INTRODUCTION

Terazije Terrace is a space in the very center of Belgrade, specific as a place that connects very diverse ideas originating from different moments in the architectural history of the 20th century. Having been the subject matter of numerous architectural competitions and commissioned projects, this partly empty urban block served as a spatial framework and an inspiration for many architects of the Serbian, the Yugoslav and the international scenes to make their proposals for the future development of the city center.

Linked directly to Terazije Square, the central point of the Belgrade downtown, the sloped area of Terazije Terrace opens itself up to the view of and towards the river Sava and the far horizons in the west (Figure 1). As the main axis of the city center (Kalemegdan – Terazije Square – Slavija Square) lies partly on a ridge, there are several points along that line from which the attractive views of the surroundings could be opened.

According to Kovaljevski (1930), after the Committee for the Development of the Master Plan of Belgrade had officially marked the place for a terrace-belvedere in 1923, in the place that, as against Terazije Square, opens itself up between the hotels “Moskva” and “Balkan”, the city government started repurchasing the land of the sloped terrain towards Kraljice Natalije Street in order to form a new public space for the purpose of building the terrace.

The making of the Master Plan was preceded by an international urbanistic competition in 1922. Among the awarded and mentioned entries, six proposed a terrace-belvedere in the place where Terazije Square opens itself up towards the Sava Slope (Vuksanović-Macura, 2014). This happened due to the fact that the competition brief suggested as advisable that such public spaces should be incorporated into the proposals of the Master Plan. Later, the Report on the Master Plan included the ideas about the repeated motif of the terraces located at Kalemegdan Fortress, Terazije Square, areas of Kosančićev venac, Topčider Hill and the Plateau of Vračar. These series of terraces have never been realized, just as has been the case with many other valuable planned conceptions (Maksimović, 1980).

According to the known data from 1901, the idea of the reconstruction of the urban block of Terazije Terrace in the form of a public space with the accompanying public objects dates back to the time when Dimitrije Leko pointed to that space as a representative one, suitable for building a new Parliament which could thus, dominate over the extended Terazije Square (Ibid.).

In 1910, the architect Jefta Stefanović proposed the same place as a possible location for a new Town Hall, stating that it was one of the most beautiful sites for such a kind of edifice. As Vuksanović-Macura (2013: 156) noticed, there...
was no reliable information whether these first ideas were accompanied by drawings or projects. Given that fact, one of the perspective drawings comprised by Chambon’s 1912 Plan is considered to be the first drawing of the idea of Terazije Terrace. Since this plan was a free vision of a future city rather than a proper regulation plan, the drawing of the area of Terazije Square and Terazije Terrace was also a kind of an imagined romantic setting inapplicable to the actual urban situation.

Viennese architects Emil Hoppe and Otto Schönthal made a design for Terazije Terrace in 1921, according to Vuksanović-Macura (2013), possibly as a commission by the Bank of the Danube Society (Banka Podunavskog Društva). In this beautifully drawn eclectic proposal, the space of the Terrace is designed in a series of oval green areas (with decorated little pavilions and terraces) and the streets around them. At the top point of the Terrace, a belvedere with border colonnades was proposed (Figure 2).

The 1923 Master Plan opened the possibility of the realization of the idea of Terazije Terrace as an open plaza with a view of the horizon in the west, and a set of buildings on the lateral sides. The plan proposed three cascades of the open area in the axial composition, flanked by different kind of buildings – “in the upper group – those for public offices, and in the lower group – those for the restaurants, the pubs, the cinema and so on” (Maksimović, 1980: 251).

In one period of time, lively polemics against the possible location of the future Town Hall filled the pages of Belgrade newspapers. In an article published in the Politika in 1927 (The Town Hall and Terazije Terrace, 1927), Terazije Terrace was indicated as a possible site for this purpose. Additionally, a detailed description of the program of the building was given, which referred to the entire space between Terazije Square and Kraljice Natalije Street. According to that program, municipal architect Jan Dubovi made a sketch of the building, which obviously largely influenced the future competition brief which we will return to later. In 1928, the same architect made a project for the temporary development of the space of the terrace by constructing an object on its side, at the top of Balkanska Street, conceived as “a multifunctional space with a public reading-room, a journalists’ club and the City Museum” (Mišašinović Marić, 2001: 33).

However, the preparation for the competition was continued, although in 1929 there was still a part of the land to repurchase in order to complete the necessary area according to the plan. The public had already been under the influence of the propagated idea that the site was one of the most beautiful in the city and that its future joining to the public space of Terazije would secure the most beautiful way of its development and extension (Competition for Terazije Terrace, 1929).

THE 1929 COMPETITION: A MODERNIST BREAKTHROUGH

The Competition Brief and the Results

In August 1929, only seven months after the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes had changed its name into the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and the dictatorship of King Aleksandar Karađorđević had been announced, an international ideas competition was opened for the architectural solution to Terazije Terrace. After the 1922 competition for the Master Plan, that was the first new contest of an international character expected to lead to a solution to that important urban location in Belgrade. The results were published in June 1930. The winner of the competition was the architect of the younger generation, Nikola Dobrović, with his design under the password “Urbanismus” (Figure 3). Out of the twenty-five submitted entries, ten were awarded prizes or mentions by the competition jury. About one-half of the entries came from abroad. Nikola Dobrović himself sent his work from Prague, were he was starting his career of an independent architect, after having successfully worked at prominent architectural offices for several years.

Having in mind the dominant tendencies on the Serbian architectural scene, the building policy in general, as well as the taste of an average citizen, the vision that Dobrović proposed was the one of a radically new image to envisage in the very center of the city. Branko Popović, one of the jury members, wrote a lengthy article on the competition results for the capital’s newspaper Politika, emphasizing that, speaking from the architectural point of view, Dobrović had
made the extension of Terazije Square “substantially modern and monumental, even in its tiniest detail” (Popović, 1930: 112). Describing the winning design, Popović testified that it “solves the problem of the terrace in a radical way. The terrace itself as well as the buildings flanking it, span over the whole area to be treated. The terrace extends almost to the building line in Kraljice Natalije Street, which transforms it into a grandiose, raised plaza.” (Ibid.; 112).

The general criteria for the evaluation and preferences of the jury become even more obvious once we are aware of the fact that three of the four awarded designs are clearly modernist. The design made by the professor of Munich Polytechnics, O. Kurc, awarded the second prize, was an exception. The overall expression of his architecture was monumental, serious and not deprived of a certain pathos. The third awarded solution came from Prague, where it had been made by Croatian architect Mijo Hečimović, who had done it together with his colleague Gustav Bohutinski. The published drawing testifies to the architecture of a radically modernist conception, formed from the large cubes, also proposing a huge terrace over the whole depth of the block, in a manner even more radical than the one in Dobrović’s proposal. The design that received the fourth award was the work by the architects Branimar Kninovčić and Dragoljub Jovanović, and was also conceived as a dominantly modernist architecture, although clearly playing with the classical motifs of the plaza, the gate and the belvedere.

Among the six mentions, there were very different architectural approaches which, all taken together, contributed to the diversity of the conceptions the competition had collected as the answers to its program. Besides the modern ones, there were a lot of eclectic, or conservative designs, among which there were some that did not adhere to the competition brief and closed the view of the river. According to Zoran Manević, as well as many other authors, modern architecture won the competition and the winner himself was the best one among the modernist proposals. According to Ljiljana Blagojević (2003: 116), “the crucial point of the rejection of modern architecture and planning in Belgrade could be explained by the example of the winning competition project for Terazije Terrace”.

The significance of and the ideas lying behind the winning proposal

There is no doubt that Dobrović’s design for Terazije Terrace is the most famous non-built modernist project in Serbia. Many authors stressed its crucial significance for the introduction of the ideas of modern architecture to the local architectural scene. Miloš Perović (2003: 130) argues that, in comparison with the projects of a similar program, the competition designs for Alexanderplatz in Berlin, dating from 1928, and the complex of the Rockefeller Center in New York, Terazije Terrace by Dobrović was more organized and more successful in combining multiple different functions (Figure 4), bringing at the same time an image of a pure and transparent structure.

What is of special interest for the subject matter of this paper is the following question: What exactly is the autonomous contribution of an architectural competition and the set of ideas behind the proposed projects to a local culture, to the way of defining the urban issues and the urban planning policy?

As we have mentioned earlier, two years before the competition a local newspaper had published a detailed description of the possible program of the future complex on Terazije Terrace (The Town Hall and Terazije Terrace, 1927). The multi-purpose buildings grouped into a simple scheme as demonstrated by Jan Dubovi’s illustration together form
a monumental terrace with laterally placed volumes. The way of funding was also proposed – the municipality would only participate by providing the land for the construction, while different private companies would find an interest in investing in this multifunctional edifice.

Dobrović’s answer to the competition brief was direct and fully met all its requirements. Moreover, the basic difference between his design and the other good-quality projects at the same competition is an impressively clear; simple and ordered functional scheme, as the basis for the beautifully designed architectural form authentically modern in all its elements. Describing his intentions underlying the project, Dobrović (1932: 114) gave a list of its key goals:

In the first place, the following should be introduced: 1) traffic in the city center should be regulated; 2) the concentration of crafts, the commercial and the cultural activities; 3) citizens’ recreational activities; 4) new-aesthetic moments; 5) the economic aspects; 6) the elimination of housing for rent from the downtown area.

This list was immediately followed by an extended description of the regulation of pedestrian circulation on and around the site, through the building, in all possible directions – vertically, horizontally and up-and-down the slope – which was remodeled and incorporated into the interior of the building under the terrace. He writes about the motivated circulation of users, presenting the project as a device for the regulation and distribution of the flow of people, as well as for the efficient and complementary overlapping of many diverse functions. Writing about Corbusier’s project for Centrosoyuz in Moscow, J. L. Cohen emphasizes the fact that Corbusier frequently used the term circulation to describe the core idea of this project. Corbusier elaborated on this: “Architecture is circulation. Think what it means. It condemns academic methods and sanctions the principle of pilotis” (as cited in Cohen, 2008: 54).

We can argue that, apart from all its formal qualities which clearly distinguish the winning project by Dobrović as the most consequent modern architectural conception the Serbian public had faced until then, its overall intrinsic logic and the set of ideas it presented could be the most important novelty to be absorbed by the local culture. It is quite another question whether that culture has the capacity to embrace and truly comprehend those ideas so that it could make use of them, in the first place.

‘AN INTEGRATED VOID’ AND THE DISTORTED ECHOES OF DOBROVIĆ’S DESIGN

Vuksanović-Macura (2013: 161) states that the fact that Nikola Dobrović’s project was incorporated into the 1939 Master Plan as an older solution was an unprecedented event, having in mind that there were some newer proposals, among which those from the international competition for the design of Terazije Square organized in 1937.

The above-mentioned competition took place at the same time as the competition for the reconstruction of the space of today’s Republic Square, and together they brought a significant number of new architectural concepts about the potential directions of the city center development.

After the Second World War, Nikola Dobrović, as the new Belgrade Chief Urbanist and the director of the Urban Department of EPC (Executive People’s Committee), made new efforts to reanimate the subject of Terazije Terrace and his project from 1929, proposing a significantly remodeled solution in 1946, in which the stretching of the gesture through the urban tissue, starting from Terazije and going all the way to the river, became dominant.

After Dobrović had left the Urban Department, this institution did work on a new Master Plan for Belgrade, which was officially accepted in 1950. The Plan was designed under the leadership of Miloš Somborski, and within it, the architect Stanko Mandić made a new project for Terazije Terrace, which proposed a connection between the pedestrian surface of Terazije and the highest level of the Terrace, so the tunnel under it could interconnect Prizrenska and Balkanska Streets. Under the surface of the Terrace, a simple singular mass of an object is designed, which consumes only the upper part of the block between Terazije and Kraljice Natalije Street, reducing significantly the extent of construction on the site compared to Dobrović’s solution.

In the very next year, architectural magazines gave an insight into a new project for the Terrace by the architects Vladeta Maksimović and Vido Vrbanić, made within the Belgrade Design Institute (Projektni zavod IONO Beograd) (B.S. 1951; Social Architectural Objects, 1951). This project incorporates the recommendations of the new Master Plan and proposes a dominantly horizontal structure with two low annexes positioned laterally and asymmetrically, playing the role of the visual and functional connectors between the existing objects and the newly-designed structure (Figure 5). The main function of the object under the terrace is the
one of a cinema, intended for 1,500 viewers, and with a restaurant. The lower part of the block surface was designed as a park, with the idea to make a natural connection to the future green axis stretching down the slope through the urban tissue. The same as in the cases of other earlier projects, this one has also remained unimplemented in reality.

The next opportunity to survey the professional community emerged in 1968, when the competition for the urban design of Belgrade downtown – from Kalemegdan Fortress to Slavia Square – was announced. In this competition two projects were awarded the first prize: the one designed by the architects Stojan Maksimović and Borko Novaković from Belgrade (Figure 6), and the other designed by Feda Košir, an architect from Ljubljana, Slovenia (Petričić, 1968).

Both designs, as well as the other awarded ones, proposed monumental dimensions of the space of the Terrace, which, directly following Dobrović’s example, stretched in cascades towards the river Sava. Thereby, Maksimović and Novaković’s project comprised the radial repetition of this direction, multiplied four times, with a focal point on the circular plaza at the foot of the Sava Slope – designed as a kind of a connector to the “new entering point of the downtown” (Maksimović and Novaković, 1968), in the location of the main railway station. In the Slovenian architect’s work, a vigorous, linear stroke of the extended Terazije Terrace was used as one of the elements in giving a new shape to the silhouette of the city – “the horizontal texture of the terraces and esplanades with a view of Srem” (Košir, 1968: 45).

In a significant number of other awarded and mentioned projects the complex architectural treatment of the public space of the Terrace had been used mainly without any monumental masses of the built tissue, but with the whole system of the terraces, in symmetrical order, with the main direction axis (Bežan, Mušić and Starc; Stojanović; and others), or in the geometry of a certain move aside (Đokić, Petrović and Lukić).

In the winning project, the basic spatial conception combines the recognizable theme of the cascaded lateral masses with a shortened version of the terrace – as proposed in the 1950 and 1951 projects, as well as in some later solutions. Besides, it is clear at first sight that it also applied the idea of the gate, originally introduced by Dobrović, formed by placing two pylon-towers in the space of the park (Figure 7).
The password of the project was “Twin Peaks”, and its textual part provides an additional piece of evidence for the significance this compositional motif had for the authors. The theme was joined with other usual postmodernist motifs – the accentuation of the massive wall, here furnished by granite tiles (Rajović and Nikezić, 1991), perforated partly with the small windows, and the use of the cascading masses, diagonally shifted here, in the directions of the connecting elements between the main body of the building and the tower.

The second prize went to a proposal of an even more complex expression, using the themes of the postmodern vocabulary. The side forms are made of different elements, grouped into a kind of a continual flow, switching from concave to convex, leaving the middle space axially organized around the sequences of the central motifs – the fountains, the obelisk, the colonnades framing the view, and so on. Taken as a whole, this was a solution primarily engaged around the issue of the composition of an urban space, insisting on an architecture forming a series of micro-ambiances (Figure 8).

In his book *Architecture’s Desire*, K. Michael Hays (2010:1) argues:

> Architecture comprises a set of operations that organize formal representations of the real (...) and hence, rather than merely being invested with an ideology by its creators and users, it is ideological in its own right – an imaginary “solution” to a real social situation and contradiction (as Louis Althusser’s take on Jacques Lacan puts it); that is what is meant by its “autonomy”.

We could argue that the 1991 competition was a demonstration of an evident inertia at the local architectural scene, which acted as if perpetually engaged with postmodern themes of form, composition and symbolism. In this context, the autonomy of architectural discourse was employed only as a basis for the formal exercises. The scene as a whole missed a good opportunity to offer relevant “solutions” to the social and urban contradictions of their time.

**THE 1998 COMPETITION: A NEW ANSWER TO THE OLD QUESTIONS**

Hesitant about the adoption of the final solution for the central part of the location, the local authorities announced a new architectural competition for Terazije Terrace in September 1998. The winners of the competition were the team of architects: Karolina Damjanović Grujičić, together with Zorica and Boris Penušliski. According to the jury, their work successfully met all the requirements of the competition brief. Still, this solution has also remained unrealized.

However, another project is remembered as the most provocative and the most vigorous design of this competition (Figure 9). Awarded the second prize, this work had been designed by the architectural team: Dejan Miljković, Branislav Mitrović, Gordana Radović, Zoran Radojičić and Marina Šibalić. In their report, the jury stated that, among other significant advantages of the solution, there were also: “the simplicity, strength and attractiveness of the concept, based on the traditional understanding of Terazije Terrace in creating the identity of Belgrade’s spaces and the image of the city, as established by Dobrović’s concept” (Društvo arhitekata Beograda and Savez arhitekata Srbije, 1999: 3). Further on, along with the functional qualities, the jury also praised the exciting image of the structure, with the potential to leave a deep imprint in the spatial memory of the citizens, “with a tendency to become the most dominant architectural motif of the overall perception of Belgrade” (Ibid.: 3).
In their text accompanying the competition project, the authors gave an extensive citation of Dobrović, instead of widely explaining the project itself. It is very indicative which quotation they chose – the well-known sequence where Dobrović elaborates his experience of Belgrade's Genius loci, and his critique of local urban planning and architecture as focused on unimportant themes and without any broader vision. In the context of the competition, this citation can be understood as a way to effectively stress the qualities of the project – it should lead to the conclusion that this project offers a new answer to all the old questions: it solves an architectural problem, it is not hairsplitting, and it takes the role of a new symbol of the city.

In the case of the 1998 competition program, the architectural problem of the Terrace which Miljković and the team had to solve was somewhat different from Dobrović’s problem. The building in the location of 2 Balkanska Street was to be realized, and the project for the other one was intended for realization. The central slope of the block was supposed to be an attractive public space, as well as a functional link to all necessary access communications to these two buildings that would eventually form its architectural framework.

This issue, along with the other two key aims (non-hairsplitting and the creation of a new symbol of the city), were solved in one simple expressive gesture – introducing a huge bearing metal structure with a terrace raised radically – at the most distant point from Terazije Square, with the idea to conquer that place in the air (which intrigued citizens' imagination in the 1930s, proposed by Dobrović's daring design).

Ten years after this competition, new city authorities announced yet another contest for an architectural solution to the central part of the Terrace, above Kraljice Natalije Street. The jury extended the competition in the second round, after which the first prizes were given – one went to the ARCVS studio (Branislav Redžić and the team) and the re:ac.t studio (Grozdana Šišović and Dejan Milanović). Although different activities connected with the potential implementation of one of these projects are still topical (in 2016), the final shape of this space, or at least a new temporary intervention, is nowhere in sight.

CONCLUSION

Gaining an insight into the part of the architectural history of Terazije Terrace (Table 1), and especially focusing the research on the competition projects from different periods, we can conclude that those many efforts and reflections in service of the creation of a new, better and up-to-date city center have left a small mark in space, but have made a significant impact on the local architectural milieu.

The 1929-1930 competition can be understood as the crucial moment of the breakthrough of modern architecture into the provincial architectural scene of Belgrade, although Dobrović’s vision has unfortunately never been realized. Many authors share the view that competitions can serve as great opportunities for the promotion of new ideas, regardless of whether the proposal in question is awarded or not. The usual example is Corbusier’s 1927 design for the competition for the League of Nations in Geneva. He and other modernists lost the competition, but won the day, eventually, through the further promotions of their ideas.

In the case of Dobrović, the competition was won, but the realization has never come, due to different reasons, among which the resistance of the local conservative forces was probably the most significant one. However, the autonomous contribution of his architecture has left its mark on the cultural heritage in the form of the set of unprecedented ideas about a place, a city and its potential development.

The 1991 competition reflected a certain disorientation of the architectural scene of the period. The highest-ranked projects could be understood as negotiating with a brutal and overwhelming urban reality beyond control, where the conflict between the private and the public interest was hard to soothe by virtue of an architectural project. The outcome was possibly even better than its odds were.

In 1996, the competition project that shook the scene was an indicative sign of a new fresh wave of architectural ideas, which introduced itself through the work and way of thinking of the new generation of Belgrade architects. Referring to the architectural theory of 'the post-critical practice', which emerged at the 'fin de siècle', we can argue that this project shows all the main signs of the projective (as defined by Somol and Whiting (2002)) behavior – it simplifies the problem, acts performatively and uses the autonomous game of architecture to give new, unexpected and attractive solutions to a spatial situation. The competition surely was a unique opportunity to propose an architecture of this kind in the most effective way and to possibly help open the door to the ongoing shift of ideas and new architectural discourses.
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Table 1. The chronology of activities on planning and designing Terazije Terrace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project/Competition</th>
<th>Client/Jury</th>
<th>Author/Awarded</th>
<th>Organizer/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>A sketch</td>
<td>Jan Dušević</td>
<td>– A proposal presented in newspapers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>A design project</td>
<td>Bank of Denbe</td>
<td>Emil Hoppe and Otto Schönthal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-1922</td>
<td>International Competition for the Master Plan of Belgrade</td>
<td>Dobra Mitrović, Dragutin Đorđević, Vlada Mitrović, Ranko Preradović, Milan M. Jovanović, Vilko Popović and Branko Popović, French architect Chiffot, Swiss arch. Edmond Fasio and engineer Duc.</td>
<td>I prize – Municipal of Belgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>International Competition for the Design of Heir of the Throne Square</td>
<td>Branko Popović, Dura Bajalović, arch., Đorđe Đorđević, arch., Đorđa Radovanović</td>
<td>I prize – Municipal Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Master plan</td>
<td>Đorđe Đorđević and Danica Tomić – Milunavlević</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>project revision</td>
<td>Nikola Dobrović – revision of the project from 1930.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Design project</td>
<td>Vladeta Maksimović and Vido Vrhanić – supervision team: Dragša Bralevan, arch.; Duša Lazarević, eng.; Miladin Prijepošćan, arch.; Miloš Somberski, arch.; Bogdan Ignjatović, arch.; Bratislav Stojanović, arch.; Josip Najman, arch.</td>
<td>Design Institute of Belgrade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Optišinski dom i Terazijaka terasa (1927) Politika, 10. decembar. [The Town Hall and Terazijaka Terrace (1927) Politika, 10 December.]


Received May 2016; accepted in revised form June 2016.