

Housing Construction and the Role of the Neighbourhood Unit in Ljubljana under Socialism

Jelka Piškurič*

vol. 11, 2022, 2, pp. 117–139

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33542/CAH2022-2-05>



After World War II, the improvement of housing conditions was one of the Yugoslav political and social care priorities. Although the guidelines for housing development were politically planned, the authorities had to adapt to the increasing demand of the growing population. The shift in housing policy from the 1960s made it possible for Slovenian architects to apply the idea of a neighbourhood unit in organized housing construction. Planned along major arterial roads into Ljubljana, the new neighbourhood units were envisaged to meet all the workers' needs, offering housing with the infrastructure necessary for quality living. They never fully developed into social hubs with all public services; nevertheless, they still represented a huge change in quality of life. Over the decades, new neighbourhoods significantly changed the appearance of Ljubljana.

Keywords: History; City; Urban history; Yugoslavia; Slovenia; Twentieth century; Socialism; Housing policy; Housing construction; Neighbourhood unit; Ljubljana.

Introduction

Yugoslavia's and Slovenia's road to modernization was largely determined by political developments during and after World War II, as the country, which started as part of the Communist bloc, eventually established itself somewhere between the East and the West, creating its own model of socialism. The political system impacted the country's socio-economic development. Yugoslavia was governed by a single party, the League of Communists. Its economy was planned, but included some elements of the market. It also had a developing consumer culture.

One of the priorities of the Yugoslav political system was the improvement of housing conditions and building appropriate housing for its working class. Every worker (from factory workers to professors and high officials) was supposed to get an apartment. Accordingly, many architects understood their work as a means to achieve the society's ideals. Neighbourhood units, as they were developed from the 1960s, were primarily to serve the needs of their residents.¹ In addition to the right of every worker to an apartment, attention was also paid to quality leisure time. This was reflected in the new spatial plans and appearance of cities across Yugoslavia.² In Slovenia as in Yugoslavia in general, the construction of multi-apartment housing was considered the best model for solving the housing issues of the working class.

* Dr Jelka Piškurič, Study Centre for National Reconciliation, Ljubljana, Slovenia; jelka.piskuric@scnr.si; ORCID iD: 0000-0002-2202-7330.

1 TERŽAN, *Socialistična stanovanjska arhitektura*, 63.

2 Despite the common political framework, we can also see some significant differences in urban planning across Yugoslavia, originating partly in different historical and cultural experiences. See e.g.: JERLIU – NAVAKAZI, *The Socialist Modernization of Prishtina*, 55–74; KLADNIK – LUDWIG, *Cultural Heritage*, 59–64.

Although new neighbourhoods served to symbolize the technical, social and cultural progress of the new political system,³ their construction arose from existing needs of the growing population.

This paper tracks housing conditions in the case of Ljubljana and the role of the new neighbourhood units in providing much needed housing. Its main objective is to show how the neighbourhood units contributed to the quality of living and whether they were able to meet all the workers' needs. In order to achieve the objective, the paper begins with a short historical and architectural background of Yugoslavia and Slovenia and subsequently presents the development of the housing policy in Slovenia and the implementation of the neighbourhood unit in Ljubljana.

A short account of the Yugoslav political and architectural framework

The rise of the Communist Party began during World War II, as it was able to organize and eventually take control over the resistance against the occupying forces. Although guided by the demand for radical social change, it postponed the goal of obtaining full political power until the post-war period, when it began to consolidate its ruling position in all areas of life.⁴ While initially adopting the Soviet model, Yugoslavia began developing its own system after the tension with the Soviet Union and the break with the Cominform in 1948. As a result, socialist self-management was put into practice in the early 1950s. Self-management was both a political and economic system, originating from the concept of social ownership, as opposed to state ownership in the East and private ownership in the West. The idea was to create new economic and governmental foundations by including workers' councils in management and workers' representatives in self-governing bodies, thus theoretically transferring economic and political authority to the working class. Through the decades, self-management was to constantly evolve and became an extremely complex system, hard to understand and unfamiliar to the masses. Even though it was designed for the working people, the decision-making process remained within the party hierarchy.⁵

As a federation, Yugoslavia consisted of six republics – Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Slovenia – that were, except in the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in principle organized as nation-states. Due to the centrally organized Communist Party, Yugoslavia was in fact a distinctly centralist state from the beginning. Self-management brought a certain degree of decentralization, not significantly changing the position of the republics, as it emphasized the class aspect.⁶ Still, in 1953, the responsibility for housing moved to the republics and municipalities. Further decentralization was achieved by the housing reform of 1965.⁷

Decentralization was one of the reasons for diverse housing development in Yugoslavia, the other being multiple national identities and their cultural differences. Architectural centres, which played an important role in the development of Yugoslav cities, were organized within republic borders. Beograd, Zagreb and Ljubljana already had established architecture departments at universities and consequently

3 See e.g.: BARA, *Socialistička modernizacija grada*, 49–64.

4 DEŽELAK BARIČ, *Vloga in značaj komunistične partije Slovenije*, 95–108; GABRIČ, *Ljudska fronta*, 847–849.

5 REŽEK, *Politične spremembe*, 939–941; BING, *Socialist Self-Management*, 1–34; ZAJC, *Delavsko samoupravljanje*, 131–145.

6 REPE, *Slovenija od medvojnne federalne enote*, 129–137.

7 RENDLA, *Stanovanjska politika*, 211.

a larger number of educated architects in the early socialist period. Many of them were leading pre-war modernists and their students. Departments in Sarajevo and Skopje were founded under socialism, whereas Montenegro didn't have its own school of architecture. Each of the schools developed its own style, defined by the most prominent architects who were also influential professors.⁸

The attempt to follow the Soviet example of socialist realism was short-lived and leaving the Soviet political route enabled Yugoslavia to reach for new prospects in architectural development. The shift of focus from the East to the West was quick and cultural connections from the pre-war period were re-established. The revival of modernism is apparent in renewed acknowledgement of Le Corbusier's work and the reintegration of Yugoslavia into networks of international modernism.⁹

The Slovenian school of architecture was specific within the Yugoslav framework. It combined local architectural tradition and international modernism under the leadership of Edvard Ravnikar, who became the republic's post-war authority in the field of architecture. He was a student of Jože Plečnik, expanded his knowledge at the University of Vienna and in the 1930s briefly worked for Le Corbusier in Paris. He was well connected internationally and highly regarded at home and abroad. Alongside Ravnikar, many younger architects were evolving. In housing design, Slovenian architects were responding to local needs, following the criteria of practicality and high quality of living for the socialist working class, while remaining open to European trends. When searching for solutions in non-socialist countries, they established an important connection with Scandinavian architecture.¹⁰

Although the architectural profession in Slovenia enjoyed a certain autonomy, it could only realize its work in relation to the investor, which was in many cases the state or its republic and municipal counterparts.¹¹ Construction of the built environment was ideological and public space intentionally used. Monumental buildings of representative importance and industrial facilities demonstrated the success of the new political system, whereas attitudes towards political opponents, for example the Catholic Church, could also be seen. In Ljubljana, Ursuline monastery garden was over time transformed into the monumental complex of Revolution Square, and the Church of St Joseph in the Poljane district was given over for use to a film company. New monuments, the renaming of streets and commemorative practices such as the Trail of Remembrance and Comradeship were to strengthen the official memory of World War II and the leading role in the resistance of the Communist Party.¹²

In everyday life the emphasis was on functionality of architecture, such as housing in new residential neighbourhoods, facilities for various public services (kindergartens, schools, health centres), shops and other infrastructure (utilities, roads). This type of architecture was supposed to display socialist values, for example social equality, raising the quality of life for everyone or promoting a sense of belonging to the community.¹³ Political initiatives to raise the general standard of living are apparent

8 KULIĆ – MRDULJAŠ, *Modernism in-between*, 33–34, 77–87.

9 DEU, *O urbanizmu*, 52–54; KULIĆ – MRDULJAŠ, *Modernism in-between*, 32–40.

10 DEU, *O urbanizmu*, 52–55; KULIĆ – MRDULJAŠ, *Modernism in-between*, 84–87; MERCINA, *Arhitekt Ilija Arnautović*, 8–11, 20–21.

11 MERCINA, *Arhitekt Ilija Arnautović*, 8–9.

12 PIŠKURIČ, "Bili nekoč so lepi časi", 282.

13 MERCINA, *Arhitekt Ilija Arnautović*, 15–17.

from the mid-1950s and one of the areas concerned was housing policy. The conditions for extensive residential construction were beginning to improve by the end of the decade.¹⁴

The socialist period coincided with post-war reconstruction and industrialization, but also with general modernization and urbanization processes. The major cities in Slovenia experienced rapid urban and architectural transformations and growth, while rural settlements started to lose their character and vitality. Newly built residential neighbourhoods, scientific and educational centres, industrial areas, new administrative and political buildings, public services and department stores were growing quickly, especially in the capital Ljubljana, partly through the demolition of existing buildings, partly on undeveloped land.¹⁵ The guidelines for their development were politically planned, following the guidelines for social and economic growth. The architects had to negotiate spatial planning guidelines with the relevant political authorities. In Ljubljana, official urban planners worked within the Ljubljana Urban Planning Institute, which was a national institution, and all the plans had to go through procedures in municipal bodies. Still, the municipal authorities had to adapt to the needs of people who increasingly demanded appropriate housing and infrastructure, in urban as in surrounding rural areas.¹⁶

Suitable housing for all: Housing policy and practice

Throughout the socialist period, from the end of World War II to the late 1980s, Slovenia faced a constant shortage of housing, particularly in urban areas. I am referring in particular to state-built or so-called social housing, meaning apartments owned by companies, municipalities or the republic. The republic and municipal authorities devoted considerable attention to the construction of social housing, as the development of suitable housing for the working class was one of the priorities of the Yugoslav political system. Housing shortages were a consequence of several factors: underdevelopment of housing from the pre-war period, war damage, and intense post-war industrialization and urbanization that led to strong migrations from rural to urban centres.¹⁷

Like many Yugoslav cities, Ljubljana experienced a comprehensive housing shortage. Immediately after the war, there was an estimated shortage of around 2,200 apartment units. The housing shortage originated in part from the pre-war period and was increasing, among other things, due to booming migration of citizens following the rapid industrialization and abandonment of agricultural activities.¹⁸ Ljubljana was the first among Slovenian cities to benefit from the industrialization and modernization processes that started soon after the end of World War II. The city started inviting new residents under its wing, offering diverse employment or education opportunities. The

14 DUDA, *Pronađeno blagostanje*, 18; PRINČIČ – ČEPIČ, *Urbanizacija in življenjska raven*, 1013; RENDLA, "Kam ploveš standard?", 155.

15 DEU, *O urbanizmu*, 52.

16 PIŠKURIČ, "Bili nekoč so lepi časi", 282–329; MERCINA, *Arhitekt Ilija Arnautović*, 12–14; APLENC, *To Develop the Acceptably Modern*, 7–10.

17 PIŠKURIČ, "Bili nekoč so lepi časi", 282–301; REBERNIK, *Urbano-geografsko proučevanje*, 473.

18 PRINČIČ – ČEPIČ, *Urbanizacija in življenjska raven*, 1009–1011; PETELIN, *Stanovanjske razmere v Ljubljani*, 78–80.

early attempts to develop residential infrastructure, albeit slow, provided additional appeal, as this meant a significant improvement in quality of living.

At first, the state attempted to solve the shortage in housing supply by allocating tenants to existing apartments, where they would accommodate two, three or even more families. With the 1946 constitution, the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia made a commitment to provide housing for its citizens. To reduce the housing shortage, it temporarily introduced a system of subleasing apartments. Part of the housing stock was accordingly increased with nationalized or otherwise expropriated housing. In addition to this, a regulation was issued determining the maximum surface area one family could have at its disposal. In doing so, owners or tenants of bigger apartments and houses were limited to only one part of them or relocated, while the surplus was given for use to those who needed housing or frequently also to party officials.¹⁹ In many cases, individuals who were considered opponents of the new political system or identified as big landowners were expropriated.²⁰

This type of solution could only be temporary and the need for newly-built housing remained considerable. From the very beginning, the Slovenian authorities focused on the construction of multi-apartment housing, one of the reasons being that such type of housing was in line with the new ideology. Not only because of their collectivist nature, larger apartment blocks and residential neighbourhoods were much more noticeable than low-rise single-family houses, which were initially not meant to be included in urban planning.²¹ In the first post-war years, the construction of new housing was marked by functionality. It was done at minimal cost, meeting basic technical standards, due to limited funds and a lack of construction companies with appropriate technology.²² At the same time, the urban planners and architects did not have the necessary authority to be able to influence the authorities with regard to urban development. Thus, political interests often prevailed over professional ones.²³

The development of the building industry was crucial for overall industrialization and modernization processes, including the construction of multi-apartment housing.²⁴ In 1945, after the new authorities nationalized all the major companies, Gradis (Building Directorate of Slovenia) was founded in Ljubljana by uniting 42 smaller pre-war construction companies. Gradis grew in size over time and became the leader of the technological development of the Yugoslav building industry. A few other construction companies, Tehnika, Slovenija ceste and Obnova, later merged and also became the large construction company Slovenija ceste Tehnika, building roads and other infrastructure across Yugoslavia.²⁵ Being state-owned, these companies had state guarantees and operational freedoms. Large investments in construction activities influenced their growth.

19 BARA, *Socialistička modernizacija grada*, 50; DUJO JURJEVIČIČ, *Zasedena stanovanja*, 189–207.

20 For the description of individual cases of expropriations, see e.g.: PETRIČ, *Ivan Ogrin*, 277–282; PIŠKURIČ, *Ig v letih 1945–1952*, 312–315; PETELIN, *Stanovanjske razmere v Ljubljani*, 78–80.

21 MALEŠIČ, *Delavsko stanovanjsko vprašanje*, 118; LE NORMAND, *The contested place*, 175–176.

22 BARA, *Socialistička modernizacija grada*, 51.

23 MIHELJIČ, *Novejša urbanistična zgodovina Ljubljane*, 570–571.

24 MALEŠIČ, *Delavsko stanovanjsko vprašanje*, 118.

25 LORENČIČ – PRINČIČ, *Slovenska industrija od nastanka do danes*, 240–246; MERCINA, *Arhitekt Ilija Arnaudovič*, 15–16; PIŠKURIČ, *"Bili nekoč so lepi časi"*, 51.

As the number of residents grew, demand for housing increased. According to the data from the 1948 population census and the 1949 housing census, the number of households in Ljubljana exceeded the number of apartment units by 11,000. In 1954, the number had risen to 15,500 despite the new housing construction.²⁶ At this time, Ljubljana attracted a workforce mainly from its rural surroundings and other Slovenian regions. The image of Slovenia was still predominantly rural, as in 1953 only 28.5 per cent of the population lived in cities. In 1955, 65.3 per cent of houses in Ljubljana were single-storey houses, 26.5 per cent were two-storey houses and only 8.2 per cent of houses had multiple storeys.²⁷

In the 1950s, the population growth and increasing migration of the workforce to urban areas had already become a significant factor in housing policy, changing its direction. The state, from the beginning set on ensuring its housing supply, now realized that it lacked resources and that its housing construction could not keep up with demand. In 1953, it moved the responsibility for housing to the republics and municipalities. Consequently, the main responsibility for the construction and distribution of housing and housing loans was slowly but consistently placed on work organizations,²⁸ in Ljubljana and its municipalities as elsewhere. Already in the early 1950s, the municipal authorities started encouraging work organizations to actively address the housing problems of their employees. The city council, being aware that smaller work organizations did not have enough funds to build housing for their employees, started to encourage them to join resources.²⁹

The 1950s saw several other changes in housing policy. Housing cooperatives were gaining momentum, uniting people to build housing as a group, often semi-detached or terraced houses. Housing cooperatives were generally set up by work organizations for their employees. Their advantage was, among other things, access to more favourable land, available through expropriations.³⁰ There were 35 housing cooperatives registered in Ljubljana in 1956 and as many as 177 in 1959.³¹ Despite legal encouragement, this kind of cooperative housing construction did not develop to its full potential in Slovenia, due in part to the improved conditions for the private construction of single-family houses in the 1960s.³² The first housing loans for private construction were also issued in the 1950s. In addition to this, a compulsory contribution was introduced in 1955 for all employees, deducted from their income and deposited in so-called housing credit funds.³³ Applications made by work organizations and housing cooperatives for housing loans increased towards the end of the 1950s, indicating the development of

26 PRINČIČ – ČEPIČ, *Urbanizacija in življenjska raven*, 1009.

27 MERCINA, *Arhitekt Ilija Arnavtovič*, 12.

28 RENDLA, *Stanovanjska politika*, 211.

29 Zgodovinski arhiv Ljubljana [Ljubljana Historical Archives] (hereinafter ZAL), SI_ZAL_LJU/0079 Municipal People's Committee of Ljubljana Vič (1955–1961) (hereinafter SI_ZAL_LJU/0079), technical unit 84, archival unit 214, Poročilo Sveta za stanovanjske zadeve [Report of the Housing Board], 20. 11. 1958, 11.

30 See e.g.: ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0078 – Municipal People's Committee of Ljubljana Rudnik (1955–1961) (hereinafter SI_ZAL_LJU/0078), technical unit 1, Poročilo Sveta za gradbene in komunalne zadeve za leto 1958 [Annual Report of the Council for Construction and Utilities Infrastructure for 1958], 9.

31 RENDLA, "Kam ploveš standard?", 157; ČELIK, *Modernistične soseske v Ljubljani*.

32 Slovenska stanovanjska gradnja v času socializma. In: *Radio Študent*, KOLARIČ, *Stanovanjska politika*, 192.

33 ČEPIČ, *Zvišanje življenjske ravni*, 1091.

lively construction activity.³⁴ Despite that, the municipal authorities estimated that there was still a housing shortage of around 15,000 units in Ljubljana at the end of the 1950s, with the number of applicants increasing by around 1,400 per year.³⁵

Spatial planning became an integral part of housing construction. Starting from the mid-1950s, state-appointed urban planners were tasked with creating spatial and building plans, first for Ljubljana and other Slovene cities, then gradually also for surrounding rural areas. In this process, the municipalities of Ljubljana began to determine their building areas and campaigned at the same time for a ban on building and land subdivision until the adoption of appropriate building plans. They also argued that urban development should include appropriate utilities infrastructure (i.e. water and electricity supply, waste water treatment). From the beginning of the 1960s, the municipalities of Ljubljana started paying attention to the development of surrounding rural areas as well, but to a greater extent only from the 1970s.³⁶

In the 1960s, the population growth in Ljubljana was at its highest of the socialist period. The rapid growth of the city can be seen in its appearance. The decade permitted greater freedom in architecture, residential construction became more intensive and many new representative or commercial buildings were built.³⁷ Although the programme for the urban development of Ljubljana was prepared in 1957, it was not until 1966 that it was finally adopted. The General Plan for the Urban Development of Ljubljana, as it was called, was the city's first comprehensive urban document after World War II, which allowed it to expand but also regulated and guided the intensive expansion.³⁸ The rise in housing construction from the mid-1960s was also due to the Act on Nationalization of Leased Buildings and Construction Land that was adopted in 1958 and gave the republic and municipal authorities access to large swathes of undeveloped construction land. This stage of nationalization was completed in 1962.³⁹ The housing reform of 1965, which was part of a wider economic reform, brought further changes, notably the permission to construct housing for the market. Banks

34 PIŠKURIČ, "Bili nekoč so lepi časi", 79–80; 289–290.

35 ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0079, technical unit 83, archival unit 213, Zapisnik 22. redne seje, Izvlečki poročil [Minutes of the 22nd Regular Meeting, Extract of the Reports], 28. 6. 1957, 21.

36 For the municipalities' development plans of rural areas, see e.g.: ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0078, technical unit 1, Poročilo Sveta za gradbene in komunalne zadeve za leto 1958 [Annual Report of the Council for Construction and Utilities Infrastructure for 1958], 9–10; ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0079, technical unit 90, archival unit 220, Poročilo sveta za komunalne zadeve za leto 1959 [Annual Report of the Council for Utilities Infrastructure for 1959], 1–4; ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0080/1 – Assembly of the Municipality of Ljubljana Vič – Rudnik (1961–1994) (hereinafter SI_ZAL_LJU/0080), technical unit 10, archival unit 20, Analiza pogojev gospodarjenja v letu 1966 [Analysis of Management Conditions in 1966], 44; ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0080/1, technical unit 12, archival unit 23, razprava k Obravnavi problematike stanovanjsko-komunalnega gospodarstva, urbanizma in zemljiške politike [Debate to the Point of Discussing the Issues of Housing and Utilities Infrastructure, Urban Planning and Land Policy], 22. 9. 1966, 20–21; ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0080/1, technical unit 14, archival unit 30, Analiza pogojev gospodarjenja v letu 1968 [Analysis of Management Conditions in 1968], 55–56; ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0080/1, technical unit 18, archival unit 40, Poročilo in predlog k l. fazi urbanističnega programa za izven mestno območje občine Ljubljana – Vič – Rudnik [Report and Proposal to the First Phase of the Urban Planning Programme for the Non-urban Area of the Municipality of Ljubljana Vič – Rudnik], 4. 6. 1970; ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0080/2, technical unit 97, archival unit 150, Podrobni urbanistični red naselja lg [Detailed Urban Development Plan for the Village lg], October 1974.

37 PIŠKURIČ, "Bili nekoč so lepi časi", 85–87.

38 MIHELIC, *Novejša urbanistična zgodovina Ljubljane*, 572; OTOREPEC, *Ljubljana*, 99; VIDMAR, *Nedokončane modernizacije*, 10.

39 PRINČIČ, *Nacionalizacija najemnih zgradb*, 193–201; PRINČIČ – ČEPIČ, *Urbanizacija in življenjska raven*, 1011.

thus started offering commercial housing loans, whereas work organizations provided low-interest housing loans for their employees. In doing so, even more responsibility was assigned to work organizations regarding the housing issue.⁴⁰ Last but not least, the rise in housing construction was also boosted by an overall improvement in the standard of living.

After the reform of 1965, the Slovenian architects could finally promote the idea of high-density low-rise construction. It did not however catch on in organized housing construction; instead the idea of the neighbourhood unit was applied, as we will see in the case of Ljubljana.⁴¹

The evolution of the neighbourhood unit

A neighbourhood unit is considered to be a specific form of spatial design. It is theoretically based on the idea that settlements need to be divided into smaller urban units, which would also serve as social hubs, combining all infrastructure necessary for balanced everyday life. The essence of a neighbourhood unit is therefore not spatial design, but an organizational concept, used for planning the development of fast-growing cities, while at the same time including measures for improving quality of life. In this way, the number and size of buildings is not specified; a neighbourhood unit is rather determined as a spatially, functionally and symbolically complete entity. In neighbourhood units, all infrastructure, including schools, kindergartens, recreational areas and other green areas, should be accessible on foot and not obstructed by traffic. Thus, all roads for motor vehicles are planned on the outer part of the neighbourhood unit, defining its borders.⁴² This was the general idea that Slovenian architects tried to include in their interpretation of a neighbourhood unit (in Slovenian *stanovanjska soseska*).

This approach to spatial design emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as a response to rapid population growth in urban areas and functionality of existing housing. It was first developed by English and American urban planners. The first to use the term residential unit was the American urban planner Clarence A. Perry in 1929. Following the concept of Ebenezer Howard's influential garden city, Perry determined the size of a neighbourhood unit by limiting the number of their inhabitants, emphasizing the role of pedestrians, eliminating traffic within individual building areas, and positioning the location of public infrastructure. In the early 1930s, similar concepts were developed by other American urban planners such as Clarence Stein and Henry Wright. In Europe, the idea of the neighbourhood unit as a form of residential construction did not have a great impact in the period between the world wars. Le Corbusier developed his variation on the garden city vertically, stacking individual apartments one on top of another and placing the emphasis on functionality.⁴³ The functional zoning of urban landscapes was also the main foundation of the Athens Charter, adapting cities to the needs of the people and providing extensive green belts for their leisure activities. After World War II, the charter had a significant impact on urban planning.⁴⁴

40 RENDLA, *Stanovanjska politika*, 216; MANDIČ, *Stanovanje in država*, 137.

41 MALEŠIČ, *Delavsko stanovanjsko vprašanje*, 118.

42 MALEŠIČ, *Nastanek in rast*, 63.

43 Ibidem, 63–64; FIKFAK – ZBAŠNIK SENEGAČNIK, *Preobrati v organizirani večstanovanjski gradnji*, 35–37.

44 CHARITONIDOU, *From the Athens Charter to the "human association"*, 28–42.

As for the neighbourhood unit, English urban planners began to adopt Perry's and Stein's models at the end of World War II. The model of the neighbourhood unit was later adopted by the Scandinavian countries, especially Sweden, where it corresponded with their understanding of the welfare state. The first examples still followed Perry's principles, while the later ones leaned toward low-rise construction. In the early 1950s, the neighbourhood unit was included in the spatial planning of Stockholm and became a model for other cities in Sweden, but also across Europe.⁴⁵



Figure 1: Children playing in Litostroj neighbourhood, 1950. National Museum of Contemporary History of Slovenia, photography: Marjan Pfajfer.

⁴⁵ MALEŠIČ, *Nastanek in rast*, 64; FIKFAK – ZBAŠNIK SENEGAČNIK, *Preobrati v organizirani večstanovanjski gradnji*, 37.

In Slovenia, the concept of the neighbourhood unit began to evolve in the 1950s. The short period from the end of World War II to the Cominform crisis did not leave a lasting impression on Yugoslav or Slovenian architecture, the rhetoric of socialist realism resonating mainly in the architectural journals. From 1950, modernism was re-established as an all-Yugoslav architectural style. The change can be seen in the reception of Le Corbusier and the reintegration of Yugoslavia into international architectural networks.⁴⁶ Establishing an important connection with Scandinavian architecture, Slovenian architects knew about the concept of the neighbourhood unit and started incorporating its models into Slovenian design. It was Ravnikar who started to develop the idea in the early 1950s, inspired in particular by the Swedish examples, in his seminar at the Faculty of Architecture in Ljubljana. He introduced an important shift in the conceptualization and design of residential areas that started to include different types of housing, green areas and the regulation of traffic. However, it was only in the late 1950s that the first urban plans incorporating some elements of the neighbourhood unit were adopted.⁴⁷

Up to the mid-1950s, housing construction in Ljubljana advanced inconsistently, leaving unbuilt space between individual residential areas. Housing construction could not keep up with growing demand and was already criticized for not meeting the modern needs of the working class.⁴⁸ The first post-war residential areas were inspired by German pre-war models, with a uniform appearance, geometrical urban design and standardized apartment blocks, but also incorporating the ideas of modernism. An example of this design is the Litostroj neighbourhood, built between 1948 and 1954 by the Litostroj factory and the Municipal People's Committee. It was divided into three functionally separate areas, industrial, educational and residential, with three-storey standardized apartment blocks.⁴⁹

The early 1950s was a period of the slow but consistent shift of the main responsibility for the construction and distribution of housing and housing loans towards work organizations.⁵⁰ Next to Litostroj neighbourhood, the first major housing project in Ljubljana built by work organizations was the apartment buildings in the Savsko naselje residential area, where construction started in the autumn of 1946. Major investors included the Yugoslav People's Army, the Gradis construction company, and the Housing Construction Institute. Both residential areas continued to grow beyond this timeline, but were not planned as neighbourhood units from the beginning and only later received various public service facilities.⁵¹

In 1958, the building plan for the Savsko naselje residential area was adopted as the first to follow certain principles of a neighbourhood unit. Until then, Savsko naselje had been expanding without a proper plan. The new plan integrated old residential buildings and new apartment blocks into a neighbourhood with a retail store and

46 MALEŠIČ, *Z Vzhoda na Zahod*, 108–118; KULIČ – MRDULJAŠ, *Modernism in-between*, 36–37.

47 MALEŠIČ, *Nastanek in rast*, 64–65; FIKFAK – ZBAŠNIK SENEGAČNIK, *Preobrati v organizirani večstanovanjski gradnji*, 41.

48 MALEŠIČ, *Nastanek in rast*, 63; PETELIN, *Stanovanjske razmere v Ljubljani*, 84.

49 Ibidem; FIKFAK – ZBAŠNIK SENEGAČNIK, *Preobrati v organizirani večstanovanjski gradnji*, 41; ČELIK, *Modernistične soseske v Ljubljani*; PETELIN, *Stanovanjske razmere v Ljubljani*, 83–84.

50 RENDLA, *Stanovanjska politika*, 211; ZAL, SL_ZAL_LJU/0079, technical unit 84, archival unit 214, Poročilo Sveta za stanovanjske zadeve [Report of the Housing Board], 20. 11. 1958, 11.

51 ČELIK, *Modernistične soseske v Ljubljani*.

green areas. The first attempt to implement Ravnikar's idea of a neighbourhood unit on a smaller scale was the construction of the Bežigrad neighbourhood BS 6 in 1962. Different types of residential buildings were included in the neighbourhood, which was planned alongside one of the major arterial roads into the city. Free from traffic, the centre of the neighbourhood was defined by a bus stop, a shop and a kindergarten.⁵²

In the 1960s, urban planners discussed a concept for a modern neighbourhood unit and its most appropriate forms. Within such a neighbourhood unit each individual should be able to realize his or her full potential. In the end, the feature of modernity was attributed to the architectural form, high density and multi-storeyed buildings, including services that were seen as necessary such as kindergartens, schools, shops and green areas.⁵³

The changes were possible due to various factors that had arisen after leaving the Soviet political route. The political decision to raise the general standard of living, announced in 1955, meant a change in economic development, an overall improvement in the standard of living and the steady development of consumer culture. The simultaneous revival of modernism brought a shift in architectural design, following the criteria of practicality and high quality of living for the socialist working class.⁵⁴ The extensive residential construction was made possible due to nationalization, performed between 1958 and 1962, which provided the municipalities with large swathes of undeveloped construction land.⁵⁵ And finally, the housing reform of 1965 enabled the construction of housing for the market and a favourable loan policy for the working class.⁵⁶

In 1966, the General Plan for the Urban Development of Ljubljana was finally adopted. Dividing the city into building areas, intended for residential construction, the plan defined the neighbourhood unit as one of the building blocks of urban development of Ljubljana, which were to territorially correspond to the local self-management units.⁵⁷ Planned along major arterial roads into the city, the new neighbourhood units were envisaged to meet all the workers' needs. In addition to housing, they were to offer all public infrastructure necessary for quality living – kindergartens, schools, shops, green areas, sports and recreation activities, and an internal traffic network that separated motor vehicle traffic from pedestrians. This was an ideal image of a neighbourhood unit that was never fully implemented in reality. Organizational and spatial design were there, and often the neighbourhoods had kindergartens, schools and some of them even shops, but they never fully developed into social hubs with all educational, health and other public services. Although limited resources were often the principal reason, political decisions were also a significant element. In Ljubljana, a neighbourhood unit was primarily seen from the viewpoint of organizational and spatial design and not from a social one as in Sweden. As a consequence, the construction of supporting infrastructure was not as crucial for municipal authorities. Ljubljana is also a small

52 MALEŠIČ, *Nastanek in rast*, 64–65.

53 APLENC, *To Develop the Acceptably Modern*, 9–12.

54 PRINČIČ – ČEPIČ, *Urbanizacija in življenjska raven*, 1013; KULIČ – MRDULJAŠ, *Modernism in-between*, 36–40; DEU, *O urbanizmu*, 55.

55 PRINČIČ, *Nacionalizacija najemnih zgradb*, 193–201; PRINČIČ – ČEPIČ, *Urbanizacija in življenjska raven*, 1011.

56 RENDLA, *Stanovanjska politika*, 216; MANDIČ, *Stanovanje in država*, 137; MALEŠIČ, *Nastanek in rast*, 64.

57 MALEŠIČ, *Nastanek in rast*, 64; PETELIN, *Stanovanjske razmere v Ljubljani*, 88.

city and the proximity of the neighbourhood units to the city centre hindered their development into proper social hubs.⁵⁸ New neighbourhood units still offered a huge change in the quality of life, as contrasted with that in the rural communities where housing was not as systematically developed.



Figure 2: The rapid growth of new neighbourhoods was changing the city's image. In the background we can see Šiška neighbourhood ŠS 6 in 1969, while in the foreground a farmer is ploughing. National Museum of Contemporary History of Slovenia, photography: Marjan Ciglič.

In Ljubljana, Šiška neighbourhood ŠS 6 is considered to be the first comprehensively designed neighbourhood, its plan dating to 1966. During its construction, only residential buildings, a school and a kindergarten were built, while a retail store and cultural centre were not accomplished. A year later, Bežigrad neighbourhood BS 7 was designed with the same goal but completely different in design. A footpath was still an important element, but it no longer passed through green areas, and the centre of the neighbourhood was defined along the main street.⁵⁹ Many other neighbourhoods followed, different in size and architectural design, but all of them based on the neighbourhood unit concept. The neighbourhoods designed in the 1960s and built in the 1970s include Bonifacija in Vič district and the Fužine neighbourhood, the terraced block neighbourhood in Koseze, and Ferant Garden as the only large residential and commercial complex in the city centre. Murgle neighbourhood of atrium houses was the only example of low-rise housing construction in Slovenia, also built according

⁵⁸ MALEŠIČ, *Nastanek in rast*, 65–66.

⁵⁹ *Ibidem*.

to Scandinavian models. Designed as an alternative to apartment blocks, the houses were separated from motor traffic and offered ample green areas.⁶⁰

The period of the most intensive housing construction was the 1970s, when many big urban neighbourhoods in Ljubljana were built, but also many individual single-family houses. The 1965 economic and housing reform had brought housing construction closer to market principles. Prefabricated systems were also facilitating faster construction and more affordable housing. Additionally, the favourable loan policy and increased spending power had helped make housing more affordable, although particularly intensifying the construction of individual single-family houses.⁶¹

In 1971, the number of apartments was supposed to be equal to the number of households, but a shortage of state-built housing was still reported.⁶² In the 1970s, responsibility for setting housing policy was definitively transferred to the republics and municipalities, and in accordance with constitutional changes, self-management was given a bigger role in housing supply.⁶³ In the mid-1970s, municipalities also introduced so-called solidarity housing, designed to provide homes on the one hand for the most vulnerable groups (disadvantaged, unemployed, disabled or young families), but on the other also for World War II veterans.⁶⁴

Some of the new neighbourhoods, planned in the 1970s and mainly built in the 1980s, include Bežigrad neighbourhood BS 3, Trnovo, Nove Jarše, Draveljska Gmajna, and the Štepanjsko Naselje and Nove Fužine neighbourhoods.⁶⁵ New apartment blocks were growing all over Ljubljana, quickly changing the city's image. A good example is the Trnovo district, whose appearance was still very rural until the 1970s, despite its proximity to the city centre. During this decade, urban planners began planning the demolition of old houses and the construction of a new residential neighbourhood, which was built by the late 1980s. Despite the opposition of the locals and a partial change of plans, the image of this part of the city was urbanized with some of the old farms remaining among the new apartment blocks.⁶⁶

60 Ibidem; ČELIK, *Modernistične soseke v Ljubljani*; VIDMAR, *Nedokončane modernizacije*, 59.

61 RENDLA, "Kam ploveš standard?", 161–166; MERCINA, *Arhitekt Ilija Arnavtovič*, 8–17.

62 ČEPIČ, *Zvišanje življenjske ravni*, 1092.

63 RENDLA, *Stanovanjska politika*, 217.

64 Ibidem, 213; MANDIČ, *O distribuciji stanovanjskih virov*, 62–63.

65 MALEŠIČ, *Nastanek in rast*, 66.

66 APLENC, *To Develop the Acceptably Modern*, 7–22.



Figure 3: Construction of one of the neighbourhood units in Bežigrad district, April 1975. National Museum of Contemporary History of Slovenia, photography: Marjan Ciglič.

Although the improvement of housing conditions was one of the Yugoslav political and social care priorities,⁶⁷ it soon became apparent that this policy generated inequalities in access to state-built or so-called social housing. There were not enough affordable units for all; frequently, priority in access to this type of housing was given based on status, such as type of employment and work position, education and, last but not least, membership in socio-political organizations.⁶⁸ Social housing was not subjected to market forces; the rent was determined administratively and was very low compared to commercial rents, purchase or construction. Due to the limited amount of social housing and the high demand for it, competition was strong and applicants were subjected to selective measures. Only a small number of citizens were entitled to flats owned by municipalities or the republic, and the majority of social housing was owned by work organizations, so people mostly relied on such housing as an employment benefit. Each work organization had its housing fund and special housing commissions decided how much money would be spent on building housing and how much on loans for the employees.⁶⁹

People who were not eligible for social housing could resort either to buying or building their home, or to a lesser extent also to renting. Building their own house

67 RENDLA, *Stanovanjska gradnja v Sloveniji*, 127–129.

68 MANDIČ, *O distribuciji stanovanjskih virov*, 59–71; BARA, *Socialistička modernizacija grada*, 51; PIŠKURIČ, "Bili nekoč so lepi časi", 299–300.

69 MANDIČ, *O distribuciji stanovanjskih virov*, 62–63; MANDIČ, *Stanovanje in država*, 138–139.

proved to be the only option for many, especially in rural areas. Thus, they did not have to pay for the workforce (using the help of family, neighbours and friends), or raise financial resources all at once. Favourable loan conditions, introduced in the second half of the 1960s, only served to intensify this practice and owning a single-family house with a garden soon became the most desirable form of housing.⁷⁰

The intensive housing construction slowed down in the 1980s, due to growing economic crisis in Yugoslavia. In the second half of the 1980s, inflation started to rise at an unstoppable pace. It exceeded an annual rate of 100 per cent for the first time in 1986, and peaked in 1989, becoming hyperinflation. The country was facing constant price increases and supply constraints, which negatively affected not only the overall standard of living but also the business performance of work organizations.⁷¹ In housing construction, the number of newly built apartments began to decline in the second half of the decade. The price of housing began to rise, making access to it even more difficult.⁷² The socialist model of housing policy was losing support and legitimacy, the prevailing opinion being that it was neither socially just nor economically efficient. Its economic inefficiency was additionally manifested by the poor maintenance of housing, delays in construction and poor quality of construction materials, which became a regular problem.⁷³

Initially, high inflation even helped people to pay off loans, as they were not revaluated. By the late 1980s, however, loan conditions were not as favourable as before and higher prices of housing made it much more difficult to raise enough money in such a way. As a consequence, the role of work organizations in the distribution of housing and housing loans slowly declined and family support in solving the housing issue, although important throughout the socialist period, grew in importance.⁷⁴ Still, though many people had already resolved the housing issue by this time, the situation remained challenging, especially for the younger generation.⁷⁵ The demographic growth in Ljubljana, characteristic over the previous two decades, also slowed down considerably in the 1980s. The population grew mainly on the outskirts of the city, as the result of the process of suburbanization.⁷⁶

In the 1980s, the last big neighbourhoods in Ljubljana were completed, among them Nove Fužine as the largest one. Although planned on a larger scale, it was still based on the concept of a neighbourhood unit with green areas, regulation of traffic and facilities for various public services.⁷⁷ The original plans included the construction of four kindergartens, two primary schools, a secondary school, bachelor flats, a community centre, a social welfare centre, a health centre, two bigger and one smaller shopping

70 MANDIČ, *O distribuciji stanovanjskih virov*, 59–71; Slovenska stanovanjska gradnja v času socializma. In: *Radio Študent*; RENDLA, *Stanovanjska politika*, 209–222; IVANJŠEK, *Družina, stanovanje in naselje*, 46–47.

71 PIŠKURIČ, "Bili nekoč so lepi časi", 132–142.

72 RENDLA, *Stanovanjska politika*, 220–221; KOLARIČ, *Stanovanjska politika*, 191; PIŠKURIČ, "Bili nekoč so lepi časi", 141–144.

73 RENDLA, *Stanovanjska politika*, 221; *Informacija o sanaciji*, 17–18; ČURIN, *Bo Draveljska gmajna*, 5.

74 ŽITKO, *Prožnejši pri stanovanjih*, 1; ŽITKO, *Stanovanjski kvadratni meter*, 16; ŽITKO, *Po starem*, 16; ŽITKO, *Vsaka reforma*, 17.

75 ŽITKO, *Stanovanjski kvadratni meter*, 16; ŽITKO, *Vsaka reforma*, 17.

76 PIŠKURIČ, "Bili nekoč so lepi časi", 139–140.

77 MALEŠIČ, *Nastanek in rast*, 66; KAVČIČ, *Resnične Fužine*, 50–58.

centre and covered parking places.⁷⁸ Growing economic crisis affected the construction of Nove Fužine neighbourhood, which faced difficulties and delays in construction. As a result, not all the envisaged infrastructure was ever built. Local newspapers reported on the progress and the problems. Instead of two kindergartens, only one was built, and the completion of the school, perceived as necessary for the full functioning of the neighbourhood, also faced challenges. The municipality of Ljubljana Moste–Polje, where the neighbourhood was located, believed the construction of the neighbourhood to be a joint project of all the municipalities of the city of Ljubljana and not just their concern, as the neighbourhood would provide apartments for all of Ljubljana's citizens.⁷⁹ Nove Fužine became a high-rise and high-density neighbourhood, which could in part affect the quality of life, but it also had the highest proportion of green areas, intended for recreational and sport activities. In later years, the neighbourhood became a symbol of cultural heterogeneity, its residents coming from all parts of Slovenia and from other Yugoslav republics as well.⁸⁰



Figure 4: The Nove Fužine neighbourhood in April 1981. National Museum of Contemporary History of Slovenia, photography: Dragan Arrigler.

The policy of suitable housing for all, but also the idea of the neighbourhood unit as the basis of organized housing construction, persisted well into the 1980s. "Lasting solutions to their housing problems is so important for people that we can't even predict all the possible consequences stopping construction might have", was the

78 KAVČIČ, *Fužine*, 2.

79 *Gradnja soseske Fužine*, 2.

80 KAVČIČ, *Resnične Fužine*, 62; PIŠKURIČ, *Nastanek ljubljanskih socialističnih sosesk*, 44.

conclusion of one of the municipal conferences of the Socialist Alliance of Working People in regard to the construction of the Nove Fužine neighbourhood.⁸¹ Only at the end of the decade can we observe the first initiatives to sell the social housing fund to existing tenants. At that time, the idea was mostly opposed by young people, as it would create a disadvantage for them in access to housing.⁸²

Conclusion

Post-war housing conditions in Ljubljana were often modest. Families were living in small apartments, which were poorly equipped with utilities, often sharing toilets and occasionally kitchens.⁸³ Although the standard of living had been slowly improving since the late 1950s, a survey conducted in 1961 in Savsko naselje, one of the first residential areas developed in Ljubljana after World War II, showed that housing conditions were not changing as fast. In part, they were still very traditional, showing a lack of modern furnishings. To a certain extent this was related to social status, the tenants with higher education and standard of living having better and more functionally differentiated furnishings. The difference in housing standards also stemmed from the different phases of the neighbourhood construction.⁸⁴ For many people, housing conditions remained modest until the 1970s, when a general rise in the standard of living and favourable loan conditions made new housing and furnishings more accessible.⁸⁵

The neighbourhood unit became the basis of organized housing construction in the 1960s. In observing such units, we can see different building and housing standards. The neighbourhoods built between 1965 and 1972 were designed for 3,000 to 5,000 people, whereas those built between 1972 and 1985, at the time of a major influx of workers migrating from other Yugoslav republics, were meant to receive 10,000 or more residents.⁸⁶ Differing housing standards related not only to the sizes of the apartments and the types of construction or building materials, but to their locations as well. All of this determined the price of housing and consequently neighbourhoods attracted residents on the basis of their incomes and social power, contrary to the proclaimed equality of the working class.⁸⁷ An example of this is the neighbourhood of atrium houses in Murgle. Even though it was designed in the 1960s as a form of social housing, it had already become very popular with the upper and upper-middle class in the 1970s.⁸⁸ In the early 1970s, local newspapers argued that atrium houses, built in the second stage, were no longer accessible to the working masses, as their price increased, raising the question of the construction to the political level.

81 D. J., *Sosesko moramo graditi naprej*, 4.

82 ŽITKO, *Stanovanjski kvadratni meter*, 16; ŽITKO, *Vsaka reforma*, 17.

83 PETELIN, *Stanovanjske razmere v Ljubljani*, 78–79.

84 IVANJŠEK, *Družina, stanovanje in naselje*, 27–31, 73–105.

85 PIŠKURIČ, "Bili nekoč so lepi časi", 286–316.

86 RENDLA, "Kam ploveš standard?", 163.

87 MANDIČ, *O stanovanjski segregaciji*, 143–144.

88 MALEŠIČ, *Delavsko stanovanjsko vprašanje*, 118; PIŠKURIČ, "Bili nekoč so lepi časi", 293.

Additional complaints were aimed at the slow construction of the neighbourhood.⁸⁹ The interest for Murgle also came from its location near the city centre, ample green areas and the type of housing. Single-family houses with garden were namely becoming the most desirable form of housing.⁹⁰



Figure 5: Neighbourhood of atrium houses in Murgle, March 1978. National Museum of Contemporary History of Slovenia, photography: Miško Kranjec.

Although residential neighbourhoods provided housing for many, they were only one of the means of tackling the housing issue. Two basic forms of residential construction are characteristic for Slovenia under socialism, residential neighbourhoods and single-family houses. The construction of the first was largely enabled by social funds, be it through work organizations, municipalities or the republic. Seen as modern and cost-efficient, residential neighbourhoods were favoured under socialism; however their importance remained greater in the cities. The construction of single-family houses on the other hand displayed the agency of individuals. Although initially having no place in socialist housing development, the construction of single-family houses gained momentum due to an increasing housing shortage and overall improvements in the standard of living.⁹¹

89 *KS Trnovo – Murgle*, 4; ARKO, *Merilo je človek*, 5; *Hiša sredi ceste*, 3; SITAR, *Murgle so (spet) vroče*, 5; *Skupen sestanek o Murglah*, 3; DIMITRIČ, *Na tapeti so spet Murgle*, 5; DIMITRIČ, *Nagrada za probleme*, 9.

90 DIMITRIČ, *Kje lahko gradimo*, 5; RENDLA, *Stanovanjska politika*, 221; IVANJŠEK, *Družina, stanovanje in naselje*, 46–47.

91 MANDIČ, *Stanovanje in država*, 139; REBERNIK, *Urbano-geografsko proučevanje*, 464; LE NORMAND, *The Contested place*, 173–190.

Very often, ordinary workers had fewer opportunities for procuring social housing. In general, priority was given to the inhabitants of urban areas, people with higher education and the upper classes. Because there was not enough affordable social housing for all, building their own house was the only solution for many as it allowed them to allocate their financial resources over a longer period. Due to the lack of housing, this method of construction was also encouraged by the state from the mid-1960s. The increased construction of private home-building projects was made possible by a favourable loan policy and the improvement of the standard of living. It should also be taken into account that the input of material sources and people's own labour was considerable when building their single-family houses. At the same time, larger neighbourhoods of illegal construction arose in the less urbanized areas on the outskirts of the city.⁹² The reasons for illegal construction were numerous, ranging from lengthy procedures and high costs for obtaining a building permit, insufficiency of state-built housing and poor rental opportunities, to inefficient spatial planning, lower prices of privately owned land in both non-building areas and areas unregulated by spatial plans that was much easier to buy, and, last but not least, greater freedom in designing and building a house.⁹³

Over the decades, new construction projects, united with the political desire to blur the line between urban and rural areas, significantly changed the appearance of Ljubljana, its suburbs and rural surroundings. From the adoption of the General Plan for the Urban Development of Ljubljana the city expanded more systematically, while on the outskirts of the city new single-family houses grew rapidly. The construction of Ljubljana's neighbourhoods and overall modernization led to noticeable migration flows to the city.

At the end of socialist era, despite all efforts, Yugoslavia was still behind the Western European countries in terms of housing standards (number of people per room and living space per person), even though the development of housing for the working class was one of its political priorities. In Slovenia, the situation was slightly better than the national average. Satisfaction with housing was relatively high, with 65.9 per cent of the population content with their housing situation. Urban areas benefited the most from housing investments and achievements of modern architecture. Despite that, satisfaction with housing was even higher in rural areas, where the population largely built single-family houses.⁹⁴

92 MANDIČ, *O distribuciji stanovanjskih virov*, 67; PIŠKURIČ, "Bili nekoč so lepi časi", 299–329; MALEŠIČ, *Delavsko stanovanjsko vprašanje*, 119.

93 ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0080/1, technical unit 18, archival unit 41, *Obravnavna problematike nedovoljenih gradenj v občini* [Addressing the Issue of Illegal Construction in the Municipality], 19. 11. 1970, 17–31; ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0080/1, technical unit 18, archival unit 41, *Problematika nedovoljenih gradenj in predlogi* [The Issue of Illegal Construction and Proposals], 19. 11. 1970, 1–9; ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0080/1, technical unit 27, archival unit 58, *Problematika črnih gradenj na območju občine Ljubljana Vič – Rudnik* [The Problem of Illegal Construction in the Municipality of Ljubljana Vič – Rudnik], 16. 4. 1975, 1–3; ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0080/1, technical unit 27, archival unit 58, *Opredelitev nedovoljenih gradenj v ljubljanskem prostoru* [Identification of Illegal Construction in Ljubljana Area], 16. 4. 1975, 1–14; ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0080/1, technical unit 27, archival unit 58, *Poročilo o problematiki z delovnega področja Oddelka za gradbene in komunalne zadeve* [Report on the Issues from the Work Area of the Department for Construction and Utilities Infrastructure], 16. 4. 1975, 1–20; ZAL, SI_ZAL_LJU/0080/1, technical unit 39, archival unit 83, *Informacija o nedovoljenih gradnjah v občini s stališča izvršnega sveta* [Information about Illegal Construction in the Municipality from the Point of View of the Executive Council], 28. 10. 1981, 4–20.

94 MANDIČ, *Prispevek k opisu*, 65–67.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival sources

- Zgodovinski arhiv Ljubljana [Ljubljana Historical Archives], SI_ZAL_LJU/0078 – Municipal People's Committee of Ljubljana Rudnik (1955–1961).
 Zgodovinski arhiv Ljubljana [Ljubljana Historical Archives], SI_ZAL_LJU/0079 – Municipal People's Committee of Ljubljana Vič (1955–1961).
 Zgodovinski arhiv Ljubljana [Ljubljana Historical Archives], SI_ZAL_LJU/0080 – Assembly of the Municipality of Ljubljana Vič – Rudnik (1961–1994).

Periodicals

- ARKO, A. Merilo je človek, ne denar! In: *Naša komuna, Glasilo OK SZDL Ljubljana Vič–Rudnik*, April 1972.
 ČURIN, Jože. Bo Draveljska gmajna res zgodovina? In: *Javna tribuna, Glasilo SZDL občine Ljubljana Šiška*, 22. 1. 1988.
 DIMITRIČ. Kje lahko gradimo v naši občini? In: *Naša komuna, Glasilo OK SZDL Ljubljana Vič–Rudnik*, 10. 2. 1975.
 DIMITRIČ, Milovan. Nagrada za probleme. In: *Naša komuna, Glasilo OK SZDL Ljubljana Vič–Rudnik*, 10. 3. 1974.
 DIMITRIČ, Milovan. Na tapeti so spet Murgle. In: *Naša komuna, Glasilo OK SZDL Ljubljana Vič–Rudnik*, 24. 9. 1973.
 D. J. Sosesko moramo graditi naprej. In: *Naša skupnost, Glasilo SZDL Ljubljana Moste–Polje*, 24. 11. 1981.
 Gradnja soseske Fužine je ljubljanski program. In: *Naša skupnost, Glasilo SZDL Ljubljana Moste–Polje*, 22. 10. 1980.
 Hiša sredi ceste. In: *Naša komuna, Glasilo OK SZDL Ljubljana Vič–Rudnik*, 27. 3. 1972.
 Informacija o sanaciji stanovanjskih objektov v soseski ŠS 10 – Draveljska gmajna. In: *Javna tribuna, Delegatska priloga*, June 1984.
 KAVČIČ, Jože. Fužine – izredna priložnost za vso Ljubljano. In: *Naša skupnost, Glasilo SZDL Ljubljana Moste–Polje*, 15. 7. 1978.
 KS Trnovo – Murgle. In: *Naša komuna, Glasilo OK SZDL Ljubljana Vič–Rudnik*, November 1970.
 Skupen sestanek o Murglah. In: *Naša komuna, Glasilo OK SZDL Ljubljana Vič–Rudnik*, 11. 7. 1973.
 SITAR, Sandi. Murgle so (spet) vroče. In: *Naša komuna, Glasilo OK SZDL Ljubljana Vič–Rudnik*, 22. 5. 1972.
 TERŽAN, Vesna. Socialistična stanovanjska arhitektura. In: *Mladina, Bivanje*, February 25. 2. 2011.
 ŽITKO, Stojan. Po starem res ni več šlo, toda ali bo mogoče po novem brez večje postopnosti? In: *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 14. 3. 1987.
 ŽITKO, Stojan. Prožnejši pri stanovanjih. In: *Delo*, 31. 1. 1985.
 ŽITKO, Stojan. Stanovanjski kvadratni meter bo kmalu stal toliko kot pred desetletjem stanovanje. In: *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 14. 6. 1986.
 ŽITKO, Stojan. Vsaka reforma rada obrne stvari povsem na glavo. In: *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 5. 3. 1988.

Internet sources

- Slovenska stanovanjska gradnja v času socializma. In: *Radio Študent*. <https://radiostudent.si/dru%C5%BEBa/delavsko-punkerska-univerza/slovenska-stanovanjska-gradnja-v-%C4%8Dasu-socializma>.

Secondary sources

- APLENC, Veronica E. To Develop the Acceptably Modern: Slovenian Urban Landscape under Socialism, 1969–1982. In: *Traditiones. Zbornik Inštituta za slovensko narodopisje in Glasbenonarodopisnega inštituta ZRC SAZU*, 2005, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 7–22.
- BARA, Mario. Socialistička modernizacija grada. Iskustvo Hrvatske. In: BENCETIČ, Lidija – MANIN, Marino (eds). *Moderno lice grada. O urbanizaciji i izgradnji komunalne infrastrukture na području Hrvatske u 19. i 20. stoljeću*. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2020, pp. 45–68.
- BING, Albert. Socialist Self-Management between Politics and Economy. In: *Acta Histriae*, 2019, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 1–34.
- CHARITONIDOU, Marianna. From the Athens Charter to the “human association”: Challenging the assumptions of the Charter of Habitat. In: MOHAR, Katarina – VODOPIVEC, Barbara (eds). *Mapiranje prostorov modernističnih mest v kontekstu načel CIAM-ove Atenske listine. Zbornik prispevkov Mednarodne konference projekta Mapiranje urbanih prostorov slovenskih mest v zgodovinskem okviru* [Mapping the spaces of modernist cities within the context of CIAM’s Athens charter: Proceedings of the International Conference of the Project Mapping the Urban Spaces of Slovenian Cities from the Historical Perspective]. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, 2020, pp. 28–44.
- ČELIK, Matevž. *Modernistične soseske v Ljubljani*. Ljubljana: Muzej za arhitekturo in oblikovanje, 2015.
- ČEPIČ, Zdenko. Zvišanje življenjske ravni. In: FISCHER, Jasna et al. *Slovenska novejša zgodovina. Od programa Zedinjena Slovenija do mednarodnega priznanja Republike Slovenije 1848–1992*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 2005, pp. 1087–1093.
- DEU, Živa. O urbanizmu in arhitekturi v času socialistične družbene ureditve [Architecture and urban planing in socialist regime]. In: *Arhitektov bilten: Mednarodna revija za teorijo arhitekture* [Architect’s bulletin: International magazine for theory of architecture], 2011, vol. 41, no. 190–191, pp. 52–56.
- DEŽELAK-BARIČ, Vida. Vloga in značaj Komunistične partije Slovenije med drugo svetovno vojno. In: ČEPIČ, Zdenko (ed.). *Preteklost sodobnosti. Izbrana poglavja slovenske novejše zgodovine*. Ljubljana; Pijava Gorica: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino; Aristoteles Žlahtič, 1999, pp. 95–108.
- DUDA, Igor. *Pronađeno blagostanje. Svakodnevni život i potrošačka kultura u Hrvatskoj 1970-ih i 1980-ih*. Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2010.
- DUJO JURJEVIČ, Mirjam. Zasedena stanovanja. In: *Dileme. Razprave o vprašanih sodobne slovenske zgodovine*, 2017, vol. 1, no. 1–2, pp. 189–209.
- FIKFAK, Alenka – ZBAŠNIK SENEGAČNIK, Martina. Preobrati v organizirani večstanovanjski gradnji – koncepti, tehnologija, financiranje. In: *Urbani izziv*, 2002, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 34–48.
- GABRIČ, Aleš. Ljudska fronta. In: FISCHER, Jasna et al. *Slovenska novejša zgodovina. Od programa Zedinjena Slovenija do mednarodnega priznanja Republike Slovenije 1848–1992*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 2005, pp. 847–849.
- IVANJŠEK, France. *Družina, stanovanje in naselje. Anketna raziskava 195 stanovanj v Savskem naselju v Ljubljani (1961)*. Ljubljana: Projektivno podjetje Ambient, 1988.
- JERLIU, Florina – NAVAKAZI, Vlora. The Socialist Modernization of Prishtina: Interrogating Types of Urban and Architectural Contributions to the City. In: *Mesto a dejiny*, 2018, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 55–74.
- KAVČIČ, Jože. Resnične Fuzine. In: *Urbani izziv, Posebna izdaja*, 2015, no. 5, pp. 49–63.
- KLADNIK, Ana – LUDWIG, Andreas. Cultural Heritage of Post-Socialist New Towns: A Comparison of Eisenhüttenstadt and Velenje. In: *Mesto a dejiny*, 2016, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 50–67.
- KOLARIČ, Zinka. Stanovanjska politika – gibalno razvoja ali zastoja na stanovanjskem področju. In: *Teorija in praksa. Revija za družbena vprašanja*, 1990, vol. 27, no. 1–2, pp. 191–198.

- KULIĆ, Vladimir – MRDULJAŠ, Maroje. *Modernism in-between: The mediatory architectures of socialist Yugoslavia*. Berlin: Jovis Verlag, 2012.
- LE NORMAND, Brigitte. The Contested Place of the Detached Home in Yugoslavia's Socialist Cities. In: JELAČA, Dijana – KOLANOVIĆ, Maša – LUGARIĆ, Danijela (eds). *The Cultural Life of Capitalism in Yugoslavia: (Post)Socialism and Its Other*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 173–190.
- LORENČIČ, Aleksander – PRINČIČ, Jože. Slovenska industrija od nastanka do danes. Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 2018.
- MALEŠIČ, Martina. Delavsko stanovanjsko vprašanje v slovenski modernistični arhitekturi. In: *Mesta, razredi, umetnost*, 2014, vol. 50, no. 9, pp. 104–121.
- MALEŠIČ, Martina. Nastanek in rast ljubljanskih stanovanjskih sosesk. In: *Arhitektov bilten. Mednarodna revija za teorijo arhitekture*, 2015, vol. 45, no. 203–204, pp. 63–66.
- MALEŠIČ, Martina. Z Vzhoda na Zahod. Leto 1948 in njegovi odmevi v slovenski arhitekturni publicistiki. In: *Ars & humanitas. Revija za umetnost in humanistiko*, 2015, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 106–121.
- MANDIČ, Srna. O distribuciji stanovanjskih virov v Sloveniji. In: *Družboslovne razprave*, 1986, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 59–71.
- MANDIČ, Srna. O stanovanjski segregaciji. In: *Družboslovne razprave*, 1984, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 133–146.
- MANDIČ, Srna. Prispevek k opisu stanovanjske preskrbe v Jugoslaviji ob koncu osemdesetih let. In: *Družboslovne razprave*, 1991, vol. 8, no. 12, pp. 66–89.
- MANDIČ, Srna. *Stanovanje in država*. Ljubljana: Znanstveno in publicistično središče, 1996.
- MERCINA, Andrej. *Arhitekt Ilija Arnautovič. Socializem v slovenski arhitekturi*. Ljubljana: Viharnik, 2006.
- MIHELIČ, Breda. Novejša urbanistična zgodovina Ljubljane. In: Gestrin, Ferdo (ed.). *Zgodovina Ljubljane. Prispevki za monografijo. Gradivo s posvetovanja o zgodovini Ljubljane, 16. in 17. novembra 1983 v Ljubljani*. Ljubljana: Kronika, časopis za slovensko krajevno zgodovino; Zgodovinsko društvo Ljubljana, 1984, pp. 564–574.
- OTOREPEC, Božo et al. *Ljubljana. Podobe iz njene zgodovine*. Ljubljana: Kronika, časopis za slovensko krajevno zgodovino, 1962.
- PETELIN, David. Stanovanjske razmere v Ljubljani v letih 1945–1965. In: *Kronika. Časopis za slovensko krajevno zgodovino*, 2017, vol. 65, no. 1, pp. 77–94.
- PETRIČ, Iztok. Ivan Ogrin – veleposestnik, trgovec in dobrotnik z Lavrice pri Ljubljani. In: *Kronika. Časopis za slovensko krajevno zgodovino*, 2012, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 263–284.
- PIŠKURIČ, Jelka. "Bili nekoč so lepi časi". *Vsakdanjik v Ljubljani in okolici v času socializma*. Ljubljana: Založba Inštituta za novejšo zgodovino, Študijski center za narodno spravo, 2019.
- PIŠKURIČ, Jelka. Ig v letih 1945–1952. Družbene, politične in gospodarske razmere ter življenje v prvih povojnih letih. In: *Kronika. Časopis za slovensko krajevno zgodovino*, 2019, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 307–322.
- PIŠKURIČ, Jelka. Nastanek ljubljanskih socialističnih sosesk [Development of Ljubljana's socialist neighbourhoods]. In: BRENKO, Corinne – PURG, Urška (eds). *Odjuga. Zgodbe o identitetah na prepihu* [Up Yu go! Stories about identities on the line]. Ljubljana: Muzej novejše zgodovine Slovenije, 2021, pp. 42–46.
- PRINČIČ, Jože. Nacionalizacija najemnih zgradb in gradbenih zemljišč na ozemlju LR Slovenije (1958–1962). In: *Prispevki za novejšo zgodovino*, 1993, vol. 33, no. 1–2, pp. 193–201.
- PRINČIČ, Jože – ČEPIČ, Zdenko. Urbanizacija in življenjska raven. In: FISCHER, Jasna et al. *Slovenska novejša zgodovina. Od programa Zedinjena Slovenija do mednarodnega priznanja Republike Slovenije 1848–1992*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 2005, pp. 1009–1024.
- REBERNIK, Dejan. Urbano-geografsko proučevanje blokovskih stanovanjskih sosesk kot element urbanističnega planiranja. In: *Dela*, 2002, no. 18, pp. 463–475.
- RENDLA, Marta. "Kam ploveš standard?". *Življenjska raven in socializem*. Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 2018.

- RENDLA, Marta. Stanovanjska gradnja v Sloveniji v času socializma. Enodružinske hiše v primerjavi z družbeno usmerjeno večstanovanjsko blokovsko zazidavo. In: *Zgodovinski časopis*, 2020, vol. 74, no. 1–2, pp. 126–145.
- RENDLA, Marta. Stanovanjska politika v socialističnem obdobju – vloga države in samoodgovornost. In: STUDEN, Andrej (ed.). *Pomisli na jutri. O zgodovini (samo) odgovornosti*. Ljubljana: Inštitut za novejšo zgodovino, 2012, pp. 209–222.
- REPE, Božo. Slovenija od medvojne federalne enote preko povojne jugoslovanske republike do samostojne države. In: DOLINAR, France M. et al. *Od sanj do resničnosti. Razvoj slovenske državnosti*. Ljubljana: Arhiv Republike Slovenije, 2001, pp. 121–207.
- REŽEK, Mateja. Politične spremembe v začetku petdesetih let. In: FISCHER, Jasna et al. *Slovenska novejša zgodovina. Od programa Zedinjena Slovenija do mednarodnega priznanja Republike Slovenije 1848–1992*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 2005, pp. 939–941.
- VIDMAR, Simona (ed.). *Nedokončane modernizacije. Med utopijo in pragmatizmom. Arhitektura in urbanizem v nekdanji Jugoslaviji in državah naslednicah. Umetnostna galerija Maribor, 10. februar – 22. april 2012*. Maribor: Umetnostna galerija Maribor, 2012.
- ZAJC, Marko. Delavsko samoupravljanje med ljudmi [Workers' self-management and the people]. In: ŽUPANEK, Bernarda (ed.). *Nova doba prihaja! Industrija – delo – kapital [A new age is coming! Industry – labour – capital]*. Ljubljana: Mestni muzej, 2016, pp. 130–145.