

# Pogled skozi okno / *View through the window*

## Uvodnik / *Introduction*

Miha Dešman

Ena glavnih tem za prihodnost Ljubljane je kakovost bivanja, tema, ki se neposredno navezuje na stanovanja. Prostor, v katerem živimo in v katerem delamo, vpliva na to, kdo in kaj smo. In to tako fizični kot družbeni prostor, stanovanje kot dom, mesto kot kraj in država kot domovina.

Stanovanje je hkrati naš oblikovalec in naš portret. V odrasli dobi se ne moremo izogniti odločanju, kje in kako bomo stanovali. Vprašanje pa je, kakšne možnosti imamo pri tem odločanju!

Streha nad glavo je že od nekdaj človekova osnovna potreba in pravica. Bivanje ni zgolj individualni prostor in njegova uporaba, marveč je tudi družbeni proces. Kako in zakaj ljudje v določenem času in prostoru stanujejo, je v odločilni meri odvisno od družbeno-ekonomskih razmer in politike. Seveda pa tudi od kakovosti arhitekture, ki je investirana v načrt. Slovenci se žal ne moremo pohvaliti z izrazito visoko bivalno kulturo. Naš bivalni (avto)portret je ubožen. V zgodovini smo imeli nekaj vzponov<sup>1</sup>, ki pa so jim sledile stagnacije ali celo padci. Enega takšnih padcev smo doživeli tudi v zadnjih letih.

Pri stanovanju gre za vprašanje odnosa med zasebnim in javnim. Individualizirana in hedonistična neoliberalna paradigma, ki prisega na moč zasebnega, je povzročila in povzroča demontažo javnega, celo njegovo demonizacijo. A bistvo problema je, da se brez družbene skrbi pojavijo anomalije, ki v zadnjih letih, obeleženih s krizo, naraščajo do neznosnosti. Vzrokov je več in so kompleksni, vendar v osnovi (kot vedno) temeljijo na denarju. V ZDA velja, da povprečna družina za stanovanje porabi približno tretjino prihodka. Revni porabijo večji delež, preko polovice, bogatejši seveda manj. Pri nas teh raziskav nisem zasledil, a verjetno je odstotek podoben. Najbrž pri mnogih še višji, pri tistih, ki plačujejo realno najemnino ali pa odplačujejo kredit za stanovanje. Slovenija ima izrazito visok odstotek stanovanj v zasebni lasti (90 %). To pomeni, da sta državna skrb in odgovornost bolj izjema kot pravilo. Tako visok delež zasebnega lastništva nosi s sabo veliko prikritih družbenih, okoljskih, prostorskih in finančnih stroškov.

Anomalije, ki v zadnjem času naraščajo, so se ukoreninile skozi desetletja slabih praks. Problem je tako kakovost kot dostopnost stanovanj. Čeprav je stanovanj glede na statistiko dovolj, obstajajo neskladja med potrebami prebivalstva po stanovanjih na določenih lokacijah, njihovo dejansko razpoložljivostjo in kakovostjo. Stanovanja so pri nas bistveno premajhna po kriteriju m<sup>2</sup>/stanovalca, še slabša je slika glede bivalne kakovosti, energetske učinkovitosti, dostopnosti, razmerja med ceno in kakovostjo itd. Imamo prenizko površino stanovanj pri družinah, ki živijo v blokkih, in na drugi strani pretirano površino v individualnih hišah. Prvo je dediščina stanovanjskega minimuma, lastninjenje javnega fonda in težav z revščino, drugo pa je posledica pretežnega reševanja stanovanjskega vprašanja s samograditeljstvom. Pri obeh skrajnostih je bila vzpostavljena izkrivljena racionalnost. Tako imamo v Sloveniji hkrati preveč in predraga stanovanja, preveč ljudi, zlasti mladih, pa nima stanovanj ali stanuje v stanovanjih, ki ne dosegajo sprejemljivega minimuma kakovosti in velikosti.

Stanovanjska gradnja ima velik pomen pri prostorskem načrtovanju. V Ljubljani se je število prebivalcev v zadnjem desetletju povečalo le za 1,8 %. Ta podatek govori o neuspehu nacionalne prostorske in stanovanjske politike, saj suburbanizacija povečuje promet in stroške. Potreba po stanovanjih je izkazana skozi bolj ali manj stanovitna demografska gibanja in ne more biti rezultat nihanj na stanovanjskem trgu. Suburbanizacija Ljubljane je pravo nasprotje trajnostne mobilnosti, ki je zapisana v ciljih mestne politike. Širša okolica mesta je poseljena z enormno količino in površino razpršene individualne gradnje, ki je slabo izkoriščena, nefunkcionalna in energetske potratna. Potrebno bi bilo obrniti trend in vrniti aktivno prebivalstvo, zlasti nove generacije, nazaj v mesto. Za ta obrat so seveda potrebni proaktivna stanovanjska politika in ustrezni ukrepi. Rabimo nove koncepte stanovanjske gradnje, politike in kulture, osnovane na solidarnosti in ne na tržnih mehanizmih. Predvsem gre za to, da moramo razvijati modele, ki niso podrejeni zasebnemu sektorju. Le-ta se absolutno ni izkazal pri gradnji stanovanj za trg. Učinkovita javna stanovanjska politika je ena od temeljnih sestavin pametnega in trajnostno uravnane mesta. In takšna politika lahko temelji le na solidarnosti in upoštevanju strokovnosti, torej kakovosti arhitekture.

Za uresničevanje pozitivne vizije je v prvi vrsti odgovorna mestna uprava. Postavlja se vprašanje, ali je Ljubljana že na poti v posthedonistično, solidarno mesto? Nekateri kazalci so pozitivni, nekateri še ne. Za razliko od večine slovenskih občin razvija Ljubljana posebne socialne oblike in programe, kot so bivalne enote, hospic, varovana stanovanja, varne hiše, stanovanjske sheme za mlade in podobno.

Ljubljanska stanovanjska politika je bila v preteklem obdobju uspešnejša od slovenske, saj je nastalo nekaj dobrih primerov kolektivne stanovanjske gradnje, nekateri med njimi so predstavljeni tudi v tej številki. Kljub temu pa je problemov in s tem prostora za inovacije še zelo veliko.

Najprej je tu potreba po cenovno dostopnih stanovanjih. Socialna, po novem neprofitna stanovanja so ključni instrument za ohranjanje socialne ravnosti družbe. Da je socialno stanovanje učinkovit ukrep, so dokaz čakalne vrste. Statistika pove, da je v Ljubljani zelo veliko povpraševanje po neprofitnih oblikah najemnih stanovanj. Mestni stanovanjski sklad je leta 2015 razpisal cca 400 stanovanj, na razpis se je prijavilo 3.441 prosilcev. To pomeni, da je bilo uspešnih le dobrih 10 % prosilcev.

Še pomembnejša je kakovost stanovanj, obstoječih in novih. Potrebna je celovita prenova obstoječega stanovanjskega fonda socialističnih blokov in stolpnic, naših soresk. Pri tem je po mnenju francoskih arhitektov Lacaton & Vassal<sup>2</sup> potrebno slediti trem kriterijem: prostemu

*One of the key topics regarding the future of Ljubljana is quality of habitation, which is directly related to housing. The space in which we live and in which we work affects who and what we are - the space being both physical and social, housing in as much it is a home, the city in as much it is a place, the country in as much it is a homeland. The flat shapes and reflects us simultaneously. When we becomes of age, the decision as to where and how we'll make our home is inevitable. The question is, though, just to what extent this decision is ours to make.*

*A roof over one's head has always been one of the basic human needs and rights. Habitation is more than individual space and its use, it is also a social process. How and why people dwell in a certain time and place crucially depends on socio-political circumstances and policies - and, clearly, also on the quality of architecture invested into the design. Slovenes cannot claim a particularly developed culture of habitation; our habitational (self-)portrait is pitiful. There have been a few high watermarks<sup>1</sup> in the past, but the have all been followed by stagnation or even setbacks. We have experienced one such setback in recent years.*

*Habitation gives rise to the question of the relationship between the private and the public. The individualised and hedonistic neoliberal paradigm which champions the power of the private caused and continues to cause the dismantling and demonising of anything public. But the crux of the problem is that an absence of public concern gives rise to anomalies, and these have become intolerably exacerbated in the recent crisis-stricken years. The causes are as manifold as they are complex, but fundamentally and inevitably, money proves the common denominator in the end. It is estimated that the average American family spends a third of its income on habitation. The proportion is higher for the poor, exceeding half of the income, and suitably lower for the rich. For Slovenia, the research in this area is lacking, but it's safe to assume that the ratio is similar, possibly even higher across the board, especially with those on commercial rent or paying off their mortgage.*

*In Slovenia, the share of privately-owned housing is disproportionately high, over 90%. As a result, concern and responsibility on part of the state are often an exception rather than the rule. Such a large share of private ownership also translates into considerable hidden social, environmental, spatial, and financial cost. The anomalies which have been on the rise lately were able to take root due to decade upon decade of poor practices. Both the quality and the accessibility of flats are problematic. According to statistics, the number of flats is sufficient, but there are imbalances regarding the needs of the population in various areas, the actual accessibility of housing, and the quality. Taking sqm-per-person as the criterion, flats in Slovenia are much too small; when it comes to quality of habitation, energy efficiency, accessibility, price-quality ratio etc., they fare worse yet. Families living in flats are faced with substandard square footage; there is an excess of space in single-family houses. The former is the legacy of ancient standards of minimally acceptable housing, mass privatisation of the public built stock, and increasing poverty; the latter is the consequence of self-build being the go-to solution for the housing problem. Both extremes are marked by a twisted rationality causing the housing in Slovenia to be over-abundant and overpriced at the same time, while too many people, especially young, don't have a flat or live in flats which fall below the acceptable standard of quality and size.*

*Residential development is a major factor in spatial planning. In Ljubljana, the number of inhabitants has risen by a mere 1.8% in the last decade. This is a testament to the failure of the national spatial and housing policy with the resulting suburbanisation contributing to increases in traffic and cost. The need for housing is based on the relatively stable demographic trends and cannot be dependent on the fluctuations inherent to the housing market. The suburbanisation of Ljubljana could not be further from sustainable mobility pledged as one of the city's policy goals. An enormous amount of dispersed, underused, unfunctional, and wasteful single-family residences generates sprawl in the city's outskirts. This trend should be reversed - the active population, especially new generations, should be led back to the city. To achieve such a turnaround, a proactive housing policy with adequate measures is a must. Also required are new concepts of residential development, policy, and culture, all based on solidarity rather than the ways of the market. Crucially, we need to continue to develop models which are not subordinate to the private sector, which has done curiously little for commercial residential development. Efficient public housing policy is one of the fundamentals for a smart city focused on sustainability, and such policy can only be based on solidarity, and only informed by professional criteria, i.e. the quality of the architecture.*

*The responsibility for enacting a positive vision lies with the city hall. There is no definitive answer to whether Ljubljana has already changed course for a post-hedonistic, solidary city. Some of the signs are positive, but others yet to become. Unlike most Slovene municipalities, Ljubljana does develop special social forms and programmes such as habitation units, the Hospice, assisted-living facilities, supportive housing, youth housing schemes, etc. In the past, Ljubljana's housing policy has been more successful than the rest of Slovenia's with some good examples of collective housing development having been realised; some of them are presented in the issue. Still, there is no shortage of remaining problems calling upon further innovation.*

pogledu, ureditvi zelenih površin med objekti in povečanju stanovanjske površine. Predlagajo dve sistemski rešitvi: radikalno odprtje fasade in razširitev bivalnega prostora z balkoni, ki obdajajo celotni obod. Gre za preprost in cenovno nezahteven poseg. Na podoben način, kot da bi stavbi dodali gradbeni oder, so ob skeletno gradnjo iz zunanje strani dodani prefabricirani moduli obodnih balkonov. Primer: stanovanje, veliko 44 m<sup>2</sup>, dobi dodatnih 26 m<sup>2</sup> površine in s tem popolnoma novo kakovost. Pogled uokvirjajo panoramska smučna okna v celotnem zunanjem obodu in svetli višini. Del oboda je 2 m širok zimski vrt, del pa 1 m širok balkon. S premikanjem smučnih oken se obod prilagaja osončenju in letnim časom. S tem se na pasivnih principih lovi in shranjuje sončna energija.

Poleg mestne uprave so za kakovost bivanja najbolj odgovorni sami stanovalci. Življenje v soseskah lahko, kot kažejo tudi nekateri v tej številki predstavljeni primeri, z uveljavljanjem principov samoorganizacije in družbenega aktivizma doseže bistveno višjo kakovostno raven. Brez stroke pa tudi ne gre. Pomembna je nova, drugačna, bolj družbeno odgovorna vloga arhitektov. Podobno je pri gradnji novih stanovanj. Model so neprofitne kooperative, za katere javni sektor preko stanovanjskih skladov zagotavlja ustrezno podporo. In pa stalna skrb za razvoj stroke, za nove tipologije, za nove modele implementacije vizij.

Tudi pri tem bi navedel primer, kako lahko ideje arhitektov inovativno rešujejo realne probleme. Arhitekturni biro Elemental<sup>3</sup> iz Čila, ki ga vodi Alejandro Aravena (prihodnje leto bo direktor beneškega arhitekturnega bienala), je razvil »koncept zahtevnejše polovice«. Gre za preprosto strategijo neprofitne stanovanjske gradnje: arhitekt načrtuje, sklad ali neprofitna stanovanjska zadruga zgradi zahtevnejšo polovico stanovanj, poskrbi za parcelo in infrastrukturo, ostalo pa zgradijo stanovalci sami. Najbolj znan primer je naselje Quinta Monroy v kraju Iquique v Čilu, kjer so leta 2005 zgradili 96 socialnih stanovanj v 3-nadstropnih hišah v vrsti z vmesnimi odprtimi volumni. Do tretje gradbene faze zgrajenih 40 m<sup>2</sup> so si ljudje sami dogradili v stanovanja z 80 m<sup>2</sup> in s tem dosegli ustrezen bivalni standard s sredstvi (javnih le cca 10.000 usd na enoto), ki so jih imeli na voljo. Model: arhitektura in družba priskrbita okvir, od tam prevzamejo sami stanovalci! Podobno idejo je že leta 1944 razvijal Plečnik v študiji za »hiše pod občinsko streho« v Krakovem<sup>4</sup>.

Arhitektura ima, kot pravi Aravena, moč sinteze. Pomembno je, da so stanovanja kakovostno načrtovana – da izpolnjujejo načelo *value for money* (boljša kvaliteta za enak denar)<sup>5</sup>. Ne moremo si privoščiti niti poceni in zato slabih načrtov niti gradnje stanovanj. Z arhitekturo je podobno kot s hrano ali z avtomobili. Pri nekaterih avtomobilskih znamkah preplačamo ime, pri drugih pa dobimo več za enako denarja. A če kupimo poceni avto, je to pač poceni avto, ki če je dobro načrtovan in narejen, kljub temu dobro služi, ni potraten in je celo lep. Pri hrani je podobno. Jed iz kakovostnih sestavin, ki jo pripravi dober kuhar, je kreacija, je presežek in je lahko vredna več, kot je vanjo vloženo. Draga, a nedomiselnostna hrana je prevara. Vedeti moramo, kot potrošniki, kaj kupujemo in kakšne pravice imamo. Če se spoznamo na hrano, bo naše življenje kakovostnejše. Če se spoznamo na arhitekturo in jo znamo zahtevati, bomo bolje in lepše živeli. Tako preprosto je to.

1 Glej članek v tej številki/: Martina Malešič. / see article by Martina Malešič in this issue.

2 <http://www.lacatonvassal.com/>

3 <http://www.elementalchile.cl/en/>

4 <http://outsider.si/odprtokodna-arhitektura-jozeta-plecnika/>

5 <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/value-for-money-audit.html>

Firstly, there is the need for affordable housing with non-profit rent, which is a lynchpin of maintaining the level of social protection in the society. The waiting lists are in themselves a proof that social housing is an effective measure. Statistics show that there is great demand for various forms of non-profit housing in Ljubljana: for some 400 flats made available in 2015 by the city housing fund, there were 3441 applicants. Therefore, just over one in ten were successful in their application.

The quality of flats, both existing and new, is even more important. An comprehensive renovation of the existing built stock comprising mid-century blocks and towers, the elementary building blocks of Slovene neighbourhoods, is required. According to French architects Lacaton&Vassal<sup>2</sup>, three criteria must be adhered to: an unobstructed view, green surfaces between buildings, and an increase in the total floor area. Lacaton&Vassal recommend two systemic solutions: a radical opening of the facade and an expansion of the habitation space achieved by adding balconies along the entire perimeter. This is a simple and cost-efficient intervention: similarly to attaching a scaffolding, prefabricated perimeter-balcony modules are added to the exterior skeletal construction. Thus, a 44 sqm flat gains an additional 26 sqm of surface, which gives it a whole new quality. The view is framed by panoramic floor-to-ceiling sliding windows along the entire exterior perimeter. One part of the perimeter features a 2 m wide winter garden, the rest is a 1 m wide balcony. By moving the sliding windows, the perimeter adapts to the sunlight and the changing of seasons, allowing solar energy to be captured and stored according to passive design principles.

Beside the city government, the other party most responsible for the quality of habitation are the residents themselves. As some of the examples presented in the issue show, life in a neighbourhood can improve dramatically when principles of self-organising and social activism are applied. Yet the architectural profession is still needed and a new, different, more socially responsible role of the architect required. New housing developments are in a similar situation: non-profit co-operatives represent the model to be applied with the public-sector support provided by the housing funds. Additionally, a concentrated effort for the development of the profession needs to be made in order for new typologies, new models, and new visions to be implemented.

Another example of architects' ideas solving real problems in an innovative way warrants a mention: architectural office ELEMENTAL<sup>3</sup> from Chile, led by Alejandro Aravena, who has been chosen as director of next year's Venice Biennale of Architecture, has developed the concept of social housing development which he calls the "Concept of the difficult half". The name refers to a simple strategy of non-profit housing development. The architects designs the more difficult half of a housing unit, which then gets built by a fund or a non-profit housing co-operative. They also provide the plot and the infrastructure, while the rest is built by the residents themselves. The most famous example of this principle is the settlement of Quinta Monroy in Iquique, Chile, where in 2005, 96 social housing units were built as three-storey buildings interspersed with open volumes. After 40 sqm were developed up to construction phase III, the residents built 80 sqm homes by themselves. This way, they were able to achieve a suitable habitation standard with the funds they had available and with only \$10,000 per unit coming out of the public purse. The model is therefore as follows: architecture and the society provide the framework, and let the residents take it from there. A similar idea was being developed by Jože Plečnik in his study "Houses under the municipal roof" in Krakovo, Ljubljana<sup>4</sup>, as early as 1944.

Aravena says that architecture has the power of synthesis. It's important that housing is designed well so that the value-for-money criterion<sup>5</sup> may be fulfilled. Cheap, and consequently poor-quality housing designs and housing development are something we cannot afford. Architecture isn't too different from food or cars. With some car brands, you pay for the name while others offer the same for less money. If we buy a cheap car, it's a cheap car that can still serve us well as long as it's been well designed and well built; it's economical and it may even look good. The same goes for food: a dish made of quality ingredients prepared by a good chef is a creation, an achievement, and may be worth more than what's been invested in it. Expensive but unimaginative food is a fraud. As consumers, we need to know what we buy and what rights we have. If we are knowledgeable about food, our quality of life improves. If we are knowledgeable about architecture and know how to demand it, we'll live better and more comfortable lives. It's as simple as that.