address urban challenges effectively. New urban and building concepts predominantly rely on Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) to drive progress and responsiveness to various urban development aspects.

The conference proceedings is divided into seven main parts in correlation with the scale of planning and construction - spatial planning, urban planning, urban design, architectural design, architectural technologies, architectural education and close domains of the place and technologies, focusing on responsive spatial and urban planning, design, architecture, heritage protection, education and technological advancements in architecture. Each section delves into specific topics such as morphology, sustainable construction, cultural heritage, digital technologies, identity, teaching architecture and urban planning and climate resilience.

The event's significance lies in promoting the integration of smart technologies and modern urban concepts for sustainable city development, addressing diverse urban issues through academic research and collaboration. Different problems in the domains of urban design and planning, architectural design, building technologies, urban sociology, ICT, transport and traffic studies, resilience of place, climate change, adaptive reuse, cities and health, landscape architecture, identity, heritage etc. are presented and discussed in more than 80 conference papers made by professors, researchers, and PhD students from all over Europe and the world.

The conference serves as a platform for global researchers to enhance their academic standing, foster research networks, and initiate new scientific endeavors, contributing to the scientific advancement of Serbia and the region.

Places and Technologies conference become traditional international event gathering researchers all around the world and has provided an opportunity for them to advance their positions in the academic hierarchy, to build their research networks and to develop new scientific projects. Presentation and the quality of the papers that are results of new studies, debates and research strengthen our ambition to keep the importance of our conference among many European ones.



# CONTENT

### COMMITTEES

12 SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE; ORGANIZING COMMITTEE; TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

### **KEYNOTES**

- 16 EMBRACING THE PRINCIPLES OF CIRCULAR ECONOMY FOR SUSTAINABLE BUILT ENVIRONMENTS: NEW TRENDS, APPROACHES AND CHALLENGES
  - \_ Katerina Tsikaloudaki
- 17 GREEN URBAN RENEWAL STRATEGIES IN THE CONTEXT OF ZERO NET LAND TAKE \_ Ivana Katurić

### SPATIAL PLANNING

- 19 EXPLORING SPATIAL HETEROGENEITY OF URBAN HEAT ISLAND THROUGH BUILT ENVIRONMENT MORPHOLOGY
  - \_ Han Liang Lin \_ Li-Ting Chung \_ Chi Feng Lai
- 26 ANALYSIS OF SUCCESSFUL WASTE MANAGEMENT IN LARGE CITIES THE EXAMPLE OF TOKYO
  - \_ Marko Simić \_ Ivan Garić \_ Vladimir Vučenov \_ Dragoljub Sekulović
- THE SKOPJE CONTACT ZONE A KEY TO A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE OF THE CITY

  Ana Lukic Korobar \_ Lidija Trpenoska Simonovic

### **URBAN PLANNING**

- 44 THE EIBENTHAL INITIATIVE: AN INFORMAL MODEL FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT \_ Ştefana Bădescu \_ Ana Branea \_ Mihai Danciu
- 52 SHRINKING AND NON-GLOBAL CITIES: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

  \_Branislav Antonić
- 60 PARTICIPATORY DESIGN FOR SUSTAINABILITY

  \_ Jernej Markelj \_ Aleksandar Petrovski \_ Jan Kazak
- 68 COLLABORATIVE APPROACH FOR INTEGRATING NATURAL AND CULTURAL HERITAGE FOR SUSTAINABLE URBAN DEVELOPMENT: THE CASE OF ACTION PLAN FOR SOMBOR WITHIN DANURB+
  - \_ Danijela Milovanović Rodić \_ Ana Šabanović \_ Branislav Antonić \_ Aleksandra Đukić
- 75 PRESENTATION OF EXISTING METHODS BASED ON MULTI AGENT SYSTEMS WITH THE PURPOSE OF ROAD PLANNING
  - \_ Julijan Jurak \_ Krešimir Osman \_ Matija Sikirić \_ Ljupko Šimunović
- 83 POST-INDUSTRIAL TERRITORY DEVELOPMENT UNDER AN ARCHITECTURAL AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AS ILLUSTRATED BY THE VOLGOGRAD TRACTOR PLANT \_ Dmitrii Klimov

92	REVITALIZATION OF RURAL AREAS ON REGIONAL LEVEL AS A DRIVER FOR ECOLOGICAL TRANSITION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN SERBIA _ Milca Igić _ Milena Dinić Branković _ Jelena Đekić _ Mihailo Mitković _ Milica Ljubenović
102	THE CONSEQUENCES OF CENTRALIZED DEVELOPMENT OF TOURIST INFRASTRUCTURE: THE EXAMPLE OF BUDVA PROMENADE _ Milena Bismiljak _ Eva Vaništa Lazarević _ Jelena Marić
110	SMART CITY CRITERIA _ Dashnor Kadiri _ Morana Pap _ Bojan Baletić
117	GOING GREEN-LESS: A MORPHOLOGICAL AND FUNCTIONAL STUDY OF DECREASING GREEN PUBLIC SPACES IN NOVI BEOGRAD, SERBIA _ Ivan Filipović _ Kosta Stojanović
125	MEDIATIC APPROACH TO URBAN SPACE: A COMPREHENSIVE DISPLAY PERSPECTIVE $\_$ Zhao Lei $\_$ Wang Tie
135	RECLAIMING THE OLD INTO THE NEW CITY CONCEPT: REVISITING THE "NEIGHBOURHOOD UNIT" CONCEPT AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR THE 15-MINUTE CITY MODEL - A CASE STUDY OF "DOMCHE" IN SKOPJE _Elena Andonova _ Jasmina Siljanoska
143	DIGITAL NOMADS AS ENGINES FOR RURAL REVITALIZATION: THE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY OF PÉCSDEVECSER, HUNGARY _ Noémi Kókai _ Donát Rétfalvi
150	STUDY ON THE CONSTRUCTION MODE OF NATIONAL PARK FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF YANGTZE RIVER CIVILIZATION INHERITANCE: CHU JINAN CITY SITE NATIONAL HERITAGE PARK _ Bálint Bachmann _ Chen Kun
156	VERTICALITY OF CADASTRAL PLOT: MULTIPURPOSE FUNCTION IN SPACE _ Marko Milosavljević _ Dejan S. Đorđević _ Zlatko Stojmenović
164	APPROACH TO THE CARTOGRAPHY OF GRANADA WITH ECOSYSTEM APPROACH: FOUNDATIONAL TRAIT, URBAN FABRIC, GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND HABITABILITY _ Juan Luis Rivas-Navarro _ Belén Bravo-Rodríguez _ Elisa Larisa Negoita
172	FACTORS OF INTEGRATION AND SOCIAL COHESION OF URBAN FACILITIES IN THE NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN PERIPHERIES OF GRANADA  _ Belén Bravo-Rodríguez _ Juan Luis Rivas-Navarro _ Cecilia Hita-Alonso _ Pilar Martos-Fernández
180	GEODATA AND GIS AS A DECISION-MAKING SUPPORT INSTRUMENT IN HEALTHY CITY GOVERNANCE _Ksenija Lalović _ Ratka Čolić _ Veljko Dmitrović _ Rastko Čugalj
190	GREEN SPACE DEVELOPMENT MONITORING FOR THE SMART CITY: A NOVEL AI BASED METHODOLOGY FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF URBAN GREEN _Christina Petschnigg _ Alexander Pamler _ Daniel Pfeiffer _ Harald Urban _ Guenter Koren _ Torsten Ullrich
198	ELEMENTS OF THE GEODESIGN FRAMEWORK AS A TOOL FOR GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING ON A LANDSCAPE SCALE _ Boris Radić _ Suzana Gavrilović _ Sinisa Polovina
207	COMPUTATIONAL MODELLING AND SIMULATIONS - THE FUTURE OF PREDICTING GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF SUSTAINABLE CITIES _ Dijana P. Furundžić _ Nikola Z. Furundžić _ Aleksandra Krstić-Furundžić
212	URBAN TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE AND SUSTAINABLE MOBILITY _ Božidar S. Furundžić _ Danilo S. Furundžić

### **URBAN DESIGN**

- 221 TENSIONS OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN POST-SOCIALIST CITIES: THE CASE STUDY OF COMMUNITY BASED INITIATIVE FOR PRESERVATION AND TRANSFORMATION OF OPEN PUBLIC SPACE IN BANJA LUKA
  - \_ Ana Špirić \_ Aleksandra Đukić
- 230 THE OBJECTS BUILT OUTSIDE AN URBAN CONTEXT AS A PROBLEM IN FURTHER URBAN PLANNING AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN
  - \_ Velimir Stojanović
- 238 STUDY ON UPDATING STRATEGIES OF TRANSFORMING FROM AN OLD INDUSTRIAL ESTATE TO AN INDUSTRIAL HERITAGE COMMUNITY

  Jie Tan Hutter Akos
- 246 SHAPING RESIDENTIAL OPEN SPACE IN URBAN DENSIFICATION: GUIDING THE PROCESS TO PRESERVE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND HEALTHY LIFESTYLES IN NIŠ, SERBIA
  - \_ Milena Dinić Branković \_ Milica Igić \_ Mihailo Mitković \_ Jelena Đekić
- THE HISTORICAL PROCESSES OF TRANSFORMATION OF THE SPACE THROUGH URBAN DESIGN COMPETITIONS: THE CASE STUDY OF INDEPENDENCE SQUARE IN PODGORICA
  - \_ Nemanja Milićević \_ Ema Alihodžić Jašarović \_ Eva Vaništa Lazarević \_ Jelena Marić
- 267 THE FUTURE PROSPECTS OF THE RESIDENTIAL TOWERS IN THE MACEDONIAN CITIES

  \_ Marija Petrova
- POSSIBLE USES OF INTERACTION DESIGN TO SUPPORT PARTICIPATORY
  PROCESSES IN PUBLIC SPACE AND PRE-TESTS BASED ON VISUAL ATTENTION

  \_Araf Öykü Türken \_ Cenk Hamamcıoğlu
- 287 INFORMAL LOW-RISE HOUSING IN THE SUBURBAN CONTEXT AS A PATTERN FOR THE NEW NEIGHBOURHOODS: THE CASE OF CITY OF TETOVO, NORTH MACEDONIA \_ Vlera Tachi
- 295 LIVING LAB, TECHNOLOGICAL SIMULATION
  - \_ Aleksandra Kondraciuk
- 304 VIRTUAL REALITY FOR IMPROVING WALKABILITY
  - \_ Stefan van der Spek \_ Marijke Koene \_ Cor Wagenaar
  - \_ Sijmen A. Reijneveld \_ Jolanda Tuinstra \_ Manda Broekhuis
- MORE-THAN-HUMAN DESIGN PRACTICE: REVIEW OF APPROACHES IN MAPPING SUBJECTIVE PARAMETERS OF PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCES

  \_ Nikola Mitrović

### **ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN**

- 320 THE COMPLEXITIES AND CONTRADICTIONS OF SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AESTHETICS

  \_ Ana Kisjan \_ Dubravko Aleksić \_ Tijana Vujičić
- 325 HYBRID SPACES, HYBRID PLACES IN THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE OFFICE BUILDING \_Ana Vračević \_ Dina Stober

### **ARCHITECTURAL TECHNOLOGIES**

- THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE NEW OFFICE BUILDINGS' ADAPTABILITY: GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS
  - \_ Damjana Nedeljković \_ Tatjana Jurenić \_ Aleksandra Čabarkapa

340	REFURBISHMENT OF THE EXISTING MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING STOCK FROM THE PERIOD OF POST-WAR MASS CONSTRUCTION: SPATIAL AND ENERGY BENEFITS _ Ljiljana Đukanović _ Bojana Lević
348	MATERIAL EFFICIENCY: PATTERN DESIGN TECHNIQUES FOR 3D PRINTED RIB-STIFFENED FLOOR SYSTEMS _Maša Žujović _ Radojko Obradović _ Jelena Milošević
356	POSSIBILITIES OF STAGED RENOVATION OF REINFORCED CONCRETE FACADES OF MULTI-FAMILY BUILDINGS IN THE CENTRAL ZONE OF NEW BELGRADE _ Nikola Macut _ Tijana Žišić _ Jelena Ivanović-Šekularac
364	RECONSTRUCTION OF THE HERITAGE BUILDING OF THE ŽIČA MONASTERY FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUSTAINABILITY _ Nenad Šekularac _ Jelena Ivanović-Šekularac _ Nikola Macut _ Tijana Žišić
371	KNAUFTERM3D – SOFTWARE FOR MODELLING AND CALCULATION OF BUILDINGS ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROPERTIES _ Aleksandar Rajčić
379	COMMON BIM USES: EXPERIENCE-BASED RESEARCH _ Motasem Altamimi _ Márk Balázs Zagorácz _ Miklós Halada
387	THE IMPORTANCE OF SUSTAINABLE TIMBER CONSTRUCTION IN ACHIEVING LOW CARBON FOOTPRINT BUILDINGS _Peter Markus
393	ON THE EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON THE ENERGY PERFORMANCE OF PREFABRICATED AND CONVENTIONAL BUILDINGS _ Stella Tsoka _ Katerina Tsikaloudaki _ Theodoros Theodosiou _ Kondylia Velikou
400	NEW TECHNOLOGIES IN ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE PRESENTATION: ISSUES OF AUTHENTICITY _ Jovana Tošić
407	ENERGY SAVINGS POTENTIAL IN MODULAR ENVELOPE RENOVATIONS OF PREFABRICATED RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS IN BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA AND SERBIA _ Darija Gajić _ Budimir Sudimac _ Aleksandar Rajčić _ Slobodan Peulić _ Jelena Rašović
416	CAPABILITIES AND CHALLENGES IN BUILDING RENOVATION: APPLYING THE SUSTAINABILITY PRINCIPLES IN AN OFFICE BUILDING IN THESSALONIKI, GREECE _Katerina Tsikaloudaki _ Katerina Karanafti _ Theodoros Theodosiou _ Konstantinos Laskos _ Stella Tsoka
424	THE IMPORTANCE OF DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME FOR ENERGY SAVINGS IN BELGRADE LATITUDE AND CLIMATE _Marija Grujić _ Nikola Knežević
432	FACADE PANEL PARAMETRISATION IN THE MODERNIST HERITAGE OF NEW BELGRADE: A MULTIPLE-CASE STUDY _Djordje Mitrović

### **ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION**

- 441 SHAPING A BETTER FUTURE: CONTEXTUAL LEARNING AND TEACHING OF STRUCTURAL DESIGN IN THE PROCESS OF ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION \_ Aleksandra Nenadović \_ Jelena Milošević
- 449 SUSTAINABLE FLUIDITY IN AESTHETICAL PERSPECTIVES OF CONTEMPORARY ARCHITECTURE: POST-INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF DANUBE'S WATERFRONT IN BELGRADE
  - \_ Bojana Jerković-Babović

- 456 TOWARD THE IDEAS OF THE NEW EUROPEAN BAUHAUS: THE APPLICATION OF THE DIGITAL TOOLS IN THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULA

  \_ Vladimir Mihajlov \_ Aleksandra Stupar \_ Ivan Simic
- 465 LEED IN ACADEMIC ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION

  \_ Nataša Ćuković Ignjatović \_ Dušan Ignjatović
- 472 CREATIVE EDUCATION: NEW APPROACHES AND TRANSFORMATION OF TEACHING METHODOLOGY FOR INSPIRING STUDENTS
  - \_ Eva Vaništa Lazarević \_ Jelena Marić \_ Milena Vukmirović
- WORKCAMP IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN URBANISM: EXPERIENCE FROM DANURB+ BUILDING CAMP FOR STUDENTS IN GOLUBAC, SERBIA
  - \_ Milorad Obradović \_ Aleksandra Djukić \_ Jelena Marić \_ Branislav Antonić \_ Nikola Mitrović

### **CLOSE DOMAINS TO PLACES AND TECHNOLOGIES**

- 490 NEW GENERATIVE AND AI DESIGN METHODS FOR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS
  AND URBAN MOBILITY DESIGN, PLANNING, OPERATION, AND ANALYSIS:
  CONTRIBUTION TO URBAN COMPUTING THEORY AND METHODOLOGY
  \_Dragana Ćirić
- 504 TENSILE MEMBRANE STRUCTURES IN PUBLIC SPACES / CASE STUDY
  Aleksandar Vučur Isidora Zimović Neboiša Stanošević
- 512 URBAN AIR MOBILITY DEVELOPMENT IN WESTERN BALKAN (WB6) REGIONAL PARTNERS

  \_ Olja Čokorilo \_ Anja Stamenić \_ Lidija Tomić
- 519 SOCIAL PERCEPTION AND ACCEPTANCE OF GEOTHERMAL SYSTEMS
  Aleksandar Petrovski
- 526 URBAN INTERFACE DESIGN STRATEGIES BASED ON THE ADAPTABILITY OF 5G
  MILLIMETRE WAVE MOBILE COMMUNICATION
  \_ Hu Tianyu \_ Gabriella Medvegy \_ Ágnes Borsos \_ Wang Tie
- 539 A HUMAN SOCIETY NEEDS HUMAN PLACES
  Pieter de Haan
- 550 FOSTERING INNOVATION: UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY COLLABORATION NETWORKS IN ARCHITECTURAL RESEARCH

  \_ Milijana Živković \_ Eva Vaništa Lazarević \_ Jelena Marić \_ Jelena Milošević
- 558 ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE APPLIED TO CULTURAL HERITAGE AND SUSTAINABILITY: A PORTUGUESE CASE STUDY
  - \_ Janaina Cardoso de Mello \_ Gabriel Ko Freitag e Silva \_ Gyamarco Pereira Nascimento Secci
- 566 EVALUATING THE RELEVANCE OF COMPUTATIONAL DESIGN IN ARCHITECTURE AS
  A VIABLE RESPONSE TO THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING CHALLENGE
  \_ David Ojo \_ Gabriella Medvegy \_ Ágnes Borsos
- 573 BELGRADE UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS LEASE MANAGEMENT

  Danilo S. Furundžić Nemania Šipetić

### 8TH CONFERENCE OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH ON REAL ESTATE - CIRRE 2023

- THE ROLE OF PUBLIC SPACE IN SHAPING THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR OLDER RESIDENTS: THE CASE OF SLOVENIA
  - \_ Ajda Šeme \_ Richard Sendi \_ Maša Filipovič Hrast \_ Boštjan Kerbler

597	COMPARISON OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN HOUSING ESTATES FROM SOCIALIST AND POST-SOCIALIST ERA: THE CASE OF SLOVENIA _ Boštjan Kerbler _ Ajda Šeme _ Richard Sendi
611	METHOD FOR 3D NEIGHBORHOOD MODEL CREATION IN CITYGML STANDARD AS BASIS FOR URBAN SIMULATION TOOLS _ Galina Voitenko _ Hannes Harter _ Niki Gaitani
623	APPLICATION OF BLOCKCHAIN TECHNOLOGY IN ENERGY TRADING _ Asha Chathurini Wijethilake Haputhanthirige _ Champika Liyanage _ Ruchira Yapa _ Susantha Udagedar
635	PLANNING VISION AND THE SERVICE OF SPATIAL PLANNING _ Ivan Stanič
641	TOLERANCE TO URBAN WINDOW VIEWS IN REGARD TO VARIOUS VARIABLES _ Živa Kristl _ Ajda Fošner _ Martina Zbašnik-Senegačnik
648	THE ARCHITECTURE OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AS TRANSFORMATIVE MODEL TO WARDS SUSTAINABILITY _ Mihajlo Zinoski _ Jana Brsakoska _ Kire Stavrov
654	HIGHER PRICES, SMALLER SPACES: CORRELATION BETWEEN APARTMENT PRICES AND ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICES IN SKOPJE  _ Mihajlo Zinoski _ Vebi Fazliu _ Valmir Dalipi
662	FROM CLASSICAL MANAGEMENT TO URBAN HERITAGE FACILITY MANAGEMENT: MOBILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY IN URBAN HERITAGE AREAS _ Bintang Noor Prabowo
673	CITIZENS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE DESIGN PROCESS OF PUBLIC SPACES: THE CASE OF ELGESETER STREET IN TRONDHEIM, NORWAY _ Clémence Magnière _ Mahgol Afshari
685	THE SCIENCE OF PLAY: CONFESSIONS OF AN ENGINEER EXPLORING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY STUDIES. AN STS ANALYSIS OF SERIOUS GAMES AND CO-PRODUCTION _ Coline Senior
693	SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS AS THE FOUNDATION FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH ABOUT THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT, HEALTH, AND HAPPINESS _ Elham Andalib
704	PREVIEW INCREASED INVESTMENTS AND DIFFERENTIATION IN HEALTH CARE REAL ESTATE  _ Jan Veuger
716	REDUX: IMPACT, TRENDS AND DEVELOPMENTS IN SOCIAL REAL ESTATE _ Jan Veuger
723	USING CITIZEN PARTICIPATION METHODS TO IDENTIFY STRATEGIES FOR INCREASED ACTIVE MOBILITY - CASE ELGESETER STREET OF TRONDHEIM _ Mahgol Afshari _ Alenka Temeljotov-Salaj _ Agnar Johansen
735	COWORKING SPACES - IS IT JUST A BUZZWORD, OR DOES IT HAVE POTENTIAL? _ Margareth Berstad
747	IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE ADAPTATION OPTIONS IN LOW-COST STRATA RESIDENTIAL BUILDING IN MALAYSIA _ Mustafa Omar
758	NEED FOR CREATIVE COMPETENCIES IN ENGINEERING EDUCATION _ Olav Torp _ Elham Andalib _ Alenka Temeljotov Salaj

# COMMITTEES

### SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

### Dr Laura Aelenei

National Energy and Geology Laboratory (LNEG), Lisbon, Portugal

### Dr Bachmann Bálint

University of Pécs Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology, Institute of Architecture, Pécs, Hungary

### Dr Benko Melinda

Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Budapest, Hungary

### Dr Brandão Alves Fernando

FEUP Porto, Portugal

### Dr Ana-Maria Branea

Faculty of Architecture, Polytechnic University of Timisoara, Romania

### Dr Christine Chaloupka-Risser

University lecturer in Traffic Psychology, Vienna, Austria

### Dr Milena Dinić Branković

University of Nis, Faculty of Architecture and Civil Engineering, Serbia

### Rector Dr Đokić Vladan

Rector of University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

### **Dr Doytchinov Grygor**

Institute for Urban Design, Technical University of Graz, Austria

### Dr Aleksandra Đukić

Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Daria Gajić

Univesrity of Banja Luka - Faculty of Architecture and Civil Engineering, Banja Luka, Republic of Srpska, Bosnia and Herzegovina

### **Dr Bob Giddings**

Northumbria University Faculty of Engineering and Environment, Newcastle, United Kingdom

### Dr Cenk Hamamcıoğlu

Faculty of Architecture, Department of City and Regional Planning, Yıldız Technical University - Istanbul, Turkey

### Dr Jelena Ivanović Šekularac

University of Belgrade Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

### Arch. Milena Ivkovic

Founder of Placemaking Western Balkans, Serbia and Nederland

### Dr Aleksandra Krstić-Furundžić

University of Belgrade Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Jugoslav Joković

Faculty of Electronic Engineering, University of Niš, Serbia

### Dean Vladimir Lojanica

University of Belgrade - Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

### **Dr Piotr Lorens**

Faculty of Architecture, Gdansk University of Technology, Gdansk, Poland

### Dean Dr Ognen Marina

Faculty of Architecture, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University Skoplje, North Macedonia

### Dr Lucia Marticigh

University RomaTre, Faculty of Architecture, Rome, Italy

### Dr Martinelli Nicola

DICAR of Polytechnic of Bari, Bari Italy

### Dean Dr Garbiella Medvegy

Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology, University of Pécs, Hungary

### Arch. Ljubomir Miščević

University of Zagreb – Faculty of Architecture, Zagreb, Croatia

### Dr Miloš Mladenović

Aalto University, Finland

### Dr Florian Nepravishta

Universiteti Politeknik i Tiranës, Albania

### Dr Juan Luis Rivas Navarro

University of Granada Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Granada, Spain

### Dr Svetislav Popović

Faculty of Architecture Podgorica, Montenegro University, Podgorica, Montenegro

### Dr Boris Radic

University of Belgrade Faculty of Forestry, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Darko Reba

Faculty of Technical Science, University of Novi Sad, Serbia

### Dr Ralf Risser

FACTUM, Vienna, Austria

### Dr Lina Seduikyte

Kaunas University of Technology, Faculty of Civil Engineering and Architecture, Kaunas, Litvania

### Dr Svetlana Stanarevic

University of Belgrade Faculty of Security, Serbia

### Dr Ljupko Šimunović

University of Zagreb Faculty of Transport and Traffic Sciences, Zagreb, Croatia

### Dr Olia Čokorilo

University of Belgrade Faculty of Transport and Traffic Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Miroslava Raspopovic Milic

Metropolitain University - Faculty of Information technologies, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Francesco Rotondo

Università Politecnica delle Marche, Italy

### Dr Alenka Temeljotov Salaj

Norwegian University of Science and Technology Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Norway

### Dr Katerina Tsikaloudaki

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki Faculty of Engineering

### Dr Theodoros Theodosiou

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

### **Manfred Schrenk**

Chairman of CORP - Competence Center for Urban and Regional Planning, Vienna, Austria

### Dr Stefan van der Spek

TU Delft, Delft, Nederland

### Dr Aleksandra Stupar

University of Belgrade Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Eva Vanista Lazarevic

University of Belgrade Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Milena Vukmirović

University of Belgrade - Faculty of Forestry, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Tijana Vujičić

University of Banjaluka Faculty of Architecture, Civil Engineering and Geodesy, Bosnia and Herzegovina

### Dr Bora Yerliyurt

Faculty of Architecture, Department of City and Regional Planning, Yıldız Technical University - Istanbul, Turkey

### Dr Filipović Dejan

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Geography, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Nepravishta Florian

Polytechnic University of Tirana, Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism. Tirana, Albania

### Dr Čokorilo Olja

University of Belgrade Faculty of Transpor and Traffic Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia

### ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

FOUNDING MEMBERS OF THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

### Dr Aleksandra Diukić

Conference Director, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Aleksandra Krstić-Furundžić

Head of Publishing, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Eva Vaništa Lazarević

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Milena Vukmirović

Conference Program Director, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Forestry, Belgrade, Serbia

ASSOSIATED MEMBERS OF THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

### Dr Jelena Marić

Conference Exacutive Coordinator, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

### Dr Suzana Gavrilovic

University of Belgrade Faculty of Forestry, Belgrade, Serbia

### TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

### Dr Vladimir Kovač

Technical Committee Member, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

### Nikola Mitrović

Technical Committee Member, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

### Ana Šabanović

Technical Committee Member, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia



## COMPARISON OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN HOUSING ESTATES FROM SOCIALIST AND POST-SOCIALIST ERA: THE CASE OF SLOVENIA

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18485/arh\_pt.2024.8.ch70

### \_ Boštjan Kerbler

PhD, Senior Research Associate, Urban Planning Institute of the Republic of Slovenia, Liubljana, Slovenia, bostjan.kerbler@uirs.si

### \_ Ajda Šeme

PhD student, Junior Reseach Fellow, Urban Planning Institute of the Republic of Slovenia, Ljubljana, Slovenia, ajda.seme@uirs.si

### Richard Sendi

PhD, Senior Researcher, Urban Planning Institute of the Republic of Slovenia, Ljubljana, Slovenia, richard.sendi@uirs.si

### **ABSTRACT**

In Slovenia large housing estates were built during socialist era. The mass production of standardized construction modules offered a relatively speedy, cost-effective, and reasonably efficient approach to meet the substantial demand for housing necessary to accommodate the rapidly expanding urban population. This type of construction ended only after the collapse of Yugoslavia and the introduction of a new sociopolitical and economic framework. The shift to a market-oriented economy has brought new challenges, including changes in housing policy. The main consequence was that the state no longer assumed the role of the primary investor in providing housing for citizens. Private investors took over the role of the state, constructing residential buildings with fewer apartments. Mostly, these residential buildings were simply added to the existing infrastructure and were not built comprehensively with the broader needs of residents in mind. As a result, the concept of a housing estate has undergone a significant transformation in the post-socialist era compared to the previous socialist system. Based on the theoretical premise that housing is a commodity that significantly impacts residents' quality of life and their social values, this article proceeds from the hypothesis that the transition to a market economy has also changed the expectations and values of residents regarding quality of life, making large housing estates less attractive to them. Therefore, residents' beliefs about quality of life in socialist and post-socialist housing estates in Slovenia are compared. A comprehensive analysis of the results collected through a survey is presented, establishing their interrelationships and supporting them with residents' opinions and attitudes collected through focus groups. The conclusion develops guidelines and recommendations for proper regeneration of socialist housing estates and planning new housing estates in Slovenia with a view to ensuring the desired quality of living.

KEYWORDS \_ quality of living, housing estates, socialist era, post-socialist era, comparison, guidelines and recommendations

### INTRODUCTION

Large housing estates, characterized by their construction from prefabricated building materials and designed as high-density urban settlements, can be found in virtually every major city worldwide. In Europe, the proliferation of these large housing estates saw a significant upswing during the first two decades following the Second World War. According to research by Richard Turkington et al. (2004) and Rob Rowlands et al. (2009), the primary driving factors behind this phenomenon included: a) the necessity to address and mitigate the demand for housing arising from wartime destruction; b) poor housing conditions and population growth; c) an increased role of the state in housing provision, particularly in terms of financing its construction; d) an adherence to a modernist perspective on what constituted quality residential architecture and a favorable residential environment, and e) political backing for mass housing complexes, primarily funded by the state.

The industrial production of standardized building units offered a relatively swift, cost-effective, and reasonably efficient means of meeting the escalating housing needs of burgeoning urban populations (Knorr-Siedow, 1996). While large housing estates typically constitute only 3 to 7% of the overall housing supply in Western Europe, they account for a more substantial 20 to 40% of total housing stock in Central and Eastern Europe, regions predominantly under socialist political regimes following Second World War (Dimitrovska Andrews & Sendi, 2001; Temelová et al., 2010). In Western Europe, the construction of such mass housing complexes came to a halt much earlier than in Eastern and Central Europe, where the development of these housing estates continued until the late 1980s. This pattern also applied to Slovenia, which was part of Yugoslavia during that period. Construction ceased only after the dissolution of Yugoslavia and the advent of a new sociopolitical and economic system.

However, the transition from the former socialist system to a market economy ushered in various new challenges, including shifts in housing policy. Among the numerous changes in housing policy, one significant shift was the elimination of the state's prior role in mass housing provision, effectively marking the end of large housing estate construction. Instead, new typologies of collective housing emerged, primarily characterized by lower apartment buildings with fewer housing units. The key distinction lies in the fact that collective housing estates built after the transition to a market economy are comparatively smaller in terms of both physical space and population. Additionally, numerous examples exist of new developments where smaller multifamily apartment buildings are constructed as individual detached structures, detached from the concept of a large housing estate. Consequently, after the shift from a socialist to a market economy, the term "housing estate" now refers to a substantially different form of housing compared to the socialist era (Sendi & Kerbler, 2021). For this reason, this article distinguishes between two distinctive forms of collective living: a) socialist housing estates which refer to mass housing complexes constructed from the aftermath of the Second World War up to the late 1980s (1945-1990), b) post-socialist housing estates which allude to multifamily apartment complexes built after the transition to a market economy (1991 and onward) by analogy.

This article operates on the hypothesis that the altered social circumstances characterizing the post-socialist period have engendered new expectations among residents regarding their quality of life. This, in turn, may render housing estates from the socialist era less appealing to live in, as residents now hold higher expectations and demands for a superior housing standard and enhanced quality of the residential environment. These changed values concerning quality of life in housing estates, as perceived by the residents, align with Tone Klemenčič's (1985) treatment of housing as a commodity with physical and substantive characteristics. These characteristics serve as vital indicators of its utility or key metrics for measuring shifts in residents' social values, as reflected in their comprehension, perception, and requirements concerning quality of life. This hypothesis is subject to empirical testing through a case study conducted in Slovenia.

### Theoretical backgrounds

Large housing estates constructed after the Second World War throughout Europe, including Yugoslavia, drew inspiration from concepts formulated within the International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM; French: Congrès internationaux d'architecture moderne). CIAM, a significant organization even before the war, viewed architecture as an economic and political instrument capable of advancing societal well-being through architectural design and urban planning. The fundamental tenet of this movement was that urban social issues could be addressed through the strict functional segregation of residential areas, relocating residents to high-rise housing blocks interspersed with expansive green spaces. These estates were self-contained, providing all necessary services and infrastructure, earning them the moniker "functional cities" catering to various social classes (De Decker & Newton, 2009).

Large housing estates constructed after the Second World War throughout Europe, including Yugoslavia, drew inspiration from concepts formulated within the International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM; French: Congrès internationaux d'architecture moderne). CIAM, a significant organization even before the war, viewed architecture as an economic and political instrument capable of advancing societal well-being through architectural design and urban planning. The fundamental tenet of this movement was that urban social issues could be addressed through the strict functional segregation of residential areas, relocating residents to high-rise housing blocks interspersed with expansive green spaces. These estates were self-contained, providing all necessary services and infrastructure, earning them the moniker "functional cities" catering to various social classes (De Decker & Newton, 2009).

Anne Power (1999) suggests that one of the primary drivers behind the proliferation and postwar popularity of large housing estates was the expected economic advantage. Besides easy access to affordable greenfield land on the outskirts of major cities, the replication of prefabricated residential high-rises in a single location was believed to be cost-effective. Additionally, standardized structural elements were anticipated to further reduce construction costs, with these elements being delivered in large quantities to construction sites and identically installed across numerous buildings. However, this approach also meant that any mistakes made during the design and construction of these housing estates were repeated multiple times.

In addition to these drawbacks, large housing estates have been associated with various negative aspects, encompassing physical, ecological, economic, housing, social, and other issues. Experts began highlighting these concerns in Western Europe as early as the 1970s (Murie et al., 2003; Turkington et al., 2004; De Decker & Newton, 2009; Bolt, 2018). The physical and environmental problems pertain to the uniform appearance of residential buildings, high building density, encroachment on green spaces, inadequately designed or unfinished public and green areas, the use of pollutants (e.g., asbestos), and the utilization of low-cost, unsustainable building materials (Musterd et al., 2017; Bolt, 2018; Hess et al., 2018). Economic and housing (financial) issues are linked to the high maintenance and energy costs arising from the use of less sustainable building materials, premature deterioration of building components (e.g., facades and roof structures) after a short period, increased infrastructure costs, and higher commuting expenses (Priemus & Metselaar, 1993; Hegedüs et al., 1996; Dekker & Van Kempen, 2004). Social challenges mainly stem from the high concentration of specific minority groups and economically disadvantaged households (Van Kempen et al., 2005).

In the early 1990s, Central and Eastern European nations transitioned from socialist, planned economies to market-based systems, impacting housing policy and construction. These changes mirrored shifts that had already occurred in Western Europe in the 1970s. The CIAM-inspired models of housing construction gave way to new spatial planning priorities, emphasizing better utilization and enhancement of underused or abandoned urban land, industrial complexes, and similar areas within settlements. In contrast to the socialist era, when mass housing construction was exclusively

undertaken by the state through publicly owned construction companies, private developers emerged as new players in the mass housing construction market (Sendi & Kerbler, 2021). Consequently, in all Central and Eastern European countries, including Slovenia, public spaces faced increasing pressure from potential developers perpetually seeking available spaces for new housing construction in sought-after locations (Sendi et al., 2009).

The design of multifamily apartment neighborhoods and the architectural aspects of buildings underwent significant transformations. Private developers' primary task was constructing apartment blocks on available land, with open green spaces and social services no longer obligatory elements of neighborhood design. The previous high-rise, high-density large housing estates on greenfield land were gradually replaced by new housing typologies characterized by shorter multifamily apartment buildings with fewer housing units, resulting in lower residential density. These new forms of buildings provided residents with a more pleasant living environment, fostering a connection to existing urban infrastructure, thereby enhancing their sense of urbanity. Statistical data (see Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia, 2012) indicate that post-socialist dwellings, averaging 75 m² in size, are larger than those in socialist housing estates, which average 55 m². Furthermore, housing constructed by private developers generally exhibits higher quality in terms of building materials, modern design, and room arrangements (e.g., spacious living areas connected to dining rooms and kitchens). These improvements have led to enhanced housing standards and a broader range of housing options (Sendi & Kerbler, 2021).

### **METHODS**

The data were obtained based on a telephone survey (CATI method), which was carried out between May and June 2022 in housing estates in the two largest Slovenian cities: Ljubljana and Maribor. For the purpose of survey, a questionnaire was formulated based on findings on the quality of life in housing estates and current knowledge about the satisfaction, wishes, and needs of residents living in them. The questionnaire measured the residents' attitudes, perceptions, norms, values, and satisfaction related to the quality of housing and their lives in socialist and post-socialist housing estates. The questionnaire consisted of 94 questions, most of which were designed in the form of a Likert scale. Due to space limitations, this article only presents results for some selected questions or part of them.

The final number of surveys completed was seven hundred, which constitutes the sample of apartments and residents living in socialist and post-socialist housing estates. The sample represents 1.2% of all dwellings designated for sampling. Depending on the construction period of the housing estates, the sample includes 613 respondents (87.6%) that live in buildings from the socialist period and 87 respondents (12.4%) that live in buildings from the post-socialist period. In housing estates from both periods, two-third of respondents were female. The age of respondents ranges from twenty-four to ninety-six. Respondents in socialist housing estates have lived there for a longer period of time than those in post-socialist ones. They have resided in socialist housing estates for an average of thirty-five years, and in post-socialist ones for 18.5 years. Respondents that live in socialist apartments are more often the owners of these apartments (91%) than those that live in post-socialist apartments (77.9%) (Table 1).

Following the survey, focus group discussions were held with residents from both types of housing estates in November and December 2022. The statements made during these focus groups are complemented by the survey findings in the article.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of respondents in the sample

Variable	Socialist	Post-socialist
Housing status (%)		
Owner/co-owner	91.0	77.9
Tenant	7.2	18.6
Other	1.8	3.5
Sex (%)		
Male	34.4	31.4
Female	65.6	68.6
Education (%)		
Primary school	5.1	1.2
Specialized high school	7.3	1.2
High school	41.9	22.1
College or university	45.7	75.6
Average number of household members	1.9	2.2
Average years of residence	35.1	18.5
Average age of respondents (years)	68.2	64.8
Average income (euros)	1,876.59	2,507.49

Note: Unanswered questions (missing values) and "I do not know" answers are not included.

### RESULTS

### Residential satisfaction

The residential satisfaction measurement was based on four key facets: a) apartments, b) multifamily apartment buildings, c) the outdoor built environment, and d) services. As the results showed, the residents, regardless of the housing estate, are satisfied with all key facets of the housing estates. However, a more detailed analysis showed that there are greater differences in the assessment of individual elements within the key facets of compared types of housing estates.

### Apartments and multifamily apartment buildings

Residents of both types of housing estates rated satisfaction with individual elements of the apartment higher than elements of multifamily apartment buildings (Table 2). But the hypothesis is confirmed only by the residents' satisfaction with multifamily apartment buildings. The average satisfaction rating for all elements is 4.03 in the case of post-socialist housing estates and 3.95 in the case of socialist housing estates. In the case of apartments residents of both types of housing estates are generally equally satisfied with their apartments (average score 4.42). The most important difference in satisfaction, which is also statistically significant, is for the interior arrangement and appearance of multifamily apartment buildings. Residents of post-socialist housing estates rated this element at 4.19 on average, and residents of socialist housing estates at 3.85 on average. The former also rate maintenance, external arrangement, and general satisfaction with the residential building higher. But it is interesting, however, that residents of older housing estates are more satisfied with the quality of construction.

"I'm generally satisfied with my life in Prule [housing estate], even though I live in a block from the 1950s, which was well-built, which is nice." (Male, 56 years, Ljubljana, socialist housing estate)

Table 2: Satisfaction with apartments and multifamily apartment buildings (mean)\*

	Socialist	Post-socialist
Apartment		
Comfort	4.38	4.40
Maintenance	4.30	4.35
Size	4.42	4.44
Layout of rooms	4.37	4.31
Number of rooms	4.17	4.12
General satisfaction with apartment	4.42	4.42
Multifamily apartment building		
Construction quality	3.91	3.84
Maintenance	3.99	4.06
Energy performance	3.84	3.83
External appearance	4.07	4.13
Internal appearance (stairways, corridor, elevator, etc.)**	3.85	4.19
General satisfaction with building	4.06	4.15

Notes: \* Scale 1–5 (1 = not satisfied at all, 5 = very satisfied); unanswered questions (missing values) and "I do not know" answers are not included; \*\* significant independent-samples t-test of socialist versus post-socialist housing estate difference ( $p \le 0.05$ ).

### Outdoor built environment

Even in the case of the outdoor built environment, it turned out that residents of housing estates from the post-socialist period are more satisfied with this, which also confirms the hypothesis. The outdoor environment was divided into three groups. Respondents evaluated its general characteristics, traffic arrangement, and paths within it. On average, residents of newer housing estates rated all three groups higher in comparison to their counterparts (4.04 vs. 4.00, 3.76 vs. 3.53, and 4.14 vs. 3.89).

Regarding **general characteristics**, the most important difference in satisfaction is for general orderliness (Table 3). Residents of socialist housing estates rated this with an average score of 3.90, and those in post-socialist housing estates with a score of 4.18. The difference is also statistically significant. In post-socialist housing estates, residents are also more satisfied with appearance, safety, peacefulness, and cleanliness. However, it should be emphasized that these characteristics were rated similarly highly by residents of older housing estates. Safety was rated the highest in both cases (i.e., 4.22 and 4.28). Green areas were rated similarly highly, but residents of socialist housing estates are more satisfied with them. Their assessment of green areas is also the highest among all general characteristics of the outdoor built environment (average score 4.29).

"If I talk [from perspective] of my [neighborhood], Litostrojski bloki [housing estate], /.../ There are a lot of green areas. Many trees. Well, I think the main advantage here is precisely the abundance of greenery." (Male, 76 years, Ljubljana, socialist housing estate)

"I'm from Fužine [housing estate] /.../ There's an abundance of greenery [in the neighborhood] /.../ That's the first thing that comes to my mind /.../ There are a lot of trees, they are already big." (Female, 55 years, socialist housing estate)

Construction density, playgrounds, and other outdoor public spaces were rated the lowest. However, greater satisfaction was detected in socialist housing estates with regard to construction density and playgrounds. There is a particularly significant difference in satisfaction regarding playgrounds.

Residents of newer housing estates rated this element with an average score of 3.67, whereas residents of older ones rated this element with a score of 3.91.

"For example, there's very little space between the multifamily apartment buildings /.../ and there is actually a bit of crowding." (Female, 51 years, Ljubljana, post-socialist housing estate)

"Socialist constructions had a sense of community, so they had some communal spaces, playgrounds, open areas, but now that's simply not there anymore in the new neighborhoods. Our courtyards are open, I mean playgrounds, in the old neighborhoods." (Male, 33 years, Ljubljana, socialist housing estate)

Similar to general characteristics, residents of post-socialist housing estates are also more satisfied with **traffic arrangements**, which is in line with the hypothesis. However, it should be emphasized that there is a statistically significant difference in satisfaction only in the case of parking spaces. Nonetheless, the average rating for both types of housing estates is low. Residents of newer housing estates rated this element with a score of 3.28, and residents of older ones with a score of 2.61 (Table 3). This is also the lowest average satisfaction score given by the residents of socialist housing estates for any of the elements evaluated in the survey.

"Parking spaces are a problem because this was built for fewer cars. When I came here, there were only three cars, but now we have nowhere to park them." (Female, 80 years, Maribor, socialist housing estate)

In the case of **path arrangements**, residents of post-socialist housing estates expressed greater satisfaction with all elements evaluated. There are statistically significant differences in satisfaction with sidewalks (Table 3). The average satisfaction score for this element is 4.36 in newer housing estates and 3.96 in older ones. Residents of both types of housing estates are less satisfied with bicycle paths, but more satisfied with walking paths.

"It would be possible to significantly encourage cycling, but the bike lanes should be 3 meters wide, not just 50 centimeters." (Male, 33 years, Ljubljana, socialist housing estate)

Table 3: Satisfaction with the outdoor built environment (mean)\*

	Socialist	Post-socialist
General characteristics		
General orderliness**	3.90	4.18
Construction density	3.87	3.77
Appearance	4.00	4.08
Safety	4.22	4.28
Peacefulness	4.04	4.10
Cleanliness	3.98	4.11
Green areas	4.29	4.21
Playgrounds	3.91	3.67
Other outdoor public spaces	3.80	3.94
Traffic arrangement		
Transport connections with other parts of city	4.49	4.45
Traffic density	3.50	3.56
Sufficient parking spaces**	2.61	3.28
Path arrangement		
Walking paths	4.12	4.26
Bicycle paths	3.61	3.79
Sidewalks**	3.94	4.36

Notes: \* Scale 1-5 (1 = not satisfied at all, 5 = very satisfied); unanswered questions (missing values) and "I do not know" answers are not included; \*\* significant independent-samples t-test of socialist versus post-socialist housing estate difference (p  $\leq$  0.05).

### Services

The results of residents' satisfaction with the services available in housing estates do not support the hypothesis. On average, residents of socialist housing estates expressed higher satisfaction with services in socialist housing estates (4.09 vs. 4.01). As many as eleven of the fifteen elements evaluated were rated higher than by residents of post-socialist housing estates (Table 4). For three, the responses of the residents differ statistically significantly depending on the period of construction of housing estates. These elements are schools, preschools, and grocery stores. Residents of socialist housing estates rated schools and preschools with the highest average satisfaction score among all elements evaluated (i.e., 4.64 for preschools in 4.59 for schools). On the other hand, the most important difference in the satisfaction rating is related to grocery stores. Residents of socialist housing estates rated this service with a score of 4.52, and residents of post-socialist housing estates with a score of 4.01. Eight other services with which residents of older housing estates are more satisfied in comparison to their counterparts in newer housing estates are public transport, post offices, banks, food services, personal care services, churches / places of worship, libraries, and leisure activities. A significant difference in satisfaction was especially seen in library accessibility; namely, 3.77 versus 4.01.

"I am from Fužine [housing estate] /.../ Public transport, healthcare center, library, shops, cafes, banks, in short, it's like a small town; training facilities, playgrounds, and here, there are also public sports fields, not just school playgrounds." (Female, 55 years, Ljubljana, socialist housing estate)

"I live in Na Jami [housing estate] /.../ The bus stop is nearby, the pharmacy is nearby, the post office is nearby, the store and the bank are nearby, and even the cafes are all together." (Male, 76 years, Ljubljana, socialist housing estate)

Table 4: Satisfaction with service accessibility in housing estates (mean)\*

	Socialist	Post-socialist
Public transport	4.33	4.23
School**	4.59	4.33
Preschool**	4.64	4.29
Pharmacy	4.45	4.54
Post office	4.08	4.01
Bank	3.91	3.89
Grocery store**	4.52	4.01
Health center	3.89	4.01
Dental clinic	3.57	3.66
Food services (e.g., restaurant, café)	4.06	4.01
Personal care services (e.g., hairdresser)	4.32	4.28
Cultural services (e.g., cinema, theater)	2.90	2.91
Library	4.03	3.77
Church / place of worship	4.08	4.02
Leisure activities (e.g., gym, education)	3.90	3.79
Overall satisfaction with housing estate	4.20	4.33

Notes: \* Scale 1–5 (1 = not satisfied at all, 5 = very satisfied); unanswered questions (missing values) and "I do not know" answers are not included; \*\* significant independent-samples t-test of socialist versus post-socialist housing estate difference ( $p \le 0.05$ ).

At the end of the satisfaction evaluation of all elements, the residents also had to evaluate how satisfied they are with the housing estate in general. It turned out that the overall satisfaction with the housing estate is higher among residents of post-socialist housing estates (average score 4.33) than among their counterparts in socialist ones (average score 4.20). The difference is not statistically significant, but the result confirms the hypothesis. However, despite everything, it should be emphasized that the satisfaction rating for this element is high in both cases.

### Significance of housing estates

When determining the significance of housing estates for residents, elements of two facets of the housing estates were evaluated: a) the outdoor built environment elements and b) services in the housing estate. The results show that, on average, the elements of the first aspect are more significant for residents of post-socialist housing estates (average score 4.07 vs. 3.97), whereas the elements of the second are more significant for residents of socialist housing estates (average score 4.02 vs. 3.78). This is somewhat surprising because the satisfaction analysis showed that residents of newer housing estates are less satisfied with services whereas residents of older ones are less satisfied with the outdoor built environment. It would therefore be expected that lower satisfaction increases the significance level of these key facets. This shows that satisfaction is directly related to what residents consider significant. However, it should be emphasized that a more detailed analysis of significance nevertheless confirms expectations for some elements.

### Outdoor built environment elements

When analyzing the significance of the outdoor built environment elements, it was revealed that five out of seven elements are more important for residents of post-socialist housing estates (Table 5), which is in line with the hypothesis. These elements are proximity to public transport, proximity to walking paths, arranged bicycle paths, low construction density, and enclosure of the housing estate. Proximity to recreational areas and arranged green areas are more significant for residents of socialist housing. There are no statistically significant differences between the groups in these elements either. Arranged green areas are the most important to residents. They were evaluated with the highest rating in both types of housing estates: at 4.62 in socialist housing estates and 4.55 in post-socialist housing estates. These are followed by proximity to walking paths with average scores of 4.53 in older housing estates and 4.54 in newer ones, proximity to public transport (4.48 vs. 4.54), and low construction density. Among all the elements assessed, the least important for all residents is that the housing estates had to be gated. However, it should be emphasized that residents of post-socialist housing estates rated this element of the outdoor environment as more significant (average score 2.68) than their counterparts in socialist housing estates (average score 2.05). The difference is also statistically significant.

"I live in Nova Grbina [housing estates], where we basically have a fence all around, and it's strictly locked. Even if someone from the housing estate goes out, the gates automatically close behind them. This can be bothersome. Not only from the perspective that there's no socializing, and people from other housing estates can't come and socialize, which I miss a lot, but also from the perspective that, for instance, those who live in the buildings further inside the housing estate, away from the entrance, have no delivery options or anything else. We have privacy, but it can be a bit bothersome that the housing estates are gated." (Male, 46 years, Ljubljana, post-socialist housing estate)

### Services

The results showed that all the services evaluated are more significant for residents of socialist housing estates, which does not support the hypothesis. As many as six average scores of evaluated elements are statistically significantly different between compared types of housing estates (Table 5). These are pharmacies, post offices, banks, grocery stores, dental clinics, and personal care services. However, it should be emphasized that the first four services listed are also important for residents of post-socialist housing estates because they were rated very high. The most important service for residents of both types of housing estates is grocery stores. In older housing estates, this service was rated with an average score of 4.77, and in newer ones 4.62. These are also the highest ratings among all the elements evaluated in the survey. Residents attributed much higher significance to this service than their actual satisfaction with it. Residents of socialist housing estates also expressed great significance for three other services that they are less satisfied with regarding accessibility than their counterparts in post-socialist housing estates. These are pharmacies, health centers, and dental clinics.

Table 5: Significance of selected outdoor built environment elements and services (mean)\*

	Socialist	Post-socialist
Spatial elements		
Proximity to public transport	4.48	4.54
Proximity to walking paths	4.53	4.54
Proximity to recreational areas	4.08	3.99
Arranged bicycle paths	3.83	3.90
Arranged green areas	4.62	4.55
Low construction density	4.22	4.29
Enclosure of housing estate (gated housing estate for non-residents; e.g., fence, barriers, no trespassing signs)***	2.05	2.68
Services		
School	4.02	3.68
Preschool	4.03	3.69
Pharmacy**	4.67	4.39
Post office**	4.47	4.18
Bank**	4.36	4.07
Grocery store**	4.77	4.62
Health center	4.49	4.25
Dental clinic**	4.35	3.94
Food services (e.g., pub, café)	3.39	3.36
Personal care services (e.g., hairdresser)**	3.97	3.62
Cultural services (e.g., cinema, theater)	3.25	3.20
Library	3.91	3.87
Church / place of worship	2.89	2.54
Leisure activities (e.g., gym, education)	3.72	3.53

Notes: \* Scale 1–5 (1 = not significant at all, 5 = very significant); unanswered questions (missing values) and "I do not know" answers are not included; \*\* significant independent-samples t-test of socialist versus post-socialist housing estate difference ( $p \le 0.05$ ).

### Attitudes regarding housing estates

Regarding attitudes related to housing estates, two facets of the housing estates were evaluated:
a) habitation experiences and b) inter-neighborly relations. On average, in both cases residents of post-socialist housing estates had more agreeable views, which supports the hypothesis. In general, the average score for agreement with the statements in both housing estates was higher regarding habitation experiences: 4.21 in socialist housing estates and 4.28 in post-socialist housing estates. The average rating of all statements in the case of inter-neighborly relations is also higher in post-socialist housing estates; namely, 3.26 versus 3.21 in socialist housing estates. Despite this, it should be emphasized that some statements were still rated higher by residents of older housing estates.

Table 6: Agreement with statements about habitation experiences and inter-neighborly relations (mean)\*

	Socialist	Post-socialist
Habitation experiences		
Meets all my criteria for pleasant living.	4.10	4.17
There are sufficient green spaces.	4.29	4.28
Suitable for all age groups.	4.24	4.38
Inter-neighborly relations		
Residents are good neighbors (willing to help, friendly, etc.).	3.81	3.95
Residents are connected with each other.	3.21	3.18
Residents share the same values.	3.02	3.11
Residents share a similar socioeconomic status.	2.98	3.08
Social diversity encourages contacts among residents.	3.02	2.97

Notes: \*Scale 1–5 (1 = do not agree at all, 5 = strongly agree); unanswered questions (missing values) and "I do not know" answers are not included.

### Habitation experiences

Residents of post-socialist housing estates most agreed with the statement "The housing estate is suitable for all age groups." The statement was rated with an average score of 4.38 (Table 6). On the other hand, residents of socialist housing estates most agreed with the statement "There are sufficient green spaces in the housing estate." It was rated with an average score of 4.29. However, the residents of post-socialist housing estates rated it almost equally (4.28). It should be emphasized that all statements related to habitation experiences were rated very high, including the statement "The housing estate meets all my criteria for pleasant living," which was rated by residents of newer housing estates with an average score of 4.17 and by residents of older ones at 4.10. There were no statistically significant differences between the average ratings of the two types of housing estates.

"Here, there's intergenerational living. Teenagers seek a street full of activity and entertainment, middleaged adults are looking for easier accessibility and functionality, while the elderly, rightfully so, seek peace and quiet." (Male, 45 years, Maribor, socialist housing estate)

### Inter-neighborly relations

There were also no statistically significant differences between the average ratings of the two types of housing estates regarding inter-neighborly relations (Table 6). Other than this, no statement referring to this key aspect was evaluated with an average score higher than 4. The statement "Residents of the housing estate are good neighbors (willing to help, friendly, etc.)" was rated the highest. It was evaluated higher by residents of post-socialist housing estates (3.95) than residents of socialist ones

(3.81). Residents of newer housing estates also rated the following statements higher: "Residents of the housing estate share the same values" and "Residents of the housing estate share a similar socioeconomic status". Residents of older housing estates rated two statements higher: "Residents of the housing estate are connected with each other" and "Social diversity in the housing estate encourages contacts among residents". In post-socialist housing estates, the latter was also the lowest-rated statement (average score 2.97).

"The elderly people who came here together in the neighborhood are passing away, and new residents are moving in. Apartments are being rented out for tourism, for renting, or to students. Now there are only foreigners here, and there is no more social interaction." (Male, 75 years, Maribor, socialist housing estate)

"I have been living here since day one, for 44 years since I moved here, and I must say that relationships have always been genuine and friendly. You know, lately, people are becoming more closed off." (Male, 72 years, Maribor, socialist housing estate)

### CONCLUSION

This article explored the quality of life in two distinct forms of housing estates constructed under different sociopolitical and economic systems: a) mass housing complexes built during the socialist era (1945–1990), and b) multifamily apartment complexes constructed during the post-socialist era (1991 and after), coinciding with the transition to a market economy.

While the hypothesis was not entirely supported, the research confirmed predictions that post-socialist housing estates offer superior housing standards and a better quality of the residential environment in specific aspects. Consequently, living in these estates is more appealing. The multifamily apartment buildings in these housing estates are well-maintained and boast a modern design, offering spacious and comfortable apartments. The outdoor built environment is characterized by cleanliness, safety, and tranquility, featuring low traffic density, ample parking spaces, well-structured walking and bicycle paths, and sidewalks. All of these elements collectively satisfy the needs, desires, and demands of residents for high-quality, contemporary living.

However, the research also uncovered significant shortcomings in post-socialist housing estates. Notably, they lack essential services and green spaces, which were distinctive features of socialist housing estates. This disparity reflects the differing sociopolitical and economic systems in which these two types of housing estates were developed. Although socialist-era housing estates featured massive, utilitarian high-rise buildings and basic prefabricated apartments, they emphasized meeting residents' daily needs. These estates were situated on the outskirts of cities, primarily near industrial complexes, with a pronounced focus on providing housing and comprehensive infrastructure and services for workers. Additionally, they incorporated extensive green areas, not only to promote healthier living environments and enhance the aesthetic appeal but also to facilitate social interactions, a key priority during the socialist era.

Despite their self-sufficiency and peripheral locations, socialist housing estates maintained excellent connectivity with city centers through robust public transportation networks—a stark contrast to the weaknesses observed in post-socialist housing estates. The shift in the sociopolitical and economic system saw private developers and financial capital emerge as the primary driving forces behind housing construction. While construction quality improved, offering more spacious apartments, shorter multifamily buildings, and a modern appearance, the focus on profit led to a reduction in outdoor spaces. Building plots became fully developed, resulting in the near absence or limited use of green areas within post-socialist housing estates. This, in turn, hindered social interactions among residents, a significant concern in contemporary, highly individualistic societies.

Post-socialist housing estates often consist of individual multifamily apartment buildings with

insufficiently planned social infrastructure and services. Furthermore, public transportation systems were not adapted to accommodate these new developments, even in cases of larger building plots where various developers pursued their visions independently. In such instances, cities should ideally coordinate the planning of common social infrastructure and facilities for the future housing estate, but this frequently does not occur, or it happens to a limited extent (e.g., grocery stores). These shortcomings collectively diminish the overall quality of life in post-socialist housing estates.

To enhance residents' quality of life, cities should adopt a more holistic approach when planning new housing estates. They should allocate a portion of the capital acquired from land sales to housing developers for constructing social infrastructure that caters to the future housing estate's residents. The development of this infrastructure should parallel the construction of housing estates. Additionally, cities should specify the extent of green areas developers should create adjacent to residential buildings or undertake the responsibility of establishing green spaces themselves. To elevate the quality of life in socialist housing estates, cities should embark on comprehensive regeneration efforts, prioritizing the refurbishment of residential buildings and the outdoor environment. Cities should also ensure that essential services remain accessible and green areas are adequately maintained.

However, ensuring a high quality of life for residents necessitates a holistic approach encompassing the planning of post-socialist housing estates and the regeneration of socialist housing estates. Future research should thus concentrate on methods to accomplish and implement this objective.

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

The findings presented in this article are the result of the three-year project titled Quality of living in the housing estates of the socialist and post-socialist era: a comparative analysis between Slovenia and Croatia, which was financially supported by the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency (grant number J5-2569). The research was also carried out in Croatia, and so the results are comparable.

### **REFERENCES**

- Bolt, Gideon. 2018. "Who Is to Blame for the Decline of Large Housing Estates? An Exploration of Socio-Demographic and Ethnic Change". In Housing Estates in Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Segregation and Policy Challenges, edited by Hess, Daniel Baldwin, and Tilt Tammaru, 57–74. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- De Decker, Pascal, and Caroline Newton. 2009. "Ob padcu utopije = At the fall of Utopia." Urbani izziv 20, no. 2: 5-13.
- Dekker, Karien, and Ronald Van Kempen. 2004. "Large housing estates in Europe: Current situation and developments." Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie 95, no.5: 570–577.
- Dimitrovska Andrews, Kaliopa, and Richard Sendi. 2001. "Large housing estates in Slovenia: A framework for renewal." European journal of housing policy 1, no. 2: 233–255.
- Hegedüs, József, Tosics, Iván, and Stephen K. Mayo. 1996. "Transition of the housing sector in the East Central European countries." Review of Urban & Regional Development Studies 8, no. 2: 101–136.
- Hess, Daniel Baldwin, Tammaru, Tiit, and Maarten van Ham. 2018. "Lessons Learned from a Pan-European Study of Large Housing Estates: Origin, Trajectories of Change and Future Prospects." In Housing Estates in Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Segregation and Policy Challenges, edited by Hess, Daniel Baldwin, Tammaru, Tiit, and Maarten van Ham, 3–31. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Klemenčič, Tone. 1985. Stanovanjsko gospodarstvo. Ljubljana: Gospodarska založba.
- Knorr-Siedow, Thomas. 1996. "Present and future outlook for large housing estates." In Environmental Improvements in Pre-Fabricated Housing Estates, edited by Schwedler, Hans-Uve. Berlin: European Academy of the Urban Environment, Institute for Regional Development and Structural Planning.
- · Murie, Alan, Knorr Siedow, Thomas, and Roland Van Kempen. 2003. Large housing estates in Europe: General

developments and theoretical backgrounds, Utrecht: Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University,

- Musterd, Sako, Marcińczak, Szymon, Van Ham, Maarten, and Tiit Tammaru. 2017. "Socioeconomic segregation in European capital cities. Increasing separation between poor and rich." Urban Geography 38, no. 7: 1062–1083.
- Power, Anne. 1999. "High-Rise Estates in Europe: is Rescue Possible?" Journal of European Social Policy 9, no. 2: 139–163.
- Priemus, Hugo, and Gerard Metselaar. 1993. "Urban Renewal Policy in a European Perspective." Netherlands Journal of Housing and the Built Environment 8, no. 4: 447–470.
- Rowlands, Robert, Musterd, Sako, and Ronald Van Kempen (eds.). 2009. Mass housing in Europe: Multiple faces of development, change and response: Basingstoke, Palgraye Macmillan.
- Sendi, R., Aalbers, M., & Trigueiro, M. (2009) Public space in large housing estates. In: Rowlands, R., Musterd, S., & Kempen, R. van (eds.) Mass Housing in Europe: Multiple Faces of Development, Change and Response, pp. 131–156. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sendi, Richard, and Boštjan Kerbler. 2021. "The Evolution of Multifamily Housing: Post-Second World War Large Housing Estates versus Post-Socialist Multifamily Housing Types in Slovenia." Sustainability 13, no. 18: 1–19.
- Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia. 2012. Ljudje, družine, stanovanja: Register Census 2011.
   Ljubljana: Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia.
- Temelová, Jana, Novák, Jakub, Ouředníček, Martin, and Petra Puldová. 2010. "Housing estates in the Czech Republic after socialism: Various trajectories and inner differentiation." Urban Studies 48, no. 9: 1811–1834.
- Turkington, Richard, Van Kempen, Ronald, and Frank Wassenberg (eds.). 2004. High-rise housing in Europe: Current trends and future prospects. Delft: Delft University Press.
- Van Kempen, Ronald, Dekker, Karien, Hall, Stephen, and Iván Tosics (eds.). 2005. Restructuring large housing
  estates in Europe: Restructuring and resistance inside the welfare industry. Bristol: Bristol University Press.

CIP - Каталогизација у публикацији Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

711.4.01(082)(0.034.2) 711.4:005.591.6(082)(0.034.2)

INTERNATIONAL Academic Conference on Places and Technologies (8; 2023; Beograd)

Keeping up with technologies to imagine and build together sustainable, inclusive, and beautiful cities [Elektronski izvor]: proceedings / 8th International Academic Conference on Places and Technologies, Belgrade, 2023; editors Aleksandra Djukić ... [et al.]. - Belgrade: University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture, 2024 (Belgrade: University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture). - 1 USB (fleš memorija); 6 x 2 x 1 cm

Sistemski zahtevi: Nisu navedeni. - Nasl. sa naslovnog ekrana. - Tiraž 50. - Abstracts. - Bibliografija uz svaki rad.

### ISBN 978-86-7924-343-0

1. Đukić, Aleksandra, 1964- [urednik] a) Градови - Мултидисциплинарни приступ -Зборници b) Урбанистичко планирање -Технолошки развој - Зборници

COBISS.SR-ID 143080457

