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Our visual environment consists of natural and anthropogenic landscape. In the areas of a large population concentration architectural elements grow and strongly affect the natural landscape. Residential housing is one of the key elements changing the environment. Depending on architectural typology the buildings may obstruct weaker or stronger, or even destroy the natural landscape. Lithuania is irrelevant to high-rise building architecture which is inherent in the population centres of big countries. China, Japan and the United States try to build high-rise buildings. In Lithuania low-rise buildings dominate, and for this reason there is quite active and chaotic expansion of urban areas into the ones suitable for farming. At the same time this process changes the historically established Lithuanian rural landscape architecture.

This article examines the data on current and projected urbanization which is formed by the detailed planning projects. Architectural features that are typical of villages and their being affected by a new urbanization wave coming from the city of Klaipėda are discussed. Recreational areas in the redesigned residential quarters are presented as a matter of urgency.
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1. Introduction

It is not the first decade when Lithuanian natural landscape is influenced by metropolitan economic, cultural changes and the globalisation process. The current European Union (hereinafter - EU) policy is directed toward revitalisation and development of rural economy and terrain identity. Revival of rural areas is understood as an ability to preserve both cultural heritage of the country and its settled landscape architecture.

Natural landscape is the landscape emerging due to natural processes which play a major part in its development, while human activities have a minimum impact (preserve relatively natural forests, swamps, ponds).

Rural (anthropogenic, agrarian) landscape is that which is formed by the interactions of natural processes and human activities with preserved main natural structural features (land property, extensively built-up villages). Urban (anthropogenic, urbanised) landscape is changed, developed and maintained by human activities (cities, towns, densely built-up villages and large complex engineering territories).

Cultural landscape (both rural and urban) is a result of positive human and environmental sustainable coexistence. It is purposefully shaped satisfying biological, psychological (informative, aesthetic), social, ergonomic, economic living, working and recreation environmental quality needs (Lietuvos ..., 2004).

All over the world the traditional rural landscape has been a major local visual culture phenomenon, a reflection of different weather conditions and specific human activity. The landscape has displayed the balance between natural and man-made things, which was frequently very dynamic, but never clashing. For a long period of time, rural community was a landscape architect. Its creative work was full of individuality and authenticity. A distinctive local identity was formed in the natural environment, the
latter determining physical and aesthetic qualities of cultural monuments, buildings and artifacts.

Architecture is the language of forms, while traditional architecture is like a local dialect. In order to preserve the local identity, architectural forms are to be expressed in the language understood by the local people, i.e. in their normal configuration, materials and colours. Obviously, it is not easy to create comfortable buildings adapted to the present and future by following old traditions and yesterday’s forms. Today there is a much wider choice of means which lead to a temptation to insert neologisms to an ordinary dictionary, thus sometimes making the architectural language incomprehensible and strange to the environment (R. Bertašiūtė 2012).

Preservation of the local architecture identity requires proper management of its heritage objects. Neglected, in time unkept, ancient, culturally significant structures will entirely disappear from the landscape. Whereas, these objects can be used in densely built-up and abandoned areas to revive and reanimate it.

The aim of the article is to analyse the prospects of building-up Seniunija parish, having in mind that it is affected by the expansion of Klaipėda city, and to present the conclusions of the way of changing the natural rural landscape, and to render suggestions of its preservation for future residents.

The methods used are: analysis of the literature concerning the subject, analysis of the data of the State National Land Service and the Centre of Registers, analysis of aerophotography and photofixation and their intercomparison, analysis of a special plan exposing its basic and strategic solutions.

2. Historical architectural features of the landscape

Klaipėda region is rich in historical events which have influenced financial options of the population of the area, and according to these possibilities and the action mode the landscape was formed.

The core of the estate homesteads did not distinguish themselves by their size, more expressive planning decisions, etc. This is related to historical and geographical circumstances, declared provisions of Lutheranism (Prussian official public confession) - moderate primate of activity, and the above mentioned economic-financial control. Therefore, the estates of that region were not luxurious, there were no huge parks with a system of ponds, no palaces, no homestead entertainment elements created for representation. Even in larger estate farms the economic - productive part was prevailing and it occupied compositionally and potentially significant areas. The estates of that region were less associated with nobility, with existence of noble relatives (M. Purvinas).

This region is characterised by red-brick architecture, sloping roofs and relatively large-scale structures (Figs 1-2).

After 1990 the fate of old villages was severe due to the material well-being biased influence all over Lithuania.

Within a short period of liquidation of the Soviet agricultural system familiar to farmers, after restoration of proprietors, many things were suddenly changing in Lithuania, and villages were hit by the turmoil which responded to both people and rural architectural heritage. During the period of uncertainty and demolition, there suffered a great number of old buildings (such as, during the Soviet regime abandoned estate mansions or palaces turned into farms). Hasty privatisation, the pursuit of quick profit also devastated rural architectural heritage (for example, the old buildings were acquired only for demolition – making profit from their building materials) (M. Purvinas).

During the expansion of residential areas over the agrarian fields, it is noticed that the cultural heritage was also devastated. Nowadays, old architectural structures typical of a certain rural landscape have turned into neglected and vanishing structures, while they could be used as recreational attraction points.

In the article on the assessment of conditions of architectural heritage complexes and prediction of changes A. Mlinkauskiene says that having assessed the qualitative changes in architectural heritage it has been found that in a recent period the cultural value of architectural heritage (former mansions and estate homesteads, old villages, settlements or village homesteads, individual residential and farm buildings) has worsened. The latter objects have lost their
architectural significance and are in danger to disappear. Most physical changes are found in buildings, structures, appurtenances and small architectural objects. Architectural heritage changes in heritage objects are related not only to their physical conditions, but also to the variation of their valuable qualities: authenticity, significance and aesthetic appeal (A. Mlinkauskiene 2011).

In his paper J. Jasaitis discusses the same problem of rural development and its complexity. He says that the research of that problem has revealed that only a negligible part of resources is used for relaxation and rehabilitation, there is a lack of a more modern approach to the educational value of rural objects, to the ideas of their application. In some cases, even in resort towns the abandoned former boarding departmental rest-homes are still standing. In many villages administrative buildings, side by side with farm structures, are either collapsing without any owners or are left unfinished. Highly valuable estate ensembles are uselessly standing (J. Jasaitis 2006).

In Western Europe, in the 1970s, ecomuseums, as a last “residential” museum manifestation, began to settle in which were focusing on the exposition of the industrial and agrarian past. In an eco-museum concept a particular emphasis is placed on man and the environment, it combines ecological problems and regional ethnography. The literature describes ecomuseums as “museums without any visitors, but with residents”, “eco-museums do not protect collections, they do not intend to turn into mass tourism objects. Their aim is to transfer a certain memorial area”, “eco-museums are not traditional museums. They are museums in time and space, which take care of preservation of a particular territory and identity of the community living there”. Although the first ecomuseums have been developed for exhibition of traditional rural lifestyle and industrial heritage and for revival of the original or nearly original environment, the seemingly contradictory “living museum” idea can be used to find solutions of the conflicts encountered in the urban and rural environment joint preserving and maintaining viable rural environment “islands” in the urban environment (I. Vilneniškė 2012).

3. Urban expansion

From the very beginning, when clustering to camps, communities and villages, people looked for their alter ego. With the growth of communities the populated areas expanded. Today, the population influx to suburban areas is observed. There is a strong possibility that like-minded people come together when looking for the living environment away from the city noise, pollution, when looking for a cheaper cost of living, greater leisure time in nature, etc.

Data of the Centre of Registers show that Klaipėda city has an impact on the nearly situated Sendvaris parish, and the planned territories to be built-up in this neighborhood can be predicted according by the approved detailed planning plans which change both the purpose of the main land application and the determined land use regimes (Figure 3). Doubtless, these changes of administrative purposes shall be based on the general plan for the area which includes the intended (permissible) housing of this area.

![Projected urbanized area in Sendvaris parish](image1.png)

**Fig. 3.** Projected urbanized area in Sendvaris parish
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**Fig. 4.** Population density per hectare in respective village

According to the 2011 census, in Lithuania the most populated parishes of the district
were Priekulė, Sendvaris and Dovilai (Table 1). According to these data the most densely populated parish is Seniunija.

Comparing the 1989 and 2011 census data, during this 22-year period the greatest population growth occurred in Priekulė, Sendvaris and Dovilai parishes. Veiviržėnai and Endriejavas parishes have suffered the biggest population losses.

Table 1. Population in Klaipėda district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Klaipėda district parishes</th>
<th>Population in 100 hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agluonėnai</td>
<td>1204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauparai-Kvietiniai</td>
<td>2546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dovilai</td>
<td>3460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endriejavas</td>
<td>2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judrėnai</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kretingalė</td>
<td>3399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priekulė</td>
<td>3651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sendvaris</td>
<td>2351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veiviržėnai</td>
<td>3455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vėžaičiai</td>
<td>4368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Statistics

In the analysed parish there are registered 22 villages (Table 2). Among them Jakai, Ginduliai and Aukštkiemiai were most densely populated in 2011. Calculating the population density in villages per 100 hectares Ginduliai takes the first place (340 persons per 100 hectares), then goes Klemiškės I (290), Purmaliai (240) (Figure 4). Looking at the map it is evident that these villages are close to the main Klaipėda-Liepaja road, therefore from these suburban areas there is a convenient access to any part of the city of Klaipėda. Convenient communication is one of the main criteria creating a more attractive place of residence.

Table 2. Population in Sendvaris parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages of Sendvaris parish</th>
<th>Settlements according to category type</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage change in population over the last 10 years</th>
<th>Population in 100 hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aukštkiemiai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>118 - 118 471 +299</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baukštininkai</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>124 116 - 6 27 +285</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budrikai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24 - 157 +554</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirvupiai</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginduliai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>480 791 +64</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaudėnai</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 27 +285</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gvildžiai</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14 30 +114</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>603 921 +52</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalmuvenai</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>135 102 - 24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klausmyliai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11 0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klemiškė I</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>123 114 - 7</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klemiškė II</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76 154 +102</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klipšiai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65 109 +67</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leilai</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47 202 +327</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinai</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17 41 +141</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazūriškių</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>200 370 +58</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purmaliai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94 316 +236</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radaulai</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53 201 +279</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleniai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48 327 +581</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudmantai</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>213 201 - 5</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truskaię</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>84 300 +257</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zemgrindžia</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>79 72 - 8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Statistics

Residential areas, forming the rural landscape according to their size and other attributes, can be divided into 7 categories.

These are:
A. Suburban settlements - they are a continuation of metropolitan urban areas to the city or they can be linked by common communication lines;
B. Small towns - including villages with over than 500 people;
C. Compact large villages with 301-500 people;
D. Compact medium-sized villages with 101-300 people;
E. Compact small villages with 51-100 people;
F. One-street villages are the villages with preserved farmstead layout structure, characterized by the sixteenth-twentieth century – the period before distribution to rural homesteads;

G. Farmstead villages (P. Aleknavičius 2011).

D. Vidickienė in her research paper on evaluation of an appeal of Lithuanian rural areas as a place of residence analyses the factors, that most affect the people, and they prefer to live in the country. After reviewing the results, she claims that rural areas are more attractive to live in Lithuania due to the following factors:
- Age structure of the population. The regions having more employable people are attractive
- Employment and poverty of population. The regions populated by more income support receivers, this being related to the long-term unemployment and low income, are unattractive.
- Recreational resources. Woodlands are attractive.
- Road quality. Attractiveness of the area depends on the developed road network which enables people to work in remote areas of the central parts of the municipality, as well as to make use of public services.
- The majority of operating industry and services. Municipal activities in agriculture reduce attractiveness of a village as a residence (D. Vidickienė 2008).

However, attractiveness of suburban territories is influenced by the factors such as valuable development of infrastructure, proximity to the city centre or workplace, solutions of developed detailed plans or possibility to change the main purpose of land use (P. Aleknavičius 2011). The criteria are similar, but a rural area resident focuses on local residence, while a suburban area resident looks for a stronger potential link with a much larger nearby city.

By means of detailed territory planning plans both the basic use purpose of individual land lots and the planned residential quarters are changed. Unfortunately, these quarters are chaotically scattered all over the territory, regardless of the landscape being developed and without projecting the place for public (recreational) spaces. Land lots are usually formed of 6-10 acres and a big distance between some small residential quarters occurs (Figures 4-7). This trait prevents to build a centralized infrastructure because it makes a significant financial burden.

Reviewing the houses built in some residential quarters, monotony and rhythmics of identical structures are observed (Figures 8-9). When these alike quarters are recurrent next to each other, and continuity is felt, then poorness of the landscape comes out. Therefore, some running residential quarters with uniform structures should not be developed.

Another commonly observed feature is fenced territories (residential domains). The entire streets framed by wooden fences are seen in Figure 10 (photograph). Fences are moved away from the roadway, besides, a similar fence colour is in each side of the street.
Stark contrast is visible in Figure 11. The residents of the street barred themselves in by fences up to driveways without any possibilities for future development, such as for high quality lighting, or for walkways. In this street the fence colour mismatch is seen which creates variegation and does not provide an architectural aesthetic view. Inferior construction fences and building materials downgrade aesthetical buildings standing nearby.

All newly designed residential quarters do not offer any public spaces. Houses are being built one next to the other, obtaining narrow streets framed by wooden fences without leaving any chances for setting up a green zone. Therefore, green recreation areas (green zones, water bodies or wooded parks) are required among these quarters. Big cities suffer from destruction of public spaces and greenery. For this reason, the ways of solving this problem have to be foreseen for a newly emerging environment, while the natural landscape is to be left intact or minimally touched because it provides recreation to the residents of that area.
4. Analysis of special plan

In order to solve the urban chaos in populated areas and to provide an infrastructure perspective trying to deal with other important issues arising when setting up new settlements, on September 27, 2007 Klaipėda district council approved a special plan covering Slengiai, Mazūriškių, Trušelių, Gindulių villages and their surrounding areas, communicational corridors and engineering infrastructure (hereinafter - Special Plan).

In a special plan the selected technical parameters of the streets will ensure the road capacity and traffic safety. These standards and fixed red lines of the streets will enable development of the engineering infrastructure and its operation. It will be more difficult in previously planned and built-up parts, because in some places the streets regulatory red lines will not be implemented. Therefore, it is proposed to locate them by reducing technical parameters when developing technical (construction) projects of engineering networks by adjusting the solutions of approved and planning documents registered in the Register, determining the routes of engineering network (dominant object) and servitudes for land plots (serving thing), preparing the compensatory measures to protect population from vehicle noise and pollution.

On the basis of the existing local road network, a special plan forms the planned site structure like a radiation-driven circular system. The plan highlights the radial street connections towards Klaipėda direction and a semi-circular streets for internal communications. A semi-circular network of streets will make a residential area street network fairly complete and optimal even in the intermediate stages of development. A free network of streets (backstreets) is formed in separate quarter territories bounded by the main serving streets or natural boundaries. The mandatory technical parameters of the streets have to be determined by the detailed plans of land plots. Their development, in essence, will include the required access to the construction sites, to engineering networks, utilities and facilities. Cul-de-sacs can not be longer than 200 meters.

Providing for the construction of the shared service and trade objects which attract heavy traffic, one of the primary issues of the place is car parking and long-term parking. All car parks are set up within the formed plots, no car parking on the streets.

During the urbanisation process the street network (communication corridors) will limit individual residential units which, according to village administrative boundary changes, will form 15 residential units (districts / towns) with 44 residential quarters. Shopping centers are planned of the universal nature. Service objects are recommended to be built close to the main and serving street network.

Reserved territory communication corridors, communications, engineering infrastructure and other public objects need to have preliminary areas:

- transport communications:
  - engineering infrastructure development corridor area of 277.00 hectares;
  - state and regional multi-lane area of 88.00 ha;
  - overall length of the main, serving and auxiliary streets of 85,130 kilometers;
- territory areas for public spaces, social, educational, cultural, sports and other objects calculated for the planned 35,500 population by 2020 will need:
  - 8.25 hectares for 11 kindergartens (240 persons each);
  - 15.00 hectares for 5 schools (600 persons each);
  - 2.30 hectares for a boarding school (300 persons);
  - 1.20 hectare for a firehouse;
  - 1.43 hectare for a market;
- commercial objects territory of 102.00 hectares.

Comparative standard size of planted areas has to be no less than 25 % of the projected territory including sanitary green plantation (at least 12 square meters of planted common area per capita are behind the households, excluding school, pre-school, specialised agencies and other limited territories).

The planned area has neither central water supply nor sewage collection, therefore the Municipality needs to prepare investment projects, to collect private funds and to begin the construction of networks that in the nearest future people could use the city water supply and the sewage disposal system.

The Municipality is proposed to make a perspective transport and noise pollution map with a view of avoiding an impact on population health, and preparing a special plan of sanitary protection zones of all existing roads in the planned territory.

In Klaipėda district, in the Sendvaris parish there are several historically valuable historical localities and monuments, namely:
- mound.of Ekete;
- former manor of Klemishke;
- graveyards in Aukštkiemių, Laukžemių Slengiai, Klemiskės, Gvildžiai Lėfiai;
- ancient defensive fortifications in Jakai, Mozuriskis, Sudmantai.

In most cases the intended solutions have no impact on the cultural heritage objects, except manor buildings of Lankishkiai which are near the planned residential district. The planned engineering infrastructure solutions for water management facilities do not also have any significant impact except an electricity substation near the Slengiai pond, which should be farther from the latter (Klaipėdos 2007).

5. Conclusions

1. Sendvaris parish is urbanised comparatively in a fast pace, its population is also significantly growing (in 20 years 2682 new residents have settled). However, the urbanisation process is
carried out in a chaotic and monotonous way. To plan and to predict the trends of the process the Sendvaris Municipality has prepared a special plan which contains forward-looking solutions. The functional zoning, approximate distribution of the objects and copriddors of the network are indicated. In future, when preparing the territory planning documents it is suggested to represent the solutions by a spatial or 3D concept.

2. Developers of a special plan perceive that a fast preparation of technical plans is a must, because by means of them a valuable centralised infrastructure will be built, as previously prepared detailed plans do not meet some of the proposed requirements. Such uneven and nonengineering judgment and reckless building density destroy fertile areas suitable for growing the agricultural production. It is recommended to prepare the planning documents strictly in relation to the requirements of the rural development project.

3. Klaipėda region was not typical of richness of mansions and estates construction as more attention was diverted to agricultural performance, whereas today this feature of the new housing estates is put aside. Only some farms have reserved some land for a garden and hothouse while greater attention is turned to minor architecture in a land plot i.e. lighting, rock-garden, decorative tree planting, etc. It is noticeable that the red (reddish, brown) colour endures in the components of building materials and pitched roofs.

4. Aesthetic appeal is declining due to monotony in residential quarters. Recreational zones should be distinguished for which the forgotten cultural heritage objects, water reservoirs, forests could be used.

5. It is difficult to identify a specialist who will be able to provide what will be aesthetically and culturally valuable after 100 years. During this period, the surrounding environment is created by blindly relying on artistic professionals, and it may result in the chaos due to different awareness of values and environment among the professionals. Planning policy must have a stricter impact on engineering solutions, in which landscaping professionals should participate.
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