

FORMATION OF STYLE IN THE RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURE OF ALMATY IN THE 1930S–1950S: SEARCH FOR A NEW COURSE AND THE PROBLEM OF CHOICE

T.Y. Karatseyeva^{1,*} , A.T. Akhmedova¹ , S.V. Ilvitskaya² 

¹International Educational Corporation, 050028, Almaty, Kazakhstan

²State University of Land Use Planning, 103064, Moscow, Russia

Abstract. *Alongside the urgent need to address large-scale urban population growth and adapt housing to the natural and climatic conditions of the region, the first attempts to incorporate elements of the national architectural heritage emerged from the mid-1930s in Alma-Ata, leaving a distinctive mark on the city's residential architecture. Through the analysis, generalisation, and synthesis of theoretical and historical sources - primarily the works of architects and eyewitness researchers of the period - this study explores the directions of theoretical searches for a new architectural course in connection with the formation of Kazakhstan's regional style. Examples of residential buildings in Alma-Ata of the 1930s and early 1950s are presented to illustrate the practical embodiment of the "synthesis of the arts", reflected in regional elements of residential architecture and in the broader organisation of the city's living environment. The article examines methods of shaping the residential environment in Alma-Ata and identifies approaches to creating a harmonious, identity-reflective urban environment through regional stylistic features. These include the incorporation of architectural details such as cornices, balconies, and loggias; landscaping and irrigation of residential quarters; the integration of ornamental compositions as a link with national cultural traditions; and, more generally, the creation of coherent urban ensembles and interiors. The findings of the study may be applied to the contemporary formation of the residential environment of modern Almaty.*

Keywords: *housing architecture, regional style, synthesis of arts, urban living environment, Almaty.*

***Corresponding author**

Tatsiana Karatseyeva, e-mail: ta29ko@mail.ru

<https://doi.org/10.51488/1680-080X/2025.3-02>

Received 04 July 2025; Revised 20 August 2025; Accepted 09 September 2025

1930–1950-ЖЫЛДАРЫ АЛМАТЫНЫҢ ТҰРҒЫН ҮЙ СӘУЛЕТІНДЕ СТИЛЬДІҢ ҚАЛЫПТАСУЫ: ЖАҢА БАҒЫТТЫ ІЗДЕУ ЖӘНЕ ТАҢДАУ МӘСЕЛЕСІ

Т.Ю. Коротева^{1,*} , А.Т. Ахмедова¹ , С.В. Ильвицкая² 

¹Халықаралық білім беру корпорациясы, Алматы, 050028, Қазақстан

²Мемлекеттік жерге орналастыру университеті, Мәскеу, 103064, Ресей

Аңдатпа. Қала тұрғындарының ауқымды өсуі және тұрғын үй құрылысын аймақтың табиғи-климаттық жағдайына бейімдеу мәселесін шұғыл шешу қажеттілігімен қатар, 1930 жылдардың ортасында Алматыда ұлттық сәулет өнерінің элементтерін пайдаланудың алғашқы талпыныстары пайда болды, бұл қаланың тұрғын үй сәулетінде елеулі із қалдырды. Сипатталған уақыт кезеңінің сәулетшілері мен зерттеушісі – куәгерлері жариялаған теориялық және тарихи материалдарды талдау, жалпылау және синтездеу негізінде Қазақстанның өңірлік стилінің ерекшеліктерімен өзара байланыста жаңа архитектуралық бағытты теориялық іздестіру бағыттары айқындалады. Мақалада келтірілген 1930-шы жылдар мен 1950-ші жылдардың басындағы Алматы тұрғын үй ғимараттарының мысалдары тұрғын үй архитектурасының аймақтық элементтерінде және қаланың тұрғын үй ортасын ұйымдастыруда көрініс тапқан өнер синтезінің практикалық көрінісін көрсету қажеттілігімен байланысты. Мақалада Алматының тұрғын үй ортасын қалыптастыру тәсілдері талданады және сәулет элементтерін тұрғын үй ғимараттарына – карниздерді, балкондарды, лоджияларды бейнесіне қосу; тұрғын аудандарды суландыру және көгалдандыру мәселелерін шешу; ұлттық мәдени дәстүрмен байланыс элементтері ретінде сәндік композицияларды қосу сияқты өңірлік стильдің аспектілері арқылы халыққа бірдей үйлесімді тұрғын үй ортасын ұйымдастыру тәсілдері айқындалады, жалпы, қалалық ансамбль мен қалалық интерьерді құру. Зерттеудің алынған нәтижелері қазіргі Алматы қаласының тұрғын үй ортасын қалыптастыру кезінде одан әрі пайдаланылуы мүмкін.

Түйінді сөздер: тұрғын үй сәулеті, аймақтық стиль, өнер синтезі, қалалық өмір сүру ортасы, Алматы.

***Автор-корреспондент**

Татьяна Коротева, e-mail: ta29ko@mail.ru

<https://doi.org/10.51488/1680-080X/2025.3-02>

Алынды 04 шілде 2025; Қайта қаралды 20 тамыз 2025; Қабылданды 09 қыркүйек 2025

ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ СТИЛЯ В ЖИЛИЩНОЙ АРХИТЕКТУРЕ АЛМАТЫ 1930–1950-Х ГОДОВ: ПОИСК НОВОГО КУРСА И ПРОБЛЕМА ВЫБОРА

Т. Ю. Коротева^{1,*} , А.Т. Ахмедова¹ , С.В. Ильвицкая² 

¹Международная образовательная корпорация, Алматы, 050028, Казахстан

²Государственный университет по землеустройству, Москва, 103064, Россия

Аннотация. Наряду с острой необходимостью решения проблемы масштабного роста городского населения и адаптации жилищного строительства к природно-климатическим условиям региона, именно с середины 1930-х годов в Алматы появились первые попытки использования элементов национального архитектурного наследия, что оставило заметный след в жилой архитектуре города. На основе анализа, обобщения и синтеза теоретических и исторических материалов, преимущественно опубликованных зодчими и исследователями – очевидцами описываемого периода времени, выявляются направления теоретических поисков нового архитектурного курса, во взаимосвязи с особенностями регионального стиля Казахстана. Приведенные в статье примеры жилых зданий Алматы 1930-х и начала 1950-х гг. обусловлены необходимостью продемонстрировать практическое воплощение синтеза искусств, который нашел отражение в региональных элементах архитектуры жилища и организации жилой среды города. В статье анализируются приемы формирования жилой среды Алматы и выявлены подходы организации гармоничной, идентичной жилой среды посредством таких аспектов регионального стиля, как включение архитектурных элементов в образ жилого здания – карнизов, балконов, лоджий; решение вопросов обводнения и озеленения жилых кварталов; включение орнаментальных композиций в качестве элементов связи с национальной культурной традицией, и, в целом, создании городского ансамбля и городских интерьеров. Полученные результаты исследования могут быть использованы в дальнейшем при формировании жилой среды современного города Алматы.

Ключевые слова: жилищная архитектура, региональный стиль, синтез искусств, городская среда обитания, Алматы.

***Автор-корреспондент**

Татьяна Коротева, e-mail: ta29ko@mail.ru

<https://doi.org/10.51488/1680-080X/2025.3-02>

Поступило 04 июля 2025; Пересмотрено 20 августа 2025; принято 09 Сентября 2025

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS/SOURCE OF FUNDING

The research was conducted using private sources of funding.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors state that there is no conflict of interest.

АЛҒЫС / ҚАРЖЫЛАНДЫРУ КӨЗІ

Зерттеу жеке қаржыландыру көздерін пайдалана отырып жүргізілді.

МҮДДЕЛЕР ҚАҚТЫҒЫСЫ

Авторлар мүдделер қақтығысы жоқ деп мәлімдейді.

БЛАГОДАРНОСТИ/ИСТОЧНИК ФИНАНСИРОВАНИЯ

Исследование проводилось с использованием частных источников финансирования.

КОНФЛИКТ ИНТЕРЕСОВ

Авторы заявляют, что конфликта интересов нет.

1 INTRODUCTION

The 1932 resolution, entitled “On the Restructuring of Literary and Artistic Organizations”, gradually influenced the development of Almaty, albeit with some delay compared to the European part of the USSR. The neoclassical style, through which architects sought to define a “universal, timeless architectural language” (Selivanova, 2010), was closely aligned with the adopted ideology and readily accepted by the broader public. The architectural shifts of this period were intrinsically connected to the transformation of socio-political ideals, which shifted from utopian aspirations toward a more pragmatic focus on economic survival (Han-Magomedov, 2010) and competition with capitalist nations. Soviet state authorities strategically consolidated political power, aiming to regulate the economy and shape social dynamics (Kassymbekova, 2017). This alignment of architecture with state objectives fostered the consolidation of totalitarian and authoritarian systems, with construction activities entirely funded by the state. Art and architecture were proclaimed the principal instruments of Soviet power and ideology. The avant-garde movement virtually ceased to exist, as functional architecture was declared illegal and banned (Starostenko, 2021). It can be noted that the construction of projects with elements of the neoclassical style was relevant in Kazakhstan from the mid-1930s to the second half of the 1950s (Pronina, 2020).

It is important to emphasize that, when designing and discussing issues of residential architecture in the press or in speeches at Congresses, soviet architects paid wide attention to developments in the field of dwelling construction in the countries of Europe and America for example, in such issues as: residential arrangement, its functional-planning organization, placement of a car in the structure of a house, differences in building standards, identifying positive aspects that can be applied in Soviet design practice or, conversely, criticizing issues that are not suitable for adoption. For this study, the works of soviet and Kazakhstan’s architects were important: Ginzburg M., Shchusev A., Mendykulov M., Basenov T., Glaudinov B. A., as well as the articles that began to appear mainly in the periodical press (for example, Kalmykov V., Lavrov V., Rempel L.) about traditional techniques and methods of building houses in Central Asia, the principles of organization that were regarded as potentially adaptable to new construction (Zhalmagambetov et al., 2024).

The objective of the article is to present a comprehensive picture of the prerequisites, directions and outcomes of the search for a new regional style (where a regional style is a materialized subject-spatial object created on the basis of a cultivated aesthetic image and a way of life in a given area) in the architecture of a Kazakhstan’s urban residential of the 1930-1950s, as an integral part of the model of a comfortable urban living environment in Almaty in conjunction with theoretical research by soviet architects (on the synthesis of arts in architecture) and the ideological situation of the considering period (Akhmedova, 2016; Akhmedova, 2020; Akhmedova et al., 2022).

Revisiting this past - particularly the most vivid stage in the search for a national style, is highly relevant in our time, when the borders of Almaty are expanding, and the problems of a well-thought-out organization of a living environment identical to the people (Abdrassilova et al., 2024), corresponding to climatic conditions, emphasizing the conditions of the area and life, are becoming more and more relevant every year (Glaudinov et al., 1987; Samoilov, 2003; Karatseyeva et al., 2025).

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The design practice of the early 1930s began with critical views on the architecture of the previous period. Avant-garde architecture in the Soviet Union was labeled bourgeois. However, the core of soviet architecture was still “state property, a state order and an ideological orientation” (Kalashnikov, 2010). A series of resolutions led to a decline in scientific and creative discussions of architectural problems, which were entirely under the control of the authorities.

In 1929, Almaty received the status of the republic's capital. Architects were tasked with creating the image of a large capital city of Kazakhstan – the capital of the Union Republic (Posocco & Akhmedova, 2016). In Kazakhstan, the first design office, Kazgosproekt, opened in October 1930.

(**Glaudinov et al., 1987**). In 1932, the Union of Soviet Architects was established – a unifying unit of previous architectural movements and groups. This year marked a turning point in the development of Soviet architecture, which led to a complete revision values of society and ideas about the aesthetic ideal of architecture.

The main prerequisites included: the limited quantity and low quality of residential buildings, the dominance of “box” architecture, homogeneous development – the inability of the new architecture to express the real expectations and needs of society, the poverty of figurative language and the “nihilistic attitude (of architects) to architectural values” (**Soviet architecture, 1934**). Researchers also named the following prerequisites for choosing a new style of the architectural movement: the need for the style to be close to nature (**Shchusev, 1935**) and “plainness” accessible to the people; the opportunity to realize creative abilities, where “the classics give wide scope to fiction, pathos in the field of architectural creativity” (**Munc, 1940**); the universality of the language of forms, which with equal success ensured to represent both bourgeois democracies and totalitarian regimes, and was used to express the ideas of a socialist utopia. In addition, the new style was necessary for the authorities as a means of unifying an architectural activity.

In this period, the primary role was given not to residential construction, but to monumental public buildings and infrastructure facilities. At the same time, the search for an architectural socialistic image of new residential buildings (**Marcomini, 2024; Meuser & Khmelnitsky, 2021**) and planning solutions for apartments continued, however, on a smaller scale compared to the twenties. However, in practice, design and construction according to the new rules of architectural creativity found expression in the formation of an urban dwelling mainly from the aesthetic side (**Samoilov, 2005**).

The main goals that the architects set were:

- overcoming the consequences of the form-creation of the previous period;
- critical mastering of the historical heritage (**Vaskin & Nazarenko, 2009**).

Soviet architects saw the task of the new architectural style in creating an artistic image through the synthesis of arts (**Bachynska, 2021**). This image was to be interpreted from the position of social prerequisites, as a concept “complex and subtle, rather than the concept of pure rhythm and bare construction” (**Lazarev, 1937**), that is, to focus the search on the general volumes of the house, where with successfully found “proportions of spans, supporting pylons - no decoration of the wall with ornamentation or sculpture will be required” (**Fomin, 1933**). At the same time, the fundamental principles of classical architecture, which were not entirely the subject to imitation, but implied rethinking in accordance with the requirements of the era; in the fight against eclecticism, the search for new forms and new content, which “must be understood in development dialectically, ideologically and artistically as well” (**Vesnina, 1933**), through a creative functional method (**Ginzburg et al., 1934**), reflected the unity of goals, means and architectural image. Ginzburg defined the tasks of the architects of the era as follows: “To find the correct relationship between the elements of knowledge and science, to invent an artistic image on their basis, to find a synthesis of what previous eras demolished, to equip themselves in order to be able to fulfill the social order of the era” (**Ginzburg, 1933**). In other words, the aim was to create both a materially and aesthetically comfortable environment for human living.

Drawing a parallel between the architectural theme of the classical world (**Shchusev, 1937**), which was closely connected with the folk epos and the mythology of the worldview, the architect A. Shchusev concluded that the folk epic should be included in modern architecture, but with the note “its own”: “its own heroism and its own lyricism”, thereby emphasizing the importance of searching for means of national identity of architecture. The architect determined that “our heroism was the heroism of free labor, and lyricism was the one of a joyful life”. Shchusev A. also believed that the mechanical transfer of the classical heritage would give results only in conjunction with the existing worldview and ideology. This condition was expressed through the inclusion of modern attributes of the era in the art sphere in architecture - if sculptural, then of a soviet worker, and in the post-war period – the attributes of a defender, if in painting - the image of peace and harmony of the people who held victory. The inclusion of ornament and decoration in the consideration the issue of searching

for the style of architecture of Kazakhstan was reflected in the synthesis of arts, where painting, sculpture and sculptural decorative elements acted as ornament (**Glaudinova et al. 2019**).

The search for the aesthetic imagery of the building was not limited to decorative expression alone. Architects emphasised the importance of constructive means. In the architecture of a residential building, the main elements were to be “window openings, doors, balconies and bay windows, that is, the elements which are distinctive for a dwelling. Logically developing this concept, the architect must seek ways to create a new architectural style“ (**Shkvarikov, 1941**) including rethinking the original principles of construction and architecture. Architects needed to learn to adopt the knowledge of builders, their ability to understand the native landscape, the local nature, and the principles of creating complex pictorial compositions.

It is important to note that the architecture of the considering period was perceived by the authorities as a means of introducing social ideas into the consciousness of the “national masses” and had to be implemented “... in familiar, clear and understandable forms that appeal to the nationality for which it was intended” (**Kolotkov, 1935**). Thus, it functioned as a link between the architect-designer and the people, where the national style was reflected through the integration of classical and traditional architecture (**Glaudinov et al., 1987; Samoilov, 2004**). It was assumed that national architecture was most understandable to the people, and its essential features were the truthfulness and clarity of the architectural-spatial image, harmony with nature and with the social and everyday environment.

The centuries-old construction culture that was formed in the climatic conditions of Central Asia and Kazakhstan developed distinctive compositional methods, traditions and techniques that were reflected in vernacular architecture. Pre-revolutionary housing types in many Central Asian settlements shared common features that reflected the conditions of life (where the house was a hearth inaccessible to the gaze of others) – which was architecturally reflected in the complete isolation of the plan, the presence of one street entrance and blank walls surrounding a folk dwelling. In examining the traditional dwellings of the peoples of Central Asia, the architect V. Kalmykov (**Kalmykov, 1934**) identified the obvious need for new construction to reorganize the social and everyday basis of a dwelling and to reveal it in a new interpretation, using the basic compositional principles of architectural refinement of the external volume and internal spaces of folk dwellings of the region (for example, division into summer and winter parts, inclusion of internal courtyards, the contrast of almost blank walls and terraces, open and semi-open (iwans) rooms - recessed loggias, awnings, balconies).

Architects (**Dwelling architecture issues, 1936**) increasingly raised the question of the ensemble, according to which the image of a residential building should reflect the principles of spatiality and plasticity, due to the introduction of national elements into architecture. It was assumed that the principle of spatiality in the architecture of a residential building could be expressed through the richness of light and shade and the introduction of loggias, terraces, balconies, cornices and other details into the architecture of the house, creating a game of light and shade on the facade of the building. In the architecture of the East, according to Professor Rempel L. - the leading role belonged to the problem of light - from internal spaces to external planes of buildings, as well as - compliance with shadow protection and the spread of green areas, fountains, irrigation ditches in the urban environment.

The founder of architectural science in Kazakhstan, a professor of architecture Mendikulov Malgabar believed that the inclusion of traditional elements in the architecture of Kazakhstan “is appropriate in the conditions of a southern city and give variety, picturesqueness and the necessary shading to facades and other parts of the building” (**Baragin & Belocerkovskij, 1950**). Meanwhile, the development of architectural and artistic heritage in the capital of the Kazakh SSR occurred from “generalized regional to finely differentiated national in combination with internationally interpreted order forms” (**Mendikulov, 1953; Margulan et al., 1959; Samoilov, 2002**). However, in the post-war period the widespread use of classical orders in synthesis with national motifs in Almaty frequently resulted in eclectic or archaic outcomes.

3 MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research methodology is based on a comprehensive approach, which involves analysis, generalization and synthesis of literary, historical publications and articles. The selected sources, that were taken into consideration, touched the research topic, which was aimed at finding a new regional style for the formation of the residential environment of the city and an urban dwelling of Almaty in the 1930s - early 1950s from the point of view of the synthesis of arts, as a process of combining arts (including traditional elements and techniques of organizing a national dwelling) into a single artistic unit. Those sources, that most fully met the purpose and objectives of the article, were selected as cited materials.

In the context of the research, the following tasks had to be solved:

- to identify the most complete understanding of the prerequisites, directions and results of the search for a regional style, mainly in theoretical studies and publications of architects of the 1930-1950s;
- to trace the relationship between theory and practice, through the given examples of dwelling organization and the formation of the living environment of Almaty in the considering period.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In general, the large-scale development of residential buildings in Almaty during this period was concentrated along the city's main arterial roads - Furmanov, Kalinin, Stalin - the central arterial roads of the city. The dominant compositional approach was district-based development. In the organization of the city district, the task was to use the spatial solutions of folk architecture, taking into account the living and natural-climatic conditions. On the whole, in this period, the district began to be defined not as an isolated unit, but as part of the city system (acting as a group of residential complexes and as a group of residential districts surrounded by arterial roads). The development of the enlarged blocks of Almaty had to be necessarily linked to urban development tasks and combined with the tasks of improving a dwelling - landscaping, watering, connecting the house with the site - it was believed that such measures would most fully solve the problem of the architectural and artistic image of a residential building (Murzabayeva et al., 2022). At the same time, the silhouette had to be not sharply contrasting, but harmonious, thus creating a memorable architectural image. The practical implementation of the described techniques allowed the newly built dwellings to be harmoniously integrated into the structure of new urban areas, creating chamber protected spaces of residential districts and maintaining a visual connection with the distinctive foothill landscape (Pakina & Batkalova, 2020).

Meanwhile, a separate residential building, organically fitting into both the architecture of the square and the main city road, had to replicate "the compositional principles of the ensemble in miniature - centricity, symmetry, weighting towards the bottom" (Hmelnickij, 2006), and had to include elements of facade decoration in the architecture - the introduction of bas-reliefs, architectural decorative elements (arches, cornices, balconies, rustication), mosaics and paintings with a new socialist theme or newly rethought ornaments (Figure 1a, b) as decoration of external facades. Among the traditional elements in the architecture of Almaty dwelling were pointed arch, domes of different shapes, portal-pishtaqs, recessed entrances and loggias, blind plane of the wall (Nussipkozhaeva, 2020). Decorative treatments extended further to figured brickwork, ceramic cladding, and the widespread use of ornamental stone carving (Karpykov & Kakorin, 1980), alabaster, and woodwork in ornamental compositions.

Along with the ornament, decorative functions in the residential architecture appeared to be structural elements as well; they were specific for folk architecture, mainly those that best embodied the concept of "oriental style", but interpreted in a unique way. According to Figure 1, in it can be noted that in the design of the facade of the House of the Ministry of Water Management (architect Bapishev, 1950), such techniques as national ornament, lancet windows on the second floor, balconies with metal grilles and figured brackets were reflected. These techniques were a part of the creation

of an identical living environment - they reflected the reworked forms of traditional architecture in combination with the use of new building materials and the use of new technology in construction (Medykulov, 1953; Abdrassilova & Aukhadiyeva, 2025).




Figure 1 – Traditional elements of architecture in the residential architecture of Almaty in the 1930s-1950s.: a) fragment of the southern facade of the Ninth dwelling complexes; b) fragment of the eastern facade of a residential building on Uigurskaya Street; c) the northern facade of a semi-detached residential building of the House of the Ministry of Water Management (architect Bapishev), 1950. (Baragin & Belocerkovskij, 1950)

The period of creative exploration was reflected in the widespread use of porticoes, pediments, cornices, which decorated residential buildings in Almaty. At the same time, despite the rich decor and wide use of bay windows, loggias and balconies in the architecture of residential buildings as an integral part of a national dwelling, the architect Basenov believed that in such residential buildings before 1946, the rich architectural national heritage and folk art were not considered enough (Basenov, 1951). The emphasis in the search for regionalism was reduced to attention to the decorative design of external solutions, while the planning solutions for apartments, for the most part, remained typical and did not take into account either demographic or national traditions of life (Sarzhanov & Schurch, 2023).

Soviet architects maintained that the study of architectural heritage for imitation and adoption should include not only Greek and Roman motifs (international order forms), elements and composition of the building facade, but also modern architecture of America and Europe, which was expressed in the adoption of technical, design principles, and methods of the most rational use of building materials. There were also opinions that in the “search” for a new course it was necessary to include in the legacy fifteen years after the revolution: namely, “open, ventilated courtyards..., the necessary provision of natural light to living premises... the elimination of single-story buildings” (Fomin, 1933). Thus, the question of the necessity of combining the results of innovative experiments of the past period with historical national and world experience arose acutely. At the same time, it was necessary not only to “assimilate” all the results of both historical periods and modern times (positive developments of foreign countries), but also to understand them and even surpass them. With regard to the architecture of Almaty dwelling, such “understanding” was reflected through the selection of the most rational principles from traditional architecture: by including architectural and decorative details, ornamentation, and rethinking of traditional methods of organizing a dwelling, and the combination of these principles with the latest achievements - in the development of technology and everyday culture (Akhmedova et al., 2022). The use of decoration and the stylization of the order system required the appropriate proportioning of architectural details, as a result of which the external appearance of residential buildings became more solid and large-scale (Akhmedova, 2009).

Figure 2 illustrates a project of a forty-apartment residential building on Uyurskaya Street, Gogolya Street, Mechnikov Street, and Yunyh Kommunarov Street, which is successfully oriented to the cardinal points, where the kitchens and staircases were located on the western side of the building.

The apartments were equipped with built-in closets and a bathroom with a shower. The three-story building included loggias “recessed” behind the building’s façade line – important elements of a southern dwelling. The layout of the apartments called for through and corner ventilation. The facades reflected motifs of national architecture and ornamentation, embodied in the stucco motifs of the entrances and window openings, and in the architraves. The portals-entrances were designed in the form of a pointed arches.




Figure 2 – House on Uygurskaya Street (architect Bobovich), 1951-1952: a) second floor plan, section; b) the eastern facade of the building (Medykulov, 1953)

Soviet architects have repeatedly noted the importance of the issues of ensemble, composition, standardization, but in practice, to a large extent, everything was limited to the consideration of any of the listed aspects of a dwelling design. Only in a few cases all aspects of one architectural theme merged into a single composition. In this case, the house became a real object, successfully included in the whole ensemble, associated with nature, terrain, space (Alexander, 2020). In Almaty, such examples can be called the buildings of dwelling complexes along Furmanov Street (a drawing of the plan of the second floor and a fragment of the facade of the second dwelling complex are presented in Figure 3).

The placement of residential complexes of this period of construction in Almaty (the second – the ninth), created by architects according to individual projects, made it possible to create a single deep-spatial composition (Akhmedova, 2009). Residential buildings not only formed a holistic composition of the city's block development but also fenced off the interior spaces of courtyards from streets and roads, thereby serving as a powerful compositional tool for ensuring competent functional zoning. The characteristic features of the composition were: the formation of a holistic facade part of the street and the creation of a system of open comfortable spaces and territories, interconnected by means of architecture and design: taking into account the terrain (stairs, retaining walls, safe descents were thought out); considering the opposition of the complex of buildings to natural and climatic conditions through landscaping, inclusion of fountains and placement of dwelling complexes in accordance with historically formed architectural planning and urban planning solutions; design elements - by decorating courtyard spaces with small architectural forms. Large apartment blocks were arranged in block-by-block development, forming a residential complex with the necessary courtyard and the service part: retail and storage facilities in the basement.




Figure 3 – dwelling complexes (Zhilkombinaty) no 2 (architect Borisenko): a) second floor plan; b) fragment of the facade, photo (Medykulov, 1953)

Figure 4 clearly illustrates that the residential buildings in the historic districts of modern-day Almaty still preserve elements of the architectural and artistic explorations pursued by architects of the 1930s. These are visible in the ornamental decorations of facades—ceramic panels, uniquely interpreted national motifs, elaborately crafted column capitals and pilasters, cornices, spires, friezes, window surrounds, ceramic inserts, balcony railings, and the artistic-architectural treatment of entrance features found on Seifullin Avenue, Abilaykhan Avenue, Gogol Street, Tole Bi Street, Kunayev Street, Mailin Street, among other prominent thoroughfares.



Figure 4 – Methods for organizing the living environment: a) the spire in the architecture of the Turksib workers' apartment building (architect Il'enko); b) fragment of the facade of the House of Scientists (architect Bobovich); c) arch portal in the architecture of the residential building for specialists of the Kirov Plant (architect Bobovich) (author's material).

5 CONCLUSIONS

The synthesis of arts became a significant means of expressing the style of Soviet architecture, shaping ideology, the city, and even the everyday life and perception of citizens. s. Mainly, the synthesis of arts through the search for regional architecture in Almaty meant the decoration of architectural objects with the help of painting and ornament, but one can note a broader area - the synthesis of architecture and design, where design materialises the cultural measure of history. The main goal of this synthesis of arts in the formation of residential architecture in the city of Almaty is the organisation of a harmonious, people-identical environment of new urban territories, which was reflected in the following approaches:

1. careful organisation of apartments adapted to climatic conditions - ventilation, placement of rooms in the structure of the apartment according to the cardinal points, inclusion of traditional elements of folk architecture - loggias and balconies;
2. integration of housing with the urban environment, for example, through the inclusion of small architectural forms: skillfully ornamented lampposts, fountains, flowerpots (along Kabanbai Batyr Street, Zhandosov Street, etc.), which were an integral part of the composition of the city and the residential environment;
3. thoughtful solutions to issues of creating green spaces, watering of residential areas, and maintaining a visual connection with the unique foothill landscape;
4. extensive use of ornamental compositions in the architecture of a residential building;
5. attempts to create an urban ensemble and urban interiors, creating chamber, protected spaces of residential areas.

Theoretical guidelines and attempts at practical integrated design of the urban living environment, incorporating elements of national heritage through the synthesis of architecture and design, established the humanistic orientation of architecture towards its inhabitants. These became important prerequisites for further research into the organisation of urban dwellings and the creation of a comfortable living environment in Almaty.

REFERENCES

1. **Selivanova, A.N.** (2010). Features of "post-constructivism" (1932-1937) on the example of departmental residential buildings. Architecture of the Stalin era: an experience of historical understanding. [Osobennosti "postkonstruktivizma" (1932-1937) na primere zhilyh vedomstvennyh domov. Arhitektura stalinskoj epohi: opyt istoricheskogo osmysleniya.]. Komkniga: Moscow, Russia. (pp. 112-119) (In Russ.).
2. **Han-Magomedov, S.O.** (2010). "Stalin's Empire": problems, trends of the master. Architecture of the Stalin era: an experience of historical understanding [«Stalinskij ampir»: problemy, techeniya mastera. Arhitektura stalinskoj epohi: opyt istoricheskogo osmysleniya.]. Komkniga: Moscow, Russia. (pp. 10-24) (In Russ.)
3. **Kassymbekova, B.** (2017). Understanding Stalinism in, from and of Central Asia. Central Asian Survey (36 (1)), 1–18. doi: [10.1080/02634937.2016.1228609](https://doi.org/10.1080/02634937.2016.1228609)
4. **Starostenko, Y.** (2021). The Soviet Architecture Key Problems in the Second Half of the 1930s: on Materials of Plenums the Board of the Soviet Architects Union of the USSR. 3rd International Conference on Architecture: Heritage, Traditions and Innovations (AHTI 2021). doi: [10.2991/assehr.k.211125.167](https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211125.167)
5. **Pronina, A.** (2020). Soviet Architecture and its National Faces: Soviet Architecture in Central Asia, 1920s-1930s (Doctoral dissertation, Central European University)
6. **Zhalmagambetov, Y., Tleubayev, S., Assymova, D., Borbassov, S., & Nurmukhan, Y.** (2024). State Construction and the Impact of the Relocation of the Capital City in Soviet Kazakhstan at the Beginning of the 20th Century. Historia i Swiat, 13, 397-412. <https://doi.org/10.34739/his.2024.13.24>
7. **Akhmedova, A.** (2016). Conceptions about the comfortable components of dwellings in Kazakhstan. (pp. 189-197). Vienna: Hofburg. doi: [10.5593/SGEMSOCIAL2016/HB42/S07.024](https://doi.org/10.5593/SGEMSOCIAL2016/HB42/S07.024)
8. **Akhmedova, A. T.** (2020). Interior Design. Almaty: Lantar Trade. [Proyektirovaniye inter'yera]. (In Russ.).
9. **Akhmedova, A., Shotanova, A., & Karatseyeva, T.** (2022). Transformation of the concept of comfort of the residential and urban environment in the modern conditions of the Almaty City. Innovaciencia, 10(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.15649/2346075X.2974>
10. **Glaudinov, B.A., Seidalin, M. G., & Karpykov, A. S.** (1987). Architecture of the Soviet Kazakhstan. Moscow: Sroizdat. [Arhitektura sovetskogo Kazakhstana]. (In Russ.).
11. **Samoilov, K. I.** (2003). Architectural and artistic forms of constructivism in the architecture of Kazakhstan in the 1920s-30s. Bulletin of the Kazakh Leading Academy of Architecture and Civil Engineering 3 (7), 28-32. [Arkhitekturno-khudozhestvennyye formy konstruktivizma v zodchestve Kazakhstana 1920-30-kh godov]. (In Russ.).
12. **Karatseyeva, T.Y., Ilvitskaya, S.V., & Akhmedova, A.T.** (2025). Living environments: from XXth century theory to XXIst century practice. Bulletin of the Kazakh Leading Academy of Architecture and Civil Engineering 95(1), 56-70. doi: [10.51488/1680-080X/2025.1-03](https://doi.org/10.51488/1680-080X/2025.1-03)
13. **Kalashnikov, N.G.** (2010) Post-war low-rise ensembles: an attempt to create an ideal space of the «Stalin style». Architecture of the Stalin era: an experience of historical understanding [Poslevoennye maloetazhnye ansambli: popytka sozdaniya idealnogo prostranstva «stalinskogo stilya». Arhitektura stalinskoj epohi: opyt istoricheskogo osmysleniya.]. Komkniga: Moscow, Russia. (pp.120-130) (In Russ.).
14. **Posocco, P., & Akhmedova, A.** (2020). Kazakhstan. Soviet and contemporary architecture / Kazakhstan. Architettura sovietica e architettura contemporanea. Visioni internazionali, 2, 241-259. DOI: [10.13133/9788893771306](https://doi.org/10.13133/9788893771306)
15. **Soviet architecture prepares for the congress** (1934). Arhitektura SSSR, 10, 1-3. [Sovetskaya arhitektura gotovitsya k s"ezdu]. (In Russ.).
16. **Shchusev, A.** (1935). For first place in the world. Arhitekturnaya gazeta, 4, 1-2. [Za pervoe mesto v mire]. (In Russ.).

17. **Munc, O.** (1940). On the classics and the classical (manuscript) [O klassike i klassicheskom (rukopis)]. Retrieved from: <http://theory.totalarch.com/node/289> (cited: 03.09.2024). (In Russ.).
18. **Marcomini, F.** (2024). Immortalising Yurts? The Temporalities of Nomadic Architecture in Stalinist Central Asia. In *Time and Material Culture*. (pp. 146-163). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003375715>
19. **Meuser P., & Khmelnitsky D.** (2021) The Three Epochs of Soviet Architecture in Central Asia. *Bulletin of IICAS*, 31, 100-120. doi: [10.34920/1694-5794-2021.100-122](https://doi.org/10.34920/1694-5794-2021.100-122)
20. **Samoilov, K.I.** (2005). Characteristic features of the architectural process in Kazakhstan in the first half of the twentieth century. *Bulletin of the Kazakh Leading Academy of Architecture and Civil Engineering* 4 (18). 53-62. [Kharakternyye cherty arkhitekturnogo protsessa v Kazakhstane v pervoy polovine XX veka]. (In Russ.).
21. **Vas'kin, A.A., & Nazarenko, Yu.I.** (2009). Stalin's skyscrapers: from the Palace of Soviets to high-rise buildings. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo «Sputnik+» [Stalinskie neboskreby: ot Dvorca Sovetov k vysoctnym zdaniyam]. (In Russ.).
22. **Bachynska, L.** (2021). Synthesis of Arts in Soviet Architecture: stages of development, main directions, causes of their occurrence. *Transfer of Innovative Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.32347/tit2021.42.0102>
23. **Antonov, P.P.** (1936) Closer to the working public *Stroitel'stvo Moskvy*, 1, 17-18. [Blizhe k rabochej obshchestvennosti]. (In Russ.).
24. **Lazarev, V.N.** (1937). Debate on the reports [Preniya po dokladam]. *Problemy arhitektury*. *Sbornik materialov*, 2 (1), 20-21. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Vsesoyuznoj akademii arhitektury, (In Russ.).
25. **Fomin, I.A.** (1933). On the collaboration of an architect with a sculptor and a painter [O sotrudnichestve arhitekтора so skul'ptorom i zhivopiscem]. *Arhitektura SSSR*, 31-33 pp. (In Russ.).
26. **Vesnina, A.A.** (1933). Creative discussion. Creative paths of Soviet architecture and the problem of architectural heritage [Tvorcheskaya diskussiya. Tvorcheskie puti sovetskoj arhitektury i problema arkhitekturnogo nasledstva]. *Arhitektura SSSR*, 14-15. (In Russ.).
27. **Ginzburg, M.Ya, Vesnin, V.A., & Vesnin, A.A.** (1934). Problems of modern architecture. *Arhitektura SSSR*, 3-4, 63-69. [Problemy sovremennoj arhitektury]. (In Russ.).
28. **Ginzburg, M.Ya.** (1933). Creative discussion. Creative paths of Soviet architecture and the problem of architectural heritage. *Arhitektura SSSR*, 3-4, 14. [Tvorcheskaya diskussiya. Tvorcheskie puti sovetskoj arhitektury i problema arkhitekturnogo nasledstva]. (In Russ.).
29. **Shchusev, A.** (1937). Tasks of Soviet architecture. Report by A.V. Shchusev at the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Architects. *Pravda*. Title page [file extension when necessary]. Retrieved from: <https://theory.totalarch.com/node/390>. [Zadachi sovetskoj arhitektury. Doklad A.V. Shchuseva na Pervom Vsesoyuznom s"ezde Sovetskikh arhitektorov]. (In Russ.).
30. **Glaudinova, M. B., Glaudinov, B., Galimzhanova, A. S., Amandykova, D. A., Samoilov, K. I., & Priemets, O. N.** (2019) History of kazakhstan architecture. Almaty.
31. **Shkvarikov, V.A.** (1941). Results of the competition for the best residential building. *Stroitel'stvo Moskvy*, 1, 3-10. [Itogi konkursa na luchshij zhiloy dom]. (In Russ.).
32. **Samoilov, K. I.** (2002). The theme of Central Asian classics in the architecture of Kazakhstan in the 1920s. *Bulletin of the Kazakh Leading Academy of Architecture and Civil Engineering* 5, 12-16. [Tema tsentral'no-aziatskoy klassiki v arkhitekture Kazakhstana 1920-kh godov]. (In Russ.).
33. **Kolotkov, S.M.** (1935). On national architecture. *Izvestiya Sredneaziatskogo industrial'nogo instituta*. *Seriya "Arhitektura"*, 1, 7-8, 10. [O nacionalnoj arhitekture]. (In Russ.).
34. **Samoilov, K. I.** (2004). Architecture of Kazakhstan of the twentieth century (Development of architectural and artistic forms). Moscow-Almaty: MArI-design. [Arkhitektura Kazakhstana XX veka (Razvitiye arkhitekturno-khudozhestvennykh form)]. ISBN 9965-576-17-3. (In Russ.).

35. **Kalmykov, V.** (1934). Architectural and planning structure of old cities of Central Asia. *Planirovka i stroitel'stvo gorodov*, 4, 13-21. [Arhitekturno-planirovochnaya struktura staryh gorodov Srednej Azii]. (In Russ.).
36. **Housing architecture issues.** Third plenum of the organizing committee of the union of Soviet architects in the USSR (1936). Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Vsesoyuznoj Akademii Arhitektury. [Voprosy zhilishchnoj arhitektury. Tretij plenum orgkomiteta soyuza sovetских arhitektorov v SSSR.], 130. (In Russ.).
37. **Baragin, D.D., & Belocerkovskij, I.I.** (1950). Alma-Ata. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo arhitektury i gradostroitel'stva. [Alma-Ata]. (In Russ.).
38. **Mendikulov, M.M.** (1953). Experience of working on national form in the architecture of Alma-Ata. *Sovetskaya arhitektura*, 5, 101-110. [Opyt raboty nad nacionalnoj formoj v arhitekture Alma-Aty]. (In Russ.).
39. **Margulan, A. Kh., Basenov, T. K., & Mendikulov M. M.** (1959). On the characteristics of the architecture of Kazakhstan in the 19th and early 20th centuries. *Architecture of Kazakhstan* (pp. 116-147). Alma-Ata: Kazgosizdat [Architecture of Kazakhstan]. (In Russ.).
40. **Murzabayeva, K., Lapshina, E., & Tuyakayeva, A.** (2022). Modernization of the Living Environment Space Using the Example of an Urban Array of Residential Buildings from the Soviet Period in Almaty. *Buildings*, 12(7), 1042. doi: [10.3390/buildings12071042](https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings12071042)
41. **Pakina A. & Batkalova A.** (2018). The green space as a driver of sustainability in Post-Socialist urban areas: the case of Almaty City (Kazakhstan). *Belgeo* [Online], 4. <https://doi.org/10.4000/belgeo.28865>
42. **Simonov, G.** (1936). Architecture of a residential building. *Arhitektura SSSR*, 7, 1. [Arhitektura zhilogo doma]. (In Russ.).
43. **Hmel'nickij, D.** (2006). Stalin's Architecture. Psychology and Style. Moscow: Progress-Tradiciya. [Arhitektura Stalina. Psihologiya i stil]. (In Russ.).
44. **Nussipkozhaeva A.R.K.** (2020). Reconstruction of architectural monuments of Almaty city. *Nauka i obrazovanie segodnya*, (2 (49)), 89-92. [cited August 14, 2024]. URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/reconstruction-of-architectural-monuments-of-almaty-city>. (In Russ.).
45. **Karpykov, A.S., & Kakorin, V.D.** (1980). Architecture of the building of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR. On the problem of national form in the architecture of Soviet Kazakhstan in the 1940-50s. *Architecture, building structures and interior equipment of buildings and structures*. [Arhitektura zdaniya Akademii nauk KazSSR. K probleme nacional'noj formy v arhitekture Sovetskogo Kazahstana 1940-50-h gg. Arhitektura, stroitel'noj konstrukcii i inter'ernoje oborudovanie zdaniy i sooruzhenij]. KazPTI: Alma-Ata, Kazahstan (pp. 6-7). (In Russ.).
46. **Medykulov, M.M.** (1953). Architecture of Alma-Ata. Alma-Ata: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk Kazahskoj SSR. [Arhitektura goroda Alma-Aty]. (In Russ.).
47. **Abdrassilova, G. & Aukhadiyeva, L.M.** (2025). Architecture as a determinant in shaping the identity of a city: A case study of Almaty. *Urbani Izziv* 36(1), 85-99. <https://doi.org/10.5379/urbani-izziv-en-2025-36-01-01>
48. **Basenov, T.K.** (1951). Architecture of the Kazakh SSR. Architecture of the Central Asian republics: collection of articles. [Arhitektura Kazahskoj SSR. Arhitektura respublik Srednej Azii: sbornik statej]. Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo arhitektury i gradostroitel'stva: Moscow: Russia (pp. 73- 85). (In Russ.).
49. **Sarzhanov N. & Schurch T.** (2023). Rethinking soviet era mass housing in Kazakhstan. *Spatium*, 49, 42-50. <https://doi.org/10.2298/SPAT221002001S>
50. **Fomin, I.A.** (1933). Creative discussion. Creative paths of Soviet architecture and the problem of architectural heritage. *Arhitektura SSSR*, 3-4, 15-16. [Tvorcheskaya diskussiya. Tvorcheskie puti sovetskoj arhitektury i problema arhitekturnogo nasledstva]. (In Russ.).

51. **Alexander, C.** (2020). Rationality and Contingency: Rhetoric, Practice and Legitimation in Almaty, Kazakhstan. *Anthropology and science*, (pp. 58-74). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003135524>
52. **Ahmedova, A.T.** (2009). Spatial organization of the architectural environment of modern urban housing in the south-east of Kazakhstan: dissertation. Almaty, Kazakhstan [Prostranstvennaya organizaciya arhitekturnoj sredy sovremennogo gorodskogo zhilishcha yugo-vostoka Kazahstana: disertaciya]. (In Russ.).