

BOUNDARIES and B O R D E R S

Pozivamo studente i studentice Diplomskog studija Arhitekture FGAG-a na sudjelovanje na međunarodnoj Tempus radionici *Boundaries and Borders* koja će se ovog puta održati u Splitu na FGAG-u od 29. kolovoza do 12. rujna 2015. godine. Više o temi radionice i organizaciji pročitajte u priloženom tekstu službene pozivnice. Molimo zainteresirane da se jave Hrvoju Bartuloviću (hrvoje.bartulovic@gradst.hr). Vidimo se!

BOUNDARIES
and
BORDERS



summer workshops

invitation
organisation scheme

croatia, split, 2015





Dear Partners, Friends and Colleagues

We are honoured to invite you to participate in the second TEMPUS SEHSI summer school workshop which will take place in Split, Croatia from August 29 - September 12, 2015. Besides TEMPUS SEHSI summer school workshop, the second week will gather also the tutors and students from Switzerland, Austria, Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia and Spain who will parallelly work on specific urban planning and architecture topics continuing on analytic and diagnostic work of the previous week. The tutors and students from TU Wien, the tutors from Ljubljana, Split and Valencia will start on the SEHSI workshop and continue the whole 2-week programme. During the second week, all participants will join the efforts to propose different problems recognition criteria and contribute the development of methodology of interdisciplinary work on sustainable solutions.

Date and time

August 29th - September 12th, 2015

Location

UNIVERSITY OF SPLIT
FACULTY OF CIVIL ENGINEERING, ARCHITECTURE AND GEODESY
MATICE HRVATSKE 15, 21000 SPLIT
www.gradst.hr

We are looking forward to seeing you in Split! With kindest regards, Split team

Ana

Dario

Sanja

Hrvoje

Title and description

Boundaries and borders

Boundaries and borders, whether internal or external, or the ones linked to the wider space or time frame, as well as processes that had generated them or been generated by them, define the space of a city in a sense of its spatially-urbanistic manifestation, its role and meaning in a wider context, forming its direct contact space-territory of a city. Although terms of boundaries and borders are often used as synonyms, especially in geopolitical context, a subtle difference in meaning still exists. While the term border can be used as clear and strict dividing line and is usually used with topographic, morphological, geographical and administrative determinants, the term boundaries has less strict and tangible character inclined to subjective interpretation and depends on the level of perception (individual level, level or group, subculture, community and even nation). It is used more frequently in the context of mental, sociological, political and cultural determinants (wish and possibility, knowledge and awareness, individual and general freedom, mobility and social interaction).

The workshop will look into the terms of boundaries and borders within the context of space. The first step will be the analysis and identification of boundaries and borders, their correlation, relation of cause and effect, their role in the creation and modification of space. This "look in the mirror" of a sort is essential in the process of tracing the path for the dynamic balance and sustainable development. The second step will examine the potential of change, relocation, redefinition and abolishment of boundaries and borders. The aim of the whole process is to find real, grounded, sufficiently stable but simultaneously visionary and flexible criteria that will enable the realization of various scenarios of future development whose quality will be sufficient for creation of sustainable frame for changes that are impossible to predict.

While going through various transitional processes, towns and cities have been changing in technological, economical and functional, as well as sociological, cultural and political meaning, simultaneously trying to keep the physical frame of sustainability. Infrastructural problems, migration flows, hyper or depopulation, constant need for redefinition of economic settings that form the base of development, problem of lack of space (territory), constant search for identity and strategic points etc. have led to the need for re-examination of internal and external (cultural, sociological, economic) boundaries or related physical and administratively-political borders. As a consequence of such relation between the internal and external factors and criteria, limitations function as dually permeable and pulsating diaphragms that define physical and functional space of the city, i.e. its territory through the amplitude of their expansion and contraction in correlation to the firm and undeformable borders. The city and its territory, as living organisms in symbiotic relation, function on one side on the principles of positive enthalpy and entropy, i.e. dynamic inner balance, but on the other side, considering the enthalpic deformations and the existence of self-destructive processes caused by them, have the tendency of uncontrolled physical change that very often collides with the external factors. Thus the system is easily brought to the state of imbalance and explosion or implosion, depending on the characteristics of processes and systems they collide with. Such organic feature would not become a problem in itself, if the space they occupy was not limited and expendable, at least within a given timeframe. If they become uncontrolled and disproportionate to the condition of positive

entropy, aforementioned processes, whether they are the consequence of the external influence or internal relations, lead to the city metastasizing beyond its natural and sustainable borders and, considering duration of this process, often lead to the collapsing of the system.

To talk about borders and boundaries in the case of Split means to talk about the City, its spatially-urbanistic manifestation, its role and meaning in a wider context. Dynamics and frequency of change within historic context, geopolitical and politically-economic relations and movements and actions generated by them have formed Split region as the largest urban agglomeration on the Croatian Adriatic coast. This "mini megapolis" with Split as its administrative, but also a geometric centre, spans about 60 km long and only 0.5-1 km wide area created by physical connection of five historic towns: Trogir, Kaštela, Solin, Split and Omiš. About 280.000 inhabitants of this micro region plus 250.000 more from the gravitating area, constitutes the area of Split the second largest urban agglomeration in Croatia. Its real borders are not based on the strength and influence of the administrative function of a centre within smaller and larger region, but are spatially-functional, formed on the base of social, economic, cultural and other relations. Generated movements (migrations) are reversible, thus enabling the development of the whole gravitating micro region. Regardless of the fact that Split grew significantly and probably too fast in the period following the WWI and especially after WWII due to the political decision to make it again the "capital" of Dalmatia, and the price of its growth and development was mostly paid by the surrounding towns of Solin and Kaštela (large part of the so-called dirty industries was located in Kaštela and Solin basin), Split did not "absorb" them. Quite the contrary, the development of Solin and Kaštela over the last twenty years has shown the opposite process, the one in which the surrounding cities slow down the growth and development of the master city within the administratively divided and unconnected, but functionally interdependent urban agglomeration that had long overgrown its formally-political borders. However, at present, among all of the Croatian cities, Split is the only one that can truly be said to be living its post-socialistic transition, the one in which an over 1700 year old city is being transformed in technological, economic and functional sense, as well as sociological, cultural and political one, simultaneously trying to create unique physical frame for spatial development and urban reconstruction. This workshop will set a training ground for research and it will gather experts from various professions, approaches and interests, expand the understanding of urban planning problematic and city development on the example of Split

Organisation scheme:

WEEK 1:

(students from TU, UNIST and UA Partners)

preliminary (home)work 1A:	web preparation (we will send the advised list)
workshop work 1B:	field introduction / on-site tour lectures (5-6 thematic fields) data base analyses
workshop work 1C:	analyses of gathered situational experiences and data focusing interests / formulating problems in different scale discussions, exchange extracting possible tasks (2 from each group)
workshop work 1D:	discussion on proposed tasks (mentors and lecturers) selection and definition of 4 tasks (mentors and lecturers) adopting and gathering analyses according to formulated tasks (students)

important notes:

The lectures will be pre cross-checked internally among all the lecturers (only for UNIST lecturers) to avoid and/or arrange the overlapping on sub-topics (for example when both economy and sociology dive into tourism). The lecturers will be instructed to focus on processes not on pinning the peculiar problems. The fields will be:

The work is organised in 8 "labelled" groups, in each 5 students. Each group will base it's analytic approach relied on chosen thematic field (all fields should be covered, a few repeated, "fine tuning" after lectures provided)

Each group will have at least 1 mentor, altogether: 2 from TU Vienna, 2 from UNIST, 4 from UA

The groups are formed by the following key (related to thematic fields): up to 5 students - 1TU, 1UNIST, 2-3UA (1-2 architects and 1-2 profession related to thematic field). This is the only way to provide interdisciplinary work because UA students are the only ones who are not exclusively architects. This kind of organisation provides domestic experience and a good balance of diversity. This first week is supposed be more analytical one, so the diversity of professions in groups should provide different points of view for the fields they will be assigned to analyse, which will hopefully provide interesting problematic tasks which will be formulated for the second week work.

The exact form of final delivery will be defined.

The organisers will have 4 "emergency" tasks prepared in case the expected results will fail from any reason. On contrary, we believe that students will for sure extract interesting problems which will be formulated as final tasks with the help of mentors' fine steering.

WEEK 2:

(students from TU, UNIST, UA, + Valencia, Ljubljana, Winterthur, Graz, Skopje, ...)

preliminary (home)work 2A:	web preparation (we will send the advised list)
workshop work 2B:	field introduction / on-site tour introduction with tasks lectures presentation (5-6 thematic fields) - not a spoken word 2 hours discussion and questions with lecturers discussion among "old" and "new" (transferring knowledge of gathered experiences and data) data base analyses, situational experiences
workshop work 2C:	work on specific tasks - setting goals "translating problems into set of project objectives" discussions, exchange defining proposals / solutions / "vectors of development"
workshop work 2D:	presentation

important notes:

The second week work is organised in Studios. There will be 4 Studios (each working on 1 task from those 4 tasks selected). In each Studio there will be 2 groups from previous week 1 scheme. They will be joined by 2 new groups consisting of 4 members each. So, there will be 4 groups in each Studio, thus enabling comparisons of final solutions and proposals. Each studio tasks will be extracts of problems accordingly with situation analysis and determination of context done in first week. The "old" groups will provide their analytic experience and will additionally contribute by having other professions in their team who will also be in constant discussion with other groups providing interdisciplinary experience to the "new" groups which will consist from the architects only. Working in the same room, the groups will all be in constant touch and idea exchange. Although the Studios will be separated in different classrooms – this is only because of the special organisation of faculty facilities – the overlapping of date usage and other joining elements will provide quality workflow between the Studios. Since the overall number of students will be really huge, the mid-presentations will be in each Studio paralely (although this is to be discussed further on), otherwise it will be impossible to organise. Final presentation will be organised for all studios together.

The following are the options for groups organisation for the WEEK 2:

(It is agreed that the participants decide about the organisation together at the end of the WEEK1. UNIST will be the arbiter in case the agreement can't be achieved.)

organisation - option 1:

In each Studio there will be 2 groups from previous week 1 scheme. They will be joined by 2 new groups consisting of 4 members each. So, there will be 4 groups in each Studio, thus enabling comparisons of final solutions and proposals. The "old" groups from first week will provide their analytic experience and will additionally contribute by having other professions in their team who will also be in constant discussion with other groups providing interdisciplinary experience to the "new" groups which will consist from the architects only.

organisation - option 2:

The new groups will be rearranged and the students will be asked to choose one of four studio tasks. This should be pre-discussed so all the studios end up with similar number of groups, thus enabling comparisons of final solutions and proposals. The arrangement of groups should be done accordingly to the participants points of interests and each group should consist of four or five students. This could by inertia result in forming groups of students from the same faculty but with little impulse by mentors it does not necessary have to end up like that (or this might be the general idea - this is to be discussed)

organisation - option 3:

The third possible scheme can be developed as following: half of the groups could work within the frame of the first scenario (mixed group) and the other half within the frame of the second scenario.