

THE OBJECTS BUILT OUTSIDE AN URBAN CONTEXT AS A PROBLEM IN FURTHER URBAN PLANNING AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18485/arh_pt.2024.8.ch27

_ Velimir Stojanović

PhD, Assistant Professor, University of Pristina
in Kosovska Mitrovica, Faculty of Technical
Sciences, Serbia, velimir.stojanovic@pr.ac.rs

ABSTRACT

The cities we live in at the present time are becoming the centre of building the unwanted objects that disrupt the ambient and contextual appearance of the city by their architecture, morphology, function, and aesthetic characteristics, both in the individual parts where they appear and the city as a whole. This issue in the existing political and economic framework of society development is becoming a habit that is repeated and a trend that is increasingly difficult to stop. Regardless of the understanding of the economic currents that enable, justify, and protect the construction of buildings, one must think of the architectural and urban context, especially in the immediate, valuable location where these objects appear. The profession watches it helplessly, the institutions approve it or show solidarity with it, and the architectural and urban context suffers. How to stand in the way of such a phenomenon, how to achieve greater responsibility in the ongoing process, is a question for the profession, for the institutions and for the living community as a whole. These objects are created, the environment must accept, suffer, and endure them, and the profession and institutions do not give a timely or final answer to that. How to proceed with such creations and whether they are a necessary evil of the time in which we live. Is there an appropriate procedure(s) which, if the construction of such objects cannot be stopped, would at least mitigate, and compensate for their effect on the surrounding area and the environment. The conclusion follows. We have such contextual units in almost all parts of the city, and we can say that sometimes the whole city seems to be one such contextual unit. On the other hand, what disturbs (reviles) and in the end slowly devastates one such context are objects whose architectural solution by definition does not belong to that space.

KEYWORDS *_ context, building, institutions, consequences, measures*

INTRODUCTION

The causes for building objects outside the urban and architectural context can be different. The very definition of the urban complex can be debatable both within the profession and outside it. However, if a consensus can be reached on the urban context, the question arises as to what violates that context and what are all the causes and reasons for that to happen. Around this (Mitola, 2000) and (Mostashari, 2011) had a similar option. The cognitive city as a model of urban governance which is based on the introduction of many networked infrastructure systems as *cognition centric systems* - systems that function through the interaction between many human and non-human cognitive entities in order to adaptively synthesize adequate individual and collective behaviors. The cognitive city model is, therefore, premised on the ubiquity of communication and information technologies, and appears as a variant among many other similar concepts, such as "wired city", "smart city", "intelligent city", "digital city", etc.

The urban context should not be primarily tied to traditional, protected environments that contain within their framework objects that can be defined as historical monuments or cultural monuments. It has a broader meaning. The urban context can also be composed of objects that belong to modern construction (and in large numbers they are) but that respect one of the most important principles of contextual arrangement - harmony and mutual tolerance of different forms of construction even when they do not agree on their concepts, ideas and aesthetic settings. That is the essence of the context. (Picon, 2010) thinks about it. They appear as consequences of the ubiquitous presence of information and communication technologies in their present state of development, but are also related to a whole set of conditions which underline these technological currents: from the physiological processes in living bodies and mental states in humans, to the broader socio-economic and political phenomena. In the field of urban theory a number of hypotheses were made about the impact of digital technologies on the urban morphology and urban space: from optimistic insight into the new possibilities for liberation of urban space from many material ties potentially relegated to the digital realm and speculations on the future of urban form, whether in the sense of its dispersal or concentration, to examinations of the changing importance of physical and digital space on the processes of socialization.

The opportunity for even what seems to disagree to finally fit into a bearable, successful and pleasant space. When do problems arise and from what sources they come? The non-fitting of the newly built object into the existing architectural and urban context may occur for the following reasons:

- due to the negligence and incompetence of the designer (investor) to fit into the existing one with his new content,
- due to inadequate care and intervention of the competent institutions (construction directorate, inspection services ...) which, for reasons known only to them, allowed the construction of such a facility in an unauthorized space.
- due to various other ways that can be a combination of the previously listed factors and which in their final outcome can lead to the appearance of an unwanted content.

Planners and designers would be, simply put, obliged to "reduce the damage" produced by these facilities with their further activities, which leads us to the open questions. Are other planners and designers obliged to do so, and then even if they accept such a challenge, what will be their impact and will they produce the desired goals? There is also an open moral dilemma based on the elimination of damage done by others and which other planners and designers do not have to accept to deal with. From this we can draw the conclusion that one reckless and irresponsible act has become a concern of the wider urban, architectural and professional community as well as the general community of space users and citizens as a whole. (Jean - Louis Cohen, 2012) says about it. In contrast to the Jencks' prescriptive stance, Jean-Louis Cohen concludes his book *The Future of Architecture Since 1889* by identifying seven problems that confront the discipline of architecture at the beginning of the third millennium and represent the points of its opening towards broader cultural

phenomena. These issues are related to contemporary socio-economic, technological and political reality and concern the possibilities of the critical engagement with the dominant image culture and the globally pervasive processes of commodification of space, appropriation of innovations in the fields of construction materials and methods, participation in the matters of ecological and social sustainability of construction and use of space, intervention in the patterns of interaction between different actors driving processes of urbanization and the development of cities, proposition of new locally specific and globally bound types of urban space between architecture and landscape, and the questions of institutional organization of the discipline of architecture and its agency in the persisting social problems such as the housing conditions of the poorer segments of society.



Figure1: a building built out of context and an fit into the environment (source author)

Planners and designers would be, simply put, obliged to “reduce the damage” produced by these facilities with their further activities, which leads us to the open questions. Are other planners and designers obliged to do so, and then even if they accept such a challenge, what will be their impact and will they produce the desired goals? There is also an open moral dilemma based on the elimination of damage done by others and which other planners and designers do not have to accept to deal with. From this we can draw the conclusion that one reckless and irresponsible act has become a concern of the wider urban, architectural and professional community as well as the general community of space users and citizens as a whole. (*Jean – Louis Cohen*, 2012) says about it. In contrast to the Jencks’ prescriptive stance, Jean-Louis Cohen concludes his book *The Future of Architecture Since 1889* by identifying seven problems that confront the discipline of architecture at the beginning of the third millennium and represent the points of its opening towards broader cultural phenomena. These issues are related to contemporary socio-economic, technological and political reality and concern the possibilities of the critical engagement with the dominant image culture and the globally pervasive processes of commodification of space, appropriation of innovations in the fields of construction materials and methods, participation in the matters of ecological and social sustainability of construction and use of space, intervention in the patterns of interaction between different actors driving processes of urbanization and the development of cities, proposition of new locally specific and globally bound types of urban space between architecture and landscape, and the questions of institutional organization of the discipline of architecture and its agency in the persisting social problems such as the housing conditions of the poorer segments of society. The methods used in this work are based on the hypothesis that construction outside the context is very present. That hypothesis can be specific but also very broad. It was then verified through statistics and studies in a real urban environment.

However, even if we assume that the planners and designers will deal with this issue and solve the problems of objects built outside the urban and architectural context, it means that they must

prevent further spread of undesirable influences through space and at the same time perform a kind of the “camouflage” of what has already been done, if we may call it like that. We draw another conclusion from this - and that is that once the damage is done, it cannot be completely repaired, but only mitigated by thoughtful measures, which becomes an expensive process in further building the city and preserving the overall ambient structure, organization and function. These measures would certainly include preparations related to the change of existing urban plans, gathering of expert teams and individuals who would deal with it, development of new plans and projects, adaptation of existing facilities to possible reconstruction and revitalization, etc. It is hard work that requires enough time and effort to bring the necessary results. On the other hand, objects outside the context “should not do anything”, but would patiently wait for someone else to solve the problem they caused. After all, no one could guarantee that, despite their efforts, the final solution(s) can turn out to be successful and good. This is the price that the environment where the problem of objects built outside the context occurs must pay. But without any doubt, it is also a process that must be resolved in a serious urban environment.

THE PROBLEMS OF FURTHER URBAN PLANNING AND ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN CAUSED BY THE OBJECTS BUILT OUTSIDE THE URBAN CONTEXT

A construction land is a land determined by law or a planning document for the construction and use of a facility, as well as land on which facilities have been built in accordance with the law. Construction land is used according to the purpose determined by the planning document, in a way that ensures its rational use, in accordance with the law. With the entry into force of the planning document which changed the purpose of the land into construction land, the owners of that land acquire the right and obligations prescribed by this law and bylaws adopted on the basis of the law, regardless of the fact that the authority responsible for registration of real estate and rights on them did not implement change in the public book on real estate and rights records.

The purpose of architectural planning and design is to reconcile the contradictions that are constantly happening in a continuous series of construction time course. These contradictions are inevitable because, especially over a longer period of time, there is no way or possibility for everything to be built in an appropriate, expected and acceptable context. Various styles, directions, architectural and art schools, investment opportunities and urban-legal regulations after some time give a set of architectural-urban products. Nevertheless, the city, consciously and unconsciously, tries to realize the context of construction as the core of city life, the continuity of architecture as a process and the stability of managing the construction of the city as a responsible and thoughtful strategy and tactics. We could also talk about the desire of the inhabitants for the city to be a whole, that is experienced and exists as a set of connected places that shape history and leave traces on moments and important periods of its development. This, let's call it 'collective urban consciousness', is more than a romantic phrase. It is an objective statistical data, a factual situation and, after all, the history of the city itself. Construction that lasts through decades and centuries, demolition and rebuilding necessarily produces the city as a heterogeneous creation created from different objects connected by their structure, organization and function that should not be disjointed, chaotic and aesthetically unacceptable. The escape of functionalism, fixed typologies and rationalism, enables new architecture close to (Rahm,2010) says. Deleuzian materialism to emerge, that sees the human body in an immediate contact with space through the row exchange of matter. Many cities, places, different in size, content and significance, were created mainly in this way. Modern city design has introduced new ideas, methods, rules and even orders based on beliefs about what a city should look like. With these new ideas, hitherto unseen in urban planning, an attempt was made to give the city a uniquely recognizable look. To obtain contours that would be less changeable and based on firm and clear rules of its construction, change and expansion. It was believed, and it is believed even now, that this is the right way to build a modern city where there are no unwanted activities and

unwanted phenomena that could endanger it. (Knox,2010) He things about it. Ongoing processes of urbanization make for a con-text of change in which economic, demographic, social and cultural forces are continuously interacting with these urban spaces.

Modern cities thus have complex, elaborated and disciplined regulations, which, according to the idea, nothing should change. However, the city, at least at first glance, is perceived as a scattered, chaotic and not so well-organized whole, woven of multiple buildings of different purposes, functions and needs. Such a picture of the city is simply inevitable and one should not run away from it. The unified city, its parts as well as the rules according to which it should be obtained have long been abandoned and have been replaced by the ideas of partial development, mutual reconciliation of opposites and the desire to keep the differences that necessarily arise from the very need of city life. (Castells, 2010) has an opinion on this. The space of place is historically rootedspatial organization of our common experience. He says the same (Castells, 2010). Postmodernism break altogether rational and historical codes, mixing everything, escaping the historic meanings and locality of places, establishing conceptual "end of history". (Simon, 1962) things about it. Complex whole is organized as a hierarchical set of complementary levels of the organization, where eachlevel is a product of the previous and the origin of the following sequence, in the unity of unbroken wholeness.

New problems arise when in such a well-preserved whole of the city, products appear that deviate from many set construction rules, and even from those not so strictly prescribed, and where they violate what is carefully guarded - the continuity of the environment?(Briggs , 1992) thinks as follws. As such fragmented approach was unable to answer many questions relating complex systems of built environment; there was an urge to find new way of thinking, one that was deeply inspired by fractals and theory of chaos. In that line, Briggs delegates a question whether we inhabit a world shaped (as we have long believed) by a lifeless mechanical fragments driven by mechanical laws that are waiting for our planning and control; or we inhabit the world - one that imply fractals and chaos - which is alive, creative and diverse because its parts are united, indivisible, and born of the uncertainties in the ultimate sense out of our control?



Figure2: a six story building is being built on a parking lot (source author)

If we exclude objects that were built sensibly despite the rules in order to leave a special impression with their unusualness, extravagance and contrast and provide proof that in a modern city everything is possible and allowed on the one hand - and that the legacy of those cities is preserved on the other, we can more easily come to the conclusion which are the objects that are not created according to the order and the law, who promotes them, invests, represents, protects and finally builds them.

If we go back for a moment to the listed legal-administrative acts that clearly prescribe what is allowed to be built in the city and what is not, and if we look at the established rules of the profession

related to codes, respect for directions and styles and a kind of builder's morality, it is concluded that these facilities were constructed by violating those same acts, rules and codes of norms and morals. How could this happen in practice? (*Portugali, 2011*) has an attitude. For Portugali there are differences between artificial, biological and human cognitive complexity. He thinks the same. Problems related to the complexity of built environment could not be resolved or predicted by a single or simplified statistical models, even computational models based on complexity theory, because often "simulation models tend to overlook the non-quantifiable urban phenomena" (*Portugali, 2011*). (He also thinks so. (*Portugali, 2011*)). Built artificial environments such as cities are a complex systems, that has properties of nonlinearity and emergence, implying that the local behaviour of a single urban agent (single citizen) might affect the city as much or even stronger than the city planning team.

When it comes to norms, codes, rules and professional morality, the first thing that comes to mind is that in some new times they have been replaced by some new behavior. That they were replaced by some new people who behave differently. Then let's think about the fact that urban-legislative acts in charge of preserving the old, existing and future environment have weakened and allow what should not happen in practice to happen. This is accompanied by reflections on corruption and other forms of unorganized and organized crime that are in force and cannot be opposed. The whole series of questions is lining up, and the answers to them must be clear and precise. When in a more or less organized city structure it happens that the object is built outside all the prescribed rules, and with all the omissions that the relevant institutions have made or avoided doing, the only appropriate means is to remove (destroy) that object, which in practice it rarely happens, especially if it is a project in which a lot of money and funds have been invested, so over time, the various ways to legalize it and to leave it be are being found. (*Giedion, 1941*) therefore thought thus. History as a process, "a pattern of living and changing attitudes and representations" (*Giedion, 1941*) could be a genetic repository of future tendencies, development and prospects, based in local and global contexts of social, political, economic and cultural background.

The profession, faced with such a problem, and whose hands were "tied", must and can try to relate to these objects. The easiest way is to leave these objects where they are, not to pay attention to them, with the potential danger that they will remain an example for further construction in such a way in a narrower and wider framework. The context that fortunately remained after one such construction can serve as a way out of an unwanted situation. Of course, before that, all the actors who led to that should be influenced, so that such actions would not be repeated. How can the remaining context make an impact and create the necessary (re) balance of the disrupted urban structure? (*Alexander, 1977*) considers. Universal structure of the invariants in patterns of built heritage could be defined and analyzed. There are objects that are contextually stable and which therefore make the necessary environment in relation to the unwanted object, that is there is a possibility to subsequently influence the unwanted object. Sooner or later, in such a contextual environment, there will be a need for further construction. Such an opportunity should be used to adapt the newly designed objects as well as possibly the wider urban zone to the unwanted object, that is to "mitigate" its bad effect and performance with its newly created content.

(*Heidegger and Norberg – Shulz, 1980*) think this could be interpreted as follows. In philosophical thought home is associated with place. The concept of place (conceived in contrast to space, which is a rather abstract concept having to do with ordering things – a priori form of intuition as Kant put it) has been exhaustively debated by architects, cultural geographers, sociologists and philosophers alike, time and again since at least since the mid 1950's, when *Martin Heidegger* published his seminal *Building Dwelling Thinking*. The conclusion follows. We are not deliberately talking about the architectural and urban context from the appropriate time and period with characteristic and recognizable morphological features of a certain epoch or style, but about the architectural and urban context in the broadest sense where it already has set parameters and where it does not matter what time period it belongs to.

Above all, there should be the consent of the profession, support within the institutional framework and, of course, the appropriate economic means by which this could be done. (Heyen, 1999) has the following opinion. The garnering of memories and the recollecting of one's own personal history that "constitutes the essence of dwelling" may be achieved "out of place" in the literally sense of the word. The conclusion follows. It is stated that urban and architectural contexts are created slowly, by careful selection of built objects and values over time, and that their most important feature is that harmony, compatibility and mutual tolerance, even when, for justified reasons, they arise at different times, through different influences and through different approaches and ideas of the creator architects.

CONCLUSION

From the above, it can be concluded that the objects built outside the urban and architectural context arise from the negligence and unprofessional behavior of the designers and urban planners themselves and that they, in recent times, are not a rare occurrence. In addition, there is the inevitable conclusion that there is a connection behind that negligence and incompetence and the expected intervention of the appropriate institutions, where the analysis of these connections would be the subject of a special discussion. It has also been shown that objects constructed in this way (even when built as individual objects) disrupt the established order of the urban and architectural context, whatever it may be.

During the work, at the end, measures are proposed that the profession, institutions and the entire construction and creative framework should apply in such cases. Among the first measures (which is both logical and legally justified), it was proposed that the unsuitable object be removed (demolished), but it was noted that this was expected and justified in theory, but that it rarely happens in practice. Then, several more measures were proposed that are possible and usable, but require more engagement, expertise and, of course, material and economic resources. The first measure was conceived as a gradual, temporal recontextualization of a narrower or wider zone that the unwanted object affects, so that the subsequent construction, design and architectural-urban design would try to "cover up" the object and enter it into a contextual framework that continues to develop. This move and procedure was assessed as complex, time-consuming, relatively expensive and with possible resistances and disagreements that could come from the professional environment. In the end, another solution was proposed - cheaper, faster, more efficient, but with a result that could not be known in advance and evaluated as successful. It is an immediate intervention on the most undesirable object where he would undergo all those measures of rearrangement and transformation, from the rough constructive ones to the easiest ones, if we can call them "cosmetic", so that it would get the necessary qualifications to fit into the contextual environment, where it is already located. The conclusion follows. It is important to note the shortcomings of a haphazard urbanization triggered by financialization, which eliminates the cultural aspect, and in the case of our country, creates a sense of non-place without authenticity identity, and identification, where man loses the sense of community and socialization, and where it is necessary to create an individual sense. Identification determines the conditions of existence, including material and symbolic resources that are needed to maintain it. Finally, we can say that the architecture, shape, appearance and treatment of the facades with the use of appropriate style and direction (or worse without them) are something that completes the assessment, that this is a completely failed object that should not be in the existing contextual and ambient environment.

These three solutions were offered as the only three possible and feasible solutions that the profession and the institutions in cooperation with each other can offer, so that the problem can be solved. Truth be told, there was another solution, and that is to leave such an object and leave it to time without any interventions to see what time could do for it, but that version was assessed as something that few would accept and with what few would agree. The final conclusion would be that such phenomena occur in modern times due to inconsistent regulation of investment and financing

in the neoliberal environment and poor cooperation with the institutions that should approve, monitor and regulate these processes. Unfortunately, they are a phenomenon that will follow the cities for a long time and where both the profession and the institutions will be able to do little if they do not react in time. The conclusion follows. A review of the actions of laws and regulations as well as the institutions that should implement those laws and regulations, led us to the conclusion that in certain cases this is not done and that this is one (if not the second most important) reason why such unwanted objects occur. This paper does not delve into all possible motives for such actions because it would require a special analysis that would correspond to the intentions and reasons for such behavior of institutions. It was only stated that it is a noticeable and well-known phenomenon that does not happen often, but it happens to a sufficient extent that the contextual space is disturbed. The laws and provisions prescribed by law and in connection with them deviations that occur in practice are also listed.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, C., et al. 1977. *A Pattern Language: Towns-Buildings-Construction*: New York: Oxford University Press.
- Briggs, John. 1992. *Fractals: The Patterns of Chaos: A New Aesthetic of Art, Science, and Nature*: New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Castells, Manuel. 2010. *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*: Oxford, England: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cohen, Jean-Louis. 2012. *The Future of Architecture Since 1889*. London: Phaidon Press.
- Knox, Paul L., and Steven Pinch. 2010. *Urban Social Geography: An Introduction*: Harlow: Pearson
- Mitola III, Joseph. 2000. *Cognitive Radio: An Integrated Agent Architecture for Software Defined Radio*. PhD thesis. Royal Institute of Technology (KTH) Stockholm, Sweden.
- Mostashari, Ali, Friedrich Arnold, Mo Mansouri and Matthias Finger. 2011. "Cognitive Cities and Intelligent Urban Governance." *Network Industries Quarterly* 13, no. 3: 4-7.
- Norberg-Schulz 1971: Norberg-Schulz, Christian, *Existence, Space, and Architecture*, Studio Vista, London, 1971.
- Norberg-Schulz 1980: Norberg-Schulz, Christian, *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*, Academy Editions, London 1980.
- Picon, Antoine. *Digital Culture in Architecture. An Introduction for the Design Professions*. Basel: Birkhäuser, 2010.
- Portugali, Juval. 2011. *Complexity, Cognition and the City*: Berlin: Springer.
- Rahm, Philippe. 2010. "Form and Function Follow Climate, An Interview of Philippe Rahm by Laurent Stadler." *Archithese*, no. 2 (February): 88-93.
- Simon, Herbert. 1962. "The Architecture of Complexity" *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 106, no. 6(Dec): 467-482.