



UDC 72.01  
ORCID ID: 0000-003-2567-686X  
ORCID ID: 000-0001-5659-6411  
DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2411-3034-2024-36-3>

## DEVELOPMENT OF RESIDENTIAL AREA BEHIND DERZHPROM IN KHARKIV: CONCEPTS, SPATIAL, COMPOSITIONAL, AND FUNCTIONAL FEATURES

**Kateryna Didenko**

*PhD in Architecture, Associate Professor at the Department of Architectural Design Fundamentals  
O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv  
[yekaterina.didenko@gmail.com](mailto:yekaterina.didenko@gmail.com)*

**Olena Gella**

*PhD in Architecture, Associate Professor  
at the Department Architectural Design Fundamentals  
O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv  
[alena.gella@gmail.com](mailto:alena.gella@gmail.com)*

**Abstract.** *The purpose of this article is to highlight the history and features of the residential districts «Novyi Pobut», «Chervonyi Promyslovets», and «Budynok Spetsialistiv» in the context of the creation of the metropolitan center of Kharkiv in the 1920s and 1930s, as well as to identify the concepts implemented in these districts. **Methods.** In order to achieve this goal, the study applies the method of systematization of literary, documentary and digital sources and uses a systematic logical and genetic approach. **Results.** The article explores the history and peculiarities of the residential area behind the Derzhprom (State Industry Building) in Kharkiv on the example of three residential complexes: «Chervonyi Promyslovets», «Budynok Spetsialistiv» and «Novyi Pobut», built in the 1920s and 1930s not far from the new administrative center of the city. This article is a continuation of the authors' previous research, and its scientific novelty lies in revealing the reflection of progressive architectural and urban planning trends of the early 20th century in the architecture of residential complexes: concepts of garden city, house commune and residential combine. The urban planning of Kharkiv's administrative center, where residential quarters are separated from the administrative and business district by a wide green boulevard, implements the concept of a garden city. In turn, the «Chervonyi Promyslovets» and «House of Specialists» embody the idea of a residential combine, while the «Novyi Pobut» partially realizes the concept of a house commune.*

*The relevance of this article is determined by the need to preserve architectural heritage as an essential component of the modern European strategy, which is a key factor in understanding the value of historical landscapes and architectural monuments. Documenting Kharkiv's architectural and urban heritage, particularly from the period of its active development, is crucial for the preservation and further study of unique monuments, as these buildings not only reflect the city's history but also showcase progressive architectural concepts of the 20th century.*

**Conclusions.** *The capital period of Kharkiv was one of the most fruitful, turning the city into a center of early modernist complexes. In the 1920s and 1930s, a new administrative center emerged in the city with residential districts that embodied variations of the «house-commune» and «garden city» concepts. The «Novyi Pobut», «Chervonyi Promyslovets», and «Budynok Spetsialistiv» complexes demonstrate the evolution of the concept of a «residential combine» – serviced residential buildings.*

*The article examines the history of three residential blocks, including «Novyi Pobut», which embodies the concept of a «house-commune», and «Chervonyi Promyslovets» and «Budynok Spetsialistiv», which represent the concept of a «residential combine». Throughout its existence, the «Novyi Pobut» residential*

complex has undergone the greatest spatial changes over time, while the other two have remained without significant changes in structure and appearance. The results of the study will contribute to the preservation of the unique residential blocks of the central part of Kharkiv, their integration into the strategies of monument protection and increase their value.

**Key words:** Kharkiv, modernism, residential area behind the Derzhprom, garden-city, residential combine, house-commune, compositional and functional peculiarities.

## ФОРМУВАННЯ ЖИТЛОВОГО РАЙОНУ ЗА ДЕРЖПРОМОМ У ХАРКОВІ: КОНЦЕПЦІЇ, ПРОСТОРОВІ, КОМПОЗИЦІЙНІ ТА ФУНКЦІОНАЛЬНІ ОСОБЛИВОСТІ

**Катерина Діденко**

кандидатка архітектури, доцентка

Харківський національний університет міського господарства імені О. М. Бекетова

yekaterina.didenko@gmail.com

**Олена Гелла**

кандидатка архітектури, доцентка

Харківський національний університет міського господарства імені О. М. Бекетова

alena.gella@gmail.com

**Анотація.** Метою даної статті є висвітлення історії та особливостей житлових кварталів «Новий побут», «Червоний промисловець» і «Будинок спеціалістів» у контексті створення столичного центру Харкова у 1920–1930-х рр., а також виявлення реалізованих у цих районах концепцій.

**Методи дослідження.** Для досягнення поставленої мети у дослідженні застосовано метод систематизації літературних, документальних й цифрових джерел та використано системний логіко-генетичний підхід. **Результати.** У статті досліджено історію та особливості житлового району за Держпромом у Харкові на прикладі трьох житлових комплексів: «Червоний промисловець», «Будинок спеціалістів» та «Новий побут», зведених в 1920–1930-х роках неподалік від нового адміністративного центру міста. Стаття є продовженням попередніх досліджень авторів, а її наукова новизна полягає у виявленні відображення прогресивних архітектурних та містобудівних тенденцій початку ХХ століття в архітектурі житлових комплексів: концепції міста-саду, будинку-комуни та житлового комбінату. Містобудівне планування адміністративного центру Харкова, де житлові квартали відокремлені від адміністративно-ділової зони широким зеленим бульваром, реалізує концепцію міста-саду. Своєю чергою, «Червоний промисловець» і «Будинок спеціалістів» втілюють ідею житлового комбінату, а «Новий побут» частково реалізує концепцію будинку-комуни.

Актуальність статті обумовлена необхідністю збереження архітектурної спадщини як важливої складової сучасної європейської стратегії, що є ключовим фактором для розуміння цінності історичних ландшафтів й архітектурних пам'яток. Документування архітектурної та містобудівної спадщини Харкова, особливо періоду його активного розвитку, є надзвичайно важливим для збереження унікальних пам'яток та їхнього подальшого вивчення, адже ці об'єкти відображають не тільки історію міста, але й прогресивні архітектурні концепції ХХ століття. **Висновки.** Столичний період Харкова став одним із найплідніших, перетворивши місто на осередок ранньомодерністських комплексів. У 1920–1930-х роках у місті виник новий адміністративний центр з житловими районами, що втілювали варіанти концепцій «будинку-комуни» та «міста-саду». Комплекси «Новий побут», «Червоний промисловець» і «Будинок спеціалістів» демонструють еволюцію концепції «житлового комбінату» – житлових будинків з обслуговуванням. У статті досліджено історію трьох житлових кварталів, зокрема «Новий побут», який втілює концепцію «будинку-комуни», та «Червоний промисловець» і «Будинок спеціалістів», що репрезентують концепцію «житлового комбінату». Упродовж всього існування, житловий комплекс «Новий побут» зазнав найбільших просторових змін у часі, тоді як інші два залишилися без значних перебудов у структурі та вигляді. Результати дослідження сприятимуть збереженню унікальних житлових кварталів центральної частини Харкова, інтеграції їх до стратегій пам'яткоохоронної діяльності та підвищенню їхньої цінності.

**Ключові слова:** Харків, модернізм, житловий район за Держпромом, місто-сад, житловий комбінат, будинок-комуна, композиційні та функціональні особливості.

**Problematisation.** The relevance of this work is caused by the need to preserve and revitalize modernist public and residential buildings and complexes in eastern Ukraine, and especially in the Kharkiv region, as an integral part of the

architectural, cultural, and historical context of the region. The tendency of densification of historical buildings with objects of contemporary architecture that emerged in the 21st century is also observed in the spatial environment of the behind Derzhprom

(State Industry Building) ensemble. These days, we can witness with our own eyes the destruction of the historical morphology of residential blocks and the stylistic homogeneity of buildings. In addition, today, during the full-scale war waged by Russia against Ukraine, architectural monuments are under threat of destruction from bombing, and one of the most pressing issues is the preservation of documentary evidence and descriptions of the cultural heritage of Ukraine, and Kharkiv in particular. Undoubtedly, the administrative center of Kharkiv the capital period and the residential area behind it are objects of cultural and historical value that are subject to documentation and analysis.

An interesting fact is that the area behind the State Industry Building, despite the unified urban planning plan, became a kind of "testing ground" on which different theories, narratives and, as a consequence, typologies were practiced. Undoubtedly, this fact is worthy of a separate study, since it was undeservedly forgotten and was not shown in the studies devoted to this period of the blossoming of constructivism in the Kharkiv the capital.

#### **Analysis of recent research and publications.**

The archival documents of the Kharkiv State Architectural Archive [1] and other archives of Ukraine [2] became one of the most significant sources for studying and documenting the architecture of early modernism in Kharkiv. The important source of information was the works of O. Bouryak [3], O. Remizova [4], O. Shvydenko [5], S. Smolenska [6], L. Kachemtseva [7] and others. The issues on the historic environment of the city are described in works of L. Prybiega [8] and many other prominent scholars. For the purpose of writing this paper, the publications of scientists covering the specifics of professional work during the architectural avant-garde [9–11], graphic materials and facts presented in literary and historical sources published in the 1930s [12–17] are significant. The work draws on the proposals and materials of discussions on the development of a new way of life in the Ukrainian SSR, which were covered in the publications of H. Heorhiievskiyi [12], O. Polotskiy [14; 15], A. Hinzburh [16] and others, and also includes sources on the construction of a new administrative and residential district in Kharkiv in the 1920s and 1930s [17], archival photos [18], and photo databases [19].

**The purpose of the publication** is to highlight the history of the creation, formation, and specifics of the residential blocks of Novyi Pobut (New Life), Chervonyi Promyslovets (Red Industrialist), and Budynok Spetsialistiv (House of Specialists) in the context of the creation of the administrative

metropolitan center of Kharkiv in 1920–1930s and to identify the concepts that were implemented in these districts and the administrative and residential center of Kharkiv. To work out the set goal, a systematic logical-genetic approach was used.

This approach allowed for a comprehensive study of the residential area behind the State Industry Building, tracing its development from an administrative center to housing and service systems for workers. It also examined the impact of early 20th-century social and urbanistic concepts, as well as Soviet narratives, on the formation of various residential typologies. Additionally, it identified key components that exemplified early Soviet architectural theories. The research involved a historiographic study of literary and documentary sources, along with the systematic organization of information to summarize findings.

**Main material.** In the 1920s and 1930s, Kharkiv became an experimental site for the development of the new capital in general and for the construction of a number of well-known early modernist complexes. Among them, one of the most striking was the new republican administrative centre with its large Dzerzhynskiyi Square (now Svobody Square) and the unique residential blocks adjacent to it. A competition for the planning of the administrative centre of Kharkiv was held in 1923–1924 and the proposal of V. K. Trotsenko was accepted for implementation, with the design of a large square stretching from east to west, ending in a circular shape, and a system of radial circular streets in the area between Klochkivskiyi Spusk, the slopes of Shatylyvskiyi Ravine, and the future Novyi Avenue (today: Nauky Ave.). The layout of the new district was based on the radial-ring principle of E. Howard's garden city [11]. The street system emphasized the compositional significance of the circular part of the square and the spatial relationship between the Building of State Industry and the surrounding area. A wide green boulevard separated the residential areas from the new business centre. A large strip of botanical gardens, a zoo, and a park closed the slopes of the district to the west. The project implemented the idea of a circular square adjacent to the city park along Veterynna str. (now Svobody str.), with radial development of administrative buildings and residential blocks organised around its perimeter. The main thoroughfares divided the new residential area into separate blocks that stretched northwest from Svobody Square and formed radial sectors. Three main buildings formed the perimeter of the circular square: The State Industry Building (architects S. Serafimov, S. Kravets, M. Felger, engineer

P. Rottert), the House of Projects (architects S. Serafimov, M. Zandberg-Serafimova) and the House of Cooperation (architects O. Dmitriev, O. Muntz), which were to concentrate all the republican ministries and institutions that had previously been scattered throughout the city.

The need for housing to accommodate employees of numerous institutions led to residential areas being located within both historical and new administrative centers. The residential complexes were strategically placed within a fifteen-minute walk from workplaces, aligning with the concept of proximity. The complex behind the State Industry Building extended the new administrative and business center of Svobody Square, completing the ensemble's composition. These residential complexes were constructed between 1926 and 1937 [5; 9].

The project for the administrative center and the development of residential blocks in the northwest hill area planned 14 residential blocks bordered by the green belt of the University, Botanical and Zoological Gardens, and former university lands. These blocks followed a new design principle, with buildings on the periphery and the remaining space dedicated to green areas, swimming pools, and green streets. Unlike traditional blocks, this open design allowed for ample sunlight and air, creating "lung-gardens." Centralized services unified various block designs, a concept still visible in the Chervonyi Promyslovets and Chervonyi Khimik (Red Chemist) buildings [19].

Blocks of residential buildings and complexes with a communal sector were built up with sectional residential buildings of 3 to 7 storeys high, which included all types of services. A network of service enterprises was created in the area: a cinema club, two children's centres, three secondary schools, and a factory kitchen. The buildings were equipped with lifts, centralised heating and electricity. One of the first buildings on the territory to be constructed by the State Industry Committee was the block of houses with consumer services, the Chervonyi Brodylnyk (Red Fermenter) and Chervonyi Kondyter (Red Confectioner – Kofok), and the GPU (State Political Administration) Workers' House (all built in 1928). In the early 1930s, there were the Profrobitnyk (Trade worker) (1930), Lypnevyi Plenum (July Plenum), Chervonyi Partisan (Red Partisan), Chervonyi Promyslovets, Chervonyi Tabachnyk (Red Tobacconist), Chervonyi Khimik (1931), the Five-Year Plan in Three Years, the first buildings of Novyi Pobut (1932), and Budynok Spetsialistiv (1934–36), Shveynyk (Sewer), Voened (Military leaders) (1937) etc.

In the following years, before the outbreak of the Second World War, several dozen residential buildings and complexes were built, among which the Chervonyi Promyslovets (1929–1931, architect S. Kravets) should be highlighted, which occupies almost the entire huge block along the arc of Nezalezhnosti Ave. between the radial streets of J. Zoifer (First Radial or A. Barbusse) and L. Kurbas (Second Radial), and the Budynok Spetsialistiv (1934–1936, architect L. Lemysh), which covers the block between Nauky Avenue, Nezalezhnosti Avenue, L. Kurbas str., and B. Chychybabin str. (Second Ring Road or VIII Congress of Soviets of the USSR). They represented residential complexes with additional social and domestic functions.

In the relatively short period of Kharkiv's capital, significant changes in spatial planning schemes and approaches to the design of the urban living environment have been recorded, which are reflected in the residential complexes of these years, primarily those built by the State Industry Building. In order to maximise the ventilation of the block, the block of the Chervonyi Promyslovets complex has an atrium space and is representative of perimeter development, as is the development of the residential buildings and neighbourhoods closest to it: Chervonyi Tabachnyk, Chervonyi Drukar, Shveynyk (Sewer) etc. The Budynok Spetsialistiv residential complex is already showing the first signs of free planning: the plate houses have been pushed into the middle of the block, and two squares cover the block only from the side of Nauky Ave. and L. Kurbas St.

Instead of a block with a peripheral arrangement of residential buildings and a market building in the centre, a block with through ventilation of courtyards was built, consisting of five residential buildings-plates of the Novyi Pobut complex standing in parallel – an example of experimental row housing.

Considering the issue of the functional content of residential complexes broadly, at the level of concepts, in the context of housing construction that unfolded in Kharkiv, it should be noted that from the mid-1920s to the first half of the 1930s, four successive stages can be distinguished in housing construction: "garden city", "house-commune", "residential combine" and "socialist city", and three of them can be traced in the area behind the Derzhprom. Here we can see the planning principle of a garden city with a clear separation of residential areas by radial streets and ring boulevards. The "Red Industrialist" and the "House of Specialists" exemplified the transitional concept of

the "residential combine" – a step from communal houses toward socialist cities. These complexes, designed as house-quarters, integrated extensive service functions within a single residential area or building [9]. The idea of the house-commune did not take root in Kharkiv, but a partial embodiment of this concept can be seen in the example of residential complexes of the late 1920s, which were supposed to be a transitional stage to the future communist socialisation of everyday life. The debate "New Life – New Man" which took place at Depo-October in Kharkiv in May 1930, was a landmark event. Socialist culture envisaged the destruction of self-interest, collective cooperation based on the community, and the predominance of collective interests over personal, family, and household interests. This was to be achieved through two branches: the liberation of women from housework and the creation of an extensive system of pre-school, school and vocational education, leisure and self-education systems. Such a radical restructuring of everyday life and leisure became the basis for the creation of a new type of housing, catering facilities, and consumer services [16, 17].

The answer was the complex of buildings "Novyi Pobut" (1930–1932, architect M. Pokorny), in the block bounded by the modern Danilevskoho str. (XIV Congress of Soviets of the USSR), Kultury str. (Barachnyi Lane, which bordered Shatylivskiy Yar to the north), and Nauky Avenue (Novyi Avenue or Lenin Avenue). The site had a trapezoidal shape with a curved base on the slopes of the Shatylivskiy ravine. In its northwestern part, there was a tram traction substation building (probably circa 1928) and a two-storey kindergarten building. The majority of the block to the north and east was occupied by the residential complex "Za Novyi Pobut" (For New Life), while the buildings of the district kitchen factory and a secondary school were planned to be located in the south.

The original residential complex comprised several parallel buildings, representing a new approach to block development in the Kharkiv city center (reconstruction scheme, 1932). Five residential buildings were aligned in rows parallel to Nauky Avenue. The spacing between Buildings 1, 2, and 3 (to count from Nauky Av.), and between Buildings 4 and 5, equals two façade heights, approximately 30 meters. The gap between Buildings 3 and 4 is doubled, allowing for a spacious courtyard park. Buildings 1 and 2 form a six-story, twelve-section structure, 158 meters long, fronting Nauky Avenue. The building features three wide staircase and lift

blocks in the third, sixth, and eleventh sections, while the remaining sections have narrow staircases serving up to the fifth floor. The building is divided into two asymmetrical parts, with glass stairwells acting as dividing elements. The roof overhangs extend significantly beyond the walls, and horizontal divisions are subtly marked by façade rods at the first and top floors. The building's ends feature corner balconies from the third to sixth floors. The courtyard-facing façade lacks horizontal divisions, with rows of square windows interrupted by narrow, paired ones.

Buildings 3 and 4, each 122 meters long, have nine sections, with two equipped with lifts. Their façade design mirrors that of Building 1. Building 5, a twelve-section structure, is five stories tall and lacks lifts. From the first to the fifth floors, two- and three-bedroom apartments were designed with toilets but no bathrooms or kitchens. The sixth floor had a corridor layout with rooms for communal living, meetings, study, dining, and clubs. The communal kitchen and dining room were located in a nearby four-story building. Additional facilities included communal bathhouses, dormitories for singles, a boiler room, laundry, bicycle and motorcycle garage, children's shelter, and nursery.

Over time, the Novyi Pobut block has undergone the greatest changes. The sixth building of the Novyi Pobut, added later, closes the space of the block from the north, in the gap between the 3rd and 4th buildings. It was placed perpendicular to the five main buildings of the block in order to correct the flaws in the original layout.

In 1938, a transverse building (Building 6, designed by architect L. G. Lyubarsky) was added between Buildings 3 and 4 in the Novyi Pobut block, closing off the wide green space of the central courtyard. This building was introduced to eliminate inconvenient through passages created by the original row layout. Building 6 is a multi-apartment structure consisting of four sections: the two lateral sections have entrances facing the courtyard, while the two central sections face outward. Unlike the austere early modernist façades, Building 6 features richer architectural details, including loggias and bay windows.

A pedestrian alley separates the southern section of the Novyi Pobut block, where a factory kitchen and evening school were originally planned. However, due to a shift in priorities around 1933–1934, these were replaced by a flight school, built according to the standard design for narrow plots (School Project 1937, series 108A/B). Several such schools were constructed in Kharkiv,

including one at 99 Klochkivska Street. The flight school building, also housing the Novyi Pobut home kitchen, has four floors and was initially L-shaped. A western wing was added postwar, and the building was later converted for judicial use. The façades facing Nauky Avenue and Chychybabin Street are designed in Stalinist neo-classical style with Art Deco elements. The first three floors are plastered with faux French rustic stone. The main entrance on Nauky Avenue features a four-columned portico.

The school at 11 Chychybabin Street (now Secondary School No. 131) was built in 1936 following the Ukrainian SSR's standard design No. 103 for a secondary school for 880 students (architect E. Kodnir). The monumental 14,532-square-meter building has a central three-story section flanked by two four-story towers, with a two-story rear extension. The towers house the lobby, canteen, administration, laboratories, and a library, while classrooms with recreational spaces occupy the central part. Similar schools were built in cities like Horlivka, Kyiv, Mariupol, and Odesa, with the design often adapted to incorporate classical architectural forms.

The early 1930s residential complexes, **Chervonyi Promyslovets** and **Budynok Spetsialistiv**, exemplified the residential combine concept. These developments incorporated extensive service functions within a single residential complex or building, reflecting the evolving urban planning ideals of the period. These complexes envisaged fully communalised catering, full coverage of children by nurseries and kindergartens, full coverage of residents by food distributors, and premises for cars, bicycles, and motorcycles. The functional content of the **Chervonyi Promyslovets** complex was certainly not purely residential and had additional functions. The first floors of the buildings along the perimeter of the complex, located on Nezalezhnosti Avenue and L. Kurbas str., had elements of consumer services: a kindergarten, shops and other public facilities were located on the first and second floors. It is known that the ground floor even accommodated school No. 105, which was later moved to Danilevskoho str. in a separate building. In the **Budynok Spetsialistiv**, the majority of the ground floor premises facing Nezalezhnosti Av., Nauky Av. and B. Chychybabin St. were given over to retail and service functions.

The **Chervonyi Promyslovets** residential complex at 5 Nezalezhnosti Avenue was built between 1929 and 1931 for employees of the State Industry House. Constructed by Ukrpaybud under a contract with the Ukrainian State Joint Stock

Company Chervonyi Promyslovets, the project was initially proposed by architects S. Kravets and A. Linetsky. Ultimately, S. Kravets's design, with some modifications, was selected. Kravets, who also co-designed the State Industry Building, designed the Chervonyi Promyslovets complex, which occupies nearly an entire block in the residential area behind the State Industry Building.

The complex is situated in the first row of residential blocks, identified as Block 2 in the 1930 master plan, directly across from the State Industry Building [18]. It spans a large block along Nezalezhnosti Avenue, bordered by Y. Zoifer and L. Kurbas streets, and consists of two buildings separated by entrances to a vast courtyard park. One building faces Nezalezhnosti Avenue, Y. Zoifer, and L. Kurbas streets, while the other faces L. Kurbas and Borys Chychybabin streets. The complex varies in height: the corner sections are 7 stories, while the sections facing Nezalezhnosti Avenue and B. Chychybabin Street are 5 stories. The 7-story sections have elevators, and although lift shafts were also included in the 5-story sections, they were primarily intended for storage use.

Due to the slope from Nezalezhnosti Avenue to Chychybabin and Zoifer streets, the semi-basement level at the building's corners becomes a full ground floor, giving the structure the appearance of an 8-story building. The first building, facing Nezalezhnosti Avenue, has a symmetrical "U" shape. The façade features a dynamic rhythm of recessed and extended sections, culminating in 7-story towers at the corners and continuing with 6- and 7-story sections along L. Kurbas and Yu. Chychybabin streets. This rhythmic alternation creates a plastic and expressive silhouette, echoing the compositional language of the State Industry Building, particularly in its recessed central section. The ground and semi-basement floors along Nezalezhnosti Avenue are slightly recessed, with risalits imitating columns, evoking the State Industry Building and one of Le Corbusier's five principles: a building on columns. This effect is enhanced by larger ground-floor windows compared to those on the upper floors, although other modernist principles such as linear glazing, a universal plan, and a rooftop garden were not implemented. Originally, however, a horizontal roof was intended for this complex [1]. The second building in the complex features a long, five-story façade facing B. Chychybabin Street and a short, seven-story façade facing L. Kurbas Street. Unlike the first building, where rhythmic plasticity is present on both outer and courtyard facades,

this building's rhythmic design is primarily on the courtyard-facing façade. The B. Chychybabin Street façade is smooth, with vertical glazed openings only in the stairwells, which were designed as through-passages, creating a rhythmic effect similar to the State Industry Building.

The ground floors along Nezalezhnosti Avenue and L. Kurbas Street housed various public amenities, including a kindergarten, shops, and other services. After the war, the ground floor even hosted a school temporarily. The semi-basement of the first building, fully above ground, was initially used as a temporary kindergarten until the second building was completed. Additional facilities included a housing office, a temporary dining room, and a dormitory. The basement housed a central boiler room and storage spaces [1]. The residential component of Chervonyi Promyslovets consisted of 292 apartments, ranging from three to five rooms each, with kitchens and one bathroom. Room sizes varied from 15 to 20 square meters. During construction in 1930, some of the originally public spaces in the second building were converted into residential areas.

The **Budynok Spetsialistiv** complex was located in the first strip of residential blocks and, according to the 1930 master plan of the entire residential area. It was constructed between 1934 and 1936 and originally intended for the staff of the House of Projects. However, the concept evolved, and the building became home to a professional elite, including scientists, doctors, lawyers, artists, and physicists. The first building was completed in May 1934, with the final three finished by 1936.

Occupying a large block between Nauky Avenue, L. Kurbas Street, Nezalezhnosti Avenue, and B. Chychybabin Street, the complex features two C-shaped buildings that span Nauky Avenue and L. Kurbas Street. Between these are two parallel, seven-story linear buildings, while the C-shaped buildings are five stories high, with rounded corners and only four floors along the avenues, creating a distinct architectural rhythm. These corners housed sculptors' studios, with large windows and high ceilings. The building along L. Kurbas Street has an additional floor due to the sloping terrain. The design promotes natural ventilation and sunlight exposure for all apartments due to the block's 15-20-degree rotation from the north [9]. The residential complex has 26 entrances: three for the plate buildings and ten for each of the "C" buildings. Each entrance was equipped with an elevator, staffed by an operator. Stairwells, naturally lit, typically served two apartments with through ventilation, bathrooms,

toilets, and insulation. The complex comprises 291 apartments, each with four to five rooms; the five-room units included a maid's room. The ground floors along Nezalezhnosti Avenue housed shops and services, including a library with a reading room, a music school, a club for events, and various stores and services such as a savings bank, a polyclinic branch, and a kindergarten. The complex also offered amenities like laundry and dry cleaning facilities [20].

Over time, significant changes in spatial planning and functionality were introduced, particularly in the postwar period, shifting from perimeter development to free planning in the 1960s and 1970s. However, these changes affected the architectural integrity of the complex, especially the Novyi Pobut, where modifications in 1939 altered facade elements, and postwar developments further changed the block's layout. A severe fire in 1987 led to the collapse of one building, replaced by the Sloboda Manor complex.

In recent decades, self-initiated modifications, such as glazed balconies and attached storefronts, have further altered the facade aesthetics. Despite these changes, the Chervonyi Promyslovets and Budynok Spetsialistiv complexes have retained their original residential and service functions, although the facades have been significantly altered.

**Conclusions.** The capital period in Kharkiv's architectural history was among its most fruitful, turning the city into an experimental hub for world-famous early modernist complexes. From the mid-1920s to the 1930s, a new metropolitan center emerged, featuring administrative buildings and a distinctive residential area that embodied cutting-edge concepts such as the "house-commune," "residential combine," and "garden city." The New Governmental Center, anchored by the State Industry Building, was designed to house numerous republican institutions. This concentration of institutions required nearby housing for employees, strategically located within walking distance of both historical and new administrative centers. The residential areas were separated from high-speed roads by green belts, reflecting the garden city ideal. The residential blocks behind the State Industry Building, developed in the late 1920s, included extensive social services, nearly all of which were implemented. The Novyi Pobut, Chervonyi Promyslovets, and Budynok Spetsialistiv complexes became remarkable examples of serviced residential buildings.

The article explores the history and unique features of these three residential blocks,

demonstrating their role in realizing key urban concepts. The Novyi Pobut complex partially embodies the "house-commune" concept, with residential buildings featuring apartments without full kitchens, complemented by a factory kitchen and service sector both within and beyond the block. Chervonyi Promyslovets and Budynok Spetsialistiv represent the broader "residential combine" concept, offering fully-equipped apartments alongside a wide range of social and household services within the complex itself.

The Novyi Pobut complex has experienced the most significant changes over its existence, impacting its spatial and functional structure. In contrast, the other two complexes have not seen substantial alterations in their compositional, spatial, or functional aspects. Over the past three decades, the most noticeable changes have occurred in the plasticity of the facades across all three

complexes, as the original appearance of historic buildings is still not widely recognized as a value in Ukrainian society.

The results of the study can be used to develop programmes for the preservation and restoration of residential blocks designed behind the Derzhprom in Kharkiv, which are unique examples of architectural and urban planning concepts of the early twentieth century. In particular, the identification of a progressive idea consisting of a spatial framework within the idea of a 'garden city' and its filling with experimental objects from 'house-communes' to 'residential combines'. This will not only enhance the value of these individual buildings as cultural heritage sites but also contribute to a holistic perception of the spatial and temporal context of the entire district behind Derzhprom. It will facilitate their integration into modern heritage conservation strategies.

#### References

1. Chervonyi promyslovets [Red Industrialist]. (1930). F. 1777 (Op. 2, Spr. 178), Derzhavnyi arkhiv Kharkivskoi oblasti [State Archive of Kharkiv Region], Kharkiv, Ukraina [in Ukrainian].
2. Garanin, O., Gorbatiuk, M. & Shnurovska, L. (2012). *Arkhivy Ukrainy : Putivnyk 2012* [Archives of Ukraine: Guidebook 2012]. Interkontynental-Ukraina [in Ukrainian].
3. Buriak, A. & Rusanowa, M. (2022). Garage of the People's Commissars' Council in the "Kommunar" complex in Kharkiv – architectural monument of Ukrainian Constructivism History and present. *Modernism in Europe – modernism in Gdynia, Industrial, port and urban architecture of the 20th century*, 8, 266–273 [in English].
4. Remizova, O. (2020). Ideia ploshchi Svobody v Kharkovi ta yii znyschennia. Vidnovliuuchy vtrachene [The idea of the freedom square in Kharkiv and its destruction. Recovering the Lost]. *Doslidzhennia, dokumentatsiia ta vtrachene poskodzhennykh ta perebudovanykh pamiatok suchasnoi arkhitektury* [Research, Documentation, and Restoration of Damaged and Reconstructed Monuments of Modern Architecture] (s. 43–46) [in Ukrainian].
5. Shvydenko, O. (2018). Budivlia Narodnoho komisariatu pratsi v Kharkovi yak obiekt kulturnoi spadshchyny Ukrainy [The building of people's commissariat of labor in Kharkiv as an object of the cultural heritage of Ukraine]. *Naukovyi visnyk budivnytstva* [Scientific Bulletin of Construction], 93(3), 104–110 [in Ukrainian].
6. Smolenska, S. (2022). Selected issues of preserving the historical environment of residential complexes of the 1920s-1930s in Ukraine. *Fortifications*, 16, 32–39 [in English].
7. Kachemtseva, L., Khorodian, N. & Soloviov, Ye. (2020). Budynok pratsivnykiv osvity v Kharkovi. Istoriia stvorennia ta suchasnyi stan [The House of Education Workers in Kharkiv. History of creation and current state]. *Povertaiuchy Vtrachene: Doslidzhennia, Dokumentuvannia ta Vidnovlennia Poskodzhennykh i Perebudovanykh Pamiatok Suchasnoi Arkhitektury* [Recovering the Lost: Research, Documentation, and Restoration of Damaged and Reconstructed Monuments of Modern Architecture], (s. 52–53) [in Ukrainian].
8. Prybieha, L. (2022). Istorychne seredovyshe mista: sutnist i zasady okhorony [The Historic environment of the city: the essence and principles of protection]. *Natsionalna Ukrainska Akademiia Mystetstva. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats «Ukrainska Akademiia Mystetstva»* [Ukrainian Academy of Art: research and scientific and methodological proceedings], 30, 14–20 [in Ukrainian].
9. Didenko, K. (2023). *Sotsialno-zhytlovi prohramy v arkhitekturi stolychnoho Kharkova* [Social and residential programs in the architecture of the capital city of Kharkiv]. UKRLOGOS Group [in Ukrainian].
10. Gella, O. (2023). The ideas of "social condensers" and their realization in the architectural and urban planning practice of Kharkiv in the 1920s and 30s. *The 23rd Int. Scientific and Practical Conf. The Influence of Society on the Development of Science and the Invention of new methods*, 13–16 June 2023e (s. 28–30) [in English].
11. Gella, O., & Kachemtseva, L. (2016). Vplyv utopichnykh idei na mistobudivnu praktyku Kharkova 1920–1930-kh rokiv [The influence of utopian ideas on urban planning practice in Kharkiv in the 1920s and 1930s]. *Naukovyi visnyk budivnytstva* [Scientific Bulletin of Construction], 93(3), 41–49 [in Ukrainian].



12. *Kodeks pravyl planuvannia naselenykh punktiv: proekt instruktсии, shcho maie buty vydanyi na rozvytok Statutu tsyvilnoho budivnytstva 1930 roku* [Code of rules for planning settlements: draft instructions to be issued to develop the 1930 Statute of Civil Engineering] (1930). Derzhavne Vydavnytstvo Ukrainy [in Ukrainian].
13. Heorhiievskiy, H. (1930). Zhytlove budivnytstvo v Ukraini u 1920-1930 [Housing construction in Ukraine in 1929–30]. *Hospodarstvo Ukrainy [Economy of Ukraine]*, 2, 80–90 [in Ukrainian].
14. Polotskiy, O. (1930). Nove zhyttia – nova liudyna. Vystup na dyskusii v depo «Zhovten» u Kharkovi [New life – new man. Speech at the discussion at Depot Zhovten in Kharkiv]. *Chervonyi shliakh [Kharkiv the Red Way]*, 5/6, 186–195 [in Ukrainian].
15. Polotskiy, O. (1930). Nove zhyttia – nova liudyna [New life – new man] [Zaklichennia]. *Chervonyi shliakh [The Red Way]*, 7/8, 177–184 [in Ukrainian].
16. Hinzburh, A. (1930). Pro zasnovannia u m. Kharkovi Naukovo-doslidnoho instytutu rozvytku mist [On the establishment in Kharkiv of the Scientific and Research Institute of Urban Development]. *Hospodarstvo Ukrainy [Economy of Ukraine]*, 4, 178–187 [in Ukrainian].
17. Kondrashenko, F. (1930). Proektuvannia administratyvnoho tsentru ta skhemy zhytlovoi zabudovy v raioni ploshchi Dzerzhynskoho v Kharkovi [Design of the administrative center and residential development scheme near Dzerzhynsky Square in Kharkiv]. *Nova generatsiia [New Generation]*, 1, 28–32 [in Ukrainian].
18. Retro View of Mankind's Habitat (2009). *Retro photos of Kharkiv*. [https://pastvu.com/ps?f=r!2282\\_s!5](https://pastvu.com/ps?f=r!2282_s!5) (Accessed: 31 July 2024)
19. Photo Buildings. Architectural Photobase. *Kharkiv*. (2015). <https://photobuildings.com/list.php?cid=70> (Accessed: 31 July 2024)
20. Didenko, K. & Gella, O. (2023). Zhitlovi Kompleksy Za Derzhpromom u Strukturi Stolychnoho Administratyvnoho Tsentru Kharkova 1920–1930 rr. [Residential Complexes built behind the State Industry Building in the structure of the capital's administrative centre of Kharkiv in the 1920s and 1930s]. *Komunalne Hospodarstvo Mist [Scientific Bulletin of Construction]*, 6 (180), 51–60 [in Ukrainian].

#### Список використаних джерел

1. Червоний промисловець. Документ. 1930 // ДАХО (Державний архів Харківської області). Ф. 1777. Оп. 2. Спр. 178.
2. Гаранін О., Горбатюк М., Шнуровська Л. Архіви України : путівник 2012. Київ : Інтерконтиненталь-Україна, 2012.
3. Buriak A., Rusanowa M. Garage of the People's Commissars' Council in the “Kommunar” complex in Kharkiv – architectural monument of Ukrainian Constructivism History and present. *Modernism in Europe – modernism in Gdynia, Industrial, port and urban architecture of the 20th century*. 2022. Vol. 8. P. 266–273.
4. Ремізова О. Ідея площі Свободи в Харкові та її знищення. Відновлюючи втрачене. *Дослідження, документація та втрачене пошкоджених та перебудованих пам'яток сучасної архітектури*. 2020. С. 43–46.
5. Швиденко О. Будівля нового Комісаріату Праці в Харкові як об'єкт культурної спадщини України. *Науковий вісник будівництва*. 2018. № 93(3). С. 104–110.
6. Smolenska S. Selected issues of preserving the historical environment of residential complexes of the 1920s–1930s in Ukraine. *Fortifications*. 2022. Vol. 16. P. 32–39.
7. Качемцева Л., Хороян Н., Соловійов Є. Будинок працівників освіти в Харкові. *Історія створення та сучасний стан. Відновлення втраченого: Дослідження, документування та відновлення пошкоджених та реконструйованих пам'яток сучасної архітектури*. 2020. С. 52–53.
8. Прибега Л. Історичне середовище міста: сутність і засади охорони. *Українська академія мистецтва : дослідн. та наук.-метод. пр.* 2022. Вип. 30. С. 14–20.
9. Діденко К. Соціально-житлові програми в архітектурі столичного Харкова. Вінниця : UKRLOGOS Group, 2023. 180 с.
10. Gella O. The ideas of «social condensers» and their realization in the architectural and urban planning practice of Kharkiv in the 1920s and 30s. *The 23rd Int. Scientific and Practical Conf. The Influence of Society on the Development of Science and the Invention of new methods*, 13–16 June 2023e. Prague, 2023. P. 28–30.
11. Гелла О. І., Качемцева Л. В. Вплив утопічних ідей на містобудівну практику в Харкові у 1920–30-х рр. *Науковий вісник будівництва*. 2018. С. 41–49.
12. Вищий технічно-будівельний комітет при НКВС УСРР. Звід правил планування населених пунктів: проект інструкції, що має бути виданий на розвиток Статуту цивільного будівництва 1930 року. Харків : Одеса : Державне видавництво України, 1930.
13. Георгієвський Г. Житлове будівництво в Україні 1929-30. *Господарство України*. 1930. № 2. С. 80–90.
14. Полоцькій О. Новий побут – нова людина. Промова на дискусії депо «Жовтень» в Харкові. *Червоний шлях*. 1930. № 5–6. С. 177–184.

15. Полоцькій О. Новий побут – нова людина : заключення. *Червоний шлях*. 1930. №. 7–8. С. 186–195.
16. Гінзбург О. Про заснування у м. Харкові Науково-дослідного інституту розвитку міст. *Господарство України*. 1930. № 4. С. 178–186.
17. Кондрашенко Ф. Проект адміністративного центру і схема забудови житлового сектору навколо площі Дзержинського в Харкові. *Нова генерація*. 1929. № 1. С. 68–74.
18. *Ретро фото Харкова*. Retro View of Mankind's Habitat – Gallery (2009). [https://pastvu.com/ps?f=r!2282\\_s!5](https://pastvu.com/ps?f=r!2282_s!5) (Отримано: 31 липня 2024)
19. Photo Buildings. Architectural Photobase. *Харків*. (2015). <https://photobuildings.com/list.php?cid=70> (Отримано: 31 липня 2024)
20. Діденко К., Гелла О. Житлові комплекси за Держпромом у структурі столичного адміністративного центру Харкова 1920–1930-х рр. *Комунальне господарство міст*. 2023. Вип. 180. С. 51–60.

*Подано до редакції 13.08.2024*